

Targeted Funding: What Missouri data tells us about the impact various factors have on student outcomes

To cite this article: Koenig, K. (2020). Targeted funding: What Missouri data tells us about the impact various factors have on student outcomes. *eJournal of Education Policy*, 21(2). https://doi.org/10.37803/ejepF2007

Kelsey Koenig

Middle School Teacher School District of Clayton Clayton, MO 63105 mrskkoenig@gmail.com

Abstract:

This paper uses data from the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to study various input data and their effect on student outcomes. The data pulled were related to school district, local, and personal wealth; student demographics; classrooms and classroom teachers. A multi-factor regression was then completed to assess which of these factors was significant in relationship to the percentages of students scoring proficient or advanced in English Language Arts and mathematics, as well as the districts' overall Annual Performance Report score. The goal of this research was to identify which input data were significantly related to student outcomes and use that information to discuss school district implications.

Keywords:

Student outcomes, student achievement, targeted funding, Missouri, district budgets, education finance

Introduction

In a 2020 review of global education practices, World Population Review published an article assessing each country by student outcome data ("Education Rankings by Country 2020", 2020). After giving each country a score based on student proficiency in reading, mathematics, and science, they found that education in the United States fell behind that of 23 other countries. While the United States fell behind countries that are known for a rigorous educational program, like China and Singapore, it also fell behind countries like Liechtenstein, Slovenia, and Estonia. The United States was ranked second in a global survey assessing the perceptions of education in various countries but did not fall within the top five countries when assessed for primary school,

secondary school, high school, or collegiate-level completion rates ("Education Rankings by Country 2020", 2020, para. 3).

It is not uncommon to hear that the United States is behind other countries in terms of providing a quality education. In fact, it is a constant source of tension for American educators. Politicians and school leaders are always looking for ways to improve the nation's schools; from adjusting national and state standards to making recommendations for appropriate class sizes. In reality, researchers and administrators have a significant number of factors to consider that could contribute to student outcomes in some way. Funding is certainly a substantial factor, and a contentious one at that, that can impact the quality of United States schools and the education they offer. Nicole Galloway, running for Missouri governor in the November, 2020 election states, "As Governor, I will put more money in classrooms and pay teachers what they deserve, work to expand pre-kindergarten to help give kids the head start they need and parents the peace of mind that their children are safe," (The Best Place in America to Raise Kids, 2020). Many politicians, like Galloway, discuss education at length during election season. Galloway specifically mentions teacher salaries, expansions to preschool, and offering more funding to schools. In doing so, Galloway is already targeting funding, attempting to use funds in ways that have been proven to improve student outcomes.

According to Education Week, the national average for per-pupil spending is \$12,756 ("Map: How Much Money Each State Spends Per Student", 2019). Vermont and Utah are at the extreme ends, spending \$20,540 and \$7,635 per student, respectively. The difference in spending between these two states, at a total of \$12,905, is higher than the average per-pupil spending across the United States and the District of Columbia; a value of \$12,756, according to this data. Further, the Education Week data has a standard deviation of almost \$3000 when considering the per-pupil spending of all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Cost of living can vary greatly among states, as can the cost of supplying an education, both contributing in some way to the difference in state spending patterns. Still, a standard deviation of \$3000 amounts to nearly half of Utah's per student expenditure amount. School spending is clearly quite varied across the country. It is no surprise, then, that the success of American schools is equally varied.

While Utah spending an average of \$12,905 per student less than the schools in Vermont is significant, there are variances just as significant within individual states. Per pupil expenditures, specifically, can vary significantly between school districts in the same state. According to Education week data, Missouri spends just under the average at \$11,756 per student. The Missouri school districts considered in this study had an average per-pupil expenditure of approximately \$11,000 in 2018, but ranged from roughly \$7,300 to \$26,400 ("Current Expenditure per ADA 2009-10 to 2017-18", 2018). Bosworth R-V, the Missouri school district that spends the most per student, more than triples the spending of Richards R-V, the district that spends the least. Districts' per-pupil expenditures cover everything from salaries and benefits to school supplies for classrooms. Because there is a wide range of funding considerations that fall under per-pupil expenditures, even districts with identical per-pupil expenditures could have any number of different spending habits that may or may not be correlated to specific educational outcomes.

