

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE
Los Angeles Unified School District

INFORMATIVE

TO: Members, Board of Education Date: March 27, 2009

FROM: Randy Ross, Director of Educational Policy
Rima Zobayan, Program Analyst, Independent Analysis Unit

SUBJECT: **Analysis of Proposed Budget Cuts**

COPIES: Ramon Cortines, Jim Morris, Roberta Fesler, Megan Reilly,
Yumi Takahashi, Jefferson Crain, Jerry Thornton

This week, Budget Services and Financial Planning (BSFP) provided the Board with budget impact statements detailing the Superintendent's proposed budget reductions. To assist Board members in reviewing these proposals, we have begun to assess the implications of the proposed cuts for LAUSD's students. Our initial analysis focuses chiefly on the impact of budget cuts on the ability of schools to carry out the Board's vision of providing all students with a state-of-the-art education in a safe and caring environment and insuring that all LAUSD graduates are prepared for college and work.

We have completed analyses for the following areas:

INSTRUCTION:

- Early Childhood Education
- Elementary Instruction
- Secondary Instruction
- Special Education
- Instructional Support Services
- Professional Development
- Federal and State Programs
- School, Family, and Parent Community Services
- Student Health and Human Services

NON-INSTRUCTION

- Food Services
- Procurement
- Transportation
- Human Resources
- School Police
- Government Relations

LOCAL DISTRICTS

In each analysis, our review covers two broad factors: (1) budget impact; and (2) program impact. Under “budget impact,” we summarize the impact of budget reductions on the central office, local districts, and schools. Under “program impact,” we ask what impact the budget reductions would have on LAUSD’s students as it relates to three criteria: *effectiveness* (the impact on the quantity and/or quality of service provided children), *efficiency* (the extent to which the response to budget cuts includes strategies that reduce costs without reducing service), and *equity* (concerns the potential of budget cuts to exact different effects based on school and/or student characteristics).

A few thoughts emerge from our analysis:

- Given that Local Districts will suffer major reductions and pick up additional functions from the central office, it is not clear how LDs would be able to function effectively. To a lesser extent, the same observation applies to the functioning of schools.
- Many of the impact statements indicate some restructuring that involves multiple units. For example, it appears that the functions of the Elementary and Secondary Education divisions would be merged. Given the complexity of cross-unit restructuring, the Board’s deliberations could benefit from a broad overview of the Superintendent’s restructuring plans.
- Limited data are available for assessing the impact of the proposed budget cuts on the effectiveness of school operations. While it may be impractical for the District to develop such information in time to inform budget deliberations, the District should nonetheless take steps to analyze the effectiveness of key program areas.
- Several units cited practical strategies for improving the efficiency of their operations in response to budget cuts. This is a laudable approach that should be considered more widely.
- The equity implications of budget cuts frequently go unexamined. Throughout, we include questions designed to assist the Board in probing equity issues.

In our review of the budget impact statements provided by BSFP, in many cases we were not able to reconcile the dollar and staffing (FTE) entries with data from other sources. Pursuant to our continued review of the impact of the Superintendent’s budget proposals, we may attempt a general reconciliation of the budget data.

LAUSD Board of Education
INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS UNIT

Analysis of Impact of Proposed Budget Cuts

Program Area: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

BUDGET IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office 	Most central office positions in ECE were shifted to Local Districts beginning July 2008. With this new proposed reduction, ECE central office functions would be further reduced (\$1.2 million, 9 FTEs).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local District Offices 	Responsibilities for professional development delivery, child care licensing, support for Coordinated Program Monitoring, responding to questions and concerns, and monitoring programmatic, fiscal, and licensing compliance would be shifted to Local Districts. <i>Q: How much would these additional responsibilities cost the local districts?</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools 	NA
PROGRAM IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness (quantity and quality of service) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency (reduced costs) 	Common guidelines and tools would be provided by the central office. "The positions being eliminated are vacant and are not currently required for meeting State mandated staffing ratios."
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equity (differences in the effects of budget reductions among schools) 	<i>Q: To the extent that the early education needs of schools and students vary by Local District, were the ECE resources equitably allocated to Local Districts?</i>

LAUSD Board of Education
INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS UNIT

