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# **Strategic Planning for Continued Recovery (SPCR) SEA Plan Templates**

## **Description**

Strategic Planning for Continued Recovery (SPCR) is an initiative designed to support state educational agencies (SEAs) as they engage in their own planning and support local educational agencies (LEAs)[[1]](#footnote-2) to sustain high-leverage Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief Fund (ESSER)/Education Stabilization Fund (ESF) investments.

**The SPCR focuses on six strategies to support sustainability:**

Ensure access & opportunity for all

Communicate impact of investments

Support/sustain systemic capacity building

Determine impact of investments

Prioritize efforts for ongoing recovery & transformation

Achieve sustainability through financial planning

For each strategy we offer examples of ways SEAs might use five levers (Grantmaking, Policy, Monitoring, Technical Assistance, and Partners) as they support their LEAs.

## **How to Use**

Depending on where your SEA is in its planning, you can explore these strategies in more detail through SPCR-sponsored webinars, resource portfolios, cross-SEA collaboration opportunities, and individualized coaching (register your SEA team to participate [here](https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/98557c144dc24f62bf4084daccb6928c)!). Or you can work through these components on your own or with your LEAs, and supplement them with other tools and resources you might find useful.

As you progress through each component, start by thinking about the strategy being considered, then determine the type(s) of planning components and areas of supports you might need to enhance your SEA team’s internal work or your work with LEAs in support of each strategy. Use the chart below to record your progress through the components and chosen pathways.

| Strategy  | Planning Components | SPCR Pathways for Additional Support (choose how your SEA will receive supports) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Determine impact of investments
 | q Template 1A: Create a Logic Model for Each Investmentq Template 1B: Dissemination Plan to Communicate the Impact of the Investments | q Resource portfolioq Consultation with SPCR content experts |
| 1. Prioritize efforts for ongoing recovery and transformation
 | q Template 2A: Incorporate Leading Indicators into a Logic Model q Template 2B: Compare the Full Cost of Investments | q Resource portfolioq Cross-SEA team Collaboration Meeting |
| 1. Achieve sustainability through financial planning
 | * Template 3A: Align Investments, Outcomes, and Allocations During Budget Planning
* Template 3B: Identify Prioritized Investments and Federal and State Funding
 | q Resource portfolioq Consultation with SPCR content experts |
| 1. Ensure access and opportunity for all
 | * Template 4A. Identify Data Sources and Measures for Indicators of Domain B: K-12 Learning and Engagement
* Template 4B. Analyze Resource Equity: Make Connections Across Dimensions
 | * Resource portfolio
* Consultation with SPCR content experts
* Cross-SEA team Collaboration Meeting
 |
| 1. Communicate impact of investments
 |  |  |
| 1. Support and sustain systemic capacity building
 |  |  |

### Sustainability Tip

It is important to engage a broad and inclusive array of interest-holders when working through these different strategies, such as those individuals involved with developing, implementing, or working to sustain an investment, as well as those potentially impacted by it. Incorporating different perspectives, data sources, data collection methods, analysis approaches, and communication strategies into your work can help ensure that the work your SEA and your LEAs are doing has broad-ranging benefits across a diverse array of schools, students, and families. For example, additional questions you might ask related to this strategy include:

* Were the student groups served represented in the evidence base that informed the selected investment(s)? If not, what implications might this have on outcomes within your SEA/LEA context?
* Does the logic model consider the potential for differential impacts among diverse groups and include steps for mitigating them?
* Are the data sources inclusive of those responsible, supporting, and impacted by the investment?
* Is communication about priorities, investments, and progress effective – and how do we know this? How do interested parties offer feedback?
* Is data disaggregated to support identification of progress and/or disparities in outcomes?

## **SPCR Strategy 1: Determine Impact of Investments**

A first step in making informed decisions regarding sustainability is to determine the impact of investments that have been made. To do so, it is essential to gather and communicate both quantitative and qualitative data regarding the impact and implementation of the investments and to use this information in making decisions regarding programmatic and fiscal sustainability.

The [Determine Impact of Investments Resource Portfolio](https://compcenternetwork.org/ccnetwork-highlights/topic/8274/strategic-planning-continued-recovery-page-under-construction) includes examples of ways SEAs can use levers specific to this strategy.

There are several questions your SEA team may consider related to this strategy:

* Which evidence-based investments were selected and implemented?
* What is the [theory of action or logic model](https://compcenternetwork.org/resources/resource/7645/evaluating-impact-arpesseresf-funded-programs-using-logic-models) for each investment?
	+ How do the resources/inputs, activities, and outputs connect to produce the expected outcomes?
* What data are being tracked to determine if the investment will achieve the expected outcomes?
* How, to whom, and how often are the SEA and LEAs communicating priorities, investments, and current progress?

### SEA Reflection

There are various methods SEAs may use to determine the impact of investments, such as monitoring the pace of spending, monitoring progress toward improved student outcomes, and using logic models and evaluation to better understand investment inputs, outputs, and outcomes. The table below outlines descriptors of practice aligned to these three approaches SEAs might use either in their own work, or in their work with LEAs. It also presents different options for using additional levers to strengthen practice.