Courtenay Stevens ranked each state by comparing the average starting teacher salary to the average salary of all occupations, teachers included (Stevens, 2019). While this does not guarantee that the state rankings would stay the same if they were to consider experienced teacher's salaries, and Stevens says as much, this is one way to measure how different states prioritize teacher salaries and improvements to education. Missouri, which falls 49th in Stevens' rankings, certainly has room for improvement in regard to teacher salaries. Without any significant conversation surrounding how money could be targeted and which spending practices will substantially increase student outcomes, American education cannot be expected to surpass that of other countries. If schools are to be held accountable for student outcomes, funding should be targeted to the specific line items that will impact students most. In Missouri, districts that use their funding to prioritize teacher salaries see statistically significant improvement in student outcomes as shown by this research.

Research Question

There are many factors that go play a part in student outcomes. Of those that schools can control, like per-pupil spending or teacher salaries, which input factors have a significant relationship to Missouri students' outcomes, and can be used by school districts to improve those outcomes?

Literature Review

In 2015, Stoneberg discussed the cost-benefit analyses that are common in educational research, stating that they often misrepresent data (Stoneberg, 2015). To make the point that higher funding does not lead to higher test scores, researchers often look at historical spending and student achievement measures over time. In doing so, Stoneberg argues that they typically compare interval data to ratio data. "Unlike dollars (ratio scale), a percentage increase in scale scores cannot be calculated for NAEP scale scores (interval scale)" (Stoneberg, 2015). Even when researchers aren't specifically using NAEP scores, they tend toward SAT and other interval scale measures that assess scaled scores and do not compute in the same way dollar values can. Stoneberg noted that without comparable metrics, these studies aren't providing accurate comparisons, making it nearly impossible to show that funding does not lead to improved student outcomes.

Jackson, Johnson, and Persico, argue that most tests are limited by their focus on test scores in general, because test scores do not necessarily lead to higher degrees and higher income levels after high school (Jackson, Johnson, & Persico, 2015). Rather, they say that measures like "educational attainment, high school completion, adult wages, adult family income, and the incidence of adult poverty" are better measures of school success because of their long-term significance (Jackson, Johnson, & Persico, 2015). Likewise, they argue that comparing school funding to educational outcomes can be challenging because the schools most in need of extra funding typically have more low-income students. For those students, there are other factors at play that can hamper their scores, making an actual comparison to schools with less low-income families challenging. In a study of 15,000 people, born between 1955 and 1985, Jackson, Johnson, and Persico, found a significant relationship between school spending and educational attainment for students from low-income families more so than for students not in low-income families:

For children from low-income families, increasing per-pupil spending by 10 percent in all 12 school-age years increases educational attainment by 0.5 years. In contrast, for non poor children, a 10 percent increase in per-pupil spending throughout the school-age years increases educational attainment by less than 0.1 years, and this estimate is not statistically significant. (Jackson, Johnson, & Persico, 2015, para. 18)

Similarly, they found that the same spending increase boosted hourly wages for children from low-income families by 13 percent, while the effect on non-poor students was statistically insignificant.

In 2016, Della Sala, Knoeppel, and Marion conducted a study of 470 elementary schools that had assessment scores for students in 3rd through 5th grade. They argue, "[because] the goal of current educational accountability policy is for all students to reach proficiency, [states] must provide adequate educational resources to meet the learning needs of all students" (Della Sala, Knoeppel, & Marion, 2016, pg. 181). Even school and district level studies aren't appropriate, they add, because those studies do not account for differences in funding at the classroom level. To measure the effect on student outcomes, Della Sala, Knoeppel, and Marion looked at studentrelated factors like students with disabilities, students outside of the typical age range for each grade, and students that are gifted. They also used school-related factors, including things like student-teacher ratios and the number of professional development days per teacher. They concluded that educational resources significantly affect student outcomes. Thus, using financial resources strategically would help states to provide more equitable and appropriate educational settings for students. They write, "Funds for teacher incentive strategies would make more sense than additional funding toward instructional condition variables given the non-significant relationship between schools' instructional conditions and student achievement measures" (Della Sala, Knoeppel, & Marion, 2016, pp. 198-199).

