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A Vision for Closing the Long Standing Achievement Gap

Four years ago, Governor Jerry Brown initiated an unprecedented effort to invest billions of new state dollars in school districts that serve sizable counts of high-need and low-achieving students. What became known as the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) has brought billions of new dollars to the Los Angeles Unified School District, including $3.8 billion over the last four years generated by the ‘targeted student population’ (TSP), which includes pupils from low-income families, English-learners, and children in foster care.

In the current 2016-17 school year, the money generated from the TSP amounts to $1.1 billion. These supplemental and concentration grants equal about one-fifth of the entire funding stream from the state; a substantial part of the over $8.4 billion annual operating budget, including local and federal revenues.

LAUSD’s per pupil spending has increased as a direct result of its substantial high-need population. Funding for each child (per pupil spending) has climbed about 25 percent above pre-recession levels across LAUSD, rising from about $9,400 in the 2006-07 school year, to $12,100 in 2015-16, after adjusting for inflation.¹

The CLASS Coalition and allied pro-equity groups believe that these additional dollars should go directly towards programs that close the
long-standing opportunity gap between high-needs pupils and their more affluent peers. Using a nuanced equity formula, total budgets should be focused on the District’s high and highest-needs schools. Additionally, parents and students should be meaningfully involved in shaping investment decisions, and the District should align spending to discrete goals in the Board’s local accountability plan (LCAP).

To achieve this vision is no easy feat. We applaud the District for shifting towards equity at the high school level in particular. Contract and pension obligations make real change difficult, and potential cuts at the federal level further constrain access to resources. Now is the time to be courageous: to identify our highest-needs schools and students, to align LCAP and district goals with meaningful investments, and to involve the community in supporting LA’s young people.

2 OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS FROM THE LAST THREE YEARS

The challenge is quite simple: move new resources to schools that serve the most disadvantaged students, and identify what program strategies truly work inside schools. While we detail below some movement over time, our research illuminates the following patterns:

- Targeting Dollars. The Board continues to do the bare minimum to implement the Equity is Justice Resolution, approved in July of 2014. An ‘equity formula’ of duplicated TSP counts is applied inconsistently to school allocations tied to the “Investment Fund” (or proportionality dollars). This portion of supplemental and concentration funds equals less than five percent of the District’s operating budget. Over the past three years, only about a small percentage of the Investment Fund has gone to schools based on school rank via the equity formula.

This report widened the lens of discussion, and details variation in total funding sent to schools by the District over the last three years. While we find some evidence of increased allocations for higher-needs middle and high schools, LAUSD falls far short of a serious commitment to equity, and demonstrates how unfair the system was prior to LCFF. The District ignores the relative disadvantage of students when distributing dollars to elementary schools. Hold harmless policies and concentrations of senior teachers are two systemic barriers to achieving budget equity.

- Strategies that Lift Student Achievement. It has become clear that there are no commonly held strategies to close the opportunity gap in LAUSD, and best practices that are empirically identified are not reflected as budget priorities. The District has no cross-departmental effort underway to assess how its 40-plus initiatives supported by the Investment Fund actually affect the Board’s stated intent of narrowing achievement gaps.

Further, principals report ongoing instability in their budgets and constant, time-consuming compliance demands. This makes strategic and goal oriented budgeting challenging at the school site level as well. If new programs or positions do not receive sufficient support, it is unfair to expect that a single, one time infusion will spur sustainable change. Conversely, the District’s pending budget shortfall threatens to efface these support programs. The modest gains that high-needs schools and pupils have made are at risk without a cohesive strategy or equity formula.

- Community Engagement. Principals, teacher leaders, parents and students are becoming more familiar with LCFF, one sign of progress in the fourth year of implementation. Engagement in the District and school site budgeting, however, remains inconsistent in its implementation and results. Originally intended to be a widely participatory and community driven process, budget building under LCFF at times appears to be a regimented, inauthentic and compliance-driven process.
Principals have to make tough choices about the small portion of flexible dollars awarded to their schools based on their school’s TSP count. They have to balance the requests of all those involved in the school. While Title I requires a community driven Single Plan, approved by School Site Council, there is not a formal approval process for the “TSP allocation” line item, for example.

