



# **K-12 SCHOOL FUNDING EQUALIZATION: FORMULA REVENUE DISTRIBUTION TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND EDUCATION SERVICE DISTRICTS**

**RESEARCH REPORT # 5-24  
August 2024**

**Legislative Revenue Office**

900 Court St NE Rm 160

Salem, Oregon 97301

(503) 986-1266

<https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/lro>



August 2024

# Legislative Revenue Office

160 State Capitol Building, Salem, Oregon 97301 | 503.986.1266

## Table of Contents

<b>Table of Contents</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Background</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Financial Concepts</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>School District Equity</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>K-12 School Equalization Formula</b> .....	<b>7</b>
General Purpose Grant .....	8
Transportation Grant .....	10
High Cost Disabilities Grant.....	11
Equalization Formula Summary .....	12
<b>Education Service District Equity</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>ESD Equalization</b> .....	<b>14</b>
General Services Grant in Principle.....	14
General Services Grant for an ESD.....	15
<b>APPENDIX 1</b> .....	<b>17</b>
Other State School fund allocations .....	17
Other State Funds for Schools .....	18
<b>APPENDIX 2</b> .....	<b>19</b>
Related Research Reports by the Legislative Revenue Office .....	19

## Background

The Oregon Constitution declares that the Legislative Assembly shall provide for the establishment of a uniform and general system of Common schools. The Constitution also directs the Legislative Assembly to appropriate in each biennium a sum of money sufficient to ensure that the state's system of public education meets quality goals established by law. This report describes Oregon's school finance system

for the distribution of State School Fund dollars to K-12 school districts (SDs) and Education Service Districts (ESDs).

The operating revenue of K-12 public education in Oregon has been primarily funded through a combination of state and local resources.<sup>1</sup> The relative shares between state and local revenue resources have shifted over time, primarily in response to structural changes to the state's property tax system. In fact, the school finance system distributes combined revenue, commonly known as the "formula revenue", from both the state and statutorily defined local revenues. This report first describes the principles used to define financial equity for school districts and their implementation in the K-12 equalization formula. The report also describes the rationale for the financial equity of ESDs and the method of ESD equalization.

Prior to the 1990s, Oregon schools were funded primarily through local property taxes. Taxpayer concerns about the level of property taxes ultimately resulted in two significant structural changes from citizen initiatives during the 1990s. Voters approved Measure 5 in 1990 and Measure 50 in 1997. These two measures drastically changed Oregon's school finance system by limiting all property taxes, but particularly so for SDs and ESDs. They result was a substantial shift in funding source from local property taxes to the state general fund.

Measure 5 reduced property taxes and required the Legislature to increase state funding to replace the lost revenue during the 5-year tax limit phase-in. The increase in state funding coupled with the reduction in local revenue effectively moved the primary funding responsibility from local governments to the state. The 1991 legislature also adopted a K-12 funding equalization formula and began providing state funds to ESDs to make up a share of property tax losses. By the end of the 5-year tax limit phase-in, the state had become the primary funding source for the K-12 school system and the implementation of the equalization virtually eliminated local control over school funding.

Measure 50 during the 1997 Legislative Session continued the shift to state funding<sup>2</sup>. Measure 50 added another property tax limitation more restrictive than Measure 5. Consequently, the 1997 Legislature ended up raising the level of state funding even higher and further modified constraints to the school equalization formula.

State funding, which had been less than 30% of total available formula revenue prior to 1990-91, increased to about 70% in 1999-2000. State funding currently stands at 66.5% for the 2023-25 school years. Beginning in 2011-12, the K-12 school share of this state and local formula revenue has been 95.5% and the ESD share 4.5%.

## Financial Concepts

Before getting into the technical details, there are certain key concepts that are essential to understanding when working on policies related to school fund and equalization. Foremost among these concepts are the State School Fund and Local Revenues.

---

<sup>1</sup> Federal resources account for roughly 10% of total operating revenue.

<sup>2</sup> In 1996 voters passed Measure 47, dramatically changing the property tax system. However, the measure could not be implemented as written, so the Legislature crafted Measure 50 adhering to the spirit and intent of M47.

## State School Fund

The Legislature appropriates money to the State School Fund (SSF) primarily from the state General Fund. Thanks to Measure 91 in 2014, SSF added one more source of the fund - Marijuana taxes. Most recently, the 2019 legislature created a Corporate Activity Tax and added some of its revenue as a source of the SSF; these are the funds from the Fund for Student Success. While not occurring during the 2023-25 biennium, a transfer of funds from the Education Stability Fund in times of economic crisis can be a significant part of the SSF. The table to the right shows these sources of funds for the 2023-25 biennium.

