



LCFF: How Can Local Control Keep the Promise of Educational Equity in CA?

LCFF and Equity Convening
Sacramento, CA
October 27, 2016

LCFF: How Can Local Control Keep the Promise of Educational Equity in CA?



LCFF and Equity Convening Read-Ahead Material
Sacramento, CA
October 27, 2016

The following brief serves as an overview of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) to support the October 27, 2016 conversations focused on LCFF and Equity.

What is in This Brief?

- **Agenda** for October 27th Convening
- **Overview** of the Local Control Funding Formula
- **A review of research findings** around implementation and outcomes of LCFF in the first three years of implementation, and how it has measured up to its promises;
- **A review of promising practices and recommendations** from around California, with a focus on refining and strengthening an **equity-based** approach to state and local LCFF efforts in **seven priority areas**:
 1. *Equitable Funding to Target High-Need Students*
 2. *Achieving Transparency*
 3. *Innovation and Development of New Programs*
 4. *Deeply Engaging Families and Communities*
 5. *Establishing Clear Goals and Metrics that are Connected to Actions*
 6. *Communicating Clearly Through the LCAP Template and Process*
 7. *Committing to Continuous Improvement*

Questions for Discussion

- What should policymakers be doing in moving forward? What should practitioners/advocates be doing in moving forward?
 - What are the highest priority challenges to address?
 - What is the lowest hanging opportunity?
 - Where do we have leverage?
- What type of legislation or policy clarity does your school/district/county or organization need to promote the continuous improvement of all students?
- What networks/partnerships/opportunities are needed to move this forward? Who leads the “collective action”? How do we hold each other accountable?
- How can and should the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) strengthen and amplify current LCFF efforts to ensure equity for high need student subgroups? What is missing in LCFF that ESSA can help bolster?
- What questions remain? What is missing? Who is missing?
 - Where is additional investment needed?
 - What additional data do we need?

AGENDA

October 27, 2016

8:30 AM-1:30 PM

- 8:30-9:00AM **Registration and Coffee**
- 9:00-9:05AM **Welcome**
David Plank, *Executive Director of Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE)*
- 9:05-9:20AM **Keynote Address**
Christopher Edley Jr., *Co-Founder and President of the Opportunity Institute*
- 9:20-9:40AM **Presentation I: “Three Years Later: Evaluating the Implementation of LCFF”**
Dr. Jennifer O’Day, *AIR Institute Fellow*
- 9:40-10:40AM **Presentation II: “Empowering Local Communities and Local Control: The Reality” Panel**
Moderator: Hayin Kim, *Partners for Each and Every Child*
Panelists:
Nicole Anderson, *Association of California School Administrators*
Dr. Kitty Catania, *Fresno County Office of Education*
Geordee Mae Corpuz, *Californians for Justice*
Sandy Mendoza, *Families in Schools*
Sara Mooney, *United Way of Greater Los Angeles*
- 11:00-11:40AM **Presentation III: “Policy Levers to Strengthen Accountability and Continuous Improvement” Panel**
Moderator: David Plank, *PACE*
Panelists:
Carrie Hahnel, *EdTrust West*
Angelica Jongco, *Public Advocates*
Dennis Meyers, *California School Boards Association*
David Sapp, *California State Board of Education*
Sujie Shin, *California Collaborative for Educational Excellence*
- 11:40-12:30PM **Reflections and Group Discussion: What is the 2017 LCFF Equity Agenda?**
- 12:30-12:45PM **Closing Remarks and Next Steps**
- 12:45-1:30PM **Networking Lunch**

Overview

The Problem

Funding, resources, and effective teachers have been inequitably distributed across American schools for decades — contributing to vast opportunity and achievement gaps between high-need students and their more privileged peers.

The Promise

The passage of California’s LCFF in 2013, is one of the most promising education funding reforms in recent history, with the potential to effectively address opportunity and achievement gaps for high-need students, including low-income students, English Learners, and foster youth. Since its initial passage, Californians still believe in directing more resources to high-needs students.

70% of Californians believe in providing additional funding to districts with more high-need students
71% support local control

A voter poll conducted by Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), and surveys conducted by the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC), show that an overwhelming 70% of Californians believe in providing additional funding to school districts with more high-need students; and 71% support local control.¹

The Reality

LCFF’s equity potential can only be fulfilled, however, if it is successfully implemented. So far, districts have had two years of experience developing Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs) with stakeholders and allocating resources with greater budget flexibility. During that time, the state and community groups have begun to see the preliminary impact of the new system on high-need students, and researchers and advocates have been observing and noting key implementation challenges.