Table 1. Methods to determine the impact of investments

| **Approach** | **Descriptors of practice** | **Options to strengthen practice using levers** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Monitor Pace of Spending | * SEAs post dashboard with public spending data
* LEA communications embed spending reports
* Data from LEAs included the ESSER Annual Performance Report
 | * During the **monitoring** process, SEAs can use the [School Spending & Outcomes Snapshot](https://compcenternetwork.org/ssos) (SSOS) tool to plot school spending vs outcomes in their state using state-level data.
* Identify a selection of LEAs, based on your size and local context, of interest to work with to investigate spending and growth in student outcomes.
* Review the selected LEAs’ ESSER plans and the Annual Performance Report (APR) data to determine the type of investments in place and participation of targeted students.
* Based on investments, enlist aligned SEA departments, those providing direct **technical assistance** to the identified districts or technical assistance partners to interview and document implementation efforts within each identified LEA. ***Complete Template 1A***.
* Summarize findings and determine what might be worthy of further investigation and/or communication to others.
 |
| Monitor Student Outcomes | * LEA outcomes examined, with data disaggregated over time and by relevant student subgroups
* Data reports used to look for progress and gaps between groups over time
* Annual Performance Report data used to track eligible students who are not receiving support
 | * As part of **monitoring**, SEAs can look for other early indicators of success.
* Is engagement / attendance improving?
* Are LEAs building capacity for instruction?
* How might districts describe the early indicators of success?
* What are the inputs and outputs LEAs point to as being necessary requirements for sustainability?
* As part of **technical assistance**, SEAs can help LEAs identify whether there are disparate outcomes across different student groups and determine a plan to address any disparities.
 |
| Understand Investment Inputs, Outputs, and Outcomes  | * Investment activities and implementation documented through logic models and progress monitoring protocols
* Implementation progress and evidence of impact tracked and documented
 | * SEA **technical assistance** to LEAs can also include:
* Assisting LEAs in unpacking and documenting the [logic model](https://compcenternetwork.org/resources/resource/7645/evaluating-impact-arpesseresf-funded-programs-using-logic-models) for the investment of interest.
* Helping LEAs identify who or what interested parties should offer input or be involved in the process to develop the logic model.
* Analyzing models across schools (note similar and different practices across inputs and outputs and the impact on effect size of the outcomes).
* SEAs can provide **technical assistance** to help LEA leaders understand whether and how their current structure supports effective investments. One tool SEAs might use is National Center partner Education Resource Strategies’ (ERS) [*System Strategy Return on Investment Approach*](https://www.erstrategies.org/tap/return_on_investment_in_education), which can help LEAs think about their theory of action, which is similar to a logic model.
* SEAs can **partner** with universities or non-profit organizations to
* Conduct evaluations of different investments/interventions
* Compare findings from practice with research-based practice briefs, and determine how well the research reflects the students served by the LEA.
* Summarize findings and determine what might be worthy of additional learning and/or communication to others.
 |
| Communicate and Scale Effective Investments | * LEA efforts spotlighted in communications, convenings, case studies, or resource guides
* Direction for state-wide efforts (e.g., "North Star") established through policy or within school improvement structures based on effective implementation
* Targeted grant opportunities created to scale effective investments
* A broad and inclusive array of interest-holders from the community provides input and feedback on the efforts
 | * SEAs can invest in **policies** dedicated to communicating the known impact and related implementation factors of specific investments to multiple constituents.
* SEAs can provide technical assistance opportunities for LEAs to develop case studies and share their success with a variety of interest-holders including school boards, superintendents, school leaders, educators, parents, and community members.
* In all the work to determine the impact of investments, engage a broad and inclusive array of interest-holders, including those developing, implementing, and supporting the initiatives as well as those potentially impacted by the initiatives.
* Establish a communications and dissemination plan to ensure that all interest-holders have multiple opportunities to understand and provide input and feedback on the efforts, and to inform upcoming technical assistance, policy, and grantmaking opportunities within the SEA and with LEAs. Use the dissemination **Template 1B** to support development of the plan.
 |

###

### Template 1A: Create a Logic Model for Each Investment

After determining which investments are in place and gathering information about student/staff participation, SEAs can review the target LEAs' ESSER plans and APR data to create a logic model for each investment/intervention. This involves documenting the details of each investment/intervention, including the strategies and activities conducted; the outputs; the short-, mid-, and long-term outcomes; and the available data for each element. For more information about completing logic models, see [Evaluating the Impact of ESSER/ESF-Funded Programs Using Logic Models (compcenternetwork.org)](https://compcenternetwork.org/sites/default/files/LogicModels-to-EvaluateFunds.pdf).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| LEAName | Investment/ Intervention Name | Strategies/ Activities*What did we do?* | Outputs*What evidence is there of our efforts* | Short-Term Outcomes*What was learned?* | Mid-Term Outcomes*What actions were taken?* | Long-Term Outcomes*What benefits have been seen (to individuals, systems, broader conditions?)* | Available Data*Where can we get the data?* |
| **1.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **3.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **4.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **5.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **6.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **7.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **8.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **9.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **10.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### **Sustainability Tip**

Here are some additional considerations that would be useful to keep in mind related to each element in the logic model:

* Strategies/Activities: Who offered input (i.e., Who determined what we would do)?
* Outputs: Who participated, in what way?
* Short-Term Outcomes: Were there disparities in outcomes among those who participated?
* Mid-Term Outcomes: Were there differential efforts to address any short-term disparities?
* Long-Term Outcomes: Were there differential benefits? For whom?

|  |
| --- |
| ***Synthesis of Learning***What are the areas for using levers (grant, policy, monitoring, technical assistance, and partners) that could be applied here and how?*
*
*

What is required for implementation of the levers?*
*
*
*
 |

### Template 1B: Plan to Communicate the Impact of the Investments

When creating and managing communications, it will be helpful for your SEA team to think through how you will use data on and communicate about the impact of investments (or how you will help your LEAs to do so). It is also important to give a broad and diverse array of interest-holders the opportunity to be a part of the team that shapes the communications plan, to ensure that audiences representing varying positions and viewpoints have ongoing opportunities to understand and provide input on the investment’s implementation and impact.

When communicating impact to interest-holders, it is helpful to share information to help them understand the factors influencing implementation and outcomes of an investment, and what might be needed to make improvements to implementation activities. First, determine the specific information each target audience needs, when and how often they need the information, and the best format for communication. The plan to communicate will vary depending on the audience. For SEA and LEA staff in particular, information about the level of effectiveness of the investments may give them information about possible next steps to improve outcomes or maintain and/or expand successes. When SEA/LEA staff understand the impacts of investments, they can become powerful advocates for the work. They may be helpful in advocating for legislative, parent, family, and community support.

SEA/LEA policymakers as well as families, community members, and other interest-holders may be influenced by contextual factors such as political, economic, and social conditions, which affect an investment’s success. In fact, funding goals and perspectives on investment impacts may directly reflect these conditions. Therefore, providing contextual information about how these conditions may affect implementation and outcomes may be important.[[2]](#footnote-3) The table below outlines specific considerations for each audience group and gives space for you to work through how the information will be communicated, by whom, and by when.

| Audience | What to communicate? | How? | Who is responsible? | By when?  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SEA Staff and LEA Staff** | **Contextual Elements:*** Internal and external expectations for what an investment can produce or achieve
* Social and political support for the investment

**Questions to Answer for the Audience:*** What needs are being addressed?
* What evidence or research might be available to support the choice of investment?
* How many and what populations of individuals were (are) served?
* What are the opportunities to enhance or expand the investment’s success?
* How are investment results being disseminated?
* What data was collected, and what did they say about potential differential implications for diverse groups?
* What additional types of data might be needed to understand the impacts of the investment from the perspectives of all those involved and affected, and to identify disparities in outcomes?
 |  |  |  |
| **State and Local Policymakers** | **Contextual Elements:*** Alignment of project services with policy goals
* Leveraging of resources from multiple different funding sources
* Current or emerging policies or priorities