(\$ millions)	Biennium 2023-25
<b>State School Fund</b>	<b>\$10,200.0</b>
From General Fund	\$8,810.2
From Fund for Student Success	\$702.0
From Lottery Revenues	\$646.5
From Marijuana Taxes	\$40.8
From Miscellaneous Receipts	\$0.6

## Local Revenues

The phrase “local revenue” refers to dollars that are part of the equalization process. Conceptually, they are combined with SSF dollars as the primary input into the school equalization formula. The chart to the right lists the sources of local revenue that are offset against a district's equalization formula revenue. The term is something of a misnomer in that not each of these revenue sources is actually collected at the local level. They are, however, directed to specific parts of the state.

<b>LOCAL REVENUES</b>
Operating property taxes collected
Common School Fund
County School Fund
State managed county trust forest revenues
ESD shared revenues
Supplantable federal funds
Payments in-lieu of property taxes
Local option taxes above limit

Permanent-rate-based operating property taxes are about 95% of these local revenues. Property taxes collected include taxes paid in the current year for any prior year delinquent taxes and interest.<sup>3</sup>

A portion of the earnings to the Common School Fund (CSF) revenue is the portion of the Fund's earnings are distributed to school districts. CSF is a constitutional state fund for schools. The County School Fund is a statutory fund with various revenue sources. State Managed County Trust Forest Revenue comes from former county timberland (mostly in Tillamook and Clatsop counties) managed by the state.<sup>4</sup> ESD Shared Revenue is excess local ESD revenue, above the ESD share of the total formula revenue, shared directly with school districts an ESD is serving (called component school districts). Generally, federal law prohibits states from using federal funds to offset state aid. That said, local revenue includes limited supplantable federal funds. Payments in-lieu of property taxes are also part of local revenue. Local option property

<sup>3</sup> HB 2009 (2023) imposes on a property-tax-exempt enterprise zone business, a school support fee equal to 15-30 percent of the property taxes that would have been due without the exemption. This fee will be a local revenue for purposes of formula revenue distribution. The first collection of such fees won't start until the 2027-27 school years.

<sup>4</sup> In November 2019, a Linn County Circuit Court jury ruled that the state of Oregon breached its contract with certain timber counties by failing to generate enough revenue through logging on state managed forestlands. The jury awarded \$1.06 billion to thirteen counties. The state appealed the Linn County jury's verdict, and in April 2022, the Oregon Court of Appeals overturned the Circuit Court ruling, concluding that securing the greatest permanent value of those lands to the state did not necessarily mean generating maximum logging revenue for the affected counties, and the state could secure value by providing space for recreation, water quality control and wildlife. The Oregon Supreme Court let the appeals court ruling stand by declining to hear the case later in the year.

taxes over the statutory cap become part of local revenue too.

Local revenue sources included in the total formula revenue were traditional sources of school funding. They were also mandatory payments to school districts. Inherent in the goal of equalization, the policy decision was to share the benefits of these mandatory payments statewide. To balance equalization with local control, other sources of local funds, such as school fees and public or private contributions, were not included.

### Formula Revenue

Slightly less than 1% of the State School Fund is dedicated to special allocations identified in law<sup>5</sup>; the remaining State School Fund is combined with Local Revenue to establish what is commonly known as the "formula revenue" for equalization purposes. Of this formula revenue, school districts receive 95.5% and education service districts receive 4.5%.

<b>Formula Revenue</b> available for distribution	=	<b>School Districts</b> 95.5%	+	<b>Education Service Districts</b> 4.5%
--	---	----------------------------------	---	--

## School District Equity

The 1991 Legislature created a new measure of financial equity for school districts. What were acceptable differences in funding per student prior to 1991 were deemed unacceptable following the passage of Measure 5. A new measure of fairness was implemented. It was influenced by the outcomes of school finance court cases at the time.<sup>6</sup>

Equity as a measure of fairness does not necessarily mean that all school districts get the same funding per student. School districts face different problems and costs that may justify different funding levels. Thus, defining equity is, to some extent, a matter of policy about which reasonable people can disagree.

The measure of equity is reflected in the K-12 school equalization formula. The basic structure of this formula has not changed since the initial adoption in 1991. The formula is a statutory definition of fairness applied to the financial needs of school districts. Using school district data, the K-12 formula determines an equalization funding level for each district. This funding level is each school district's share of available state dollars (i.e., from the State School Fund) and local revenue. Starting with the amount of local revenue in each school district, State School Fund dollars are added, in varying amounts, to each district such that funding across all districts is equal, after accounting for differences in statutorily defined cost factors.

### Equity Principles

The measure of equity adopted by the legislature is essentially equal financial resources per student for

---

<sup>5</sup> These special allocations are often referred to as carve-outs. These allocations flow to statutorily specified programs, independently of the formula. They are discussed later in the section entitled "OTHER STATE SCHOOL FUND ALLOCATIONS." (See Appendix 1.)