3 **FOCUSING BUDGETS ON HIGH-NEEDS STUDENTS**

Without a strategic and monetary focus on the students and schools that need the greatest support, LAUSD will not achieve its goals of “100 percent graduation” and “proficiency for all.” LAUSD serves large counts of students from low-income or non-English speaking families. Indeed, about four in five students fall under at least one of the TSP categories. Due to this immense need, it is even more important to be nuanced and concerted with investments and school site allocations.

Wide disparities in achievement persist between schools and among pupils within schools. Moreover, schools differ in terms of the concentration or count of unduplicated students from the TSP student categories.2

Stark disparities in achievement start early on in a subgroup’s educational career and persist in the rates of college and career readiness among high school students. We see that LAUSD has made notable progress in narrowing the disparity in shares of Latino vis-à-vis White students deemed as college and career ready in recent years. Progress for Black high schoolers has been slight.3 English learners, foster youth and homeless youth have even lower rates of achievement.

Much progress remains in closing these sticky achievement gaps. It is difficult to see how this will come to pass until dollars flow to schools who serve the most disadvantaged students – the very children and youths who generate about $1.1 billion in new yearly revenues for the District under Governor Brown’s reform.
**Targeting Dollars – Budgeting to Narrow Achievement Gaps**

**Elementary Schools Receive Largest Per Pupil Investments**

Our prior LCFF Report Cards detailed how only a portion of the Investment Fund – equaling less than 5 percent of the District’s budget – actually goes to schools that serve larger concentrations of the Targeted Student Population. Given that the criterion of fairness is not applied to the remaining 95 percent of the District’s budget, this year’s analysis asks a broader question: Is the District equitably allocating total school budgets along strategic lines that aim to improve the educational outcomes of high-need students?

Thanks to LAUSD’s budget office, providing school-by-school budget data each year, we analyzed per pupil spending among differing kinds of schools over the past three years, between 2013-14 and 2015-16, the initial three years of LCFF implementation. LAUSD remains unable to provide a budget file for a true baseline year, that is, the year before LCFF kicked-in from Sacramento (2012-13).

After calculating per pupil spending for LAUSD elementary, middle, and high schools over the past three years, we can examine differences among types of campuses as fresh LCFF dollars arrived from Sacramento, as well as modest gains in federal revenues. This analysis excludes charter, continuation, special education centers, and alternative high school facilities.4

Figure 2 reveals that spending is higher for elementary school pupils, on average, relative to other grade levels. The District spent almost $7,500 per pupil in the first year of LCFF, 2013-14. This compares with about $6,400 per high school student in the same year.

This difference is likely driven by a number of historical and organizational factors. Elementary teachers hold three years more experience than their high school peers (17 versus 14 years of tenure, respectively), which drives up salary costs. Average class size is considerably lower at the elementary level as well (32:15 versus 40:16).

What’s notable is that while the state’s LCFF formula yielded significantly more dollars per high school pupil, actual costs remain greater at the elementary level, where inequitable distributions are sharpest.

This figure also shows that high school students have enjoyed the strongest spending gains over the initial three years of LCFF implementation. Spending per pupil for high schoolers climbed to just over $8,300 (30 percent jump), compared with moving up $8,650 for elementary children (16 percent gain) and a 15 percent jump for middle schoolers. The middle school gains occurred largely in the first year (13 percent increase versus 2 percent increase in 2015-16).

**Examining Whole Budget Distributions over the Last Three Years Reveal Inequitable Allocations at the Elementary Level**

Do the TSP students and schools generating the $1.1 billion in supplemental and concentration dollars actually receive fresh resources? To inform this pivotal question, we tracked per pupil, spending over time, after splitting schools based on their unduplicated concentrations of TSP pupils – English learners, low-income, foster, and homeless youths.

Starting with elementary schools, we see in Figure 3 that student composition bears little association with gains in per pupil spending. Schools serving fewer than 60 percent TSP students actually had a 20 percent gain in spending per pupil, compared to schools with over 90 percent enrollment of TSP students, which saw a 14 percent increase over two years.7 The middle TSP school group also receives more per student than the high TSP grouping.