Analysis of Impact of Proposed Budget Cuts

Program Area: ELEMENTARY INSTRUCTION

BUDGET IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office 	We could not reconcile seeming irregularities in the budget data. However, the narrative in the impact statement indicates that this unit would undergo severe cuts and major reorganization.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local District Offices 	Some of the functions heretofore carried out by this office would devolve to Local Districts. For example, LDs would have to provide space, time, and opportunities for Arts professional development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools 	Likewise, to compensate for the central office reductions in instructional support, schools would have to reallocate some of their current and federal stimulus resources.
PROGRAM IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness (quantity and quality of service) 	Professional development and support for English Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Science would be reduced. <i>Q: What impact has instructional professional development had on the achievement of elementary students?</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency (reduced costs) 	The reduction in the budget for Elementary Instruction would result in delayed services to Local Districts. However, the merger of central office instructional services into a PreK-12 continuum could help to improve the grade level articulation of standards.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equity (differences in the effects of budget reductions among schools) 	No equity issues are evident.

LAUSD Board of Education
INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS UNIT

Analysis of Impact of Proposed Budget Cuts

Program Area: SECONDARY INSTRUCTION

BUDGET IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office 	Nonschool budget would be reduced by \$3.2 million (45 FTEs). This would represent a 30% reduction in nonschool budget.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local District Offices 	Responsibility for implementing A-G would be shifted to Local Districts. <i>Q: Does the central office play a critical role in the implementation of A-G in support of the work of LDs and schools?</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools 	NA
PROGRAM IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness (quantity and quality of service) 	Curriculum development, professional development, and Multiple Pathways implementation would take longer than planned. Services to schools would be decreased (extent unknown).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency (reduced costs) 	No efficiencies are evident.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equity (differences in the effects of budget reductions among schools) 	Unclear.

LAUSD Board of Education
INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS UNIT

Analysis of Impact of Proposed Budget Cuts

Program Area: SPECIAL EDUCATION

BUDGET IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central Office 	Proposed Nonschool cut of \$5.8 million – a 28 percent reduction that includes 51 FTEs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local District Offices 	Increased time needed to resolve informal disputes. Increased monitoring of class openings and closings as well as staff assignments. <i>Q: How much additional time and money would be needed?</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools 	Increased time needed resolve informal disputes. <i>Q: How much additional time and money would be needed?</i>
PROGRAM IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effectiveness (quantity and quality of service) 	Elimination of the Special Education Leadership Academy (special education administrators) and the Paraprofessional Training Academy (for special education assistants) may result in reduced effectiveness of school special education administrators and education assistants. <i>Q: How valuable are school compliance reviews for helping to improve the quality of education accorded special education students?</i> District’s implementation of Learning Teams in selected schools would be reduced. <i>Q: What has been the impact of Learning Teams on student achievement in participating schools?</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Efficiency (reduced costs) 	Staff would explore feasibility of transferring training functions to other Central Office units, however other central office budgets are also slated for reductions (e.g., LEAD). Reduction in the frequency of school compliance reviews could reduce cost.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equity (differences in the effects of budget reductions among schools) 	No equity issues are evident.

LAUSD Board of Education
INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS UNIT

Analysis of Impact of Proposed Budget Cuts

Program Area: INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES

BUDGET IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central Office 	We could not reconcile seeming irregularities in the budget data. However, the narrative in the impact statement indicates that this unit would undergo severe cuts and major reorganization.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local District Offices 	According to the impact statement, in light of central office cuts, “Local District capacity is being built” to provide added support to school counselors. <i>Q: How much would the Local Districts’ support to counselors cost?</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools 	Schools will have the option to purchase supplemental counseling services.
PROGRAM IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effectiveness (quantity and quality of service) 	Reorganization of counseling positions, limited counseling professional development, and fewer staff to support potential dropouts could impact student services. <i>Q: To what extent do services provided by Diploma Project Advisors generate ADA revenue? What effect would the restructuring of this position as Secondary Counselor, Diploma Project have on ADA revenue generation?</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Efficiency (reduced costs) 	Part of the restructuring seems to involve reducing the specialization of various counseling position so that more counselors would be able to serve more students. <i>Q: Would this effectively reduce the student-counselor loading? If so, would counseling services be equally effective?</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equity (differences in the effects of budget reductions among schools) 	<i>Q: Would schools most in need of counseling services have enough funds to purchase supplemental counseling?</i>

