

## ELAD 6053 Planning and Resource Allocation



Version140502

### I. COURSE INFORMATION

A. ELAD 6053 – Planning and Resource Allocation

B. Professor: Dr. Steve Bounds

[\[sbounds@astate.edu\]](mailto:sbounds@astate.edu)

Office--870-972-2123

Phone--870-972-3062

Fax--870-680-8130

Address--P.O. Box 1450,

State University, Arkansas 72467

Virtual Office Hours: TBA

For use as Arkansas professional development hours, access the following website: <http://arkansased.org/pd/index.html>

### II. TEXTBOOK(S)

A. Primary Text: None

B. Supplemental Text: None

### III. PURPOSE AND GOALS OF THE COURSE

A. This course addresses planning and resource allocation in public schools. Special attention is given to site-based management responsibilities of the principal.

B. The course objectives are as follows:

1. To understand financial management (e.g., budgeting, planning, account auditing, monitoring, cash flow management, and financial forecasting).
2. To understand the development of the school building budget and its specific implications for the school.
3. To understand how to involve staff and representative members of the community in the development of school budget priorities and the effective utilization of school personnel and available resources.

4. To understand how to plan, prepare, and justify the school budget in accordance with district budgeting and state procedures.
5. To become familiar with the school site budget and expenditure reports and the state and district financial management system utilized by the district and state.
6. To apply and assess current technologies for school management, business procedures, and scheduling.

#### **IV. STANDARDS LINKAGE**

##### **A. LEADS Standards**

- 3A: Monitor & evaluate the management and operational systems.
- 3B: Obtain, allocate, align, and efficiently utilize human, fiscal, and technological resources.
- 4A: Collect and analyze data and information pertinent to the educational environment.
- 4B: Promote understanding, appreciation, and use of the community's diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources.
- 4C: Build and sustain positive relationships with families and caregivers.
- 5D: Consider and evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision-making.
- 5E: Promote social justice and ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.
- 6A: Advocate for children, families, and caregivers.

##### **A. ELCC Standards**

- 3.1: Candidates understand and can monitor and evaluate school management and operational systems.
- 3.2: Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations.

- 4.1: Candidates understand and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school's educational environment.
- 4.2: Candidates understand and can mobilize community resources by promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources within the school community.
- 4.3: Candidates demonstrate an understanding of ways to use public resources and funds appropriately and effectively to encourage communities to provide new resources to address emerging student problems.
- 5.4: Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school.
- 5.5: Candidates understand and can promote social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.
- 6.1: Candidates understand and can advocate for school students, families, and caregivers.

B. Diversity Related ELCC Standards

- 5.1: Candidates understand and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure a school system of accountability for every student's academic and social success.
- 5.3: Candidates understand and can safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the school.
- 5.5: Candidates understand and can promote social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

C. Strengthening and Enriching Learning Conceptual Framework

- 1.1a: Understands ethical and legal standards.
- 1.2a: Demonstrates competence in applying knowledge of content and research in professional practice.
- 3.1a: Knows content and concepts of the discipline at an advanced level.
- 4.2a: Demonstrates a high level of skill in identifying the human, material and technological resources necessary to be effective within their professional role.

## V. COURSE ASSESSMENT AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- A. Personal Introduction – (5 pts)
- B. Case Study Analysis/Report - The student will respond to questions related to the scenarios where the student will apply the information learned to a real-life situation faced by a school leader. (35 pts)
- C. Field-Based Activities \* - The student will complete the three field based activities listed below that also are to be included in the internship portfolio.
- (1) Survey on Allocation of Resources, [aka, Community Survey on School Funding & Allocation of Resources] (20 pts)  
[ELCC Standard: 4.3; LEADS 4C]
  - (2) Budget Expenditures Report. [aka, District & School Building Budgeting and Expenditures Report] (20 pts)  
[ELCC Standard 3.2; LEADS 3B]
  - (3) New Classroom Proposal, [aka, Budgetary Proposal for New Classroom] (20 pts)  
[ELCC Standard: 3.2; LEADS 3B]

### D. Grading Scale: 100 Points Total

90 - 100 points	= A
80 - 89 points	= B
70 - 79 points	= C

IMPORTANT NOTE: Civility is expected in this class when it comes to the Discussion Board posts. “Flaming” or derogatory remarks may result in a grade reduction up to 10 points for each occurrence.

