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ORIGINS OF THE PROJECT

• **Background** of Weighted Student Funding (WSF):
  – Descriptive evaluation in SF & Oakland
    • WSF in San Francisco Unified
    • Results Based Budgeting (RBB) in Oakland
  – WSF and RBB were both forms of Per Pupil Budgeting

• **What we learned:**
  – WSF more than a revenue distribution system

• **How SSFR project evolved:**
  – Desire to work with real LEAs
WHO’S INVOLVED IN SSFR?

Two Partners

Two Districts

American Institutes for Research®

TwinRivers

Learning Partners™
SSFR Mission and Vision

Mission Statement for the SSFR Project: an IES development project
• SSFR was designed to:
  – promotes increased equity and transparency,
  – provide schools more control over their fiscal and human resources, and
  – link decision making autonomy for school leaders to accountability for student outcomes.
• Purpose:
  – to implement and evaluate the impact of a comprehensive approach to reform of local school finance and governance in LEAs.

Vision Statement – Longer term goal: to create a...
• viable, scalable model of intra-district resource allocation that is...
  – supported by technology and participatory decision making processes and
  – is designed to foster greater opportunities for innovation and efficiency at both the school site and central office.
Theory of Action

SSFR “will make the district budget more transparent, align resources for greater impact and equity, and give schools the ability to target resources to meet their school’s specific needs, bringing funding and decision-making closer to schools and classrooms.”

(LAUSD weekly update, March 14-18, 2011, Ramon Cortines, Supt)

(1) Equity:
(a) Allocate revenues based on student need
(b) Facilitate equitable access to effective teachers and leaders

(2) Culture of Innovation/Efficiency:
(a) Link site autonomy to accountability
(b) Align resources with goals
(c) Create a service economy

(3) Transparency:
(a) Simplify allocation models
(b) Engage stakeholders in decision making
The Suite of Tools

1. District Budget and Outcome Management Tool (DBOM)
   Analysis and Reporting Tool

2. Targeted Revenue Model (TRM)
   Distributes Funds Equitably to Schools

3. Planning, Budgeting, and Allocation of Resources Tool (PBAR)
   - Site-Based Strategic Planning Tool
   - Alignment of Resources To Goals
Community Priorities

• Improving student **achievement** and **accountability**
• Focus on serving the needs of communities and **families**
• More opportunities for the **engagement** of parents and communities in collective decision making
• Increased focus on issues of **equity**

SSFR Objectives

• Foster **innovation** and **efficiency** through school **autonomy** linked to **accountability**
• Improve **equity** through the allocation of resources based on student need
• Increase **transparency** through authentic stakeholder **engagement** in planning decisions
Diversity of Cohort I & II Sites

- Poverty: 82%
- EL: 36%
- SPED: 13%
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Targeted Revenue Model

Divide available federal, state, local, and private revenues between the central office and the school sites; and

Allocate funds to school sites by schooling level (elementary, middle, and high schools) and according to a predetermined set of student need categories explicitly recognized by the district.

Accountability

Service Culture

Stakeholder Engagement

Comprehensive Planning

Teacher, Leader Effectiveness

Local Flexibility

Weighted Student Funding
Targeted Factors

Student Characteristics

- All Students
- Poverty (FRLP)
- English Learner (CELDT Level 1,2,3)
- English Learner (CELDT Level 4,5)
- Gifted Education
- Struggling Students
- Special Education

School Characteristics

- Schooling Level (Elementary, Middle, High)
## TRUSD Resources used in the TRM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Student-Need Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCLB: Title I</td>
<td>• Students Eligible for Free or Reduced Price Meals (FRPM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Impact Aid (SCE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Impact Aid (LEP)</td>
<td>• English Language Learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted and Talented Education</td>
<td>• Gifted and Talented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Instructional Improvement Block Grant (TIIBG)</td>
<td>• Elementary (K-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Middle (6-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and Library Improvement Block Grant (SLIBG)</td>
<td>• Middle (6-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High (9-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted General Fund</td>
<td>• All Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Improved Learning Outcomes

