

Learning Assistance Program Technical Working Group

Recommendations for Ensuring Program Success

Presented by: Gayle Pauley – Director Title I/LAP/CPR &
Andrea Cobb – Financial Research Analyst



Quality Education Council

November 16, 2010

Purpose of LAP

- Provides services to K-12 students who have not met state standards in reading, writing and/or mathematics.
- Provides additional educational support to those students (11-12) who are at-risk of not meeting state/local graduation requirements.
- LAP is part of Basic Education.

Issues with Current Program

- Too few students are actually served – 113,631 in 2009-10.
- Services are not provided for students not meeting state science standards.
- Credit retrieval is limited to grades 11-12.
- There is no statewide definition of program effectiveness, and student progress data is measured at the district level.

Building on Program Success

What Is In Place?

- Districts
 - What measures are used to assess student progress. (LAP iGrant)
 - How individual Accelerated Student Learning Plans are used to assess program goals.
- OSPI Approves LAP Applications
 - How districts serve LAP students.
 - What program activities are offered.
 - How the LAP will be reviewed and, if needed, modified.
- OSPI Monitors Districts
 - How student learning plans implemented and reviewed.

What Information Is Needed?

- Statewide Program Success Data
 - Program activities in which students have participated .
 - Achievement of students served in LAP compared to those not receiving LAP services.
- Statewide Measures of Success
 - How should success be defined at the state level?
 - What measure will tell us whether or not the program is successful at the state level?

Recommendations

The LAP TWG's recommendations address the following elements:

1. Goals of the Learning Assistance Program
2. Key Elements of Effective Learning Assistance Programs
3. LAP Accountability
4. Funding for LAP

Recommendation

1. Add science to the list of content areas that may be addressed, specifically for grades 6-12.

Last year, 44.8% of students passed science in 10th grade, 54.5% in eighth grade and 35% in fifth grade.

This will help to ensure that more students meet the State's science standards.

(Needs legislative action.)

Recommendation

2. Expand the option to use LAP funds for credit retrieval, from grades 11-12 to grades 9-12.

This will help to support high school students in their efforts to meet graduation requirements.

As state considers increasing graduation requirements, more students may need access to credit retrieval programs.

(Needs legislative action.)

Recommendation

3. Broaden the definition of extended learning time to include weekends, seasonal school breaks, as well as on-line supplemental learning opportunities.

Transportation will need to be provided to ensure access to extended learning opportunities. Current funding model does not pay for transportation in the summer.

(Needs legislative action.)

Recommendation

4. Refine the LAP accountability system by requiring districts to provide student achievement data to determine program success.

Add to monitoring the requirements for districts to provide data on the progress of students receiving LAP services and the overall effectiveness of the program.

This data will be used to determine baseline program effectiveness, and in the future will also be used to hold districts accountable for increasing student achievement.

(Needs legislative action.)

Recommendation

5. OSPI will provide districts with technical assistance in meeting the requirement of writing accelerated student learning plans.

OSPI should explore alternatives with districts, while maintaining the purposes of the Accelerated Student Learning Plan, to establish student learning goals and measure student achievement.

(OSPI will clarify regulations – No legislative action needed.)

Recommendation

6. Provide OSPI with funds for a research study to assess the effectiveness of the Learning Assistance Program.

Approximate Cost: \$50,000

Purpose: To gather data to determine the overall effectiveness of the state's LAP.

(Needs legislative action.)

Recommendation

- 7. Change the proposed funding structure to provide districts with the funds actually needed to serve eligible students.**

(Needs legislative action.)

- 8. Hold districts harmless at their 2010-11 funding level until a full funding amount for the LAP is established.**

(Needs legislative action.)

Current LAP Funding Formula

- **Base Allocation**
 - $\text{AAFTE Enrollment} * \text{FRPL \% Eligibility} * \text{Per Pupil Rate}$
- **Poverty Concentration Allocation**
 - $\text{AAFTE Enrollment} * \text{FRPL \% Eligibility} > 40\% * \text{Per Pupil Rate}$
- **ELL Concentration Allocation**
 - $\text{AAFTE Enrollment} * \text{ELL \%} > 20\% * \text{Per Pupil Rate}$
- **In the 2009-10 school year**
 - Per pupil allocation = \$281.07
 - Total Allocation = \$128 million
 - Total number of funded LAP Units = 455,355.04
 - Total number of students served = 113,631

LAP Funding Formula Comparison

- Formulas assume the same driver, however the proposed formula does not include enhancements.
- Allocations are based on assumptions for staff alone.

Old Formula (2010-11)	New Formula (2011-12)
\$ 283.13 per eligible FTE	1.5156 hours per week of supplemental instruction in a class of 15 students per teacher
BASE Percent of prior year's FRPL eligible students	BASE Percent of prior year's FRPL eligible students
ENHANCEMENTS Percent of prior year's FRPL eligible students in excess of 40% Percent of districts ELL enrollment in excess of 20% if FRPL % > 40%	

Comparison of Baseline Funding and Past Funding Proposals

Learning Assistance Program Current Funding and Past Funding Proposals - Side by Side

	Baseline (2011-12)		BEFTF (2009)		Picus and Odden (2006)		
	School Year	Summer	School Year	Summer	School Year	School Year (Cert. Tutors)	Summer
ELIGIBILITY	% FRPL	na	% FRPL	% FRPL	50% FRPL	% FRPL	50% FRPL
CLASS SIZE	15	na	5	10	15	1	15
HOURS PER WEEK	1.5156	na	2	10	12.5000	0.2500	6
WEEKS PER YEAR	36	na	36	4	36	36	8
Component Cost	\$ 120,957,907	-	\$ 478,851,570	\$ 133,014,325	\$ 498,803,719	\$ 301,102,226	\$ 53,205,730
Total Program Cost	\$ 120,957,907		\$ 611,865,895		\$ 853,111,676		

Essential Program Elements

- Instructional staff (K-12)
- Materials, Supplies, and Operating Costs
 - Assessments
 - Curriculum, Textbooks, and Software
 - Professional Development
- Professional Development
 - In-service days
- School District Administration
- Substitutes

LAP Funding Drivers

- **LAP Funded Units**
 - District FRPL Eligibility
- **Instructional Time**
 - 3.75 hours/week in a class of 6 (K-6)
 - 5 hours/week in a class of 15 (7-12)
- **MSOC**
 - \$138.77 per pupil
- **Professional Development**
 - 5 days/year (LAP teachers)
 - 2 days/year every 3 years (All other staff)
- **District Administration**
 - 5.3% of LAP staff
- **Substitutes**
 - Allocated at state rate for each teaching staff FTE

Total Cost to Implement LAP TWG Funding Recommendation

Program Element	# of Staff/Students	Cost
LAP Teachers	7485.69	\$ 538,719,523
LAP District Administrators	33.83	\$ 30,755,934
PD In-service Cost	672.07	\$ 18,726,933
MSOC	49,079.42	\$ 19,984,134
Substitutes	672.07	\$ 4,788,104
Total Program Cost		\$ 612,974,629

- Costs estimates above assume funding based on district's FRPL eligibility in 2009-10.