**Questions to Answer for the Audience:*** What does the investment cost?
* Are funds being expended as per the approved budget?
* Are funds being expended at an acceptable rate?
* Do the benefits outweigh the costs?
* Is there a more cost-effective way to achieve the results?
* How does the cost compare to similar programs?
* Was the overall investment worthwhile?
 |  |  |  |
| **Parents, families, and community members** | **Contextual Elements:*** Differing communication norms, needs, and priorities of interest-holders within the community
* The intended outcomes of the investment and their value to the community
* Provide ample opportunities for all groups, especially those directly involved in and affected by the initiatives, to learn about the purpose, implementation, and impacts of the initiatives and to provide input about what the impacts are from their perspectives
* Include measures to gauge the extent to which your messages have been received, understood, and responded to by all interest-holders

**Questions to Answer for the Audience:*** What was the purpose of the investment? What problem did it propose to address?
* How much did the investment cost?
* How was it implemented?
* Who did the investment serve and/or impact, and in what ways?
* How can interested individuals and groups get more involved in planning and decision making around the investment?
 |  |  |  |

## **SPCR Strategy 2: Prioritize Efforts for Ongoing Recovery and Transformation**

Once the impact of the different investments has been determined, the next step is to strategically prioritize which investments to sustain moving forward based on student needs and a refined understanding of what's working. This requires measuring trade-offs that maximize student outcomes while taking into consideration the structures and processes within the SEA and LEA.

Here we continue our focus on how SEAs can use the levers of grantmaking, policy, monitoring, technical assistance, and partnerships to support LEAs. Access the [Prioritize Efforts for Ongoing Recovery and Transformation Resource Portfolio](https://compcenternetwork.org/ccnetwork-highlights/topic/8274/strategic-planning-continued-recovery-page-under-construction) for more information about ways SEAs can use these levers through this strategy.

There are several questions your SEA team may consider as you focus on supports to prioritize efforts for ongoing recovery and transformation:

* Which evidence-based investments show promise for accelerating student learning?
* What actions should SEAs and LEAs be taking to determine the cost and likelihood of sustainability for each intervention?
* How can SEAs support LEAs in navigating budget decision trade-offs to accelerate student learning?
* Who needs to be a part of the conversation regarding spending prioritization?

### SEA Reflection

One way to do prioritize among different investments is to determine the cost, outcomes, and potential sustainability of each intervention. The National Center and its partner Edunomics Lab shared a useful [tool](https://compcenternetwork.org/sites/default/files/The%20Investment%20Grid-Linking%20Costs%20and%20Outcomes.pdf) through the webinar [*ESSER Spending: Connecting Investments and Outcomes*](https://compcenternetwork.org/resources/resource/7483/esser-spending-connectinhttps%3A/compcenternetwork.org/resources/resource/7483/esser-spending-connecting-investments-and-outcomesg-investments-and-outcomes). Another way to do this is using National Center partner Education Resource Strategies’ [*System Strategy Return on Investment (SSROI) Approach*](https://www.erstrategies.org/tap/return_on_investment_in_education#:~:text=System%20Strategy%20ROI%20is%20a,articulating%20a%20theory%20of%20action%2C). Using the SSROI tool, SEAs can work through a process to fully cost out strategies, develop a clear theory of action for each, and then use consistent progress monitoring to know what is working and how to continuously improve what is being sustained, which are the core components of an ROI approach. SEAs can integrate the ROI approach into levers they are currently using to prioritize among investments, or they can reflect on the descriptions of each component of the ROI approach to help them consider how they might use new levers to support their own or their LEAs’ efforts at prioritization.

We focus on three approaches SEA teams might use with this strategy: Use leading indicators to evaluate what's working, determine cost and investigate the likelihood of sustainability for each investment, and engage in strategic decisionmaking and communication about which investments to sustain. The table below outlines descriptors of practice aligned to these three approaches SEAs might use either in their own work, or in their work with LEAs. It also presents different options for using additional levers to strengthen practice.

Table 2. Prioritize efforts for ongoing recovery and transformation

| **Approach** | **Descriptors of practice** | **Options to strengthen practice using levers** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Use leading indicators to evaluate what's working | * A diverse set of interest-holders, particularly those impacted by the investment, support identification and monitoring of leading indicators
* Leading indicators identified to track progress toward short-term outcomes
* Data collected to measure progress on leading indicators, through partnerships with an outside evaluator or SEA department
* Successful investments identified based on data from leading indicators
 | * SEAs can build systems to track progress on leading indicators for key investments into their **monitoring** protocols.
* SEAs can offer **technical assistance** support to LEAs by referring to the logic models created for each investment, and then:
* Assist LEAs in determining leading indicators based on short-term outcomes in the logic model. ***Complete Template 2A.***
* Ensure LEAs choose leading indicators based on evidence (e.g., SEAs and LEAs might refer to the [National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Mathematics *Monitoring Educational Equity* and *Building Educational Equity Indicator Systems*](https://nap.nationalacademies.org/catalog/25833/building-educational-equity-indicator-systems-a-guidebook-for-states-and)reports)
* Encourage LEAs to provide an opportunity for a diverse set of interest-holders support identification and monitoring of leading indicators.
* Analyze data about progress on leading indicators to facilitate prioritization of investments.
* Summarize findings and determine what might be worthy of additional learning and/or revisions to the implementation of the investment.
 |
| Determine cost and investigate the likelihood of sustainability for each investment | * Target population identified for each investment
* Investments with potential to meet core needs of the target population identified
* Full cost of each investment documented to allow for comparisons
* More cost-effective ways to implement various investments identified through data analysis
 | * SEAs can provide **technical assistance** to differentiate supports for LEAs, including:
	+ Discussing trade-offs and prioritization of investments with LEAs that have spent most of their ESSER funds.
	+ Helping LEAs that have not spent as much ESSER funds to determine what is working using leading indicators as they continue to spend.
* SEAs can collaborate with **partners** to support SEA engagement with LEAs.
	+ Support SEAs in providing training and **technical assistance** to LEAs.
	+ Bring LEAs together that have made similar investments, have shared challenges, or are otherwise similarly situated.
* As part of the **grantmaking** process, SEAs can incorporate tools like [The Investment Grid: Linking Costs and Outcomes](https://compcenternetwork.org/sites/default/files/The%20Investment%20Grid-Linking%20Costs%20and%20Outcomes.pdf) (compcenternetwork.org) or the [ESSER Strategy Planner & Spending Calculator (erstrategies.org)](https://www.erstrategies.org/tap/ESSER_School_District_Strategy_and_Funding_Calculator) to help LEAs determine the costs and expected outcomes of investments. ***See Template 2B.***
 |
| Engage in strategic decisionmaking and communication about which investments to sustain | * Decisionmaking engages a cross-functional team and includes input from a broad and diverse array of interest-holders
* Student outcome and budgetary impact of investments determined through collaboration with department leads
* Prioritization of investments takes into consideration core needs for each target audience and the potential for the investment to meet those needs
* Decisions about costs, outcomes, and budget tradeoffs communicated to interested parties
 | * SEAs can provide **technical assistance** to LEAs to help them think through the outcomes, costs and benefits of different investments and make strategic decisions regarding which investments to prioritize going forward. One tool to do this is National Center partner Education Resource Strategies’ [*ESSER Hold'Em for Districts*](https://www.erstrategies.org/tap/esser_holdem_for_districts), which is a game to help LEAs plan, focus investments, and navigate tradeoffs.
* SEAs can provide **technical assistance, engage in partnerships,** and leverage **policies** to facilitate clear and transparent communication.
	+ Use transparent language with the field, interested parties, and the media to prepare them for and engage them in potential trade-offs.
	+ SEA finance and programmatic staff can work together to create coherent **technical assistance** to share tools and strategies.
	+ Regularly publish publicly available student achievement and ESSER-spending details.
* Establish a communications plan that incorporates input and feedback from an array of interest-holders.
	+ Establish measures to gauge the extent to which all interested parties understand and engage in these conversations.
 |