Connect resources to learning goals

Enable school control over the means of success

Align district policy, standards and practices

Weighted Student Funding

Local Accountability

Teacher, Leader Effectiveness

Service Culture

Stakeholder Engagement

SSFR
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Increasing Local Flexibility

Centrally Managed/Central Costs

Centrally Managed/Site Services

Site Managed/Site Services

Unrestricted

Restricted

Decision-making Over Funds

District Revenue Resources
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Example: Available EIA-LEP dollars were divided between the Central Office and School Sites

Central Office
• $536,754 (12.9%) was allocated for administration.
• $1,555,015 (37.4%) was allocated for services provided by the central office to school sites.

School Sites
• $2,065,047 (49.7%) was allocated directly to school sites.
In order to ensure performance across the district, Twin Rivers built parallel systems of data-driven planning and accountability.

- Both sites and central office departments review data and design programming based on how best to serve students, family, and community.
TRUSD Strategic Plan and Accountability

Twin Rivers Unified School District (Mission, Vision, Goals, Values)

- Site Program Design Plan
- Balanced Site Scorecard
  - Principal Evaluation
- Strategic Projects (Focus Areas)
  - Career/College Readiness
  - Effective, Engaging, Data-Driven Instruction
  - Equitable & Transparent Budgeting and Operations
  - Respectful Partnerships with Family and Community

- Service Improvement Plan
- Balanced Central Scorecard
  - Central Office Leader Evaluation

Data-Driven
Accountability for Results
### Scorecards

**Site: Highlands High**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Target Met</th>
<th>2012 Target</th>
<th>5 year Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRADUATION and WORK/CAREER READINESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The TRUSD and site graduation rates will continue to increase at a minimum of 5% annually.</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This data is shown reported one year behind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of graduates with A-G requirements met will continue to increase at 5% annually.</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This data is shown reported one year behind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% annual increase in students successfully enrolling in post-secondary institutions.</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This data is shown reported one year behind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUSD and each site will increase the number of par K – 8 students demonstrating pre requisite skills for college readiness by an increase of 5% in the number of students on flip for &quot;Causes and Work Ready&quot;.</td>
<td>Not met at this time</td>
<td>Not met at this time</td>
<td>Not met at this time</td>
<td>Not met at this time</td>
<td>Not met at this time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CAHSEE**

- First-time CAHSEE passage rates for students in grade 10 will increase yearly at a minimum of 5% annually.
  - ELA: 74.0% 77.0% No
  - Math: 65.0% 66.0% Yes

- CAHSEE passage rates by grade 12 will increase yearly at a minimum of 5% annually.
  - ELA: 60.0% 65.0% Yes
  - Math: 46.0% 46.0% Yes

- CAHSEE proficiency rates will increase yearly at a minimum of 5% annually.
  - ELA: 46.0% 48.0% Yes
  - Math: 46.0% 48.0% Yes

**ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT GAP**

- The achievement gap will decrease by 5% annually as measured by API performance of each significant subgroup.
  - Black or African American: 93 117 No
  - Asian: 17 -7 Yes
  - Hispanic or Latino: 20 21 No

- English Learners are making annual progress by meeting their annual growth targets on the CELDT.
  - 47.0% 50.0% No

**ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

- Increase the number of students proficient in Algebra by 5% annually.
  - ELA: 29.2% 32.8% Yes
  - Math: 14.2% 17.4% No

- Increase the number of students proficient or above in reading, writing, and math by 5% annually.
  - Whole Site: 19 23 Yes 3
  - Black or African American: 16 21 Yes 3
  - Asian: 3 4 No 1
  - Hispanic or Latino: 5 7 Yes 3
  - White: 10 14 Yes 2
  - English Learners: 10 13 Yes 3
  - Students with Disabilities: 24 3 No 3

- Site and all significant subgroups meet or exceed the State API growth target.

