The LCAP: Using Analytics to Measure Services
Introduction

• Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) is approaching the end of its third year and second annual update

• The local control explicitly given to local educational agencies (LEAs) has provided great opportunity
  • Opportunity does not exist without challenge!

• Discussion topics:
  • Opportunities and Challenges
  • Decision-Making Tree
  • Measuring Services
  • Proportionality Conundrum
Accountability in 2016-17

Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) Implementation

95%

Evaluation Rubrics

Year Three LCAP Implementation

Have we improved outcomes for students?
Are we closing the achievement gap?
The LCAP Tug of War

Is the LCAP a plan to support improved outcomes for students?

Is the LCAP a budget and accounting document?
Inputs vs. Outputs

- The LCFF is as much about equity and justice for our neediest students as it is about local control and causes us to think and plan differently.

- The actions and services contained in the plan are intended to improve student outcomes.

- Outcomes will be measured and evaluated by oversight agencies, as well as by your stakeholders.

- While measuring results is important, it is also important to measure how you are increasing and improving services to students in qualitative and quantitative ways – not just by the dollars that you spend.
Local Decision Making

- Local discretion is intentionally broad, and guidance from the state has been in short supply
  - Local decision making is highly contextual
  - Answers to commonly asked questions are difficult to answer because each circumstance is extremely nuanced
- How decisions are made matters
  - The answers to the questions may not be the same depending on the LEA’s local story
  - The process for deciding should be virtually the same
- We’ve created an LCAP Decision-Making Tree to assist LEAs in answering essential LCAP development questions
LCAP Decision-Making Tree
Part 1 of 4

• Making decisions that are not rooted in the LEA’s local needs assessment is like a tree trying to grow branches without a strong trunk

1. Identify Needs
   The LEA’s leadership team identifies the most significant areas of need for all students, students in significant subgroups, and its unduplicated pupils using a local needs assessment

2. Prioritize Goals
   The LEA shares the local needs assessment with an LCAP committee and they work together to identify and prioritize goals

3. Identify Actions and Services
   Based on the proposed goals, the LEA works with the LCAP committee to identify proposed actions and services for the next three years
LCAP Decision-Making Tree
Part 2 of 4

Can we use supplemental and concentration grant funds to pay for proposed LCAP actions/services?

Will your decision build or erode trust?

If a significant subgroup
- No. Students from the subgroup are not the students generating supplemental and concentration (S/C) grant funds.
- Yes. When a percentage of the subgroup is UPS, then a percentage of the services can be charged to S/C grant funds.

If all students*
- Yes. When the service is principally directed to your UPS, and is the most effective use of the funds (create a nexus) based on research, experience, or educational theory. The LEA must identify alternatives considered. CCR 15496 b(2)
- If below 55%? Yes. When the service is principally directed to your UPS, and is the most effective use of the funds (create a nexus) based on research, experience, or educational theory. The LEA must identify alternatives considered. CCR 15496 b(2)

School-wide
- If above 40%? Yes. When the service is principally directed to your UPS, and is the most effective use of the funds (create a nexus) based on research, experience, or educational theory. The LEA must identify alternatives considered. CCR 15496 b(4)
- If below 40%? Yes. When the service is principally directed to your UPS, and is the most effective use of the funds (create a nexus) based on research, experience, or educational theory. The LEA must identify alternatives considered. CCR 15496 b(4)

District-wide
- If UPs** only
- Yes

*Countywide and charterwide actions are governed by California Code of Regulations (CCR) 15496 (b)(5)

**Unduplicated pupils
How do we identify the percentage by which actions/services are increased or improved for our unduplicated pupils?

The LEA identifies the actions and services proposed in the LCAP that utilize S/C grant dollars.

5 Identify S/C Expenditures

6 Define Your Core

The LEA locally defines their core program by asking and answering “What are you providing to all students not utilizing S/C grant dollars?”

Board policies related to promotion and graduation

Administrative ancillary services that support core program

7 Measure the Increased Service

Measure the difference between your core and the increased/improved service. This demonstrates a proportionate increase or improvement in services (not an increase in dollars).

Will your decision build or erode trust?

Education Code requirements applicable to all students
**LCAP Decision-Making Tree**

**Part 4 of 4**

**Once our LCAP is approved by the county office of education, when are we required to make revisions?**

1. **8 LCAP Revisions**
   - Revisions are not required by statute. An LEA may revise its LCAP and must follow same process used for original adoption. Education Code Section (E.C.) 52602 (c)
   - When the enacted Budget provides a significant increase or decrease in the gap closure proposed at the May Revision.
   - When a change to a collective bargaining agreement requires a budget revision.
   - When the LEA is unable or chooses not to implement a planned action or service.
   - When there is a substantive change to an LCAP action(s) or service(s).
   - When the LEA believes that its community cannot tolerate the change without the opportunity for review and comment.

2. **When is a revision warranted?**
   - If significant, consider a revision.
   - If limited in scope, address in the annual update.

3. **Will your decision build or erode trust?**
Measuring Services
Measuring Services – Proportionality

- Section 3B of the LCAP requires that LEAs “demonstrate how the services provided in the LCAP year for (eligible pupils) provide for increased or improved services for these pupils in proportion to the increase in funding provided for all pupils”

- To demonstrate proportionality, you have to measure increased and improved services
  - A focus on service – rather than spending – sustains our awareness of how what we are doing is working

- Knowing what constitutes the core program is a critical piece of the proportionality equation
  - Knowing what all students receive is the only way to show that targeted pupils received more
Identify S/C Expenditures

The LEA identifies the actions and services proposed in the LCAP that utilize Supplemental/Concentration (S/C) grant dollars.