<sup>6</sup> In 1991, in *Coalition for Equitable School Funding, Inc. v. State*, the plaintiffs challenged then-current state education finance system on equity grounds. There was also a prior challenge to the system on equity (*Olson vs State, 1976*) but the Oregon Supreme Court concluded that the school finance system was not necessarily desirable but, nonetheless, was not violating either the equal protection or education clauses of the Oregon Constitution.

similar groups of students. This was the primary measure of equity used in school finance in 1991. Funding equity per student may generally provide for similar educational programs and opportunities. However, funding equity does not necessarily result in equal educational outcomes or achievement levels.

The logic of funding equity is that differences in revenue resources among school districts must be justified in a rational manner. Now that the state is the primary source of K-12 education funding, the goal is to either justify or eliminate the variations in resources among districts.

To accomplish this goal, the following four principles guided the development of the new formula:

- Share all school funding sources statewide.  
Method: Combine and allocate all state and local general operating revenue.
- Let school districts decide how to spend their allocation.  
Method: Distribute state aid in lump sum, not in categorical grants.
- Allow funding differences only for uncontrollable cost differences.  
Method: Justify revenue differences in a rational manner.
- Avoid incentives for school districts to artificially increase their allocation.  
Method: Minimize number of classifications and set limits.

In short, every district should get the same amount per student, adjusted only for unavoidable differences in costs. Implementing these principles provides the following general formula for equity:

Under this simplified formula, the amount available for distribution is the sum of state aid and local revenues. The base funding per student is the same for all districts and is determined by the amount of money available for distribution. The cost factors adjust each district's allocation higher or lower to reflect uncontrollable cost differences.

The Legislature has changed these factors over time. They will no doubt be periodically reviewed and revised by future legislatures. Hence, equity is an evolving target over time, and an analysis of the movement toward equity is one snapshot of a moving picture.

With application of this formula, each district's share of total state and local funding depends solely on the base funding and the cost factors. If local revenues are high, state aid is low. If local revenues are low, state aid is high. In effect, the formula converts local school revenue resources into part of available statewide funds for all schools. It does not matter what a district receives in property taxes or other local revenues. The only revenue that matters is the statewide sum of state and local dollars. This statewide sum, minus statutorily listed expenditures from state fund, is the Formula Revenue available for distribution.

## K-12 School Equalization Formula

For purposes of this formula, it can be helpful to consider school funding from a couple of different perspectives. On one hand, a school district’s operating revenue is simply the sum of its share of the SSF and Local Revenue. On another hand, a school district’s operating revenue is the sum of three different grants. These two views are shown in the following two formulas.

$$\boxed{\text{School District Formula Revenue (State and Local)}} = \boxed{\text{State School Fund Grant}} + \boxed{\text{Local Revenue}}$$

$$\boxed{\text{School District Formula Revenue (State and Local)}} = \boxed{\text{General Purpose Grant}} + \boxed{\text{Transportation Grant}} + \boxed{\text{High Cost Disabilities Grant}}$$

The school equalization formula, illustrated above and to be explained in detail, allocates state and local general operating revenue to local school districts. The formula allocates this revenue based on the relative need of each district for funding by using various cost factors. To establish each district’s share of the SSF, the calculations begin with determining the amounts of General Purpose, Transportation, and High Cost Disabilities grants. These are district level calculations. Cost factors are used in the three separate grant calculations that together determine the total allocation. Before discussing the formula itself, essential terms are defined.

### District Formula Revenue

While Formula Revenue often refers to the statewide sum of SSF and Local Revenue, District Formula Revenue refers to a school district’s portion of the State School Fund and local revenue (school district operating property taxes plus statutorily listed other sources). The local revenue portion stays with the district where collected but is treated like a state resource in formula revenue distributions.

$$\boxed{\text{District Formula Revenue}} = \boxed{\text{State School Fund Grant}} + \boxed{\text{Local Revenue}}$$

Formula revenue is available for general operations. It does not include bond revenue or state and federal categorical aid. These funds are dedicated to specific programs and cannot be used for general operations.

The State School Fund grant to an individual school district is its equalization formula revenue less its local revenue. If local revenue is more than the equalization formula amount, then the district does not receive a state school fund grant. However, it does keep its local revenue in excess of its formula amount. Only a few school districts have seen excess local revenue in the past.

The equalization formula, in effect, overrides whatever formula may exist for the distribution of each of these local revenues to school districts. (For example, Common School Fund revenue is apportioned to each school district based on its average daily membership, or roughly student count, from the prior year.) Although each specific local revenue distribution still operates, the equalization formula cancels its effect by offsetting the local revenue against its equalization formula revenue.

Given a fixed amount of state dollars for education, the intent of equalization is to allocate relatively more dollars to districts that lack, or have fewer, Local Revenue resources. That said, state policy does allow for some exceptions to equalization process. Two primary examples are local option property taxes within statutory limits and voluntary contributions. Without these exceptions, such resources may not be provided. These kinds of exceptions reflect a policy attempt to balance local control and statewide equalization.

