



**Use of Supplemental/Concentration Funds On a Schoolwide/Districtwide Basis**

1. Does the proposed use of funds *increase or improve services* for high need students (low-income students, English learners, and foster youth) (*i.e.*, does it “grow services in quality” or “quantity”)?
  - a. Over the level of services provided to high need students last year (during the transition to full LCFF implementation)?
  - b. Over the level of services provided to all pupils for the LCAP year?
2. Are the proposed use of funds “*principally directed*” toward meeting the *goals* that the district has set in its LCAP for high need students? (In other words, are high need pupil goals the principal purpose of the use?)
3. Can the proposed use of funds be demonstrated (by past experience, research, or theory) as an “*effective*” use of funds for serving the district’s goals for high need students?
4. If the population of high need students in the district is below 55%, or in the school is below 40%, is the decision to provide the districtwide or schoolwide service *the most effective use* of the funds, including compared to more targeted programs?
  - (Does the LCAP provide the basis for the “most effective” determination, including, alternatives considered and any supporting research, experience, or educational theory?)
5. For annual updates and future LCAP adoptions: (a) did the investment *result in an increase or improvement in services* in terms of program quantity or quality as promised? (b) Was it *effective* (or, for low-concentration schools/districts, the *most effective use*) in *improving outcomes* in the intended priority area?

If the answer to any of the foregoing questions is “no,” then the district should not propose to spend (or continue to spend) supplemental and concentration funds on that service. Either, the district should reject or discontinue the service or fund it with base funds.

Additional advocacy questions even if the legal standards above can be met:

1. What is the effect of the proposed use of funds on unduplicated pupils compared to non-unduplicated pupils? (Provide an analysis based on actual school-level expenditures, including, if applicable, the effect of differential average teacher salaries at different schools.)
2. Is there an alternative use of the funds that would more directly serve unduplicated pupils and result in better outcomes?

**Amount of Supplemental/Concentration Funding for High Need Students**

1. How did your district define the prior year (baseline) level of services for high need students in 2013-14 and each year after? (See Step 2 in the 7 step proportionality formula.)

*For high need student services provided in 2013-14:*

- Just prior level of Economic Impact Aid (EIA) or additional services too?
- If additional services beyond EIA, were they targeted “for [high need] pupils” *only* like EIA or were they general across-the-board district programs? (The latter *should not* be included in 2013-14 prior year/baseline proportionality calculations under LCFF regulations.)

*For new high need student services added in 2014-15 and thereafter:*

- Were the prior year services newly added in 2014-15 and beyond really “principally directed” toward high need student goals or were they basic, across-the-board services directed to serving the district’s goals for all pupils like base spending?
2. What is the total amount of Supplemental/Concentration funding the district must spend this year to increase or improve services for high need students this year? [See Section 3.A. of the LCAP Template]