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## What Does SSFR Intend to Promote?

$>$ Equity
>Transparency
>Autonomy Linked to Accountability
>Efficiency and Innovation

## 気AIR

## SSFR Theory of Action

(1) Culture of Innovation and Efficiency:
(a) School autonomy linked to accountability;
(b) Family Choice
(3) Transparency:
(a) Simple models and
(b) Participatory decision making processes.
(2) Equity:
(a) Allocating dollars based on student need \&
(b) Facilitating equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals.

## 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.


District establishes
 districtwide goals and

## 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
provides accountability oversight and capacity building to schools


Finalized school-level goals, strategies and budgets forwarded to

DBOM

## 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.

## 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).
ㄱㅔㅔNR $>$ 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 2008-09Decile \# (\%FRL, \%ELL, \%SE)
(Overall Expenditures in Bold)


■ Unrestricted Per Pupil Expenditure ■ Restricted Per Pupil Expenditure

## 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



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)


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)
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