### Cost Factors

In the three grants on the right-hand side of the equalization formula, four different factors are considered when accounting for cost differences among school districts:

- Weighted student count, reflecting student demographics and district characteristics
- Teacher experience adjustment, adjusting for teaching experience in districts relative to statewide average
- Transportation costs, compensating for actual cost in transporting students in districts
- High Cost disability students, providing additional money for educating certain disability students

The following sections explain these factors in detail.

### General Purpose Grant

The General Purpose grant is weighted students times the targeted per student amount, adjusted for teacher experience and balanced to total State School Fund and local revenue available. There are no constraints on how this money can be spent at the district level. The grant accounts for a little over 95% of formula revenue. Thus, the number of students and their associated weights are very important determinants of district formula revenue.

<b>General Purpose Grant</b>	=	<b>Weighted Student Count (ADMw)</b>	x	<b>Statewide Target per ADMw, Adjusted by Teacher Experience (Balanced to Formula Revenue available for distribution)</b>
------------------------------	---	--------------------------------------	---	---

### Weighted Students Count (ADMw)

Rather than attempting to generate an individual cost factor for each district or type of school district, the formula incorporates a system of weights directly into the student count.

The student count begins with average daily membership (ADM) that is attributable to a district. This becomes resident ADM (ADM<sub>r</sub>). The ADM<sub>r</sub> count is then adjusted to reflect the differences in cost of educating different types of students. For example, a special education student (one with an individualized education plan or IEP) receives an extra weight of one. The formula weight for the student is then 2.0. In effect, one student counts as two students. Technically, the student counts as 2 ADM<sub>w</sub>, where the “w” stands for weighted.

The double weighting primarily reflects a national study in 1988 that showed districts were on average spending about twice the norm for services to special education students. Although some special education students cost much more than twice the average and others cost less, the Legislature wanted

to avoid creating a complicated weighting scheme that would encourage districts to classify students in categories that generated more funds.

The table below shows the weights in the formula. In looking at these weights, please note the following:

- A district must get approval of the Department of Education to qualify more than 11% of its students for the special education weight.
- The poverty weight is based on the number of children in poverty families. It is not based on identifying individual students, but a group. Likewise, state data on students in foster homes and in facilities for neglected and delinquent children are group counts. Because these three counts do not identify individual students, they are not included in a 2.0 maximum additional weight per student.

Student Cost Weights		
	Weight	ADMw
Special Education	1.00	2.00
English Language Learner	0.50	1.50
Pregnant and Parenting	1.00	2.00
Students in Poverty	0.25	1.25
Neglected and Delinquent	0.25	1.25
Students in Foster Homes	0.25	1.25
Kindergarten if Half-Day	-0.50	0.50
Elementary District Student	-0.10	0.90
Union High District Student	0.20	1.20
Small School	Varies	Varies

- Elementary districts are those that do not offer a high school. Data showed these districts typically spend less than the average per student while the union high schools that serve these areas spend more than the average. The union high and elementary weights are designed to shift funds between these districts without affecting the total available in the geographic area.
- Students enrolled in a qualified small school receive extra weight. The weight is based on grade level, average grade size, and distance to the nearest school site. The smaller the school, the higher the weight. This weight is based on the size of each school, not the size of a school district. A few large school districts have remote small schools qualifying for this additional funding. A small school must have remained in the same location since 1995 and have qualified as a small elementary school in 1995 or small high school in 2009. To qualify, elementary schools must be remote, which is defined as more than 8 miles from the nearest elementary school in the same school district. Public charter schools qualify as small schools under conditions specified in statute. If small high schools merge, the combined weight for four grades is the higher of (1) the sum of the extra weight each small high school was eligible for prior to the merger or (2) the eligible extra weight of the merged high school if still a small high school.

Weighted students in the formula include students in the Youth Corrections Education Program (YCEP) and students in the Juvenile Detention Education Program (JDEP). The state provides the education programs for these students. These programs are treated as though they are special school districts. Each YCEP student counts as two ADMw and each JDEP student counts as 1.5 ADMw. These students are not counted by their resident school district.

The formula uses the higher of the current year ADMw or prior year ADMw. Extended ADMw is the term for the higher ADMw of the two years.

### Teacher Experience Adjustment

The teacher experience adjustment is a cost factor for differences in salary costs related to years of experience. Virtually all school districts have pay schedules based in part on teacher experience. As teacher experience increases, so do salaries. Incorporating this into a student weight was a significant issue, so an adjustment factor was added to the base funding per student. This factor increases (or decreases) each district's base funding per student by \$25 for each year the district's average teacher experience exceeds (or falls short of) the statewide average. Statewide, these district gains and losses roughly balance out.

$$\text{Teacher Experience Adjustment} = \$25 \times (\text{District Average} - \text{State Average})$$

### Statewide Target per ADMw and Balancing to Available Funds

As a starting point, per student funding level was set in law at \$4,500 per weighted student by the 1991 Legislature. In practice, this target level was intended to be factored up or down depending on total funds available for allocation by the formula and the amount of this total used for the other two grants (Transportation and High Cost Disabilities grants). For example, if using the \$4,500 led to an allocation of dollars that exceeded state and local resources, it would be multiplied by a factor of less than 100%. Similarly, if use of \$4,500 results in an under-allocation of resources, it would be adjusted upward - multiplied by a factor above 100%. This balancing ratio intentionally started out below 100%. Hence the \$4,500 has been referenced as a target. The balancing ratio was about 188% in 2019-20, meaning that the General Purpose grant per weighted student for that year was \$8,460.

$$\text{Target Balanced} = (\$4,500 + \text{Teacher Experience Adjustment}) \times \text{Balance Ratio}$$

### Transportation Grant

The Transportation Grant uses actual costs as a factor to adjust for different transportation costs per student.