### Template 2A: Incorporate Leading Indicators into a Logic Model

Building on the use of the sample logic model(s) developed using Template 1A, SEAs can help LEAs identify leading indicators of implementation and progress toward achieving outcomes. Analyzing data on these leading indicators will help them to gain a better understanding of the likelihood of success and sustainability of each investment. Use the Template below to identify indicators of implementation and of short- and mid-term outcomes for the different strategies/activities associated with each investment. For more information about leading indicators, see [Education Resource Strategies’ (ERS) System Strategy Return on Investment Approach](https://www.erstrategies.org/tap/return_on_investment_in_education).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **LEA Name:** |  |
| **Investment/Intervention Name:** |  |
| **Strategies/Activities***What did we do?* | Outputs*What evidence is there of our efforts?* | Implementation Indicators*What evidence do we have of quality implementation (e.g., fidelity, uptake, access, equity)?* | Outcome Indicators*What evidence do we have of progress toward outcomes (e.g., engagement, satisfaction, short-term growth)?* | Available Data*Where can we get the data?* |
| 1.  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |  |  |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |
| 5. |  |  |  |  |
| 6. |  |  |  |  |
| 7. |  |  |  |  |
| 8. |  |  |  |  |
| 9. |  |  |  |  |
| 10. |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Synthesis of Learning***Based on the leading indicators we have identified, what levers (grant, policy, monitoring, technical assistance, and partners) might we use and in what ways?What additional supports might be required for successful implementation of the levers? What additional partnerships/other types of engagement might be necessary to ensure decision making integrates perspectives of various interested parties? |

### Template 2B: Compare the Full Cost of Investments

When making decisions to prioritize investments, it is important to consider the full cost of each investment, including the cost of staffing, transportation, facilities, special education supports, food service, etc. Failure to integrate information about full costs of investments when making budget decisions may result in prioritization of investments that may not actually be sustainable overall. At the same time, when SEA/LEA staff understand the full cost of investments—especially those that have been working well but that may not currently have consistent funding sources—they can become powerful advocates for obtaining greater SEA/LEA leadership, legislative, parent, family, or community support for the investment. The [ESSER Strategy Planner & Spending Calculator (erstrategies.org)](https://www.erstrategies.org/tap/ESSER_School_District_Strategy_and_Funding_Calculator) tool is a helpful resource for more information about determining full cost of investments.

Once you have the full costs for each investment, you can use Template 2B to compare investments. This comparison can also help to identify if there are more cost-effective ways to conduct a specific investment. Combining this data with the data on implementation and outcomes gathered using Template 2A can provide useful information to inform decisions related to sustainability of different investments.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **LEA****Name**  | **Investment/ Intervention Name** | **Staffing Estimate** | **Transportation Estimate** | **Curriculum/ Materials Estimate** | **Facilities Estimate** | **Wraparound/ Other Supports Estimate** | **Total Cost Estimate** |
| 1.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

This document was prepared by the National Comprehensive Center under Award #S283B190028 for the Office of Program and Grantee Support Services (PGSS) within the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) of the U.S. Department of Education and is administered by Westat. The content of the document does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the PGSS or OESE or the U.S. Department of Education. If you have trouble accessing the content in this document, [contact us](https://compcenternetwork.org/get-involved).

## **SPCR Strategy 3: Achieve Sustainability Through Financial Planning**

After determining which effective investments to prioritize, the next step is to plan how to financially sustain them. This requires state educational agencies (SEAs) to understand how local educational agencies (LEAs) set their budgets and then apply various levers to influence spending and implementation decisions.

Here we continue our focus on how SEAs can use the levers of grantmaking, policy, monitoring, technical assistance, and partnerships to support LEAs. See the [Achieve Sustainability Through Financial Planning Resource Portfolio](https://compcenternetwork.org/ccnetwork-highlights/topic/8274/strategic-planning-continued-recovery-page-under-construction) for resources related to different ways SEAs can apply these levers to this strategy.

There are a couple questions your SEA team may consider as you focus on supporting LEAs to achieve sustainability through financial planning:

* How can SEAs help LEAs identify various sources of funding to continue effective investments?
* How can SEAs support LEAs as they engage in budget planning to ensure they have the resources and supports needed to sustain priority investments?

### SEA Reflection

Once SEAs and LEAs prioritize among effective investments made using ESSER funding, ensure the resources and supports needed to sustain those investments will be available involves leveraging other existing or newly identified sources of funding. Making sure SEA and LEA staff understand the allowable uses of various sources of federal funding is essential. SEA-developed guidance or technical assistance can support LEA understanding of what can and cannot be done using federal formula grant funds. Of course, sustainability planning should include more than just financial considerations. SEAs and LEAs should think strategically about other key resources needed to implement the chosen interventions, such as whether there is sufficient human capacity (e.g., staff qualifications, skills, and availability) to support the work. See [Strategy 2: Prioritize Effective Investments for Ongoing Recovery](#_SPCR_Strategy_2:) for more information about the importance of paying attention to the full cost of investments when making decisions around what to sustain.