Methodology

Missouri's Department of Elementary and Secondary Education tracks and publishes school data yearly, allowing for some amount of transparency in school spending. In an effort to realize a multitude of variables that could impact student outcomes, regardless of their financial nature, the data considered for this study looked at school district, local, and personal wealth; student demographics; and data related to classrooms and classroom teachers. These factors were used to assess their relationship to three different measures of student outcome data. The goal of this research was to determine which factors would impact student outcomes, as well as whether or not there are significant factors school districts can control. Ideally, those factors could then help districts use their finances to impact and improve student outcomes.

The input variables originally included in the multi-factor regressions were average teacher salaries, average years of experience, and the percent of teachers with a master's degree or higher, with the goal of assessing the impact that school related variables would have on student outcomes. The output data pulled were districts' Annual Performance Report (APR) scores, as the percent of total points available; the percent of students that were proficient or advanced in English Language Arts (ELA), for all assessed grade levels; and the percent of students that were proficient or advanced in Mathematics, for all assessed grade levels. Using a 90% confidence interval, multiple F-tests were used to compare all of the input data in combination to each of the output data individually. Although the original tests did show some significance within the

factors, the adjusted r-squared value for the F-test was low enough, with the highest adjusted r-squared value at 0.17, to determine that there were extra factors, not included in the study, that needed to be considered. Without finding and including these extra factors, the data would not show a strong enough relationship and would be unlikely to lead to any real conclusions regarding Missouri school funding.

For the next series of multi-variable testing, the school related input data pulled included perpupil expenditures, average student to classroom teacher ratios, average teacher salaries, average years of experience for teachers, and the percent of teachers with a master's degree or higher for each district in the state of Missouri. These factors are those that school districts can control. To capture data related to the families and surrounding community in each district, in an attempt to measure personal and community wealth, the input data considered were the percent of students receiving free or reduced priced lunches and the per-pupil local tax effort. Also included in the input data were student demographics. Missouri school districts report the percent of students that identify as Asian, Black, Hispanic, Indian, Multiracial, and Pacific Islander, and White. There were some districts that had unreported student demographic data, percentages that did not account for 100% of students, or very small percentages in one or more categories. To account for all of this, the data included the percent of students that identify as white and the percent of student that identify as students of color. Asian, Black, Hispanic, Indian, Multiracial, and Pacific Islander were grouped together as the percent of students that identify as students of color.

All data used was from the 2017 - 2018 school year, as that was the most recent year for which all of the chosen data points could be acquired from the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education website. Any districts with district related data points that were not reported to or by Missouri's Department of Elementary and Secondary Education were eliminated from the study. Eliminating this data ensured that the multi-factor regression would accurately capture Missouri trends. The schools that were eliminated from this study were primarily Charter Schools that did not report the test scores used as outcome data. Schools that did not report 100% of their student demographic data were not eliminated from this study, as releasing this information is left to the discretion of families upon enrollment. This left 508 school districts for a series of multi-factor regressions. Because there were more input variables to consider, a 95% confidence interval was used for this series of tests. After removing factors that were not significant in this series of testing, the F-tests were run again to evaluate the significance of the only the variables previously identified as significant against the same output variable.

Results

The first series of F-tests compared all inputs to each individual output. When used in combination, all of the input variables have a significant relationship to scores on the Annual Performance Report (APR) as well as the percent of students that are proficient or advanced in English Language Arts and Mathematics, as shown by the p-value for each overall F-test. When looking at the p-values for individual input variables, however, not all input variables are statistically significant when compared to those chosen output variables.

Figure 1 displays the F-test relating all of the chosen input variables to districts' APR scores. In the initial test, years of experience, percent of teachers with a master's degree, and student

demographics were not found to be significant. This left expenditures per ADA, student to classroom teacher ratios, average teacher salaries, the amount of local tax effort per ADA, and the percent of students that receive free or reduced-price lunches as significant variables. The adjusted r-squared value for this test was approximately 0.34, meaning all input variables, even those that were not individually significant, account for about 34% of districts' APR scores.