Each SD's grant is 70%, 80% or 90% of approved transportation costs. Approved costs are those attributable to transporting students from home to school (if over 1 mile from elementary school or 1.5 miles from high school), between schools, on field trips and for other reasons in special cases. This is a categorical grant only available for actual transportation costs.

To determine which districts receive a higher percentage, the average transportation cost per student is calculated for each district. Districts are then ranked from the highest to the lowest cost per student. The top 10% of highest cost districts qualify for 90% grants and the next 10% qualify for 80%. The remaining districts receive 70% grants.

<b>Transportation Grant</b>	=	<b>70% to 90% of Transportation Costs</b>	<b>District Rank</b>	<b>% of Costs</b>
			Top 10%	90%
			Next 10%	80%
			Bottom 80%	70%

The other 10-30% of approved transportation costs is not directly funded. Districts likely fund it from their General Purpose grant. Each dollar of increased transportation costs means 10-30 cents for transportation from other funds. This was likely adopted to encourage efficiency.

Before the change in 2003, the transportation grant was 70% of approved transportation costs. If a district has a very high transportation cost per student, for example \$800, its 30% or \$240 is much higher than for the average cost district (about \$75) and its General Purpose grant for other than transportation costs is less per student.

To deal with this situation the 2003 Legislature decided that the very highest transportation cost per student districts should have 80% or 90% of costs included in the transportation grant. The grant did not change for the bottom 80% of districts.

The 2023 legislature included alternative transportation as a way of providing transportation for eligible students. Alternative transportation means the arrival to, or departure from, a school by eligible students using active transportation or public transportation where active transportation uses human-powered forms of travel, including walking or bicycling.

The highest cost districts tend to be rural districts with a low density of students where most of the students ride a bus over considerable distances. These districts are helped by the change in the transportation formula. The higher transportation grants reduce funds available for general purpose grants so that districts with 70% transportation grants receive a little less state funding.

### High Cost Disabilities Grant

The High Cost disability factor is actual costs above \$30,000 per disability student to help compensate for above-average costs. High Cost special education students tend to be concentrated in urban areas where medical and therapeutic services are available. The cost for their education can be disproportional to the revenue generated from the double weighting of these students in the school equalization formula. This was viewed as an extra burden not fairly shared by all districts.

<b>High Cost Disabilities Grant</b>	=	<b>Up to Sum of Costs above \$30,000 per Disability Student</b>
---	---	---

A district's High Cost disabilities grant is the sum of the approved disability costs for each special education student that exceeds \$30,000 per year. The school district can add ESD special education costs incurred for the same student for the student's total special education cost.

The Legislature imposed a cap on total High Cost disabilities grants of \$18 million per year starting in 2007-08. The cap increased to \$35 million a year in 2015-16. Starting from 2020-21, this grant cap is \$55 million per year. If eligible costs exceed the cap, grants are prorated. Grants are typically lower than actual costs, often substantially lower.

The 2005 Legislature increased the student cost threshold to \$30,000 from the \$25,000 initially adopted by the 2003 Legislature. This reduced the expected number of eligible students by about half and increased the percent of eligible costs covered by the grant. The grant was also made a permanent part of the formula by removing the sunset date.

Adding a High Cost disabilities grant to the formula reduces the General Purpose grant total by the same

\$55 million. Thus, all districts share in the cost and those with High Cost disability students receive additional funding by their High Cost disability grant exceeding the reduction in their General Purpose grant. But these grants have a very specific purpose of providing education services to eligible students.


### Equalization Formula Summary

The equalization formula allocates available revenue to each school district using a measure of relative financial need. The formula uses weighted students as the primary determinant of funding. A school district’s equalization formula revenue is its level of funding. Consequently, the State School Fund grant is equal to the district formula revenue minus the SD’s local revenue.

This equalization formula amount is derived by summing the General Purpose grant, Transportation grant, and High Cost Disabilities grant. Statewide, the General Purpose grant is a little over 95% of equalization funding, Transportation is a bit less than 4%, and High Cost Disabilities grants are the remainder. Previous discussions make it clear that General Purpose grant uses ADMw, but two other grants do not. In fact, these two grants are considered set-asides within SD share of available formula revenue (95.5%), while the General Purpose grant allocates the remainder that is net of two grants.