---

**Figure 2 Per-pupil school spending: Total budget**

- **2013-14**
  - Elementary: $7,469
  - Middle: $6,946
  - High: $6,423
- **2014-15**
  - Elementary: $8,147
  - Middle: $7,977
  - High: $7,712
- **2015-16**
  - Elementary: $8,648
  - Middle: $8,309
  - High: $8,137
Turning to high and middle schools, the picture is quite different (Figure 4 and 5). We see that gains in per pupil spending have benefitted those campuses serving larger shares of high-need students – consistent with the governor’s policy intent. Although keeping with some equity principals, middle schools are relatively flat in terms of their gains compared to elementary and high schools. The District’s 31 high schools that serve at least 90 percent TSP pupils saw per pupil spending climb from $6,550 per pupil to almost $9,600 over the past three years. LAUSD only hosts two high schools with enrollments less than 60 percent TSP. These campus budgets leveled-off after a bump in the first year of LCFF implementation. For both middle and high schools, there was little distinction between school site allocations in 2013-14 year, the first year of LCFF implementation.

Note that these numbers do not mirror the total per-pupil spending estimates reported in the first section, as centrally held programs such as special education and foster supports, along central office payouts for building maintenance, health care and pension benefits do not appear in school-level budgets.

Investment Fund Dollars Not Targeted for Elementary Schools, Moderately for High Schools

LAUSD – like all school districts in California – must spend additional dollars to expand or improve programs for TSP students, beyond the level spent prior to the enactment of LCFF. The District created the Investment Fund, which seeks to meet the state’s Proportionality Requirement. While the District and advocacy groups disagree on the baseline for these investments, this Fund is a portion of supplemental and concentration dollars and totals $372 million in the current school year, or 4.5 percent of the total budget.
Figure 6 shows an initial increase and then leveling-off of these dollars. According to our calculations, LAUSD is actually below what they should be allocating for these “new and increased services to TSPs.

The equity community believes that under the Equity is Justice Resolution, the District should allocated all the Investment Fund dollars to schools who have a high-concentration of TSPs. Our two earlier LCFF Report Cards detailed how the existing Investment Fund is poorly targeted on the TSP population. A recent report by the Partnership for Los Angeles Schools, which manages 19 schools in Boyle Heights, South Los Angeles and Watts in cooperation with the District, concludes that a school’s ranking on the index plays only a minimal role in the distribution of funds. Our analysis reveals similar results, as seen in figures 7 and 8.

Each dot on Figure 7 represents an elementary school’s per pupil allocation. Its placement on the vertical axis, spending per pupil, bears little relation to the share of TSP students that schools enroll, the horizontal axis. This lack of equity continues to stem from the earlier decision to award all elementary schools an assistant principal and librarian, independent of student achievement levels.

In summary, the LAUSD Board – after adopting the Equity Is Justice Resolution over two years ago – still fails to focus investment funds on schools that serve higher concentrations of TSP students. Increasing the amount of Investment Fund dollars without a firm commitment to an equity formula will not guarantee equitable allocations to schools.

5 STRATEGIES TO LIFT ACHIEVEMENT – TYING INVESTMENTS TO STUDENT OUTCOMES

The District has developed multiple LCAPs, along with building a Performance Meter and strategic plan. Broad goals of 100 percent graduation and attendance, proficiency for all, safety and parent engagement are broken into outcomes with incremental gains anticipated over the coming years. If the District wants to see outcomes in these areas, budget allocations should support these efforts.

The Shifting Structure of School Budgets

On the other hand, the District’s Equity Index was moderately applied to the distribution of investment funds among high schools (Figure 8). Per pupil spending from the Investment Fund is higher, on average, in schools that serve larger concentrations of high-need TSP students. While the overall trend is consistent with the Board’s stated policy, there are many schools below the correlation line that are deemed high need, and it is unclear why schools far above the fit are so varied.

We explored what share of school budgets is allocated for teacher costs—mainly annual salary and fringe benefit expenses (Figure 9). The horizontal line in each box indicates the average share of total school spending (from all revenue sources) that’s budgeted for costs linked to certificated teachers.