The Research

For instance, several studies have found cases in which districts have either underspent funds that had been intended for high-need students, or spent these funds without explaining how the planned programs would increase or improve services for those students. Others have documented piecemeal “best practices” of how to meaningfully engage communities in decision-making, or to evaluate efforts to ensure that resource allocations positively impact student learning.

Research has also pointed to the importance of deep and meaningful stakeholder engagement in identifying student needs and distributing funds effectively – but these conversations have, so far, just begun to scratch the surface. More comprehensive and continuous engagement would involve: explicit use of an equity framework, monitoring to ensure that low-income and high-need communities are involved throughout the decision-making process, and consistent review of evidence-based programs and services to ensure positive impact.

Overview

Leveraging ESSA

The recently authorized federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) calls for the creation of a comprehensive accountability system of decision-making and resource allocation to meet equity goals. In response, State Education Agencies (SEAs), local districts, educators, and family and community advocates across the nation are working together to leverage the opportunity of the new federal law and to codify ways in which they can better identify and constructively address historical achievement and resource gaps.

“ ESSA underscores the need for California to evaluate and expand current efforts ”



With ESSA’s increased focus on meaningful stakeholder engagement, states are also challenged to democratize decision-making in recognition that educators, community advocates, and policy makers must prioritize transparency and collaboration in order to transform systems and cultures of accountability.

To that end, many will look toward California and the preliminary successes and challenges of LCFF to understand how the policy is impacting district budget and resource allocations, how districts are being supported to prioritize and assess evidence-based strategies, how student outcomes are shifting, and how meaningful engagement is driving continuous improvement efforts.

The Bottom Line

The success and sustainability of efforts to improve educational excellence and equity, particularly with regard to our highest-need students and communities, requires robust and thoughtful partnership between and among federal, state, and local governmental agencies and stakeholders. While the promise of LCFF remains an indispensable goal, implementation reality must continue to address misconceptions, empower new voices, and ensure shared ownership for the reforms our schools need. Furthermore, ESSA underscores the need to carefully scrutinize and improve the ways in which communities with historically less voice are represented in decision-making and served by their schools – including those not explicitly targeted under LCFF.

“ California must consider how the opportunities in both ESSA and LCFF are fundamentally linked ”



California must consider how the opportunities in both ESSA and LCFF are fundamentally linked, and that both emphasize the need for coherence and collective responsibility to ensure that together, we can fulfill the promise to give high-need students the strong start that every child deserves.

? Guiding Research and Policy Questions:

- How is the design and implementation of California’s new accountability system keeping the promise of educational equity?
- What evidence might demonstrate that districts are using targeted funds to expand services and opportunities for low-income, English learner, and foster youth?
- What structures are in place to support districts that need help, and what more must be done to ensure that all districts have the capacity to improve opportunities and outcomes—especially for their neediest students?

The First 3 Years of LCFF Implementation (2013-2016)

Researchers who have been studying the first 3 years of LCFF implementation share one particular reason for optimism in positive impact: both education officials and parents remain enthusiastic about the law. At the same time, however, researchers and advocates have been consistent about the importance of improving implementation in order for LCFF to successfully realize its equity potential. **They have identified seven key priority areas:**

1. Equitable Funding to Target High-Need Students

The Promise: A fundamental provision of LCFF was to change how the state funds K-12 schools--directing more money to schools that serve larger numbers of high-need students.

On top of a base grant, districts receive additional funds (supplemental and/or concentration grants) based on the number of low-income children, English learners, and foster youth. This formula was based on the assumption that school districts need more resources to provide quality learning opportunities for high-need students concentrated in high-poverty communities. It confronted the trend of providing less resources to these districts, which systematically underserved students with the greatest need.