Combining the calculation of each of the three grants yields a completed equalization formula.<sup>7</sup>

#### K-12 SCHOOL EQUALIZATION FORMULA



<sup>7</sup> This is the current formula for 2023-25. The formula is permanent in the sense that it continues to operate until changed by new legislation. Temporary constraints or exceptions to the equalization formula ended in 2000-01. Constraints usually took the form of minimum grants that provided funding above the formula allocation during the phase-in. Prior minimum grants were commonly known as flat grants and stop-loss grants.

## Payment Schedule

Districts receive State School Fund payments according to the payment schedule listing, shown in the table to the right. Using information from school districts, the Oregon Department of Education makes an estimate in March preceding the school fiscal year for budgeting purposes. The department makes payments based on this March estimate during the following fiscal year until May when adjustments are made using a revised estimate. Based on new information during the fiscal year, the department periodically revises its pre-fiscal year March estimate and informs districts about the new estimate.

PAYMENT SCHEDULE	
July 15	16 2/3 %
August 15	8 1/3 %
September 15	8 1/3 %
October 15	8 1/3 %
November 15	8 1/3 %
December 15	8 1/3 %
January 15	8 1/3 %
February 15	8 1/3 %
March 15	8 1/3 %
April 15	8 1/3 %
May 15	8 1/3 %
June 15	0 %
	100 %

## Education Service District Equity

ESDs began receiving State School Fund dollars after 1990's Measure 5 to help compensate for property tax cuts. From 1991 to 2001, each Legislature provided State School Fund dollars to ESDs only for the immediately following biennium. The amount was based on a percent of property tax losses due to Measure 5 and 50. However, the issue of an imbalance in state and local revenue per student among ESDs had not been addressed.

The 1999 Legislature started to narrow the gap between high and low revenue ESDs, but ESD property tax and state funds per student still varied substantially. These ESD funds were in the hundreds of dollars per student, but the high per student amount was over four times as great as the low amount. This was a high multiple difference compared to school districts. The 2001 Legislature passed Education Service District (ESD) revenue equalization legislation.

As of 2020, there are 19 ESDs. ESDs are distinct from school districts, but territorially are made up of school districts. The school districts within the boundary of an ESD are the ESD's component school districts. The student count for an ESD is the sum of students in its component school districts. However, the allocation of revenue to an ESD does not directly use a measure of students in the ESD.

### School District and ESD Financial Equity

Defining permanent ESD equity was a two-step process. The first step defined equity between ESDs, and K-12 school districts. The 1999 interim Legislative Task Force on ESDs recommended a permanent split of total state and local revenue available for allocation between K-12 school districts and ESDs. The Legislature adopted the recommendation for a split of 5% for ESDs and 95% for school districts when fully phased-in.

The 2005 Legislature reduced the ESD share by 1/4 of a percentage point and added it to the school share with additional adjustment in the following year. Beginning in 2011-12, the K-12 school share has been 95.5% with the ESD share remaining 4.5%, which remains the split to this day.

Year	K-12 Share of Total	ESD Share of Total
2003-04	95.25%	4.75%
2004-05	95.15%	4.85%
2005-06	95.00%	5.00%
2006-07	95.25%	4.75%
2011-12	95.50%	4.50%

### Equity Rationale

The second step was to define equity among ESDs. The question was how the ESD portion of the total should be fairly divided up among the 21 ESDs existing at the time. After consideration of various options, the Task Force's Subcommittee on Finance reasoned along the following lines:

- ESDs support their school districts as a primary function
- ESD support services and funding levels vary significantly around the state
- ESDs provide many special education services
- K-12 school equalization formula already exists with special education weights
- Equalize ESDs using a percent of K-12 formula revenue allocated to their school districts.

Recognizing that ESDs are support districts for school districts, the task force recommended that ESD equalization be measured by the K-12 school equalization formula. Consequently, an independent and separate ESD equalization formula was not developed. The idea of piggybacking ESD equalization onto K-12 school equalization was to recognize the reality that an ESD would face similar financial needs of school districts it was serving. Since the equity of financial needs among school districts were addressed in school equalization formula, it was natural to take advantage of results from K-12 formula revenue distribution.

### Equalization Revenue


The ESD share of total formula revenue is 4.5% beginning in 2011-12. Total formula revenue is the sum of (1) State School Fund dollars available for distribution to school districts and ESDs and (2) statutorily listed local revenue (primarily property taxes) from SDs and ESDs.

## ESD Equalization

The ESD equalization calculation determines each ESD's operating revenue (or general services revenue) from the State School Fund and local revenue. The allocation formula basically assumes that ESD revenue should be proportional to the equalization formula revenue of its component school districts.

### General Services Grant in Principle

Just as with school districts, General Services grant for an ESD is the sum of State School Fund grant allocated to the ESD and the local revenue of the ESD.