\*Mastery Learning Assignments: In the event that the grade on a “Mastery Learning” assignment is lower than a B, a student, using feedback from the professor or teaching assistant, may make corrections and resubmit the assignment within *three* days after receiving feedback on the initial submission. No grade higher than a B will be possible on a resubmitted assignment.

### E. Late Submission Policy:

Except in cases of serious extenuating circumstances, tardy work will not be accepted. The course professor will determine if the excuse for late work rises to the level of being a “serious extenuating circumstance.”

## VI. COURSE OUTLINE

- Week 1 Context & Funding Perspectives**
- Week 2 Funding Structures, Accountability**
- Week 3 Budget Planning**
- Week 4 Budgeting for Personnel and Instruction**
- Week 5 Student Activities**
- Week 6 Transportation and Food Service**
- Week 7 Facilities and Site-Based Leadership**

**ASSIGNMENT DUE DATES:**

*Week 1 --- Case 1: Personal Introduction*

*Week 2 --- Case 2: Local Tax Report*

*Week 3 --- Case 3: District Audit **AND** Field Activity 1: Community Survey*

*Week 4 --- Case 4: School Website **AND** Field Activity 2: District & Building Budget Report*

*Week 5 --- Case 5: Fundraising Activities*

*Week 6 --- Case 6: Transportation/Food Service Report **AND** Field Activity 3: Budget Proposal for New Classroom*

*Week 7 --- Case 7: Liability Issues **AND** Case 8: School Theft*

**VII. SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS AND/OR FEATURES OF THE CLASS**

- A. Instructional Methods: Lectures, discussion board, case studies, and field-based activities are employed to increase learning and accommodate a variety of learning styles.
- B. Candidates are required to access Epic to check for announcements, retrieve course documents, and participate in on-line discussions and assignments.
- C. Students are required to use word processing and APA Publication Manual, 5th Edition to prepare the course papers. (See rubrics in course documents for details on grading criteria.)

- D. Students are required to utilize LiveText for portfolio construction.
- E. Flexibility Clause: Circumstances may arise which will prevent us from fulfilling each and every component of this syllabus. Therefore, the syllabus is subject to change. However, you will be notified of any changes that occur prior to any due date for assignments.
- F. Academic Conduct: All acts of dishonesty in any work constitute academic misconduct. The academic disciplinary policy will be followed, as indicated in the ASU Student Participant Handbook, in the event of academic misconduct. Students should familiarize themselves with the handbook, especially the policy pertaining to plagiarism.

### VIII. PROCEDURES TO ACCOMMODATE STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

If you need course adaptations or accommodations because of a disability, have emergency medical information to share, or need special arrangements, please notify the professor ASAP and/or the ASU Officer of Disabilities  
<http://www2.astate.edu/disability/> 870-972-3964.

### IX. REFERENCES

- Arsen, D., & Davis, T. (2006). Taj Mahals of decaying shacks: Patterns in local school capital stock and unmet capital need. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 81(4), 1-22.
- Baicker, K. & Gordon, N. (2006). The effect of state education finance reform on total local resources. *Journal of Public Economics*, 90, 1519-1535.
- Bifulco, R. & Ladd, H. (2006). The impact of charter schools on student achievement: Evidence from North Carolina. *Education Finance and Policy*, 1(1), 91-122.
- Bigelow, M., Jones, A. & Stead, R. (2002). *Organization and Financing of Washington Public Schools*, OSPI Handbook.
- Blendinger, J., & Wells, L. R. (in press). *Mississippi School Finance in a Nutshell*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt.
- Brimley, V. & Garfield, R. (2005). *Financing education in a climate of change*. (10th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon. ISBN 0205511791.