As they work together to support sustainability, SEAs can engage with LEAs to rethink long-standing budget development processes and, if needed, develop a new budgeting mindset focused on ensuring investments support improved academic, behavioral, and mental health outcomes for students and staff. SEAs can scale promising practices by spotlighting LEA efforts in communications, convenings, case studies, or resource guides. SEAs can also consider how their oversight can influence LEA spending and program implementation. The table below outlines descriptors of practice aligned to these approaches SEAs might use either in their own work, or in their work with LEAs. It also presents different options for using additional levers to strengthen practice.

Table 3. Achieve Sustainability Through Financial Planning

| **Approach** | **Descriptors of practice** | **Options to strengthen practice using levers** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Engage with LEAs in Budget Planning | * Supports to LEAs are based on data about student outcomes
* Supports, including resources and convenings, are tailored for multiple audiences
* Data linking outcomes to investments are required to be included in LEA budget submissions to SEAs
* Targeted grant opportunities for LEAs are developed based on data related to investment effectiveness
* A cross-functional team incorporating input from a diverse array of interest-holders is engaged in budget planning and decisionmaking
 | * SEAs can provide **technical assistance** to LEAs by helping them review and disaggregate outcomes data to identify what is working and whether disparities in outcomes are present to inform decisions about which investments to prioritize. **See Template 3A.**
* SEAs can spotlight LEA efforts in communications, convenings, case studies, or resource guides as part of their **technical assistance** to promote promising practices across LEAs**.**
* SEAs can develop a **policy** requiring LEA Chief Financial Officers and Title grant managers to examine outcomes and evidence of effectiveness prior to budget submission. This will encourage LEAs to think through ways to shift toward a more outcomes focus.
* During the **grantmaking** process, SEAs can
	+ Require LEAs to submit evidence that their investments are improving student outcomes, particularly among targeted student groups. Specifically, SEAs can require LEAs to disaggregate data by student groups; identify any disparities in access to the investment, and in impacts; and, where necessary, develop action plans to address identified gaps. **See Template 3A below.**
	+ Use state-wide data to create targeted grant opportunities to address disparities identified in the data.
	+ Encourage LEAs to incorporate input and feedback from a diverse array of interest-holders—including those developing, implementing, and supporting the initiatives and those potentially impacted by those initiatives—when identifying disparities and potential solutions, and when budget planning and making key decisions about resources.
	+ Require LEAs to identify their priorities and/or other state-aligned priorities they intend to address as well as submit any relevant evidence showing current progress or plans to address the priority.
 |
| Amplify ED Spending Guidance | * Spending guidance is developed in coordination with federal program staff and content experts
* Spending guidance/technical assistance to supplement ED Guidance documents is created by:
	+ Determining the issue that needs to be addressed
	+ Identifying the audience and outlining the scope of the guidance
	+ Obtaining input from a cross-functional team and a diverse array of interest holders
* Supplemental spending guidance/technical assistance contains:
	+ Concrete examples of activities federal funds can support, acknowledging that allowability and allocability always depends on regulatory requirements
	+ Activity/Investment-focused guidance to show how more than one federal funding source can be blended/braided to support a particular initiative
 | * SEAs can use external and internal **partnerships**, including federal program staff, legal staff, and outside content experts,to develop effective supplemental guidance resources.
* SEAs can develop/revise **policies** or offer **technical assistance** based on strategies outlined in the CCSSO resource[*Developing Effective Guidance: A Handbook for State Educational Agencies*](https://ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-10/CCSSODevelopingEffectiveGuidanceHandbook.pdf)*,* which focuses on determining what issues to address in the guidance, determining the audience and scope of the guidance, and drafting the guidance while getting feedback on the draft.
* SEAs can develop/revise **policies** that outline specific examples of activities different federal grants can support for LEAs to use during the budget process.See for more information, Federal Education Group, CCSSO,[*How Traditional U.S. Department of Education Grants Can Help Sustain ESSER Activities*](https://learning.ccsso.org/how-traditional-u-s-department-of-education-grants-can-help-sustain-esser-activities). **See Template 3B below**.
* SEAs can use information obtained in **Template 2B above**to create **technical assistance** guidance related to specific investments LEAs plan to sustain.
 |
| Enhance/Create SEA Monitoring Systems for Federal Grants[[3]](#footnote-4) | * Grant application forms are:
	+ Designed to align with SEA priorities
	+ Designed to encourage LEAs to identify and align funded activities with data related to student needs
	+ Topically focused (instead of focusing on a particular funding source)
* Oversight of spending and program implementation is coordinated across SEA fiscal and program offices
* Audit findings are regularly reviewed, and appropriate actions are taken based on the findings
* Federal grant compliance requirements are regularly enforced, and issues addressed
 | * SEAs can **monitor** LEAs to:
	+ Ensure alignment between LEAs’ grant application(s) and implementation of grant-funded activities.
	+ Identify disparities in access to the intervention and the way implementation is taking place across different schools/locations/etc.
* SEAs can provide **technical assistance** to help LEAs address any challenges identified through monitoring related to compliance, access to interventions, differences in implementation across schools, and/or disparities in outcomes.
* SEAs can provide **technical assistance** to LEAs based on a review of budgeting and spending data relative to student outcomes.
* SEAs can **partner** across program and fiscal offices to review LEA applications to ensure budget activities are aligned across programs.
* Develop **technical assistance** for auditors and LEAs on state interpretations of federal rules to ensure auditors apply the correct standards.
 |

### Template 3A: Align Investments, Outcomes, and Allocations During Budget Planning

There are different ways state educational agencies (SEAs) might support local educational agencies (LEAs) in strategic financial planning to support sustainability of the investments they have chosen to prioritize. As discussed in [Strategy 2](#_SPCR_Strategy_2:), SEAs can offer technical assistance to LEAs by helping them review and disaggregate outcomes data to inform decisions about priorities. During the grantmaking process, SEAs can require LEAs to submit, with their applications, evidence that their investments are improving student outcomes, particularly among targeted student groups. Further, SEAs can require LEAs to disaggregate data by student groups; identify any disparities in access to programs or interventions as well as disparities in outcomes; and, where necessary, develop action plans to address identified gaps.