### State School Fund Grant

The State School Fund Grant is the ESD's allocated general services amount less its local revenue. If local

revenue is greater than the general services amount, then the State School Fund Grant is zero and there is excess local revenue. Treatment of excess local revenue is discussed later in this report.

### Local Revenue

Local revenue is the sum of two sources: permanent-rate property tax collections (current year and delinquent payments and interest from prior years) and revenues from state managed county trust timber (Oregon Revised Statutes Chapter 530). Like for schools, local revenue does not pass to the state for reallocation to ESDs. Local revenue stays with the ESD (unless there is excess as described below).

### General Services Grant for an ESD

Beginning in 2011-12, the General Services grant is 4.712% times the sum of the school formula revenue for the ESD component districts. Since SDs' share of formula revenue is 95.5%, by multiplying component school districts' combined formula revenue by 4.712%, the aggregation of all ESDs' formula revenue becomes 4.5% of the total formula revenue, thus exhausting all ESD share ( $4.712\% \times 95.5\% = 4.5\%$ ).

By using school district formula revenue as the basis for allocating general services revenue, ESD equalization depends on the same factors as school district equalization. ESDs in their role of assisting component school districts are assumed to have the same relative need for funds as their school districts.

$$\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \text{General} \\ \text{Services} \\ \text{Grant} \\ \hline \end{array} = 4.712\% \times \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \text{Sum of} \\ \text{Component} \\ \text{School Districts} \\ \text{Revenue} \\ \hline \end{array}$$

While this grant calculation applies to most ESDs, the legislature established a minimum grant, taking into consideration that certain small ESDs do not receive enough revenues to cover ongoing operating expenses if their grants are calculated based on the formula above. The 2005 legislature set the minimum General Services grant at \$1 million per school year.

A district's minimum grant is \$1.165 million starting from 2015-16 and fluctuates proportionately with the State School Fund. This minimum has been increasing as SSF appropriation grows in the past several years. If the base revenue allocation for an ESD is initially less than the minimum in a school year, the base is increased to that minimum.


### Percent to Balance

The 4.712% of component district formula revenue uses up the 4.5% of total formula revenue available for ESDs. So, if extra funds are necessary to meet the minimum for certain ESDs, distributions to ESDs that are receiving over-minimum allocations will proportionately decline to compensate for the extra funds needed for minimum receiving ESDs.

### Equalization Summary

To determine General Services grant, the first step is to allocate 95.5% of total formula revenue to each school district using the K-12 formula. The second step is to allocate to each ESD, 4.712% of its component school districts' allocation. If all ESDs receive above a minimum for a school year, the allocation from the second step is final. If there is at least one ESD receiving below the minimum in the second step, allocation

process moves on to the third step. The third step is to increase any ESD allocation below the minimum to the minimum, which reduces collective allocation to ESDs receiving above the minimum. The last step is to reduce the revenue of all ESDs above the minimum by the same percentage to exhaust all remaining ESD share of the formula revenue that is net of sum of all minimum grants.



### Excess Local Revenue

If an ESD's local revenue is greater than its general services revenue for a school year, the State School Fund grant is zero. Any local revenue in excess of the entitled allocation is distributed to component districts proportional to the year's extended ADMw and is included as local revenue for them for the following year.

### State Payment Schedule

The ESD July payment is 16.67% of the estimated State School Fund grant with 8.33% in each of the following 10 months. There is no June payment. Adjustments for audited data are made the following year. This is the same payment schedule as for school districts.

## APPENDIX 1

### Other State School fund allocations

Funding for some expenditures is allocated directly from the State School Fund (SSF). These allocations flow to statutorily specified programs, independently of the formula described above. These expenditures are often called carve-outs or off-the-top expenditures as they are taken directly from the SSF, and the remaining SSF dollars are the formula revenue available for distribution.

#### Educator Advancement Fund (previously Network of Quality Teaching and Learning)

In the 2013 regular session, the Legislature created the Network of Quality Teaching and Learning (NQTL). NQTL is the predecessor to the Educator Advancement (EA) program created by the 2017 legislature. For the 2017-19 biennium, EA Fund was provided by \$6 million from the State School Fund, and \$16.75 million each from SDs and ESDs out of their respective formula revenues. EA Fund fluctuates proportionately with the State School Fund. Total funding to EA is \$42.9 million in 2023-25.

#### English Language Learner Program

Each biennium, \$12.5 million from the State School Fund will be transferred to the Statewide English Language Learner Program Account. Moneys in the Statewide English Language Learner Program Account are used for statewide activities related to English language learner programs.

#### Healthy School Facilities Fund and Office of School Facilities

Each biennium, \$2 million from the State School Fund will be transferred to the Healthy School Facilities Fund to be used as grants for costs associated with testing for elevated levels of lead in water used for drinking or food preparation. Allocation to the Office of School Facilities is to assist school districts with capital construction projects and is capped at \$6 million per biennium.

#### School Safety and Security Program

Each biennium, up to \$3 million from the State School Fund will be transferred to the School Safety and Security program to be used to help improve safety and security of students and staff of school districts, education service districts and public charter schools. This program is going to start in the 2023-24 school year.