### Department: Family and Community Involvement Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer</th>
<th>2010 Base (A/SA)</th>
<th>10/11 Annual</th>
<th>10/11 Target</th>
<th>% to 10/11 Target</th>
<th>11/12 Target</th>
<th>Ultimate Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Reported as the percentage of respondents who Agreed or Strongly Agreed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship – continuously demonstrate interest in listening to the customer and acting with issues</td>
<td>Site and Central Office Personnel</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact – deliver successful results that make it easier to focus on students</td>
<td>Site and Central Office Personnel</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value – knowledgeable and consistently deliver high-quality services</td>
<td>Site and Central Office Personnel</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort – work hard to assure initiatives are resolved</td>
<td>Site and Central Office Personnel</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsive – helps customers quickly, promptly, and in a timely manner</td>
<td>Site and Central Office Personnel</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer</th>
<th>2010 Base (A/SA)</th>
<th>10/11 Annual</th>
<th>10/11 Target</th>
<th>% to 10/11 Target</th>
<th>11/12 Target</th>
<th>Ultimate Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site and all significant subgroups meet or exceed the State API growth target.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Resource Management

**Investing in our People**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>District Strategy</td>
<td>District Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees Satisfaction</td>
<td>District Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrators Support</td>
<td>District Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Learning Community</td>
<td>District Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Under development**
Annual Planning Cycle

- Aligned budget, staffing and site planning processes to allow for authentic shared leadership
- Extensive detail in site plans for site budgets and costs
- Site-to-site access to share goals and strategies for improvement
Planning Cycle

- Fall
- Summer
- Winter
- Spring

Needs-assessment & Goals
Implement
Monitor & Evaluate
Review & Approve
Costs & Budget
Strategies & Priorities
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• Believing the concept that equal and meaningful representation of all stakeholders produces better, more thoughtful decisions
• Using the results, information and opinions that come out of the process of engagement.
• Stakeholders see evidence of their impact on decision making.
School Learning Community
Leadership Teams

School Leadership Teams *before* ...

- Leadership decisions at the school are made by a coordinated collaboration between leadership teams made up of school stakeholders

School Leadership Teams *now* ...

American Institutes for Research and Pivot Learning Partners
Coordinated Timeline

**Fall**
- ELAC 1 Needs Assessment
- SSC 1 Needs Assessment
- SLT 1 Needs Assessment

Goal Areas
- ELAC 3 Goal Setting
- SSC 3 Goal Setting

**Winter**
- SLT 2 SMARTRQ Goal Development
- SLT 4 Strategy Development
SSFR Challenges and Lessons...

Culture Changes
- Compliance to accountability
- Central to Site management
- Authentic Engagement

Consistent Executive Sponsorship
- Superintendent
- Board Members

Identify key stakeholders

Current Financial Crisis
Matt Hill,
Chief Strategy Officer

Los Angeles Unified School District
Budgeting for Student Achievement has evolved over time in LA

• 1993-1999 LEARN — focused on flexibility and school-level empowerment, demand for change came from local community and business

• 2008 Belmont Pilot Schools

• 2009 Per Pupil Funding

• 2010 Transparent Budgeting

• 2011 Budgeting for Student Achievement

• 2012 New collective bargaining agreement

• 2013 Governor’s Local Control Funding Formula
Accomplishments

- Over 100 schools are piloting the per pupil model
- Improved overall district budgeting process based on pilot
  - Transparency:
    - 95% of funding directly support schools
    - Budget dashboards
  - Flexibility
    - All schools have increased flexibility over positions or dollars
  - Accountability & Support
    - Budget planning tool
    - Training modules
  - Equity
    - Strategic investments despite difficult financial environment
Budgeting for Student Achievement