LAUSD Board of Education
INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS UNIT

Analysis of Impact of Proposed Budget Cuts

Program Area: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

BUDGET IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office 	Nonschool budget would be reduced by \$4.8 million (39 FTEs). This would represent a 38% reduction in nonschool budget. In addition, the Administered budget would be reduced by \$2.2 million.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local District Offices 	Some administrative training responsibilities would be shifted to Local Districts.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools 	Schools that implement the Learning Teams model may have to pick up some of the implementation cost.
PROGRAM IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness (quantity and quality of service) 	The proposed reductions would affect both the quantity and quality of service (e.g., on-site mentoring of administrators). <i>Q: What's the likely effect of reducing administrative support on student achievement?</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency (reduced costs) 	No efficiencies evident.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equity (differences in the effects of budget reductions among schools) 	<i>Q: Would the proposed reduction have a disproportionate impact on the most needy schools?</i>

LAUSD Board of Education
INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS UNIT

Analysis of Impact of Proposed Budget Cuts

Program Area: FEDERAL AND STATE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

BUDGET IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office 	Nonschool budget for specially funded programs would be reduced by \$1 million (9 FTEs). This would represent a 28% reduction in nonschool budget.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local District Offices 	Local Districts would absorb some Compensatory Education technical assistance responsibilities.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools 	NA
PROGRAM IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness (quantity and quality of service) 	Technical assistance to schools and local districts for Compensatory Education, Program Improvement, and QEIA/High Priority Schools would be reduced. <i>Q: What effect would this have on the prospects for turning low-achieving schools around?</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency (reduced costs) 	<i>Q: Would the reduction in technical assistance for QEIA negatively affect the likelihood that QEIA schools will continue meet the state's conditions for QEIA participation?</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equity (differences in the effects of budget reductions among schools) 	Unclear.

LAUSD Board of Education
INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS UNIT

Analysis of Impact of Proposed Budget Cuts

Program Area: SCHOOL, FAMILY AND COMMUNITY AND PARENT SERVICES

BUDGET IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office 	Nonschool budget would be reduced by \$0.9 million (3 FTEs). This would represent a 36% reduction in nonschool budget.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local District Offices 	Unclear
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools 	NA
PROGRAM IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness (quantity and quality of service) 	Direct services to parents in support of advisory committees would be reduced, curtailing committee and parent training activities. <i>Q: Is the Strategic Plan for Parent Involvement and Engagement still functional?</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency (reduced costs) 	No efficiencies are evident.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equity (differences in the effects of budget reductions among schools) 	<i>Q: This unit is designed to improve the engagement of parents in low-achieving (e.g., Title 1). To what extent would this cut affect the quality of parent engagement in such schools?</i>

LAUSD Board of Education
INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS UNIT

Analysis of Impact of Proposed Budget Cuts

Program Area: STUDENT HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

BUDGET IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office 	Nonschool budget would be reduced by \$3 million (22 FTEs). This would represent a 38% reduction in nonschool budget. In addition, the Administered budget would be reduced by \$9.5 million (39 FTEs).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local District Offices 	Responsibility for expulsion reviews would be shifted to Local Districts. Local school support service staff would be responsible for providing counseling services for students participating in integration and permits with transportation programs at 23 school locations.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools 	Responsibilities for supervision and evaluation of school nurses and Extended Learning Academy counselors would be shifted to schools. Schools would need to find and pay for CPR trainings.
PROGRAM IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness (quantity and quality of service) 	Elimination of the supplemental nursing services provided to high priority schools and reduction in the number of immunization clinics offered to students may negatively impact student achievement if adverse health issues arise.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency (reduced costs) 	<i>Q: In light of proposed budget cuts, and given the intent to restructure the provision of support to potential dropouts, would this division employ more efficient strategies for carrying out this work?</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equity (differences in the effects of budget reductions among schools) 	<i>Q: To what extent would the elimination of supplemental nursing services result in higher health risks for individual students and the school community, as a whole, in high priority schools? Q: What criteria would be used to determine which immunization clinics would be closed?</i>