The Reality: In those LCAPs that indicated how supplemental and concentration grants are being spent, researchers find that districts are spending on programs unlikely to ‘increase or improve services’ for high-need students. Districts are spending higher levels on districtwide programs like security services, facilities improvements, or salary increases with no explanations and justification of how such programs specifically benefit high-need students.² Researchers are especially concerned about this trend in districts that have very uneven distributions of high-need students across schools.³

2. Achieving Transparency

The Promise: A key aspect of LCFF is that it gives districts both more flexibility over how they spend funds (versus the former system of categorical

funding restrictions) and more responsibility to be transparent about how those funds will benefit high-need students. In their Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs), districts are required to show how supplemental and concentration funding:

- will be used to increase or improve services for high-need students (in comparison to services provided in the past year and in comparison to services for ‘all students’);
- will be ‘principally directed’ toward meeting the district’s goals for high-need students—and effective in meeting those goals.⁴

The Reality: LCAP reviews by Public Advocates, the ACLU, Californians Together, the Education Trust-West, and PPIC, as well as testimony from State Board of Education President Michael Kirst,⁵ finds that most districts were not meeting these two transparency requirements. One study finds that the “greatest concern in reviewing LCAPs was the near universal failure to clearly identify and justify the use of the supplemental and concentration funds generated by [and intended to be directed toward] high-need students as required by the law.”⁶

3. Innovation and Development of New Programs

The Promise: In order to address opportunity and achievement gaps, districts need to fundamentally evaluate and change their resource allocation and spending patterns. A goal of LCFF is to spur innovation and encourage the exploration of new, comprehensive approaches to support high-need students.

The Reality: In contrast however, researchers find that districts are largely still spending money as they had prior to LCFF and/or are restoring programs that were cut in the recent recession, with little analysis of which programs would be most effective for high-need students.⁶ As for specific subgroups, many districts have not yet identified or adequately funded programs for foster youth; others have given minimal attention to important materials, such as the English Language Development standards, which are designed to shift pedagogy for English Learners.⁸

4. Deeply Engaging Families and Communities

The Promise: LCFF prioritizes deeper engagement of stakeholders including families, caregivers and community organizations throughout the educational decision-making process, including planning and evaluation of impact.

The Reality: Most districts are enthusiastic about that engagement and have identified goals and funding for that purpose. However, statewide, districts are struggling with how to meaningfully and consistently engage stakeholders as a part of on-going transparency, two-way communication, and shared decision-making.⁹ Most have little experience, especially in reaching diverse groups and listening closely to incorporate their feedback.¹⁰ While districts are required to explain how feedback from stakeholders shapes the development of the LCAPs, very few do.¹¹

5. Establishing Clear Goals and Metrics that are Connected to Actions

The Promise: Districts can most clearly track and communicate progress by explaining how spending actions are intended to meet specific goals, connecting those goals to specific targeted sub-groups, and describing the rationale behind the program or implementation strategies.

The Reality: Few districts operate this way.¹² Districts are struggling with the development of metrics to measure the effectiveness of their programs intended for high-need students.¹³

6. Communicating Clearly Through the LCAP Template and Process

The Promise: The LCAP template was intended to ensure transparency. Specifically, it was meant to be a clear and accessible district plan that communities could read to understand the district's budget and decision-making process and annual updates. The template asks districts to outline their goals, describe their actions and spending as related to eight priority areas, and explain how spending would increase or improve services or programs for high-need students.

The Reality: Researchers and district officials alike point to a need for a clearer LCAP template and a streamlined process for completing it. When researchers looked for best practices in clear communication, they found that all districts had room for improvement. Most LCAPs are very long and include jargon and complicated tables, making them taxing for district officials to complete and difficult for families and community partners to understand.¹⁴ Most recently, the State Board of Education adopted a new LCAP template. The Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE) is planning webinars and trainings to help districts improve communication.

7. Committing to Continuous Improvement

The Promise: The LCAP process was intended to foster continuous improvement, acting as a tool for districts to comprehensively plan and reflect on their goals and progress

The Reality: Most districts have not yet made this shift from a "compliance orientation."¹⁵ Additionally, some worry that LCFF will not last or that funding levels will fall; this uncertainty makes it harder for them to plan comprehensively for long-term progress.¹⁶

Looking Forward: How Can We Keep LCFF's Promise for High-need Students?