Budget Planning Tool

Los Angeles Unified School District
School Budget Planning Tool

| School and Location Code: | School Year: | 2013-2014 |

Minimum Staffing Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th># FTEs</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELEMENTARY TEACHER (6 hour)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$5,144,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCIPAL, ELEMENTARY (8 hour)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$141,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY TO DAY SUBS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$95,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH ADMINISTRATIVE ASSIST (8 hour)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$67,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANT MANAGER I (8 hour)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$65,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS &amp; GROUNDS WORKER (8 hour)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$57,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMP PERSONNEL ACCT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$20,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,650,352</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th># FTEs</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE TECHNICIAN (9 hour)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$105,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLERICAL SUBS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$7,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$114,677</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Funds - Budgeted</th>
<th>- Remaining</th>
<th>Exceeds Indirect Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>$3,764,059</td>
<td>$3,662,110</td>
<td>$102,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I</td>
<td>$199,143</td>
<td>$202,947</td>
<td>($3,704)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title III LEAP</td>
<td>$7,584</td>
<td>$7,587</td>
<td>($3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAP</td>
<td>$200,156</td>
<td>$203,688</td>
<td>($3,532)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Improvement</td>
<td>$22,127</td>
<td>$22,124</td>
<td>$3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I Parent Involvement</td>
<td>$3,480</td>
<td>$3,480</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$4,287,449</td>
<td>$4,319,235</td>
<td>($22,886)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allocation Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>1% (Range 50 - 75)</th>
<th>2% (Range 76 - 99)</th>
<th>Status Quo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Value (in %) | 75 | 85 | 100%
| Action | Calculate | Calculate | Calculate |
| Amount | $3,215,587 | $3,644,330 | $4,287,449 |

Add New Budget Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row #</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Purchase?</th>
<th>New/Existing</th>
<th>Budget Line Item</th>
<th>Performance Metric</th>
<th>Budgeted</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
<th>Funding Source(s)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cat MSR</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>3-Position ELEMENTARY TEACHER (6 hour)</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>$97,270</td>
<td>$4,190,179</td>
<td>Unrestricted (100%)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cat MSR</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>3-Position ELEMENTARY TEACHER (6 hour)</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>$98,757</td>
<td>$4,051,422</td>
<td>Unrestricted (100%)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cat MSR</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>3-Position ELEMENTARY TEACHER (6 hour)</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>$202,023</td>
<td>$4,906,799</td>
<td>Unrestricted (100%)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cat MSR</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>2-Position ELEMENTARY TEACHER (4 hour)</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>$80,101</td>
<td>$3,026,968</td>
<td>Unrestricted (100%)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trainings

With input and feedback of school leaders, LAUSD is developing a set of training modules that will support school leaders and stakeholders in the school planning and budget development process. These self-paced, web-based learning modules allow school leaders to assess their own level of skill in and understanding of each activity. Click here to see the vision for this training support.

Your input is important. If you’d like to participate on the training review team or would like to send feedback on these modules, please complete this form: Feedback form

Leadership Skills Training Support and Resources

Recognizing the needs of our employees, parents and community members to engage each other in meaningful, respectful, and authentic discussions on how best to meet the academic needs of our children, we have collaborated with the Personnel Commission’s Workforce Management Classified Training team to compile the Leadership Skills Training Support and Resources below to support all of our stakeholders. These trainings have been developed and organized around topics we believe are universal, and fundamental, to leading an open, transparent, and engaging process. Click on a topic below for more information and a link to training and resources.

Meeting Management

Should we have a meeting on this? How are we going to get through all of this? What should be on the agenda for this meeting? What tips do you have for dealing with a disruptive member? If you’ve ever asked yourself any of these questions, take a look at the link below to our Meeting Management page! You’ll find the answers to these questions, as well as training, job aides and sample documents to help you effectively manage your meetings and participants for results. http://classifiedtraining.lausd.net/employee_resources/jlt/meeting_management
Challenges & Lessons Learned

• Pilot vs. Big Bang
• Much easier to invest new resources vs. reallocating resources - don’t create winners & losers.
• Schools must hear the virtues of the model from their peers; identify champions early and support them and their work
• Central Office buy-in, support and advocacy is critical
Jesse Levin,
SSFR Research Director

Nicholas Mills,
SSFR Task Leader
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Motivation and Research Question

• Purpose of Analysis
  – Provide baseline account of spending equity across schools prior to implementation of BSA (LAUSD) and SSFR (TRUSD).
  – Evaluate changes in equity associated with implementation.