LAUSD Board of Education
INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS UNIT

Analysis of Impact of Proposed Budget Cuts

Program Area: FOOD SERVICES

BUDGET IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office 	Business Services – Food Services Branch. Proposed Nonschool cut of \$4.5 million (38 FTEs) and Administered cut of \$9 million (198 FTEs) for a total of about \$14 million.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local District Offices 	NA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools 	Reduction in need for food service workers at 149 elementary schools, resulting in net reduction of \$3.6 million in costs and 100 FTEs. In addition, students’ reduced meal choices would yield estimated savings of \$7 million.
PROGRAM IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness (quantity and quality of service) 	Elementary students would have 2 instead of 3 entrée choices. Secondary students would have 3 instead of 5 entrée choices. <i>Q: Would fewer choices result in reduced student demand?</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency (reduced costs) 	Increased centralization of food preparation at Newman Nutrition Center (increase from 19 to 149 elementary schools) would reduce costs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equity (differences in the effects of budget reductions among schools) 	<i>Q: What criteria are used to decide which schools’ food would be prepared by Newman Nutrition Center?</i>

LAUSD Board of Education
INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS UNIT

Analysis of Impact of Proposed Budget Cuts

Program Area: PROCUREMENT SERVICES

BUDGET IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office 	Business Services – Procurement Group. Proposed budget cuts of nearly \$2 million and 20 FTEs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local District Offices 	NA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools 	NA
PROGRAM IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness (quantity and quality of service) 	Could have negative impact on quality of schools' educational programs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency (reduced costs) 	Staff estimates that the central office cut would reduce savings by an estimated \$5 million. An implication is that schools and offices would have to pay more per unit for some equipment and supplies. We note, however, that this impact would be affected by schools' and offices' smaller budgets.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equity (differences in the effects of budget reductions among schools) 	NA

LAUSD Board of Education
INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS UNIT

Analysis of Impact of Proposed Budget Cuts

Program Area: TRANSPORTATION

BUDGET IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central Office 	Nonschool cut of \$1.3 million (41 FTEs) and a \$9.5 million (0 FTEs) reduction in the Administered budget for a total of nearly \$11 million (about 5 percent).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local District Offices 	None.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools 	“Anyone needing Saturday service will have to pay the overtime hourly rate for a dispatcher.”
PROGRAM IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effectiveness (quantity and quality of service) 	Transportation transports about 60,000 students. Budget cut would eliminate service to following: (1) ROC/ROP; (2) secondary magnet students living between 2 and 3 miles of their schools. Q: How many students would be affected by this reduction? Q: How would elimination of ROC/ROP transportation affect the ability of the District to enroll more students in ROC/ROP?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Efficiency (reduced costs) 	No efficiencies described.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equity (differences in the effects of budget reductions among schools) 	Q: What are the characteristics of ROC/ROP students and secondary magnet students living between 2 and 3 miles of their schools?

LAUSD Board of Education
INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS UNIT

Analysis of Impact of Proposed Budget Cuts

Program Area: HUMAN RESOURCES

BUDGET IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office 	Nonschool budget would be reduced by \$3.6 million (34 FTEs). This would represent an 18% reduction in this division's nonschool budget.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local District Offices 	NA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools 	NA
PROGRAM IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness (quantity and quality of service) 	Delays in processing of new teachers, increase in the time to contact and place substitute teachers, and limited ability to recruit teachers could impact delivery of instruction.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency (reduced costs) 	No efficiencies are described.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equity (differences in the effects of budget reductions among schools) 	Classroom vacancies and teacher retention rates vary considerably among LAUSD schools. <i>Q: To what extent would the proposed reduction in state and Williams assignment monitoring capabilities affect some schools more than others? How would Human Resources mitigate these effects?</i>

LAUSD Board of Education
INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS UNIT

Analysis of Impact of Proposed Budget Cuts

Program Area: SCHOOL POLICE

BUDGET IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office 	Nonschool budget would be reduced by \$0.1 million (0 FTEs). This would represent a 5% reduction in nonschool budget. In addition, the Administered budget would be reduced by \$1 million (11 FTEs).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local District Offices 	NA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools 	The small reduction in the administered budget of this unit is consistent with the Board's denotation of safety as the District's highest priority.
PROGRAM IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness (quantity and quality of service) 	NA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency (reduced costs) 	NA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equity (differences in the effects of budget reductions among schools) 	No equity issues are evident.