Once decisions have been made about which investments to prioritize going forward, it is important to ensure alignment between the focus of the investments and the budgeted activities. It is also helpful to revisit whether the budgeted activities align with outcomes data demonstrating areas of highest need, particularly among targeted student groups. SEAs can use Template 3A to review the alignment for specific SEA-level investments and ask LEAs to review their priority investments as well. Data needed to complete this Template include disaggregated outcomes data for each investment and detailed budget planning documents. For each investment in the table below, answer yes or no for each prompt in columns 2–4 and then describe any necessary budget adjustments and supporting evidence that was used to make the response in columns 3-4. After reviewing the investments, SEAs/LEAs might use the table below to compare rationales for maintaining the various priority investments and necessary budget adjustment to further inform prioritization and budget planning decisions. Upon reviewing the information included in the table, SEAs/LEAs can determine whether they want to continue with the original selection of priority investments or focus on a different group of investments.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority Investment** | **The choice of priority investment is clearly supported by data demonstrating evidence of need** (e.g., disaggregated student outcomes data showing disparities in 8th grade math achievement)(Yes/No) | **Budgeted activities align with the outcomes data, indicating areas of greatest need** (e.g., data indicate needs in math and budget includes funding for math tutors)(Yes/No) | **Budget includes activities to adequately support this investment** (e.g., transportation from afterschool tutoring, curriculum/materials, facilities, wraparound supports)(Yes/No) | **Necessary Budget Adjustments** (e.g., the budget needs to include more staff hours to support on-going tutoring) | **Supporting Evidence** |
| Priority Investment 1:  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Priority Investment 2:  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Priority Investment 3:  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Priority Investment 4:  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Synthesis of Learning***In reviewing the table above—especially those with a response of ‘no’—some additional questions to consider include:* What needs identified using outcomes data are not being met through the prioritized investment?

 * What changes could/should be made to the budgeted activities to better address needs?

 * What additional supports might be required to successfully sustain investments to better address needs?

  |

### Template 3B: Identify Prioritized Investments and Federal and State Funding

SEAs can support LEAs’ creative use of federal formula funds through technical assistance documents related to spending. These types of technical assistance documents can include concrete examples of activities, highlighting a variety of funding options. Blending and braiding of funds is an example of a creative funding option for LEAs. “Braiding refers to the weaving together of federal, state, and local funding streams—and the development of funding strategies—to support high-quality programs. Blending involves comingling the funds into one ‘pot’ in which leaders can draw down service dollars, pay for personnel expenses, or meet other program needs” ([Braiding and Blending Federal Funds: A Step-by-Step Guide for Illinois Schools, March 2023, region9cc.org)](https://region9cc.org/sites/default/files/Illinois-Braid-Blend-Guide-508.pdf). No matter the funding option, SEAs and LEAs need to follow with the cost principles of 2 C.F.R. part 200 ([Uniform Guidance](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-2/part-200/subpart-E)), including ensuring that the expenditure is reasonable and necessary in the view of a prudent person.

Another example of technical assistance around spending is a budget crosswalk. The crosswalk enables LEAs to determine which investments are allowable under federal formula, state, and local funding sources. Template 3B can assist SEAs with creating a budget crosswalk. SEAs are encouraged to add to the crosswalk sources of federal funds and, if applicable, any state, or local funds that might be used to support the investment. SEAs and LEAs need to remember that allowable costs depend on the intent, purpose, underlying facts, and circumstances for each investment.

In the table below, identify the sources of funding available for the prioritized investments. Start by specifying any applicable state and local funding sources at the bottom of the table. Then add the priority investments based on [Template 3A](#_Template_3A:_Budget) into the column headers. Finally, complete the table to indicate which sources of funding can be used to support a particular investment (see the high-dosage tutoring example below) SEAs/LEAs might use the table below to compare investments by funding sources to further inform budget planning decisions. Upon reviewing the information included in the table, SEAs/LEAs can determine whether funding sources overlap and decide whether to continue using the identified funding source for a particular investment or to make budget adjustments to better allocate funding across investments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Funding Sources** | **Priority Investments** |
|  | (e.g., High-dosage tutoring) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Title I, Part A |[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| ESEA Section 1003 |[x] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| Title I, Part C Migrant Ed |[x] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| Title II, Part A |[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| Title III |[x] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| Title IV, Part A |[x] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| IDEA, Part B  |[x] [ ] [ ] [x] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| Perkins |[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| McKinney-Vento |[x] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| State (specify): (e.g., State Literacy Act)  |[x] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| Local (specify): |[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

1Ninety-five percent of ESEA Section 1003 funds must be allocated to the LEAs.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Synthesis of Learning***In reviewing the funding for the investments outlined in the table above, some additional questions to consider include:* Where are the funding shortfalls, if any?
* What other sources of funding/resources might be leveraged (community, foundation, in-kind contributions, etc.) to support a particular investment going forward?
 |

## **SPCR Strategy 4: Ensure Access and Opportunity for All**

Considerations of access and opportunity for all students are fundamental concerns in federal funding, including the different Title programs and the use of ESSER funds. Specifically, an important purpose of ESSER funding was to ensure that students most affected by the pandemic, including students who have historically been marginalized, would be prioritized in state/local educational agency (SEA/LEA) planning for learning recovery. The themes of access and opportunity are inherent in the three SPCR strategies that have been covered thus far; here we focus on ways that SEAs and LEAs might identify and shape investments that are critical for creating equitable conditions and outcomes for all students.[[4]](#footnote-5)

The [National Academies of Science, Engineering and Medicine (NASEM, 2019)](https://nap.nationalacademies.org/catalog/25389/monitoring-educational-equity) states, equitable access and opportunity are achieved when there is parity between student groups in terms of educational outcomes (e.g., high school graduation rates) and access to resources and opportunities (e.g., high-quality teachers, instruction, and educational programs). Access and opportunity are also achieved when there are efforts to mitigate the effects of structural or systemic factors that disproportionately affect different students.

In addition to the five levers of grantmaking, policy, monitoring, technical assistance, and partnership to support LEAs, SEAs need to also leverage a sixth lever—communication—in this work. Purposeful communication promotes intentional thought and action among SEAs and LEAs about how they share and receive feedback. By regarding the goals and impacts of their investments and how they prioritize investments for sustainability,[[5]](#footnote-6) purposeful communication can help create a shift in mindset:

Centering access and opportunity for all requires SEAs and LEAs to make clear value statements and take intentional actions aligned to these value statements. Explore the [Ensure Access and Opportunity for All Resource Portfolio](https://compcenternetwork.org/ccnetwork-highlights/topic/8274/strategic-planning-continued-recovery-page-under-construction) for resources related to different ways SEAs can apply levers to this strategy.

Here are several questions your SEA team might consider as you focus on providing supports to ensure access and opportunity for all:

* How are the SEA and LEAs working to reduce disparities in opportunities to learn in order to reduce achievement gaps?​
* How have LEAs prioritized the needs of students most affected by the pandemic through the different ESSER investments?​
* To what extent have ESSER investments made to date contributed to improving access and outcomes for students?​
* How are the SEA and LEAs communicating about investments to diverse groups?