LCFF remains a valuable opportunity to create a more equitable school system, with targeted resources to fund intentional strategies that support high-quality teaching and learning for high-need students. The benefit of the last 3 years of experience and research is that we can take a more informed approach to improve implementation—and begin to close gaps for high-need students through effective local control. This research highlights **seven key promising practices and recommendations to address each of the priority areas:**

1. Equitable Funding to Target High-Need Students

Promising Practices: A few counties and districts have developed LCAPs that explicitly articulate how LCFF funds will be targeted to benefit high-need students:

- The **San Mateo County Office of Education** created a model LCAP Section 2 for districts: under each goal, there is one list of actions for 'all students' and another list of increased and improved services for high-need students.¹⁷
- **Los Angeles Unified** allocates funds to schools based on the number of high-need students.¹⁸

Recommendations:

Many groups are vital to improving the process of targeting funds to high-need students:

- The state can provide clarity on the allowable uses of supplemental and concentration funds¹⁹ and can require districts that do not meet the Minimum Proportionality Percentage (MPP) in the current year to utilize the remaining balance to increase or improve services for high-need students the following year;²⁰
- County Offices of Education (COEs) can train districts on how to: develop a vision for closing achievement gaps, conduct a root cause analysis of those gaps, plan strategically, and identify and evaluate high-quality programs for high-need students;²¹
- The state, COEs, and researchers can give additional support and guidance (on how to most effectively target funding to high-need

students) to districts in regions that have relatively low shares of high-need students distributed unevenly across schools (those regions include Orange, San Diego, and Sacramento Counties, and the Bay Area).²²

2. Achieving Transparency

Promising Practices: Some county offices of education (COEs) and districts have prioritized transparency in their LCAPs by establishing external partnerships and developing their own organizational system:

- The **Sacramento Office of Education** has partnered with Public Advocates to provide trainings and exemplars of the LCAP's Section 3, so that districts can provide clearer justifications of their use of supplemental and concentration funding.²³
- **Oakland Unified** includes the vast majority of the district's general fund spending (88%) in its LCAP (for comparison: other districts included less than 50% of general fund spending, as they included only supplemental and concentration funds, as opposed to all LCFF funds). It also included appendices with spreadsheets sortable by funding source²⁴ and provides tables showing supplemental and concentration fund allocations by school.²⁵

Recommendations:

Using these promising practices as a guide, the state can play a substantial role in increasing transparency statewide. Specifically, research suggests that the state can:

- Build capacity for budgeting and planning at the district and COE levels;²⁶
- Give additional guidance as to which funds should be accounted for in the district's LCAPs.²⁷ For example, require that districts include "all education-related spending, including all supplemental and concentration — and most [LCFF] base — funding;"²⁸
- Establish clear, simple ways for districts to show how supplemental and concentration funds are being spent; for example, create common, statewide accounting or funding source codes;²⁹
- Give COEs the ability to reject a portion or portions of a district's LCAP, so that individual sections can be refined and improved;³⁰
- Give more guidance to COEs on how to review LCAPs, for example, how to identify a clear justification for the use of supplemental and concentration funds;³¹
- Revise the LCAP template and include an electronic spreadsheet with:³²
 - the total amount of supplemental and concentration funding that the district must spend to meet the Minimum Proportionality Percentage (MPP);
 - detailed spending actions by subgroup, connected to evidence of effectiveness.

3. Innovation and Development of New Programs

Promising Practices: A few districts are focusing on innovation and clearly identifying which of their programs are new and targeted to high-need students:

- In its LCAP executive summary, **Fresno Unified** made sure communities would understand which programs were new, versus continued from the previous year, with a large label ("New!").³³
- **Los Angeles Unified** clearly outlined its LCFF investments to support foster youth (its program includes 75 counselors and social

workers specifically responsible for identifying foster youth needs and monitoring their progress).³⁴

Recommendations:

Given the importance of developing new programs to close opportunity and achievement gaps:³⁵

- The state and COEs can build capacity among districts by helping them identify which innovative programs and new approaches have evidence of effectiveness for high-need students;
- Districts should consider pilots or innovation zones, which can allow schools to try new approaches, like project-based learning or collaborative teaching practices.

4. Deeply Engaging Families and Communities

Promising Practices: To leverage districts' enthusiasm for community engagement, several organizations have stepped in to build capacity, with a focus on ensuring meaningful engagement that deeply involves communities in decision-making and resource allocation processes.