This share declined from 53 to 48 percent among elementary schools, on average, over the past three years. For high schools, the share of budget going for teachers fell from 47 to 39 percent on average. These budget shares are larger overall when looking just at state LCFF dollars. That is, large portions...
of federal and state categorical aid dollars go for non-teach-
ing support personnel inside schools.\(^{11}\) As federal funding
cuts loom in the future, it will be important for the District
to examine what positions are federally and/or state funded.

The District reports that the count of administrative posts
has climbed from 2,036 to 2,407 since 2013-14 as well,
including central office staff (where many special education,
homeless and foster youth support positions are held). Per
pupil spending has grown most rapidly in high schools serving
larger concentrations of TSP students.\(^{12}\) Meanwhile, the count
of certified teachers declined from 26,364 to 25,276 over
the same period. The count of school support staff rose from
3,657 to 4,498.\(^{13}\)

**The Principal’s Perspective:**
**Hedging Bets with Consistent Inconsistency**

Due to an unclear and inconsistent strategy at the District
level, principals juggle budgets interwoven with compliance
and uncertainty—making it difficult to faithfully allocate LCFF
dollars. Based on our interviews, principals invest LCFF dollars
in a mix of new teacher posts aimed at reducing class
sizes, along with support personnel to address student
needs holistically. All four principals have ‘purchased’ or
are looking to ‘purchase’ counselor posts or new psychologists
to help students prepare for college, or to address deeper
issues of ‘trauma’ and stress stemming from their homes
or among peers.

We also discovered that the uncertainty of budgeting year
to year encourages some principals to purchase materials or
short-term teacher training efforts, rather than longer-term
staff. Most principals report unpredictable fluctuations in
their budgets year to year. And mid-year budget adjustments
add to the uncertainty. So to adapt to these exigencies, our
interviews have noted that principals tend to spend surplus
money on big-ticket items like technological equipment.

“We’ve never been in this situation where we are now,”
reported another principal, “where we just got a large [budget]
surplus because of our increased enrollment and because
of the number of [high needs] students. I am concerned because
they keep saying one budget is going to roll-over and the other
isn’t, so if that were to happen, we can definitely just buy
computers school wide, right? But I don’t want to do that,”
he said.

“I think first of sustaining the position,” another principal
reported. And staffing quota set downtown prescribes the
count of allowable teaching posts, unless a principal wants
to fight and convert about $110,000 in resources (for one
teacher) into other posts or programs. “It’s just easier to buy
a support staff person,” the principal said, who can be let
go if the additional dollars disappear in the following year.

While uncertainty and compliance dictate a lot of principal
spending decisions, some do think carefully about how buying
a new post or mounting a novel program leads to results.
Among a variety of funding streams and reform ideas from
inside one’s school, a bet is placed on a particular initiative.

**Based on our interviews, principals invest LCFF
dollars in a mix of new teacher posts aimed at
reducing class sizes, along with support personnel
to address student needs holistically.**

One principal drew an upward slope in the air, saying “there
are a lot of studies where you change one variable,” and you
see gains in student achievement. “So, we hired additional days
with an attendance counselor. You would think our attendance
rate should go up. But that may or may not happen,” she said.
“You’re just having to go, based on your best thinking.”

Principals are doing their best in often hectic conditions.
Despite increased investments that have brought some
much-needed relief to schools, there needs to be a greater
emphasis on creating whole school ecosystems that support
TSP achievement.
Sacramento’s architects of Local Control Funding emphasize the advantages of budget flexibility for District leaders.¹⁴ The state, however, mandates that community, parents and students be involved in the decision making process about budget allocations and investments.

LAUSD has moved in a generally positive direction in terms of its “LCAP Input Sessions,” making strides each year to increase engagement and report back to participants. The actual impact of these community demands on district budgeting is not always clear, however. There are also improvements from our Year Two findings where principals had not heard of LCFF, nor understood the intention of additional dollars.