Define Your Core

The LEA locally defines their core program by asking and answering “What are you providing to all students not utilizing S/C grant dollars?”

Measure the Increased Service

Measure the difference between your core and the increased/improved service. This demonstrates a proportionate increase or improvement in services (not an increase in dollars).

How do we identify the percentage by which actions/services are increased or improved for our unduplicated pupils?

Board policies related to promotion and graduation

Administrative ancillary services that support core program

Education Code requirements applicable to all students

Will your decision build or erode trust?
Potential Metrics

Instructional Tools
- Average age of textbooks
- Number of technology-enabled classrooms
- Number of instructional minutes

Time
- Work year

Teachers
- Student-to-teacher ratio
- Average years of experience
Example – Measuring Instructional Minutes

Description of Service Provided to All Students

- Kindergarten classes average 200 minutes per day

Description of Increased Services

- The kindergarten day will be increased to 265 minutes per day districtwide
- This represents a 33% increase in instructional minutes

![Instructional Minutes Graph]

- Core Program: 200 minutes per day
- Increased Services: 200 + 65 = 265 minutes per day
- Increase of 33%
Potential Metrics

Support Services

Parental Engagement
- Number of parent training/events
- Opportunities for parent participation
- Parent home-to-school communication

Educational Environment
- Number of campus supervisors
- Programs to improve school climate
- Number of child welfare and attendance staff
Example – Measuring Parent Home-to-School Communication

**Description of Service Provided to All Students**
- 5,000 newsletters are annually sent home with students outlining upcoming school activities and highlighting past successes

**Description of Increased Services**
- An additional mailing will be provided to parents of students identified as English Learners (ELs) that includes California English Language Development Test results, progress markers, and other information pertaining to ELs
- This will add 600 mailings, representing an increase of 12%

*Chart showing the number of newsletters per year:*
- Core Program: 5,000
- Increased Services: 5,600 (an increase of 12%)
Potential Metrics

- Facilities
  - Square foot per student
  - Custodians per square foot/classroom
- Transportation
  - Number of bus routes
  - Ridership
- Food Service
  - Student participation
  - Number of meal/snack offerings
Example – Measuring Transportation

Description of Service Provided to All Students

- Transportation is provided to all students who live more than two miles from their home school

Description of Increased Services

- Transportation will be provided to students living one or more miles from their home school
- This will add ten additional bus routes, representing an increase of 50%

Bus Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Bus Routes</th>
<th>Core Program</th>
<th>Increased Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10 + 20 = 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50% increase
Our Evolving Accountability System

• The State Board of Education suspended Academic Performance Index starting in the 2014-15 school year and began the transition to a multiple measures accountability approach aligned to the LCFF eight state priorities

• Desire to move away from a system of rankings and sanctions

• Desire to develop a continuous improvement model reliant on a coherent system of metrics and indicators that measure the effectiveness of educational programs and services:
  • How well are programs and services preparing all students for postsecondary success?
Our Evolving Accountability System

- The evaluation rubrics will play a key role in the accountability system
- It will be several years before full implementation of the new system
- Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA) will be the primary tool used to measure student performance and progress toward mastery of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS)
  - 2014-15 scores were predictably low which resulted in criticism of CCSS, SBA, and the effectiveness of our new funding and accountability system
The Proportionality Conundrum
The Proportionality Conundrum

An LEA’s minimum proportionality percentage requirement changes at full implementation

Gap Years
Target S/C grant funds minus prior-year S/C grant expenditures, multiplied by the gap % \( \div \) Base Grant Funding

Full Implementation
Target S/C grant funds based on the revenue calculation contained in E.C. 42238.02
The Proportionality Conundrum

- Given our accelerated climb towards full implementation, some LEAs have found it difficult to expend all of their S/C grant dollars.

- Unexpended S/C grant dollars, if not used in subsequent years to support continued implementation of LCAP actions and, if not accounted for in calculating the subsequent year’s proportionality percentage, inflate the base.

- If used to support other ongoing costs, an LEA in this circumstance will have to clear a high hurdle in meeting its minimum proportionality percentage requirement at full implementation.
The Proportionality Conundrum

In this example, the district has a UP percentage of 72%

The top line assumes that the district spends 100% of its supplemental and concentration grant funds each year

The bottom line assumes that the district spends 70% of its new S/C grant funds each year, and the remaining 30% falls to fund balance

The 30% that falls to fund balance allows the district to rebench its supplemental and concentration curve during the implementation of LCFF
The Proportionality Conundrum

- If full implementation of LCFF were reached in 2017-18, for example, the district would need to increase S/C grant spending in excess of the new LCFF revenues it would receive in that year to meet its minimum proportionality percentage requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>LCFF Revenues (in millions)</th>
<th>S/C Grant Expenditures (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>$8.7</td>
<td>$3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>$9.7</td>
<td>$4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>$3.8</td>
<td>$1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>$7.1</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LCFF Revenues and S/C Grant Expenditures
Year-Over-Year Changes (in millions)