LAUSD Board of Education
INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS UNIT

Analysis of Impact of Proposed Budget Cuts

Program Area: GOVERNMENT RELATIONS

BUDGET IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office 	Nonschool budget would be reduced by \$1 million (8 FTEs). This would represent a 66% reduction in nonschool budget.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local District Offices 	NA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools 	NA
PROGRAM IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness (quantity and quality of service) 	Review and tracking of measures in the Legislature, monitoring of State Board of Education meetings, and monitoring of proposed federal and state regulations would be eliminated. <i>Q: Would the elimination of bill tracking result in lower revenue?</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency (reduced costs) 	No efficiencies are evident.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equity (differences in the effects of budget reductions among schools) 	No equity issues are evident.

LAUSD Board of Education
INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS UNIT

Analysis of Impact of Proposed Budget Cuts

Program Area: LOCAL DISTRICTS

BUDGET IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office 	NA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local District Offices 	According to individual detailed budget reduction impact statements, Local Districts' Nonschool budgets (both \$ and FTEs) would be reduced by 40 percent, overall. The dollar reductions would vary from 36% (LD 6) to 44% (LDs 4 and 8). (See attached tables.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools 	Schools would have to figure out how to provide certain services no longer provided by LDs (and/or the central office)
PROGRAM IMPACT:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness (quantity and quality of service) 	As a result of cuts, some LDs say they would improve the targeting of services. Some LDs would reduce the number of school visits. Two LDs would eliminate technology support services to schools; given the reduction in technology support provided by the Central Office, schools would have to identify other means for meeting technology support needs (including reallocating budget resources).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency (reduced costs) 	LDs would be asking un-RIFed staff to do more with less.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equity (differences in the effects of budget reductions among schools) 	Some Districts indicated they would allocate their limited resources on the basis of schools' needs. <i>Q: To what extent are resources allocated to LDs on the basis of need?</i>

Proposed LAUSD Budget Reductions (\$millions): Local Districts

Local District	Total Non-School Budget 2008-09 (\$millions)	Total Proposed Nonschool Budget 2009-10 (\$millions)	Proposed Reductions (\$millions)	Proposed Reductions %
D1	\$ 6.25	\$ 3.80	\$ (2.45)	-39%
D2	\$ 6.47	\$ 3.82	\$ (2.64)	-41%
D3	\$ 6.18	\$ 3.72	\$ (2.46)	-40%
D4	\$ 5.92	\$ 3.29	\$ (2.63)	-44%
D5	\$ 5.79	\$ 3.50	\$ (2.28)	-39%
D6	\$ 4.54	\$ 2.89	\$ (1.65)	-36%
D7	\$ 6.19	\$ 3.61	\$ (2.58)	-42%
D8	\$ 6.05	\$ 3.37	\$ (2.69)	-44%
All LDs	\$ 35.15	\$ 21.03	\$ (14.12)	-40%

Source: LAUSD, Budget and Financial Services, *Budget Reduction Impact Statements*, 3-25-09.

Proposed LAUSD Budget Reductions (FTEs): Local Districts

Local District	Total Non-School Budget 2008-09 – FTEs	Total Proposed Nonschool Budget 2009-10 FTEs	Proposed Reductions FTEs	Proposed Reductions %
D1	52	30	-22	-42%
D2	51.9	29.6	-22.3	-43%
D3	49.5	29.5	-20	-40%
D4	47.8	27.6	-20.2	-42%
D5	48.8	29.1	-19.7	-40%
D6	36.8	27.8	-9	-24%
D7	51.8	28.5	-23.3	-45%
D8	48.5	28.3	-20.2	-42%
All LDs	387.1	230.4	-156.7	-40%

Source: LAUSD Budget and Financial Services, *Budget Reduction Impact Statements*, 3-25-09.