For example, the U.S. Department of Education, the California Department of Education, Families in Schools, and the Education-Trust West have all developed standards for family engagement, which districts can use as tools to deepen their strategies.³⁶

Recommendations:

The state and COEs can provide further support through capacity-building, resources, and guidance.³⁷ Researchers suggest that districts can:

- Be sure to use family and community engagement standards, frameworks, and supports;
- Partner continuously with community organizations, like Families in Schools, Californians for Justice, and PICO, that can support training, outreach, and the inclusion of community feedback in the LCAP;³⁸

- Hire or allocate dedicated staff tasked with meaningful facilitation and integration of community engagement into the LCAP development process. Ensure that staff have the authority to incorporate community feedback into the LCAP and implementation of resource allocation and program impact evaluation;³⁹
- Ensure inclusivity by setting aside funding and hiring family liaisons or other dedicated staff to provide translation and to reach out to new, diverse voices;⁴⁰
- Start early in the year and re-engage the community regularly in a comprehensive process including a needs assessment, root cause analysis, strategic planning, reflection, and evaluation of efficacy;⁴¹
- Provide teachers with coaches and professional development and make family engagement an explicit priority;⁴²
- Train teachers and families on LCFF and LCAP processes together, focusing on active-listening and team-building;⁴³
- Maintain an online information sheet or webpage with contact information, so that families and community organizations can submit questions, feedback and suggestions at any time;⁴⁴
- Provide the following at stakeholder engagement meetings: translation, childcare, food, and transportation support;⁴⁵
- In meetings, look at the data on student needs, community assets and program effectiveness, with communities to prioritize programs together;⁴⁶
- Build trust by explaining, in LCAPs and at meetings, exactly how prior community input has shaped decisions;⁴⁷
- Track the opportunities that families have had to get involved, hiring experts when needed;⁴⁸
- Ensure that feedback from communities is being used to shape decisions. As one

superintendent said, “It’s not just a matter of having large numbers of parents present in the room, but ensuring that parent voice becomes a part of our planning process to close the achievement gap.”⁴⁹

Several researchers emphasize that building trust between districts and communities takes time—and the key is to stick with it. And it is important for all to remember the power in sitting down together: “leaders [can] walk through the components of a district’s plans with the individuals and groups that have brought equity concerns” and, likewise, equity organizations can go beyond LCAP reviews by reaching out to district officials to talk face-to-face and to offer their resources and networks.⁵⁰

5. Establishing Clear Goals and Metrics that are Connected to Actions

Promising Practices: Various districts are excelling in creating LCAP goals and metrics:

- **Huntington Beach Union High School District’s** LCAP included a polished infographic connecting each action or program to specific goals and each goal to specific subgroups of high-need students.⁵¹
- **Fresno Unified** has included innovative, early measures of college and career readiness. For example, the percent of 4th graders that visit a local business and 8th graders that visit a university.⁵²
- **Oakland Unified** includes disaggregated data in its LCAP. To reduce chronic absenteeism, it has set a target rate for all students as well as specific targets for subgroups, like foster youth.⁵³

Recommendations:

Researchers offer suggestions for how other districts can follow suit:

- In LCAPs, clearly connect each spending action or program to specific goals, connect goals to high-need subgroups, and provide rationales and evidence for why each program will lead to the given goals.⁵⁴

- Include target levels or rates and explain how the district and communities will be able to see evidence of progress over time, either annually or longer-term;⁵⁵
- Set specific goals, programs or policies, and metrics for high-need students;⁵⁶
- Allocate more staff time for systematic, publicized evaluation and data collection;⁵⁷
- Additionally, COEs can provide trainings on producing specific, measureable, rigorous goals.⁵⁸

6. Communicating Clearly Through the LCAP Template and Process

Promising Practices: A few districts have notably strengthened communication with communities:

- **Bear Valley Unified** produced, in addition to its official LCAP, a separate user-friendly version for families and communities.⁵⁹
- **Sacramento Unified** and **Oakland Unified** are both focusing on ensuring that communication with communities is two-way, using methods such as surveys and home visits to collect feedback and suggestions.⁶⁰

Recommendations:

Research suggests that the state has an important role to play in streamlining the template and the LCAP process--especially in the context of ESSA--to the benefit of both district officials and communities. Specifically, the state can:

- Revise and simplify the LCAP template, encouraging narratives and data summaries;⁶¹
- Provide exemplars of LCAPs, annual updates, and summaries;⁶²
- Create one, comprehensive planning process that districts can follow to meet all requirements- including those under LCFF, Title I, SARC, etc.;⁶³
- Synchronize the timing of the LCAP with the budget approval and student data releases;⁶⁴
- When changes are made to the LCAP template

or process, phase in those changes and give county and district officials time to adjust.⁶⁵