• Key Research Question
  – Have schools that receive dollars via the allocation mechanisms developed under BSA and SSFR experienced significant increases in equity compared to their peers that are provided resources according to traditional staffing models?
Methodology

• Difference-in-Differences Model for LAUSD

\[ PPE_{st} = \sum_{s=1}^{S} \mu_s + \sum_{q=1}^{Q} \beta_q X_{qst} + \sum_{t=2}^{6} \gamma_t + \delta_1 ENR_{st} + \delta_2 ENR^2_{st} + \sum_{t=p}^{6} \epsilon_t TREAT_{st} + \sum_{t=p}^{6} \theta_t TREAT_{st} \ast FRL_{st} + \epsilon_{st} \]

– \( PPE_{st} \) is per-pupil expenditure for school \( s \) at time \( t \);
– \( \mu_s \) is an indicator variable for school \( s \);
– \( X_{qst} \) is a matrix of \( q \) student background characteristics (percent FRL and EL) for school \( s \) at time \( t \);
– \( \gamma_t \) is an indicator variable for year \( t \) (ranging from 2 to 6);
– \( ENR_{st} \) denotes student enrollment for school \( s \) at time \( t \);
– \( TREAT_{st} \) is an indicator for school \( s \) receiving treatment year \( t \) (ranging from \( p \) to 6, where \( p \) is the first year of treatment for each schooling level);
– \( TREAT_{st} \ast FRL_{st} \) is an interaction variable for school \( s \) at time \( t \) (ranging from \( p \) to 6, where \( p \) is the first year of treatment for each schooling level) between \( TREAT_{st} \) and percent free/reduced price lunch;
– \( \epsilon_{st} \) is an error term assumed to be correlated across school-specific observations over time.
– Model run separately by schooling level (elementary, middle and high).

• Experimenting with alternative specifications.
• Model for TRUSD is similar, but could not be run separately by schooling level.
Data

• LAUSD
  – Fiscal data from central district office
  – Demographics from California Department of Education
  – 2006-07 through 2011-12 (3 pre/3 post for elementary and middle schools, 2 pre/4 post for high schools)

• TRUSD
  – Fiscal data from central district office
  – Demographics from California Department of Education
  – 2008-09 through 2011-12 (2 pre/2 post for all schools)
Main (Preliminary) Results for LAUSD I

• *Level* Differences in Spending/Poverty Relationship Between BSA and Traditionally-Funded Schools

Results suggest that in some cases BSA schools have experienced decreases in the *level* of the spending/poverty relationship that are significantly *larger* than traditionally-funded schools in years of BSA implementation.

  • For elementary schools, the *negative* BSA/Traditional school difference in general level of spending by poverty is *always* statistically significant.
  • For high schools, the *negative* BSA/Traditional school difference in general level of spending by poverty is *sometimes* statistically significant.

• *Slope* Differences in Spending/Poverty Relationship Between BSA and Traditionally Funded Schools

Results suggest that in some cases BSA schools have experienced increases in the *slope* of the spending/poverty relationship that are significantly *larger* than traditionally-funded schools in years of BSA implementation.

  • For elementary schools, the *positive* BSA/Traditional school difference in spending/poverty slope is *often* statistically significant.
  • For high schools, the *positive* BSA/Traditional school difference in spending/poverty slope is *sometimes* statistically significant.
Main (Preliminary) Results for LAUSD II

• Observed changes in intercepts and slopes have resulted in increases in implicit student poverty weights among BSA schools over time.
  — For elementary schools, the implicit poverty weight increased from 1.03 in the baseline year to 1.35 in the most recent year of BSA implementation (change is significant at the 5%-level).
  — For high schools, the implicit poverty weight increased from 0.98 in the baseline year to 4.82 in the most recent year of BSA implementation (change is significant at the 5%-level).