Figure 1
Predicting Districts' APR Scores Using All Inputs

Dependent variable	9	6 on APR Repor	1								
ndependent variables						age Salary, Years centage, % of Stu					
V		84		******			arminar gan	-	40000		
Regression Statistics											
Togradou standard		0.59825	R-Squared		0.35790	Adjusted R-Squa	rorl		0.34245		
MSE		0.00158			0.03974		- Gu		3,37561		
Durbin-Watson (DW)			Log likelihood		698.75692	WAI L			0.31301		
Akaike Inf. criterion (AIC)		-3.58728			-3.58602						+
Schwarz criterion (BIC)			Hannan-Quinn cr	iterion (HOC)	-3.54647						
RESS			PRESS RMSE	ionon (rido)		Predicted R-Squa	book		0.31800		
		2.02102	, in a series		2.0010.12				2.2.1000		
Carlot and Carlot and Carlot	ters+ + 2.86428	E-6 * Local Tax	Effort per AD	A - 0.00039 * F	ree and Redu	ced Lunch Per	centage - 0,0	0224	* % of St	udents of Co	lor - 0.000
Carlot and Carlot and Carlot	d.l.	SS	MS MS	A - 0.00039 * F	p-value	ced Lunch Per	centage - 0.0	00224	* % of St	udents of Co	lor - 0.000
ANOVA	Sec. Sept.					ced Lunch Per	centage - 0.0	00224	* % of St	udents of Co	lor - 0.000
NOVA Regression	d,f.	SS	MS	F	p-value	ced Lunch Per	centage - 0,0	00224	* % of St	udents of Co	lor - 0.000
NOVA Regression Residual	<i>d,I.</i> 9	SS 0.32921	MS 0.03658	F	p-value	ced Lunch Per	centage - 0,0	00224	* % of St	udents of Co	lor - 0.000
NOVA Regression Residual	d.f. 9 374 363	SS 0.32921 0.59061 0.91982	MS 0.03658 0.00158	F 23,16298	p-value 0.00000			00224			lor - 0.000
NOVA tegression tesidual total	d,f. 9 374 383 Coefficients	SS 0.32921 0.59061 0.91982 Std Err	MS 0.03658 0.00158	F 23.16298 UCL	p-value 0.00000 t Stat	p-value	H0 (5%)	00224	viF	udents of Co	lor - 0.000
NOVA Regression Residual Total	d.f. 9 374 383 Coefficients 1.04907	SS 0.32921 0.59061 0.91982	MS 0.03658 0.00158	F 23,16298	p-value 0.00000		H0 (5%) Rejected			TOL	lor - 0.000
NOVA Regression Residual Total	d,f. 9 374 383 Coefficients	SS 0.32921 0.59061 0.91982 Std Err 0.29334	MS 0.03658 0.00158	F 23.16298 UCL 1.62588	p-value 0.00000 t Stat 3.57632	p-value 0.00039	H0 (5%) Rejected Rejected			TOL	lor - 0.000
NOVA tegression tesidual total Intercept Expenditures per ADA Student to Classroom Teacher Ratio	d.f. 9 374 383 Coefficients 1,04907 4,29898E-6	SS 0.32921 0.59061 0.91982 Std Err 0.29334 1.80489E-6	MS 0.03658 0.00158 LCL 0.47227 -7.84800E-6	F 23,16298 UCL 1,62588 -7,49972E-7	p-value 0.00000 t Stat 3.57632 -2.38185	p-value 0.00039 0.01773	H0 (5%) Rejected Rejected Rejected			TOL	lor - 0.000
Intercept Expenditures per ADA Student to Classroom Teacher Ratio Average Salary	d.f. 9 374 383 Coefficients 1.04907 -4.2988E-6 -0.00258	SS 0.32921 0.59061 0.91982 Std Err 0.29334 1.80489E-6 0.00114	MS 0.03658 0.00158 LCL 0.47227 -7.84800E-6 -0.00481	F 23,16298 UCL 1,62588 -7,49972E-7 -0.00031	p-value 0.00000 t Stat 3.57632 -2.38185 -2.23915	p-value 0.00039 0.01773 0.02573	H0 (5%) Rejected Rejected			TOL	lor - 0.000