Our inquiry centers on if school leaders and school community know about and can engage in decision making about LCFF. A small portion of the Investment Fund called the “Allocation to School TSP” which gives principals flexibility to purchase additional positions or materials. The following details highlights from interviews with four principals at high-needs high schools:

Coordinating Funding Streams Amongst Compliance Demands

Local Control Funding is commonly viewed as just another “piece of the pie”, one element of a “complicated” or “confusing” budget puzzle overseen by District headquarters. And the elements of differing funding streams are weighed against other dollars, including LCFF funds.

“I put all of the budgets under one umbrella,” one high school principal told us. “You can’t make a decision involving categorical [funds] without including the other [funds], such as LCFF. I just can’t say, You know what? I’m going to buy a teacher here without them [any given stakeholder group] knowing, ‘cause then they [another stakeholder group] might want to buy a teacher,” he said.

All four principals understand and appreciate the greater fungibility of the new LCFF funding. Most try to focus the dollars on TSP students – which typically makes up the majority of their students. LCFF is sometimes viewed as yet another funding stream with its own goals and compliance requirements.

The District’s requirement of an annual ‘strategic plan’ from each principal may help nudge them toward articulating
their priorities and thinking about an organizational strategy for addressing the needs of struggling students. As discussed in our Year Two Report Card, this plan is often rolled into Single Plan discussions with School Site Councils with little community buy in.

When examining overall budgeting practices, it is unclear how all investments tie into goals and outcomes, particularly when lifting the performance of high-needs students.

Advice on the compliance elements of LCFF is available from area district offices, most principals reported. Initial workshops on the goals and reporting rules around LCFF were quite helpful in the eyes of these principals. But no one reported sustained coaching on how fungible dollars and new staff positions might cohere into a school-wide strategy.

Principals do talk with teacher leaders, parents, and their school site council to determine weaknesses in their schools—delineating the students or programming that deserves the most urgent attention. Unless the principal hires an external coach, however, they report scarce help from the District in devising a strategy and evaluating what is working inside their schools.

**Balancing the Intent of LCFF Dollars**

Principals for the most part echo LCFF’s commitment to supporting historically underserved pupils. They have funded after-school enrichment efforts, class size reduction, new reading efforts, and additional counselors and psychologists to buoy these members of the ‘targeted student population.’ The principals also report that they are not supposed to use LCFF dollars to backstop special education costs.

The issue does arise between supporting English learners and other high-need student groups, given the District’s focus on narrowing disparities for EL’s. Creative principals can use new LCFF funding in ways that frees-up federal Title I or other dollars to ensure balanced support of all high-need pupils. One principal emphasizes stronger support for immigrant or ‘newcomer’ students, who face both language and social-emotional challenges, and three of the four schools had highlighted dramatic increases in these populations over the last three years.

Our overarching suggestion: The LAUSD Board and Superintendent must develop policy and budgeting practices that target schools and students based on the varying degrees of need across the district. Governor Brown’s stated intent is to lift low-performing students. But the District’s leadership has yet to specify a budget strategy that moves resources to schools that serve disadvantaged pupils.

In addition, District equity policies and practices should be rooted in knowledge of what is effective for raising the performance of high-need students. For the last three years, CLASS and other community partners have called on the Board and Superintendent to do just that. The Board has made clear progress in widening access to A-G courses and better serving foster youth. We have welcomed gains in counselor supports as well. But when examining overall budgeting practices, it is unclear how all investments tie into goals and outcomes, particularly when lifting the performance of high-needs students.
The Board is presently searching for a new budget director and is about to hire their own Independent Analyst. Both offices should enrich the District’s capacity to (a) study how funds are distributed among schools, and (b) trace this down to schools and classrooms to determine what school initiatives are truly raising student achievement. The analytic strategy is quite simple, but it requires a determined, long-term commitment by the Board.

The District can demonstrate a commitment to equity and reaffirm its own goals of increasing graduation and college going rates by adopting the following policies and becoming mindful about implementation:

■ Distribute additional resources to schools that serve high concentrations of high-need pupils – the very students who generate over $1.1 billion in additional aid from Sacramento. The Board, Superintendent and local area superintendents must distribute funding equitably to elementary schools, and increase its commitment to equity at middle and high schools. Creating a solid foundation for our youth is increasingly important, particularly as the District expands its A-G graduation policies. One-off programs cannot thrive in a constrained or unstable environment.