• Observed changes in intercepts (↓) and slopes (↑) imply that higher poverty elementary BSA schools have been better insulated from cuts in spending that have occurred over the BSA implementation period.
### Sign/Significance of Estimated Level and Slope Treatment (BSA) Effects on the Relationship Between Percent Free or Reduce Price Lunch (FRL) and Overall Per-Pupil Spending in LAUSD Elementary, Middle and High Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schooling Level</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: “+” and “−” denote positive and negative level and slope treatment effects that are significant at the 5%-level.
Predicted Overall Per-Pupil Spending Across Percent Free or Reduced Price Lunch (FRL) for BSA Elementary Schools in LAUSD (2008-09 to 2011-12)

Notes: Predictions hold enrollment and percent ELL at year-specific sample averages. Significance of baseline FRL slope estimate corresponds to test of null hypothesis that estimate is equal to 0. Significance of year-specific FRL slope estimates correspond to tests of null hypotheses that differences from baseline FRL slope estimate is 0. ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% levels, respectively.
Predicted Overall Per-Pupil Spending Across Percent Free or Reduced Price Lunch (FRL) for BSA Middle Schools in LAUSD (2008-09 to 2011-12)

Notes: Predictions hold enrollment and percent ELL at year-specific sample averages. Significance of baseline FRL slope estimate corresponds to test of null hypothesis that estimate is equal to 0. Significance of year-specific FRL slope estimates correspond to tests of null hypotheses that differences from baseline FRL slope estimate is 0. ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% levels, respectively. Student poverty weights are shown in parentheses (weights calculated as [(profile constant + slope * 100)/profile constant]).
Predicted Overall Per-Pupil Spending Across Percent Free or Reduced Price Lunch (FRL) for BSA High Schools in LAUSD (2007-08 to 2011-12)

Notes: Predictions hold enrollment and percent ELL at year-specific sample averages. Significance of baseline FRL slope estimate corresponds to test of null hypothesis that estimate is equal to 0. Significance of year-specific FRL slope estimates correspond to tests of null hypotheses that differences from baseline FRL slope estimate is 0. ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at the 1%, 5 % and 10% levels, respectively. Student poverty weights are shown in parentheses (weights calculated as [(profile constant + slope * 100) /profile constant]).
Summary of LAUSD Results II

- There is some evidence suggesting that BSA schools experienced improvements in spending equity after implementation.
  - Significant positive differences in slope of spending/poverty relationship between BSA and Traditionally-Funded schools.
    - Elementary Schools - FRL slope estimate for BSA schools is significantly different from the baseline at the 5%-level in two of the three implementation years.
    - Middle Schools – No significant differences in FRL slope estimate between BSA schools and baseline.
    - High Schools - FRL slope estimate for BSA schools is significantly different from the baseline at the 5%-level in one of the four implementation years.

- Final Thought – Equity Improvements in the Context of Fiscal Crisis and Recovery
  - The study period includes years of significant budget cuts. While BSA seems to improved equity in some cases (e.g., elementary schools) and helped higher poverty schools better “weather the storm”, will these improvements be sustained over time once fiscal conditions improve? That is, was BSA implemented at an opportune time to springboard a new era of enhanced equity?
Next Steps