tegression tegression tesidual total Intercept Expenditures per ADA Student to Classroom Teacher Ratio	d.f. 9 374 383 Coefficients 1.04907 -4.29886-6 -0.00258 1.80671E-6	SS 0,32921 0,59061 0,91982 Std Err 0,29334 1,80489E-6 0,00114 5,73213E-7	MS 0.03658 0.00158 LCL 0.47227 -7.84800E-6 -0.00481 4.79581E-7	F 23,16298 UCL 1,62588 -7,49972E-7 -0,00031 2,73383E-8	p-value 0.00000 t Stat 3.57632 -2.38185 -2.23915 2.80298	p-value 0.00039 0.01773 0.02573 0.00533	H0 (5%) Rejected Rejected Rejected Rejected			TOL	lor - 0.000
Intercept Expenditures per ADA Student to Classroom Teacher Ratio Average Salary Years of Experience	d.f. 9 374 383 Coefficients 1.04907 -4.29898E-6 -0.00256 1.80671E-6 0.00147	SS 0.32921 0.59061 0.91982 Std Err 0.29334 1.80489E-6 0.00114 5.73213E-7 0.00129	MS 0.03658 0.00158 LCL 0.47227 -7.84800E-6 -0.00481 4.79581E-7 -0.00105	F 23,16298 UCL 1.62588 -7,49972E-7 -0.0031 2,73383E-6 0.00400	p-value 0.00000 t Stat 3.57632 -2.38185 -2.23915 -2.0298 1.14619	p-value 0.00039 0.01773 0.02573 0.00533 0.25245	H0 (5%) Rejected Rejected Rejected Accepted			70L	lor - 0.000
Expenditures per ADA Student to Classroom Teacher Ratio Average Salary Years of Experience Percent of Teachers with Masters+	d.f. 9 374 383 Coefficients 1.04907 4.2988E-6 -0.00258 1.80671E-6 0.00147 0.00021	SS 0.32921 0.59061 0.91982 Std Err 0.29334 1.80489E-6 0.00114 5.73213E-7 0.00129 0.00020	MS 0.03658 0.00158 LCL 0.47227 -7.84800E-6 -0.00481 4.79581E-7 -0.00105	F 23.16298 UCL 1.62588 -7.49972E-7 -0.00031 2.73383E-6 0.00400 0.00060	p-value 0.00000 1 Stat 3.57632 2.38165 -2.23915 2.80298 1.14619 1.08473	p-value 0.00039 0.01773 0.02573 0.00533 0.25245 0.27874	H0 (5%) Rejected Rejected Rejected Accepted Accepted			70L	lor - 0.000
Intercept Expenditures per ADA Student to Classroom Teacher Ratio Average Salary Years of Experience Percent of Teachers with Masters+ Local Tax Effort per ADA	d.f. 9 374 383 Coefficients 1.04907 4.29898-6 0.00256 1.80671E-6 0.00147 0.00021 2.86428E-6	SS 0.32921 0.59061 0.91982 Std Err 0.2334 1.80489E-8 0.0014 5.73213E-7 0.00129 0.00020	MS 0.03658 0.00158 LCL 0.47227 -7.84800E-8 -0.00481 4.79581E-7 -0.00105 -0.0017 1.41893E-7	F 23,16298 UCL 1,62588 -7,49972E-7 -0,00031 2,73383E-6 0,00460 0,00060 5,58657E-6	p-value 0.00000 1 Stat 3.57632 -2.38185 -2.23915 2.80298 1.14619 1.08473 2.06888	p-value 0.00039 0.01773 0.02573 0.00533 0.25245 0.27874	H0 (5%) Rejected Rejected Rejected Accepted Accepted Accepted Rejected			TOL	lor - 0.000

A second test limiting the input variables to only those shown to be significant previously found an adjusted r-squared value of approximately 0.16 as shown by figure 2. Thus, expenditures per ADA, student to classroom teacher ratios, average teacher salaries, the amount of local tax effort per ADA, and the percent of students that receive free and reduced-price lunches account for about 16% of districts' APR scores, when used without the extra variables.