In the meantime, districts can improve communications with communities by:⁶⁶

- Identifying a team of key staff who have the capacity and authority to develop and project-manage a comprehensive approach to stakeholder engagement, LCAP development, and resource allocation;⁶⁷
- Making plans to translate and publicize LCAP drafts as they are developed and revised throughout the year;
- Following these 3 key LCAP tips from the California Collaborative on District Reform: avoid jargon, include a glossary of key terms, and keep it at 5 pages or less (using hyperlinks to additional information);
- Identifying various audiences--such as families, equity groups, and policymakers--and produce different materials for each; use test audiences to be sure materials are clear;
- Using multiple forms of communication, like texts, videos, and meetings with Q&A;
- Translating all materials for families of English Learners, while also recognizing that some families may have varying levels of literacy, and make new opportunities for one-on-one communication.

7. Committing to Continuous Improvement

While researchers have not yet found specific LCFF district-level promising practices in continuous improvement, they have several recommendations.

Recommendations:

- The state can encourage districts to utilize the fall months of each year to update, analyze, and reflect on their data of program progress and effectiveness;⁶⁸
- The state can allow districts to focus on just a few priorities in each LCAP (e.g., focusing on

only a few of the 8 priority areas in the current LCAP and addressing the rest in the next LCAP; or cycling through phases of community engagement and data collection in the current LCAP or through multiple subsequent LCAPs);⁶⁹

- Schools and districts can learn from each other through partnerships. The California Collaborative for Educational Excellence (CCEE) is tasked with building an infrastructure to support LEA's. To the extent that CCEE can provide knowledge sharing, evaluation support (including what to do with data and how to use it in LCAP planning), California schools and districts will be better equipped to implement a unified long-term strategy for continuous improvement.⁷⁰
- COEs can demonstrate their commitment to continuous improvement by giving technical assistance and substantive coaching, rather than basic guidance for filling out the LCAP template. For example, they can advise on “the substantive development of strategic plans or selection of strategies to address the needs of targeted students;”⁷¹
- Districts can go beyond compliance in their data collection; for example, by showing how community input shaped decisions, rather than just reporting on meeting attendance.⁷²

How Can Communities Get Involved?

The shift promised by the Local Control Funding Formula is a fundamental change to California’s education system. It involves not only creating a more equitable system by directing funding to high-need students, but also creating a more democratic system by giving districts and local communities more control of and responsibility for how those funds are spent. Both of these important goals require all groups to come to the table with open minds and ready hands, prepared to learn and explore new ways to collaborate.

As the state, COEs, and districts continue to improve implementation, individuals and community organizations need not—and should not—wait to get involved. A few examples stand out as ways that communities can take action immediately:

- **Community groups can work to empower parent leaders.** Families in Schools, for example, hosted a 2-day institute to help 140 parent leaders feel confident giving their feedback on LCAPs. The institute described the purpose of LCFF, the high-need subgroups, and the state’s 8 priorities.⁷³
- **Families can step up to organize their communities.** For example, a group of parent leaders in San Francisco Unified hosted their own neighborhood forums to inform others about LCFF.⁷⁴
- **Students can look for ways to express their voice.** In Los Angeles Unified, about 150 students, nearly all of them high-need students, attended a town hall, which was designed by the local United Way to gather student suggestions on the use of LCFF funding. Students suggested that the district

focus more on college readiness and entrance by hiring more college counselors.⁷⁵

- **Larger organizations can team up to be sure that communities are heard.** For example, Public Advocates and Californians for Justice set up forums or “LCAP Community Review Days” in 4 cities so that community members, including students and families, could review the LCAPs and give their candid feedback and suggestions on programs for high-need students.⁷⁶

Communities and families are already seeing the benefits of their pro-active involvement:

- In Alum Rock Union School District, a community organization of parents influenced the district to invest in bilingual family liaisons at every school.⁷⁷
- In Oakland Unified, parents in the Parent Student Advisory Committee persuaded the district to allocate supplemental and concentration funds to schools based on the number of high-need students—and to open up the use of those funds to a shared, public decision-making process.⁷⁸

The goal of LCFF—to establish a truly equitable education system through local control, ultimately giving high-need students the same chance to succeed as their peers—is ambitious. But it’s achievable if education leaders, equity organizations, and communities work together.