• Experiment with Alternative Model Specifications
• Decompose Overall Spending Variations
  – Spending from unrestricted revenues
  – Spending from restricted revenues
• Extend Analysis to Distal Outcomes (Student Achievement)
  – California Academic Performance Index (API)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>-49.6 (39.6)</td>
<td>-575 *** (161)</td>
<td>-271 *** (72.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>297 *** (32.3)</td>
<td>-46.1 (89.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>-573 *** (28.3)</td>
<td>-261 *** (64.4)</td>
<td>-445 *** (113)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>-748 *** (40.4)</td>
<td>-295 ** (126)</td>
<td>-207 (164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>-597 *** (44.9)</td>
<td>-586 *** (165)</td>
<td>-279 (178)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>-9.25 *** (1.05)</td>
<td>-5.35 *** (.944)</td>
<td>-2.72 *** (.563)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Sq.</td>
<td>.0031 *** (.0006)</td>
<td>.0009 *** (.0002)</td>
<td>.0003 ** (.0001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent FRL</td>
<td>2.63 * (1.44)</td>
<td>.791 (7.99)</td>
<td>-1.65 (6.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent ELL</td>
<td>9.93 ** (3.94)</td>
<td>26 (22.4)</td>
<td>14.7 (15.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA - 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2106 *** (496)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA - 2010</td>
<td>-920 ** (414)</td>
<td>-813 (988)</td>
<td>-690 (1077)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA - 2011</td>
<td>-1291 ** (638)</td>
<td>-2304 * (1205)</td>
<td>-2694 * (1530)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA - 2012</td>
<td>-1501 ** (616)</td>
<td>-2655 * (1533)</td>
<td>-5353 *** (1307)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSAXFRL - 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5 (8.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSAXFRL - 2010</td>
<td>9.08 (9.76)</td>
<td>12.9 (12.9)</td>
<td>5.4 (16.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSAXFRL - 2011</td>
<td>19.8 ** (8.62)</td>
<td>36.2 * (19.8)</td>
<td>28 (20.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSAXFRL - 2012</td>
<td>20.6 ** (8.7)</td>
<td>37.6 * (22)</td>
<td>61 *** (15.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>12828 *** (445)</td>
<td>13247 *** (1343)</td>
<td>11365 *** (816)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-Sq.</td>
<td>0.8591</td>
<td>0.8215</td>
<td>0.8370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Observations</td>
<td>2715</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jay Chambers,
SSFR Principal Investigator

American Institutes for Research
2012-13 Perspectives and Attitudes

Analysis of Interviews and Surveys
Analysis of Perspectives and Attitudes

2012-13 Interviews:
- 25 central office staff in Twin Rivers Unified School District (TRUSD) and Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) combined
- 13 principal interviews, 8 with principals from TRUSD and 4 with principals from LAUSD
- 10 end-of-project central office interviews in TRUSD

2012 Surveys:
- TRUSD
  - Principals (n=38; Cohort 1: 11; Cohort 2: 9; Cohort 3: 15)
  - Teachers (n=291; FTE and partial-time teachers: 101; non-teacher: 190)
  - School Site Councils (n=225; Cohort 1: 41; Cohort 2: 59; Cohort 3: 49; Unknown: 76)
- LAUSD
  - Principals (n=745; Non-pilot: 629; BSA pilot: 116; Non-pilot BSA: ?)
  - Teachers (n=13,957; Pilot: 1,498; Non-pilot: 12,459; BSA: ?; Non-BSA: ?)
  - School Site Councils (n=132; Pilot: 28; Non-pilot: 64; unknown: 40)
**INVEST for STUDENT SUCCESS (ISS) Team**

Dr. Jay G. Chambers, ISS Director  
Mahala R. Archer, ISS Coordinator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research/Tool Development Team</th>
<th>Implementation Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jesse D. Levin, Director</td>
<td>Jessica Johnson, Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Mills, Task Leader</td>
<td>Aaron Butler, Task leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jennifer Schroll, Director, Technology Support Team  
Jason Willis, Senior Advisor, Asst. Supt, San Jose Unified School District

Website: [www.investforstudentsuccess.org](http://www.investforstudentsuccess.org)
ISS is a Core Reform Strategy that re-conceptualizes WSF as an integrated collection of policies, procedures, and tools that can be applied to reorganizing the school finance and governance structures in a school district for the purpose of improving student learning.

Goals of ISS:
- To improve student outcomes
- To increase equitable access to educational resources
- To create a culture of innovation, accountability, and efficiency

ISS includes:
- The next generation of electronic tools
- Enhanced policies, procedures, and training programs