#### Small High School

The Small School District Supplement Fund receives \$2.5 million per year from the State School Fund. Small school districts are districts under 8,500 weighted students with high schools having less than 350 students for four grades and 267 for three grades. Out of 197 school districts, about 90 school districts qualify for a grant each year.

Each small school district receives its proportionate share based on its share of small high school ADM (average daily membership) each year of the biennium. This policy started in the 2003-05 biennium.

#### State Special Education Programs

Certain state education programs are funded directly out of the State School Fund. These are for students in pediatric nursing facilities, long-term care facilities and the State School for the Deaf. The State School Fund amount is limited to the statewide average net operating expenditure per student times the number

of student slots available in these special education programs.

### At-risk Youth Education Program

Each biennium the Oregon Department of Education transfers from the State School Fund to the Oregon Military Department, the amount necessary to pay for educational services provided through programs operated by the military department for at-risk youth that are outstanding after any General Fund appropriations and the calculation of available federal funds for the programs. This carve-out will ensure a matching federal grant. The transfer amount for the program from the State School Fund is expected to vary across biennia.

### Other Direct Expenditures from the State School Fund

Allocation to support the development of talented and gifted education is capped at \$350,000 per biennium and the speech language program receives up to \$150,000 per biennium for its administration. Other spending directly out of the State School Fund includes (1) \$968,000 per biennium for grade 10 testing purpose, and (2) \$1,600,000 per biennium for purposes related to the Oregon Virtual School District.

Local option grants (varying annually) and charter school closure fund (limited duration) are other direct expenditures. In 2001, the Legislature created a local option equalization grant for eligible school districts levying a local option property tax. Districts with an assessed value per student less than the target district are eligible.

## Other State Funds for Schools

In addition to the State School Fund, the Legislature may distribute other state funds to school districts.

### School Improvement Fund

The legislature has not allocated money to the School Improvement Fund for some time, but money has been occasionally allocated since the establishment of the fund in 2001. The Legislature has not made an appropriation to the School Improvement Fund since the 2007-09 biennium. When funded, districts receive an allocation based on their prorated share of weighted students. Many of policy goals of this fund have been incorporated in the Student Success Act, funded through newly created a corporate activity tax (CAT).

### Corporate Activity Tax

The 2019 Legislature created a corporate activity tax (CAT) based on commercial activity conducted by businesses and dedicated the tax revenues to the programs initiated in the Student Success Act. After administrative expenses and direct allocations to the SSF, the remainder of revenues from the CAT fund three accounts - Student Investment Account (at least 50%), Statewide Education Initiatives Account (up to 30%), and Early Learning Account (at least 20%). Moneys allocated to the Student Investment Account are distributed to school districts based on ADMw with poverty weights doubled. In addition, HB 3427 of the 2019 legislature specified that some of its revenues be used for the State School Fund.

### Education Stability Fund

Voters approved a constitutional amendment converting the Education Endowment Fund to the Education Stability Fund (ESF) in 2002, allowing the principal to be used to fund public education. The fund receives 18% of lottery net proceeds. The size is limited to 5% of General Fund revenue. Use of the principal requires meeting criteria reflective of an economic recession and approval by a 3/5 majority vote

in each legislative chamber. The principal can also be used if the Governor declares an emergency and both chambers approve by a 3/5 majority vote. If approved by the legislature, money from the ESF can be transferred to the State School Fund for distribution to SDs and ESDs.

## APPENDIX 2

### Related Research Reports by the Legislative Revenue Office

Oregon Public Finance: Basic Facts (2024), Research Report #1-24  
2023 Session - Revenue Measures Passed by the 82nd Legislature (Report #4-23)  
2020 - 2021 Sessions: Revenue Measures Passed by the 81st Legislature, Research Report #4-21  
K-12 and ESD School Finance: State School Fund Distribution (2020), Research Report #4-20  
Corporate Activity Tax: Frequently Asked Questions (2020), Research Report #2-20  
Revenue Measures Passed by the 80th Legislature (2019), Research Report #3-19  
K-12 and ESD School Finance: State School Fund Distribution (2010), Research Report #2-10  
2009 School Finance Legislation: Funding and Distribution (2009), Research Report #8-09  
Small School District Funding (2008), Research Report #4-08  
Student Weights for Small Schools (2008), Research Report #3-08  
2007 School Finance Legislation: Funding and Distribution (2007), Research Report #4-07  
Student Weights: Individualized Education Program (2006), Research Report #7-06  
Student Weights: English as a Second Language (2006), Research Report #2-06  
2005 School Finance Legislation: Funding and Distribution (2005), Research Report #3-05  
The Education Stability Fund (2004), Research Report #5-04  
School Local Option Property Tax: Legislation and Utilization (2004), Research Report #4-04

These publications are available at the Oregon Legislative Revenue Office website:  
<https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/lro>