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What Does SSFR Intend to Promote?

- Equity
- Transparency
- Autonomy Linked to Accountability
- Efficiency and Innovation
**SSFR Theory of Action**

(1) **Culture of Innovation and Efficiency:**
   - (a) School autonomy linked to accountability;
   - (b) Family Choice

(2) **Equity:**
   - (a) Allocating dollars based on student need &
   - (b) Facilitating equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals.

(3) **Transparency:**
   - (a) Simple models and
   - (b) Participatory decision making processes.
Overview of SSFR Tool Suite

1 - Targeted Revenue Model (TRM)
District determines services and dollars to place under school discretion and equitably distributes these resources to schools based on pupil needs.

2 - Planning, Budgeting and Resource Allocation (PBAR)
Schools set goals, develop strategies and specify staff/materials to achieve goals, and link budgeted dollars to revenue sources.

3 - District Budget and Outcomes Management (DBOM)
Reporting and monitoring based on current school spending and goal/budget data coupled with information on school outcomes.

Projected school-level budget caps forwarded to PBAR

District establishes districtwide goals and provides accountability oversight and capacity building to schools

District modifies TRM based on review of DBOM reports

Finalized school-level goals, strategies and budgets forwarded to DBOM

District modifies TRM based on review of DBOM reports
The Value of SSFR

- **Establish clarity on goals.** SSFR decision making processes requires you to be explicit about your goals.

- **Establishes a concrete, transparent, and evidentiary foundation for your budget.** SSFR encourages school leaders to justify resource allocation decisions.

- **Align resources and goals.** SSFR encourages site leaders to align resource allocation decisions with goals.

- **Participatory process.** SSFR encourages inclusion of a wide range of stakeholders in resource allocation decisions.

- **Determine sources of revenues.** SSFR requires sites to link revenue sources with programmatic and service elements.
Requirements and Challenges for Implementing SSFR

- SSFR requires LEA commitment to equity, transparency, and autonomy at the school site.
- SSFR requires development of capacity and support structures for school leaders on budget development.
- SSFR requires a paradigm shift and hence threatens the way certain individuals do their work.
- Thoroughly leveraging a per-pupil needs-based budgeting system requires:
  - Applying actual rather than district-average salaries in the budgeting process.
  - Allowing greater teacher mobility.
  - Obtaining union concessions to affecting these changes.
Where Do We Begin?

- Conduct interviews with key district and school administrators to learn about current budgeting practices.
- Generate resource allocation analyses (e.g., exploring variation in resources by student need):
  - Main Question: Do higher need students have equitable access to the additional resources needed to achieve state and district goals?
- Quantity and Qualifications of Teachers
- Analyses of School-Level Per-Pupil Spending
  - Restricted Versus Unrestricted Spending
  - Plots of Spending Versus Poverty
  - Estimates of Spending/Poverty Relationship Controlling for Other Cost Factors
Autonomy/Flexibility and Equity in LAUSD

**Autonomy/Flexibility** – Principals and teachers both generally reported having the autonomy to implement an instructional program that meets their students’ needs.

- Principals (96% Pilot, 79% Non-Pilot).
- Teachers (76% Pilot, 79% Non-Pilot)

**Equity** – Half or less of principals and about one-third to forty percent of teachers agreed with the statement that “funds are equitably allocated to schools.”

- Principals (43% Pilot, 54% Non-Pilot).
- Teachers (34% Pilot, 43% Non-Pilot)
Quantity and Qualification of Teachers in High-Need LAUSD Schools

- More Teachers Per Pupil in High Poverty Schools
  - Elementary Schools
    - High poverty elementary schools have about 1 teacher per 17 students
    - Low poverty elementary schools have 1 teacher for every 20 students
  - High Schools
    - High poverty HS have about 1 teacher per 20 students
    - Low poverty HS have 1 teacher for every 25 students

- High Poverty Schools Have
  - Less Experienced Teachers
  - More Students Exposed to Out-of-Field Teaching
    - High Poverty Schools – 7 percent of the students taking core subjects are instructed by out of field teachers.
    - Low Poverty Schools – Figure equals 1 percent.
## Average Overall, Restricted and Unrestricted Expenditures Per Pupil by Decile of Poverty for LAUSD Elementary Schools in 2008-09

(Overall Expenditures in Bold)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decile # (%FRL, %ELL, %SE)</th>
<th>Unrestricted Per Pupil Expenditure</th>
<th>Restricted Per Pupil Expenditure</th>
<th>Overall Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decile 10 (96%, 57%, 10%)</td>
<td>$5,108</td>
<td>$3,675</td>
<td>$8,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decile 9 (94%, 55%, 10%)</td>
<td>$5,210</td>
<td>$3,528</td>
<td>$8,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decile 8 (93%, 50%, 10%)</td>
<td>$5,065</td>
<td>$3,511</td>
<td>$8,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decile 7 (92%, 48%, 11%)</td>
<td>$5,091</td>
<td>$4,011</td>
<td>$9,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decile 6 (90%, 51%, 11%)</td>
<td>$5,270</td>
<td>$3,720</td>
<td>$8,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decile 5 (88%, 43%, 11%)</td>
<td>$5,155</td>
<td>$3,506</td>
<td>$8,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decile 4 (83%, 39%, 12%)</td>
<td>$5,376</td>
<td>$3,696</td>
<td>$9,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decile 3 (74%, 31%, 14%)</td>
<td>$5,605</td>
<td>$3,872</td>
<td>$9,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decile 2 (55%, 19%, 13%)</td>
<td>$5,558</td>
<td>$3,412</td>
<td>$8,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decile 1 (20%, 11%, 12%)</td>
<td>$5,322</td>
<td>$2,259</td>
<td>$7,581</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spending/Poverty Relationship in LAUSD Elementary Schools

- Positive relationship between overall expenditures and poverty.
- Lots of variation around the fitted line.

Plot of Overall Expenditure Per Pupil by Poverty for LAUSD Elementary Schools in 2008-09

- Positive relationship between overall expenditures and poverty.
- Lots of variation around the fitted line.
Conditional Spending/Poverty Relationship in LAUSD Elementary Schools

In 2008-09, the highest poverty elementary schools spend $1.27 on low-income students for every $1 spent on non-low-income students, controlling for differences in school size and percent EL students.

Ratios of Total Per-Pupil Expenditure in LAUSD Elementary Schools Serving Varying Percentages of Students Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (2006-07 to 2008-09)

Note: ***, **, and * denote statistical significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels, respectively.
Conditional Spending/Poverty Relationship in LAUSD Elementary Schools

In 2008-09, for every unrestricted dollar spent on a non-low income student, 93 cents is spent on a low-income student in elementary schools.

Ratios of Unrestricted Per-Pupil Expenditure in LAUSD Elementary Schools Serving Varying Percentages of Students Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (2006-07 to 2008-09)

Note: ***, **, and * denote statistical significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels, respectively.
Conditional Spending/Poverty Relationship in LAUSD Elementary Schools

In 2008-09, spending out restricted funds drove the overall spending-poverty relationship. $2.38 of restricted funding was spent on every low-income student for each dollar spent on non-low-income students.

Ratios of Restricted Per-Pupil Expenditure in LAUSD Elementary Schools Serving Varying Percentages of Students Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (2006-07 to 2008-09)

Percent Free/Reduced-Price Lunch

Note: ***, **, and * denote statistical significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels, respectively.
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