




AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH®

# Strategic School Funding for Results (SSFR):


An Overview of the Project in LAUSD

April 27, 2010

# Overview of SSFR

- ▶ The *Strategic School Funding for Results* project has three major goals:
    - (a) to develop and implement more **equitable** and **transparent** strategies for allocating resources to schools within each district,
    - (b) to link those strategies to systems designed to encourage **innovation**, and
    - (c) to strengthen **accountability** for student outcomes.
- 

# SSFR – 6 Basic Policy Elements

1. Increased transparency for resource allocation policies and practices
  2. Need-based funding of schools
  3. School autonomy linked with accountability for results
  4. Equitable access to highly qualified teachers across schools
  5. Expanded educational choices for families and children
  6. Options for schools to select and purchase central office services
- 

# Where does one start on a project like this?

- ▶ Learn more about:
  - Current patterns of resource allocation
  - Current practice related to resource allocation


*Do higher need students have sufficient access to additional resources they need to achieve district and state goals?*

Variations in resources by student need (%poverty & %EL):

- ▶ School level spending per pupil – 3 different angles
  - Restricted v Unrestricted spending
  - Scatter plots
  - Spending–poverty relation, controlling for other cost factors
- ▶ Quantity and qualifications of teachers
- ▶ Next steps


# Average Overall, Restricted and Unrestricted Expenditures Per Pupil by Decile of Poverty for LAUSD Elementary Schools in 2008-09 (Overall Expenditures in Bold)

Decile (Poverty, ELL, SE)




# Average Overall, Restricted and Unrestricted Expenditures Per Pupil by Decile of Poverty for LAUSD Middle Schools in 2008-09 (Overall Expenditures in Bold)

Decile (Poverty, ELL, SE)



# Average Overall, Restricted and Unrestricted Expenditures Per Pupil by Decile of Poverty for LAUSD High Schools in 2008-09 (Overall Expenditures in Bold)

## Decile (Poverty, ELL, SE)







# Scatter plots

Spending against student poverty with indicators of prevalence of ELs

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



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



The scatter plot displays the relationship between the percentage of students in the Free and Reduced Lunch Program (X-axis) and Per-Pupil Expenditure (Y-axis). The X-axis ranges from 0% to 100% with major ticks every 20%. The Y-axis ranges from 0 to 20,000 with major ticks every 4,000. A solid black line represents the linear fit for the Low\_ELL group (blue circles), showing a positive correlation. A dashed vertical line is positioned at approximately 70% on the X-axis. Data points for High\_ELL (purple squares) are clustered between 65% and 95% on the X-axis and 6,000 to 12,000 on the Y-axis. Data points for Low\_ELL (blue circles) are more widely distributed across the X-axis range from 20% to 95% and Y-axis range from 4,000 to 10,000.


Percentage of Students in Free and Reduced Lunch Program	Per-Pupil Expenditure	Category
22%	6500	Low_ELL
35%	5000	Low_ELL
44%	6800	Low_ELL
45%	8000	Low_ELL
46%	8200	Low_ELL
47%	6800	Low_ELL
48%	7200	Low_ELL
52%	7500	Low_ELL
54%	7800	Low_ELL
55%	6800	Low_ELL
62%	7500	Low_ELL
63%	5000	Low_ELL
64%	9200	Low_ELL
65%	7500	Low_ELL
68%	7800	Low_ELL
69%	8000	Low_ELL
70%	7800	Low_ELL
71%	6500	Low_ELL
72%	8200	Low_ELL
73%	8000	Low_ELL
74%	5000	Low_ELL
75%	9500	Low_ELL
76%	7200	Low_ELL
78%	7500	Low_ELL
80%	10000	Low_ELL
85%	9500	Low_ELL
67%	7500	High_ELL
68%	7800	High_ELL
69%	8200	High_ELL
70%	7500	High_ELL
71%	8500	High_ELL
72%	7800	High_ELL
73%	8200	High_ELL
74%	7500	High_ELL
75%	8000	High_ELL
76%	7200	High_ELL
77%	7800	High_ELL
78%	7500	High_ELL
79%	8200	High_ELL
80%	7800	High_ELL
81%	8000	High_ELL
82%	6500	High_ELL
83%	8500	High_ELL
84%	12500	High_ELL
85%	7200	High_ELL
86%	7800	High_ELL
87%	7500	High_ELL
88%	8200	High_ELL
89%	7800	High_ELL
90%	8500	High_ELL
92%	6800	High_ELL
94%	7500	High_ELL

# Relation of spending to poverty controlling for %EL and school size

- ▶ Changes over time

# Controlling for other factors, total per pupil expenditure increases as the percentage of poverty at elementary schools increases.


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.

# But, there is a negative relationship between unrestricted per-pupil expenditure and percentage of poverty at 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.

# Restricted per-pupil expenditure drives the overall positive relationship between per pupil expenditure and percentage of poverty in elementary schools.




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)



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





The pattern holds true for middle schools: the positive relationship between total per pupil expenditure and percentage of poverty is driven by restricted per pupil spending.



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

The same pattern holds true for high schools, except in 2008–09, when there was a positive relationship between unrestricted per pupil expenditure and percentage of poverty.



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

Other resource measures:

The quantity and quality of  
teachers

# Quantity and quality of teaching in high need LAUSD schools


- ▶ **More FTE teachers/pupil in high poverty schools.**
  - High poverty schools tend to have more FTE teachers per pupil (smaller classes) than low poverty schools.
  - For example, high poverty elementary schools have ~ 1 teacher per 17 students, while low poverty elementary schools have 1 teacher for every 20 students.
  - For example, high poverty HS have ~ 1 teacher per 20 students, while low poverty HS have 1 teacher for every 25 students.
- ▶ **High poverty schools have the least experienced teachers and more students are exposed to out of field teaching.**
  - For example, as many as 7 percent of the students in core subjects are taught by out of field teachers in high poverty high schools, while this is closer to 1 percent in the lowest poverty schools. This is true in English, Math, and science with the largest difference in science.

# Next steps:

- ▶ We are back to the original question we posed:

*Do higher need students have sufficient access to additional resources they need to achieve district and state goals?*

# **We are building a need based funding model for LAUSD**

- ▶ **Determining the costs of pupil needs.**
  - ▶ **Gathering cost data.**
  - ▶ **Linking dollars to goals and creating weights.**
  - ▶ **Policy meetings to define NBFM.**
- 

# Guiding Questions for cost model activities: think **G. E. E. R.**

- ▶ **G**oals:
  - *Will your program design achieve the goals?*
- ▶ **E**fficient:
  - *Does your program design minimize cost?*
- ▶ **E**vidence-based:
  - *Is your program design supported by research evidence?*
- ▶ **R**ealistic:
  - *Does your program design fit the realities in your district and have a reasonable chance for implementation?*

# Why we do this cost analysis

1. Establish clarity on goals.
  2. Concrete, transparent foundation for weights.
  3. Align resources and goals
  4. Participatory process
  5. Determine sources of revenues
    - a) Dividing resources between school and district level services.
    - b) Provide foundation for decisions on local tax levels.
  6. Models unique for each district
- 