Notes

1. PACE/USC Rossier poll. (August 2016). Californians support teachers, schools but accountability concerns remain. Retrieved from: <http://www.edpolicyinca.org/projects/paceuscrossier-poll-californians-support-teachers-schoolsaccountability-concerns-remain>; Baldassare, M., Bonner, D., Lopes, L., and Petek, S. (April 2015). PPIC Statewide Survey: Californians and Education. Retrieved from: http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/survey/S_415MBS.pdf.
2. Education Trust West (ETW). (April 2016). Puzzling Plans and Budgets: Making Sense of California's Second Year Local Control and Accountability Plans. Retrieved from <https://west.edtrust.org/resource/puzzling-plans-and-budgets-making-sense-of-californias-second-year-local-control-and-accountability-plans/>; Jongco, A. (April 2016). Keeping the Promise of Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF): Key Findings & Recommendations After Two Years of LCFF Implementation. Public Advocates. Retrieved from http://www.publicadvocates.org/wp-content/uploads/report_public_advocates_keeping_the_promise_of_lcff.pdf.
3. Baldassare et al., 2015.
4. ACLU California Affiliates. Use of Supplemental/Concentration Funds On a Schoolwide/Districtwide Basis. Retrieved from <http://www.publicadvocates.org/our-work/education/guiding-questions-use-supplementalconcentration-funds-schoolwidedistrictwide-basis-lcff/>; Jongco, 2016.
5. Education Trust West (ETW). (December 2014). Building a More Equitable and Participatory School System in California: The Local Control Funding Formula's First Year. Retrieved from http://west.edtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2015/02/ETW-Building-a-More-Equitable-and-Participatory-School-System-in-California-Report_0.pdf; Baldassare et al., 2015; Jongco, 2016.
6. Jongco, 2016.
7. Humphrey, D., Koppich, J. (October 2014). Research Brief: Toward a Grand Vision, Early Implementation of California's Local Control Funding Formula. SRI International. Retrieved from: <https://www.sri.com/work/publications/toward-grand-vision-early-implementation-californias-local-control-funding-formula/>; ETW, 2014; Jongco, 2016.
8. Armas, E., Lavadenz, M., Olsen, L. (2016). A Review of Year 2 LCAPS: A Week Response to California's English Learners. Californians Together. Retrieved from: <https://www.californianstogether.org/study-of-year-2-local-control-accountability-plans-lcaps-reveals-a-weak-response-to-the-needs-of-english-learners-save-and-exit-without-saving/>; ETW, 2014.
9. London, R. (2016). Family Engagement Practices in California Schools. Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC). Retrieved from: http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_616RLR.pdf; ETW, 2014; Humphrey and Koppich, 2014.
10. Families in Schools (FIS). (2016). How California School Districts are Reimagining Parent Engagement in the Era of Local Control Funding Formula. Retrieved from http://www.scusd.edu/sites/main/files/file-attachments/families_in_schools_lcap_report.pdf;
- Humphrey, D., Koppich, J., Marsh, J. (December 2015). Two Years of California's Local Control Funding Formula: Time to Reaffirm the Grand Vision. Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE). Retrieved from: <http://edpolicyinca.org/publications/two-years-californias-local-control-funding-formula-time-reaffirm-grand-vision/>; Humphrey and Koppich, 2014.
11. Knudson, J. (2016). Implementing LCFF: Communicating about District Plans. American Institutes for Research (AIR). Retrieved from <http://www.air.org/resource/implementing-lcff-communicating-about-district-plans>
12. Knudson, 2016, ETW, 2014.
13. Jongco, 2016.
14. Knudson, 2016; ETW, 2016.
15. Knudson, 2016; Jongco, 2016.
16. Humphrey and Koppich, 2014; Humphrey et al., 2015.
17. Jongco, 2016.
18. Hill, L., Ugo, I. (March 2015). Implementing California's School Funding Formula: Will High-Need Students Benefit? Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC). Retrieved from: http://www.ppic.org/main/publication_quick.asp?i=1127.
19. California School Boards Association (CSBA). (2016). Strengthening the LCAP Recommendations for improving the template, process and state supports. Retrieved from https://www.csba.org/GovernanceAndPolicyResources/~media/CSBA/Files/GovernanceResources/EducationIssues/FairFunding/061416Strengthening_LCAP_CSBA_Recommendations.ashx ; ETW, 2014.
20. Jongco, 2016.
21. Humphrey et al., 2015.
22. Hill and Ugo, 2015.
23. Jongco, 2016
24. Jongco, 2016
25. ETW, 2014
26. ETW, 2014; Humphrey et al., 2016.
27. Humphrey et al., 2015; Jongco, 2016.
28. Jongco, 2016
29. ETW, 2014; Jongco, 2016.
30. Jongco, 2016.
31. Jongco, 2016.
32. Jongco, 2016.
33. Knudson, 2016.
34. ETW, 2014.
35. ETW, 2014.
36. FIS, 2016; Hill and Ugo, 2015.
37. ETW, 2014; Jongco 2016.
38. Jongco, 2016; Humphrey and Koppich, 2014.
39. Partners for Each and Every Child. (2016). A Handbook for Meaningful Stakeholder Engagement: A Tool to Support State Education Agencies in Planning and Implementation of ESSA. Retrieved from http://partnersforeachandeverychild.org/P4_EngagementHandbook_ESSA_0616.pdf
40. London, 2016; FIS 2016; Humphrey et al., 2015.
41. ETW, 2014; Humphrey and Koppich, 2014.
42. FIS, 2016.
43. London, 2016; FIS, 2016.
44. Partners for Each and Every Child, 2016.