### SEA Reflection

Ensuring access and opportunity for all is both a key driver for and a key goal of ESSER funding. It is necessary to engage in explicit communication among leaders and educators as well as with parents, families, students, and other interest holders about the intention and the actions required to achieve access and opportunity for all. Moving forward, SEAs and LEAs must continue to focus attention on students with disproportionately low outcomes, address disparities in students' academic achievement and attainment outcomes and engagement in schooling, and ensure equitable access to resources and opportunities.

What is the current practice of your SEA/LEA as it relates to designing, targeting, and evaluating interventions that ensure access and opportunity for all?

* To what extent were ESSER investments designed to address disparities in opportunities to learn and student outcomes?
	+ Investments (e.g., summer learning, tutoring) are not specifically designed to target particular student groups
	+ Investments are designed primarily to meet the needs of historically marginalized students
	+ Investments are targeted at students most affected by the pandemic and historically marginalized students
* To what extent have ESSER investments helped to address disparities in opportunities to learn and student outcomes?
	+ Evaluation data demonstrate how investments benefit historically marginalized students and those most affected by the pandemic
	+ Disaggregated results show that learning recovery by historically marginalized student groups and those most affected by the pandemic is similar to or better than other groups of students

SEAs and LEAs need to connect intentions, actions, and results to address disparities in opportunities and outcomes. The NASEM report, [*Monitoring Educational Equity*,](https://nap.nationalacademies.org/catalog/25389/monitoring-educational-equity) connects race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic factors with opportunity to learn and discusses how systems and structures can lead to disparities. SEAs and LEAs may use the *Monitoring Educational Equity* indicators to design for, monitor implementation of, and evaluate whether their interventions are resulting in improvements to access and opportunity for all students. Here are some questions to consider:

* Which investments were intended to address any of the NASEM indicators, and in what way?
* How effective were those investments at improving outcomes for students from historically marginalized populations and those most affected by the pandemic?
* How can future investments be adjusted to better serve student needs?

A system of supports and a combination of resources are essential to enable educators to meet each student’s needs. SEAs and LEAs can use evaluation data to look at specific interventions as well as more systemic conditions to see how they might be influencing outcomes for students. For example, the Alliance for Resource Equity identifies 10 dimensions of education resources that identify potential institutional practices and structural barriers that may prevent or support access and opportunity for all (See [Template 4B](#_Template_4B._) below to explore these further).

Ensuring access and opportunity for all requires commitment from both the SEA and the LEAs. The table below outlines descriptors of practice aligned to approaches SEAs might use either in their own work or in their work with LEAs to better support improved access and opportunity for all students. It also presents different options for using additional levers to strengthen practice.

Table 4. Ensure Access & Opportunity for All

| **Approach** | **Descriptors of practice** | **Options to strengthen practice using levers** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Focus attention on students with disproportionately low outcomes | Goals to address disproportionality in certain target areas are integrated into the SEA’s grantmaking processes.Goals to address disproportionality in certain target areas are integrated into the LEAs’ investment and allocation processes.  | SEAs can provide **technical assistance** to LEAsas part of the grantmaking process on *how* to identifywhichstudents to target (e.g., based on outcomes data and/or input from interest holders) SEAs can provide **technical assistance** to LEAs as part of the grantmaking process on linking the target students to the goals (e.g., improvement in access and opportunity) for funded investments. During **grantmaking**, SEAs can require needs assessments to encourage LEAs to identify the requisite supports needed for targeted groups. SEAs can use **policies** that require interim reporting on regular assessments of whether targeted students are being served and making progress by investment. During **monitoring**, SEAs can require presentation of data related to disproportionality in reports of investment outcomes.  |
| Address disparities in students' academic achievement and attainment outcomes and engagement in schooling  | Information about the types of investments most likely to reduce disparities is communicated, and implementation supports are provided to LEAs. | SEAs **communicate** with interested parties about state-wide disparities in opportunities and outcomes to support implementation of investments that are most likely to reduce disparities. As a form of **technical assistance**, SEAs spotlight LEAs and schools that are successfully closing gaps.SEAs can model **partnership** practices to engage a wide range of interest holders, including students, families, and community members, in decisionmaking.SEAs facilitate the creation of **partnerships** with service providers.SEAs **communicate** with LEAs about successful strategies for supporting students with high needs (e.g., wraparound services, community schools).Through creation of **technical assistance** briefs and case studies, SEAs encourage LEAs to select investments with a high potential to reduce disparities. |
| Resource allocation takes into consideration the effect on access and opportunity | The state-wide accountability system includes multi-faceted monitoring of investments as well as systemic and structural disparities. Systemic and structural resources are available to address disparities in access and opportunity.  | SEAs can require LEAs to include in **monitoring** reports data related to disparities and a plan for addressing them. SEAs can **monitor** LEAs for multiple factors that affect equitable conditions, including access or lack of access to financial resources, quality teachers, technology, etc.  |

### Template 4A: Identify Data Sources and Measures for Indicators of Domain B: K-12 Learning and Engagement

The NASEM report *Monitoring Educational Equity*[[6]](#footnote-7) identifies key indicators for measuring and monitoring disparities in the K–12 education system. The purpose of the indicators is not to track progress towards achieving aggregate goals, but rather to identify differences in progress towards the goals among different student groups. Carefully choosing to examine data related to equity indicators can highlight disparities, providing a way to explore potential causes and point towards improvements. The report identifies seven domains and 16 related indicators and suggests constructs, data sources, and measures to include or use in grantmaking, monitoring, and policymaking activities. This template lists potential measures for each of the indicators identified within Domain B: K-12 Learning and Engagement.

Note for Use:

* SEA staff may use this template to assess the availability of data related to these indicators to inform their own decisionmaking, with LEA staff to explore whether they have data that can inform decisionmaking at the LEA level or with LEA staff to examine availability of data to inform school/classroom-level decisionmaking.
* There may be multiple sources of data for the same measure, especially across various levels of the K–12 system (e.g., summative vs. formative assessments or year-end data vs. quarterly data).
* Include additional measures that can provide data within each indicator for local context.
* Consider using this template for a particular sub-group of students or with several sub-groups (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, English-language status, disability status, eligible/not eligible for free or reduced-price lunch) to identify disparities.