- Burtless, G., ed. (1996). *Does Money Matter? The Effect of School Resources on Student Achievement and Adult Success*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution. Chapter 1, "Introduction and Summary," pages 1-42.
- Carnoy, M., et al. (2006). Worth the price? Weighing the evidence on charter school achievement. *Education Finance and Policy*, 1(1), 91-122.
- Carnoy, M. (2007). The limitations of teacher pay incentive programs based on inter-cohort comparisons: The case of Chile's SNED. *Education Finance and Policy* 2(3), 189-227.
- Corcoran, S., Evans, W., Godwin, J., Murray, S., & Schwab, R. (2004). The changing distribution of education finance, 1972-1997, in *Social Inequality*, Neckerman, K., ed., New York: The Russell Sage Foundation.
- Filardo, M. (2008). Good buildings, better schools: Economic stimulus opportunity with long-term benefits. Economic Policy Institute Briefing Paper #216.
- Grubb, W., Huerta, L., & Goe, L. (2006). Straw into gold: Spinning out the implications of the improved school finance. *Journal of Education Finance*, 31(4), 334-359.
- Hack, W., Candoli, I., & Ray, J. (2001). *School business administration: A planning approach*. (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hanushek, E. & Rivkin, S. (1997). Understanding the twentieth-century growth in U.S. school spending." *Journal of Human Resources*, 32(1), 35-68.
- Hoxby, C. (2001). All school finance equalizations are not created equal. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116, 1189-1231.
- Imazeki, J. (2008). Assessing the costs of adequacy in California public schools: A cost function approach. *Education Finance and Policy*, 3(1), 90-108.
- Ittelson, T. (1998). *Financial statements: A step-by-step guide to understanding and creating financial reports*. Franklin Lakes, NJ: Career Press. ISBN: 1564143414.
- Johnson, G. & Callahan, L. (1994). *Mississippi finance handbook*. Mississippi State University: College of Education.
- Johnson, S. & Papy, J. (2009). *Redesigning Teacher Pay: A System for the Next Generation of Educators*. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.
- Keagy, D., & Piper, D. (2008). *Pennsylvania school business: A guide for educational administrators*. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Association of School Business Officials.

- Kersten, T. (2009). *Taking the mystery out of Illinois school finance*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Houston, TX: Connexions.
- Krueger, A. (2003). Economic considerations and class size. *Economic Journal*, 113, F34-F63.
- Ladd, H. & Fiske, E. (Eds.) (2008). *Handbook of research in education finance and policy*. New York: Routledge.
- Ladd, H., Chalk, R. & Hansen J., eds. (1999). *Equity and adequacy in education finance: Issues and perspectives*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- LaFaive, M. (2007). *A school privatization primer: For Michigan school officials, media and residents*. Midland, MI: Mackinac Center for Public Policy.
- Mathis, W. & Jimerson, L. (2008). *A guide to contracting out school support services: Good for the school? Good for the community?* Education and the Public Interest & Education Policy Research Unit.
- Milanowski, A., et al. (2007). *Recruiting new teachers to urban school districts: What incentives will work?* University of Washington Center on Reinventing Public Education, Working Paper 11.
- Moser, M. & Rubenstein, R. (2002). The equality of public school district funding in the United States: A national status report. *Public Administration Review*, 62, 63-72.
- Ni, Y. (2009) Do traditional public schools benefit from charter school competition? Evidence from Michigan. *Economics of Education Review*, 28(5), 571-584.
- Odden, A. & Picus, L. (2008). *School finance: A policy perspective* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Papke, L. (2006). The effects of spending on test pass rates: Evidence from Michigan. *Journal of Public Economics*, 89, 821-839.
- Picus, L., et al. (2005). Understanding the relationship between student achievement and the quality of educational facilities: Evidence from Wyoming. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 80(3), 71-95.
- Podgursky, M. & Singer, M. (2007). Teacher performance pay: A review. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 26(4), 909-949.
- Reschovsky, A. & Imazeki, J. (2001). Achieving educational adequacy through school finance reform. *Journal of Education Finance*, 26(4), 373-396.



Schwartz, A., Stiefel, L. & Rubenstein, R. (1998). Education finance, in Thompson, F. & Green, M., (eds), *Handbook of Public Finance*. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc.: 447-482.

Thompson, D., Wood, R., & Honeyman, D. (1994). *Fiscal leadership for schools*. New York: Longman.

Underwood, J. & Verstegen, D., (eds.). (1990). *The impacts of litigation and legislation on public school finance: adequacy, equity, and excellence*. New York: Harper & Row.

Wang, W. & Duncombe, W. (2009). School facilities funding and capital outlay distribution in the states. *Journal of Educational Finance*, 34(3), 324-350.

Williams, C, & Heins, R. (1985). *Risk management and insurance* (5th ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill.

Yinger, J., (ed.). (2004). *Helping children left behind: State aid and the pursuit of educational equity*. Cambridge: MIT Press.