45. ETW, 2014.
46. FIS, 2016.
47. Knudson, 2016; London 2016.
48. Humphrey et al., 2015.
49. FIS, 2016.
50. FIS, 2016, Knudson, 2016.
51. Knudson, 2016.
52. Jongco, 2016.
53. Jongco, 2016.
54. Knudson, 2016.
55. Knudson, 2016.
56. Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE) (April 2014). 2020 Vision: Rethinking Budget Priorities Under the LCFF. Retrieved from <http://edpolicyinca.org/sites/default/files/PACE%202020%20Vision.pdf>; CSBA, 2016.
57. ETW, 2014; Humphrey et al., 2015.
58. Jongco, 2016.
59. ETW, 2014.
60. London, 2016.
61. ETW, 2016; Humphrey et al., 2015.
62. Humphrey et al., 2016; Jongco, 2016.
63. CSBA, 2016; Humphrey and Koppich, 2014; Humphrey et al., 2015.
64. Humphrey et al., 2015.
65. Humphrey et al., 2015.
66. Jongco, 2016; Knudson, 2016.
67. Partners *for* Each and Every Child, 2016.
68. Jongco, 2016.
69. CSBA, 2016; Humphrey et al., 2015.
70. Darling-Hammond, L. and Plank, D. (January 2015). *Supporting Continuous Improvement in California's Education System*. Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE). Retrieved from: <http://edpolicyinca.org/sites/default/files/PACE%20Scope%20CCEE%20January%202015.pdf>
71. Humphrey et al., 2015.
72. Knudson, 2016.
73. ETW, 2014; Families in School (FIS). (2015). A Parent's Guide to School Funding: Learning the Fundamentals about LCFF and LCAP. Retrieved from www.familiesinschools.org/wp-content/Parents-Guide-to-School-Funding-LCFF.pdf.
74. ETW, 2014.
75. Clough, C. (October 2015). LAUSD students offering their views on how to spend extra state money. LA School Report. Retrieved from <http://laschoolreport.com/lausd-students-offering-their-views-on-how-to-spend-extra-state-money/>.
76. Jongo, A. 2015. 6 School Districts and 4 Cities in 12 days: Back to School with Public Advocates. Public Advocates. Retrieved from <http://www.publicadvocates.org/resources/blog/6-school-districts-4-cities-12-days-back-school-public-advocates/>.
77. Jongco, 2016.
78. Jongco, 2016.

Authored By Jacqueline Nader



Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE) is an independent, non-partisan research center based at Stanford University, the University of Southern California, and the University of California – Davis. PACE seeks to define and sustain a long-term strategy for comprehensive policy reform and continuous improvement in performance at all levels of California’s education system, from early childhood to postsecondary education and training. PACE bridges the gap between research and policy, working with scholars from California’s leading universities and with state and local policymakers to increase the impact of academic research on educational policy in California.



The mission of the Partners for Each and Every Child project is to build an infrastructure of interconnected work that will encourage a growing portion of the education policy community to break down barriers to advance sound educational policies, attentive to matters of equity and responsive to the needs of at-risk, under-served, and politically underrepresented students. A project of The Opportunity Institute, Partners for is a collaborative, nonpartisan network of education researchers, advocacy organizations, and policy experts who are committed to educational excellence for each and every child. The network grew out of the work of the Congressionally chartered national Commission for Equity and Excellence in Education.