Figure 2
Predicting Districts' APR Scores Using Reduced Inputs

inear Regression											
Popieratori variable Independenti variable: V			A Shaters to Class	o, Average Salary, I	recet Tax Elfort per	ADA, Free are	l Flechar	ed Lunch	Percenta	ige.	
Regression Statistics										_	
9		8.40651 R				djuring P-Squired			0.158		
rtsit.		0.00195 3			9.94416 A	MW			3.630	634	
Ourtin-Watson (DW)			sy laiethood		887,17010						
Newke inf. critivition (AIC)		-3.39046 A		I deserte	41.19022						
SCHWINS CAMMIN (BILD)			aknan-Dutin critisi	NI (HOC)	3,37086	THE PERSON IN			0.00	and a	
WESS		1.00685 Pt	RESS MIMSE		0.04452 P	reachet R-Source	U.		0.143	297	
s, on APR Report = 1,08224 - 4,50467E- and Reduced Lunch Percentage	* Expenditures per	ADA - 0.00361	Student to Class	scoom Teacher I	Ratio + 1.92464E	-7 * Average Sal	ary = 1.55865	E-0 -1	ocal Tax	EMprt	per ADA
				scoom Teacher I		-7 * Average Sal	ary = 1.55865	E-0 - 1	ocal Tax	EMort (per AD/
and Reduced Lunch Percentage	ži.	-88	MS	ŧ	p-value	-7 * Average Sal	ary = 1.55865	E-0 - 1	ocal Tax	EMort	per AD/
and Reduced Lunch Percentage UNOVA	at a	3S 0.116cs	MS 0.03KU1	F 20 11091		-7 * Average 5a)	ary = 1.55861	E-0 - 1	ocal Tax	EMort	per ADA
ind Reduced Lunch Percentage NOVA Ingression South of	211 202	-SS d 19665 d 97875	MS	ŧ	p-value	-7 * Average Sal	ary = 1.55861	E-0 - 1	ocal Tax	Effort	per ADA
and Reduced Lunch Percentage	at a	3S 0.116cs	MS 0.03KU1	ŧ	p-value	-7 * Average Sal	ary = 1.55865	E-0 . I	ocal Tax	EMprt (per ADA
ind Raduced Lunch Percentage INOVA Ingression Souther	211 202	-SS d 19665 d 97875	AKS 0.03821 0.02195	70 (10)91	p-value			E-6 * L	ocal Tax	EMprt (
ind Raduced Lunch Percentage INOVA Ingression Souther	2.6 603 507	-35 0.10605 0.97876 1.17481	MS 0.03KU1	ŧ	p value g goodn	-7 * Average Sal	HO (1996) Flagurated	E-6 - L		EMprt (70L
ind Reduced Lunch Percentage INOVA Ingression Routing	603 507 Confloents	-85 d 19605 0.97875 1.17481	MS 0.00195	20 11091 1ACI	p value g gooden r-Star	D-1/8/QH	HP (BTE)			7 4	
and Reduced Lunch Percentage MOVA Ingression Routing Inde	21 603 507 Conflorett 1,08224	35 0 97876 1 17411 204 Em 0 02196	MS 0.0301 0.02195	# 20 11001 MCI 1,12460	p-value 0.000m r-Star 50.18612	p-valus 0.00000	HO (816) Rejected			4	
ind Reduced Lunch Percentage Ingression Reduced Intercept Expenditures per ADA	602 500 Confloant 1,00224 4,00476	-85 0.19605 0.97876 1.17481 207.61 0.02156 1.300515-6	MS 0.031921 0.03195 (C1 1.03687 -7.159076-6	# 20 11091 MEL 1,12460 -1,851336-8	p-value 0.00000 1.5bs/ 50.18612 -1.33950	p-Valve 0.00000 0.00001	HO (80%) Rejusted Rejusted			7 4	
Ind Reduced Lunch Percentage NOVA Ingression Routing Inde Expenditure per ADA Bludent to Consume Register Ratio	66 300 300 Commit 1 08224 4594976-6 0,00361	38 0 11665 0 97875 1 17481 384 Err 0 02156 1 160515-6 0 00019	MS 0.03821 0.00195 (CL 1.03887 -7.158078-4 0.0036	70 11091 1/421 1 12460 -1 851336-8 -0.00187	p-value 0.90000 7.51e/ 50.16612 -1.33950 4.00651	p-ve/ve 0.00000 0.000001 0.00004	HO (STIL) Rejusted Rejusted Rejusted			4	