We look forward to fighting alongside LAUSD leaders for increased education funding that is strategically invested in effective means for lifting historically underserved communities and schools.

■ To ensure that the funds get to the highest need schools, it is also vital that LAUSD adopt a new Equity Index that takes into account additional factors beyond student demographics to determine a school’s rank on the index. A new Equity Index will allow LAUSD to assess which of its schools are the highest need, and to ensure additional dollars go toward these schools. It is futile to set goals of 100 percent graduation and proficiency for all if we do not target investments and supports at our highest-needs schools.

■ Identify bright spots in new and existing programs, school models, staff compositions and investments that lift the engagement and learning of high-need students. Great work is taking place in the Division of Instruction per the 2015 Equity in A-G Resolution. We encourage the same kind of holistic evaluation that looks at need rank, per-pupil investment, student outcomes and school climate to guide program and staff investments moving forward.

■ Provide principals and teacher-leaders ongoing coaching on how to deploy fungible LCFF dollars to foster school wide reform, aiming to improve school climate and enrich student engagement. The current model of purchasing support staff and shorter-term resources (instead of teaching positions) does address community demands for whole-child supports; sustainability may be in question, however, as the District tackles its budget deficit and attempts to rein in pension costs.

Sacramento has managed a return to pre-recession levels of school spending, but per-pupil support still lags behind most other states. We look forward to fighting alongside LAUSD leaders for increased education funding that is strategically invested in effective means for lifting historically underserved communities and schools.

2. The TSP categories track against the students that are ‘weighted’ by the state, yielding greater allocations from Sacramento for these youngsters, including those from low-income or non-English speaking families, or in foster care or homeless. ‘Unduplicated’ means that one child is not counted more than once if she falls under more than one category for budget purposes.

3. College and career readiness is defined differently across state and locales. On the college-ready side, California school districts generally measure readiness as the number or percentage of twelfth-grade graduates who complete all the courses required for entrance to the University of California and/or California State University (CSU) with a grade of “C” or better.

4. We exclude any staff costs rooted in headquarters, including facilities maintenance and health care and pension contributions made centrally, or dollars not yet allocated by late fall of each year.

5. From District Staffing memo found at http://achieve.lausd.net/cms/lib08/CA01000043/CentricityDomain/185/FY%202016-17%20Board%20Approved%20Staffing%20Ratios-Elementary%20Schools%20website%20Mar%202013.pdf

6. From District Staffing memo found at http://achieve.lausd.net/cms/lib08/CA01000043/CentricityDomain/185/FY%202016-17%20Board%20Approved%20Staffing%20Ratios-Senior%20High%20Schools%20website%20Mar%202013.pdf

7. We use complete data from 68 elementary schools with student composition that is less than 60 percent TSP. The median share of enrollment, TSP children, equals 28 percent. Some 275 elementary schools display enrollments that are at least 90 percent TSP, averaging 96 percent of students in one of the TSP categories.

8. Seventy-one high schools serve pupils, between 60 and 80 percent TSP students, and their spending rose from about $6,450 to $8,400 over the three-year period.

9. L.A. community organizations including Community Coalition, InnerCity Struggle, ACLU and Public Advocates argue that LAUSD over-represented what they had previously spent on high-need pupils, in turn low-balling what they must now spend on high-needs students via the Investment Fund. This pending agreement may bring another $245 million into the District’s Investment Fund. For our purposes, we do not include the “Undetermined” category on the Target Investment List.


11. Why would the slice of school budgets going for teachers decline in recent years? Enrollment decline is likely one factor: the fixed costs required to operate a campus remain, while teaching staffs are pared back as fewer students enroll. Younger teachers have entered open posts in many high schools as well, as more and more senior teachers retire, driving down teacher costs relative to prior years.

12. Climbing from about $260 to $500 per pupil in high schools that served students of which at least 90 percent fall into the TSP category. Spending for administrative staff held steady at about $240 per pupil in the District’s two high schools with enrollments of less than 60 percent TSP.