| Indicator | Potential Measures | Is this data available?(Yes/No/Don't know) | School Year | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 3. Disparities in Engagement in Schooling** | What percent of the school has a low level of student engagement (measured by chronic absences)? |  |  |  |
| What percent of instructional days is the teacher of record not present? |  |  |  |
| What percent of instructional days are students taught by a teacher who is not certified? |  |  |  |
| What percent of the school staff is not diverse (e.g., more than 70% of teachers are non-Hispanic, White females)? |  |  |  |
| What percent of students are absent? |  |  |  |
| What percent of students report school to be unwelcoming? |  |  |  |
| What percent of students report not being academically engaged? |  |  |  |
| What percent of students report feeling unsupported? |  |  |  |
| What percent of students report feeling unsafe? |  |  |  |
| What percent of students have a total number of suspension days and/or absences that are greater in number than their number of visits to a certified counselor or nurse? |  |  |  |
| What percent of low-scoring students do not have access to academic supports, such as tutoring?  |  |  |  |
| What percent of students identified for special education had no prior access to a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS)? |  |  |  |
| What percent of disciplinary incidents result in out-of-school suspension or expulsion? |  |  |  |
| **Indicator 4.** **Disparities in Performance in Coursework** | What percent of students are repeating a grade?  |  |  |  |
| What percent of students failed their algebra class? |  |  |  |
| What percent of students failed at least one core class? |  |  |  |
| What percent of students failed two or more classes? |  |  |  |
| **Indicator 5.** **Disparities in Test Performance** | What percent of students scored at Below Basic on the most recent state reading or English test? |  |  |  |
| What percent of students scored at Below Basic on the most recent state math test? |  |  |  |
| What percent of students scored at Below Basic on the most recent state science test? |  |  |  |
| What percent of students demonstrate low growth in reading? |  |  |  |
| What percent of students demonstrate low growth in math? |  |  |  |
| What percent of students demonstrate low growth in science? |  |  |  |

Citation: This table is adapted from the [National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Mathematics *Monitoring Educational Equity* and *Building Educational Equity Indicator Systems*](https://nap.nationalacademies.org/catalog/25833/building-educational-equity-indicator-systems-a-guidebook-for-states-and)

### Template 4B: Analyze Resource Equity: Make Connections Across Dimensions

SEAs can support LEAs in taking a systems approach to analyzing resource allocation[[7]](#footnote-8) to ensure more equitable access and opportunities. SEAs can help LEAs unpack how their resource allocation decisions drive opportunity gaps by creating a dashboard that explores different dimensions of resource equity for different investments.

National Center partner, Education Resource Strategies’ *Education Resource Equity Framework* toolkit, outlines 10 dimensions of resource equity to be considered:

* School funding
* Teaching quality and diversity
* School leadership quality and diversity
* Empowering, rigorous content
* Instructional time and attention
* Positive and inviting school climate
* Student supports and intervention
* High-quality early learning
* Learning-ready facilities
* Diverse classrooms and schools

It is important to remember that it is best to explore performance on multiple dimensions (depending on the investment). Otherwise, SEAs and LEAs may risk missing connections among different dimensions that can influence performance of the system. This example compares economically disadvantaged students to non-economically disadvantaged students in five of the dimensions.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Example*Note: Illustrative data.* | **School Funding** | **Teaching Quality & Diversity** | **School Leadership Quality & Diversity** | **Empowering, Rigorous Content** | **Time & Attention** |  |
| **Vision****for All Students** | Sufficient funding, based on need, used well | High-quality, diverse teachers | High-quality, diverse school leaders | High expectations, empowering materials, and coursework | Differentiated time and attention | **Percent Proficient** |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | $6,414 Average site-based school funding | 1 of 2 teachers rated effective or highly effective | Greater likelihood of having a novice principal | 42% enrolled in advanced 6th grade math | 29 students in core-classesExtra time in readingNo extra time in math | 31% ELA33% Math |
| Non-Economically Disadvantaged Students | $5,952 average site-based school funding | 3 of 4 teachers rated effective or highly effective | Less likelihood of having a novice principal | 83% enrolled in advanced 6th grade math | 24 students in core classes | 68% ELA67% Math |

A table such as this can help LEAs conduct a resource equity analysis and make meaning of their results. The analysis includes unpacking how each dimension relates to opportunity gaps in your context. Each dimension is analyzed, keeping in mind the vision for all students and based on a target student population and current outcome and proficiency data. A review of dimensions across student groups can assist with identifying opportunity gaps within the LEA.

Notes for Use:

1. Identify the targeted student population(s) you want to focus on (e.g., Black students, students with disabilities). Fill in Box A and Box B.
2. Identify the current outcome and the proficiency rate for targeted and non-targeted student(s). Fill in Box C and Box. D.
3. Expand the table to include the desired number of columns and rows for the dimensions or student groups to be considered.
4. For each dimension, write the vision for all students.
5. Insert the data for each dimension for each targeted group of students.

The full toolkit, including specific Guidebooks and Advocating Across Government recommendations for each dimension, is available [here](https://educationresourceequity.org/toolkit/diagnostic-tool-and-supports/).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Dimension (e.g., School Funding** | **Dimension (e.g., Instructional Time)** | **Dimension** | **Dimension** |  |
| **Vision****for All Students** |  |  |  |  | **Outcome (e.g., Percent proficient)** |
| Box A (e.g., target sub-group 1) |  |  |  |  | Box C (e.g., XX% ELA, XX% math) |
| Box B (e.g., target sub-group 2) |  |  |  |  | Box D |

1. Since the majority of COVID recovery funds are allocated to LEAs, the SPCR has a heavy focus on supports SEAs can provide to their LEAs to support sustainability of their investments. We encourage SEAs with unitary status to apply the strategies/resources indicated for LEAs to the appropriate context within their SEA. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Information obtained and adapted from Lammert, J. D., Heinemeier, S., & Fiore, T. (2017). Effectively Communicating Evaluation Findings. Rockville, MD: Westat. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Information adapted from CCSSO’s [*A Guide to State Educational Agency Oversight Responsibilities under ESSA*](https://www.ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-10/CCSSO_State_Authority_Over_ESSA_Programs.pdf)*.* [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Refer to the Department of Education’s Dear Colleague Letter on Title I Resource Equity to learn more about the resource equity provisions under Title I. The document provides a description of the requirements under Title I of the ESEA. It also contains recommended best practices for conducting resource allocation reviews and identifying and addressing resource inequities within comprehensive and additional targeted support and improvement plans. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Adapted from Dr. Sam Reardon, Stanford University professor and member of the National Academies of Sciences Committee. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2019. *Monitoring Educational Equity*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/25389>. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Refer to the Department of Education’s Dear Colleague Letter on Title I Resource Equity to learn more about the resource equity provisions under Title I. The document provides a description of the requirements under Title I of the ESEA. It also contains recommended best practices for conducting resource allocation reviews and identifying and addressing resource inequities within comprehensive and additional targeted support and improvement plans. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)