In the F-test relating all of the chosen input variables to the percent of students marked as proficient or advanced in mathematics or ELA for each school district, average teacher salaries and the percent of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches were significant in both. The average number of years of experience for teachers was another significant variable for the test of mathematics scores, as shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3
Predicting the Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced in Math Using All Inputs

Linear Regression		ATTENDED TO SECTION AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY										
Degramosti vanishis		Prol/Asiy Mets		Karry lake			. 14 500 500			-		
Poligestatent werled list			Skytherif for Claimingon merrison. N. of Styles			of Espannica, Person	t of Touthern wil	rs Wander	es, Local T	in Efter	per ADA 1	****
N:		M.	rearrage, was a secure	mary Calon, while the	and appearance							
Ragression Statistics												
R		0.05500 R	Saument.			All lated P. State of			449			
MIE		73,02799 \$			8.54564	MAPLE			17,547	753		
Duraus-Wintson (DW)		2,00627 18			-1,363.84794							
Name of collector (AIC)		7.15442 At			T.15067							
Schwarz enterion (BIC)			eysan-Quey crimenes	(HOC)	7.19522	Acres de la companya della companya de la companya de la companya della companya						
PRESS		ZM.260.34248 PK	YESS MAKE		6.72918	President R-Squared			0.38	126		
Masters++0.96003 * Local Tax Effort	Der ADA - 0.18394	Free and Reduce	d Lunch Persenta		Students of Co					9.87-5		T TORKETON S
Maeders+ + 0.90009 ° Local Tax Effort ANGVA Pograssion Pograssion	#/. 274	Free and Reduce \$5 20,000,89903 27,312,40645										-
Maeders+ + 0.90009 ° Local Tax Effort ANGVA Pograssion Pograssion	d/	Free and Reduce	MS 2,298,54373	ge - 1.07184 ° %, o	Students of Co					777		
Maeders+ + 0.96009 * Local Tax Effort NGVA Pogranskor Pogranskor Pogranskor	4/. 4 374 383 Coefficients	SS 20,598 89993 77,312 46645 47,909 39000 Sir Br	MS 2,288,54373 _ 73,09799	ge - 1.87184 * %, o	Students of Co	pior - 0.84838 * % of		ta	WF.	300	FUL	
Madden++0.0005* Local Tax Effort ANGVA Pegrasson Pagrasson Statecapt	#/ 8 974 383 Card/Counts 102,08715	7 Free and Reduce 20,054, 89995 27,312,48645 47,909,38000 524 Ere 63,08104	MS 2.596.54373 73.09799 LCL -21.07091	11 23790 UCL 220 tok10	1 Students of Co	plan + 0.84838 * % of	White Studen					
Madden+ + 0.90905 * Local Tax Ether NOVA Pagnission Pagnission Antercept Expenditures per ADA	#/ 9.74 383 Caviff Cart 1.5 2.00015	20,596,89390 27,312,46645 47,909,38000 584 EV 43,08104 0,00039	MS 2.086.54573 73 (9799 LCU -21.07091 -3.00062	9e - 1.87164 " %, o	f State (1.60000) 1.61601 1.61601 3.36112	pania 0.10650 0.7331	White Student	ta				
Masters + 0.90805 * Local Tax Ether NOGVA Registration Registration Registration	#/ 874 974 974 983 Childrenth 102:08715 8:01075 8:17080	* Pres and Reduce \$0.096 8990 27.312 46645 47.909 38000 \$2400 63.08104 0.0005 0.24079	MS 2,296,84373 73 09794 LCL -21,07061 4 00062 4,37251	9e - 1.87164 " % of F1.23750 UCL 220.10610 1.00091 0.65410	1 Students of Co	plan + 0.84838 * % of	White Student	12.7				
Radders+ + 0.90908 * Local Tax Ether INOVA Opphasion Opphasion other extercapt Expenditures per ADA Student to Classroom Teacher Radio Advance Sales	#/ 974 374 383 Chiffsenh 102:08715 8:00015 8:17880 5:00009	7 Priss and Reduce 20,599,95900 27,312,46645 47,909,38000 559 57 63,08104 0,00038 0,24079 0,60012	MS 2.396.54373 73.09794 201.07091 -0.00062 -0.71257 0.00068	08 - 1.87164 * % of 11.30790 UCL 229.10810 0.0091 0.65410 0.0093	f State (1.60000) 1.61601 1.61601 3.36112	pumia 0.10650 0.10650 0.10531 0.46786 Zegweek	Ho (5%) Accepted Accepted Accepted Accepted	1 T T T				
Madders+ + 0.90905 * Local Tax Ether INOVA *ophissor *ophissor *marcapt Experimental Experimental Experimental *marcapt Experimental *marcapt Experimental *marcapt Experimental *marcapt *marca	#/ 3. 974 283 Conformin 102.08715 8.00015 5.17(86) 5.00006 6.08424	** Pres and Reduce \$0.006,85900 27.312,46645 47.909,38000 Said Br 63.00104 0.0009 0.24979 0.66012 0.27650	MS 2.586.54373 73 00798 2.51.07081 -0.00062 -0.00062 -0.00065 0.00156 0.00156	UCL 220 10510 0.05410 0.055410 0.055410 0.055410 1.055410	F Statements of Co p. 400000 F Stat F 500000 F 50000 F 50000 8 7 60000 2 7 60000 2 7 60000	p-miss 0.10650 0.10650 0.10531 0.45786	HO (5%) Accepted Accepted Rejected Rejected	1774				
Radders+ + 0.90908 * Local Tax Ether INOVA Opphasion Opphasion other extercapt Expenditures per ADA Student to Classroom Teacher Radio Advance Sales	#/ 974 374 383 Chiffsenh 102:08715 8:00015 8:17880 5:00009	7 Priss and Reduce 20,599,95900 27,312,46645 47,909,38000 559 57 63,08104 0,00038 0,24079 0,60012	MS 2.396.54373 73.09794 201.07091 -0.00062 -0.71257 0.00068	08 - 1.87164 * % of 11.30790 UCL 229.10810 0.0091 0.65410 0.0093	# Students of Co # 5260 # 52	pumbs 0.10650 0.70550 0.76516 0.46756 0.4698 0.4698	Visite Student Visits Accepted Accepted Accepted Revisited Accepte	1371453		1.6 2 2 2 3		
Madders + 0.90905 * Local Tax Ether NOVA **Ophissor **Opening **Date **Experimental Experimental	#/ 3. 974 283 Conformin 102.08715 8.00015 5.17(86) 5.00006 6.08424	** Pres and Reduce \$0.006,85900 27.312,46645 47.909,38000 Said Br 63.00104 0.0009 0.24979 0.66012 0.27650	MS 2.586.54373 73 00798 2.51.07081 -0.00062 -0.00062 -0.00065 0.00156 0.00156	UCL 229 10510 1,00091 1,00091 1,00091 1,00091 1,00091 1,00091 1,00092	F Statements of Co p. 400000 F Stat F 500000 F 50000 F 50000 8 7 60000 2 7 60000 2 7 60000	pamia 0.10650 0.10650 0.10531 0.40746 2.4080163 0.6492	HO (5%) Accepted Accepted Rejected Rejected	1774				
Expenditures per ADA Student to Classroom Teacher Ratty Average Solary Years of Experience Fercent of Teachers with Masters	#/ 3 974 983 Coefficients 102.06715 9.00079 5.1769 5.48664 8.68664 9.68664	** Pres and Reduce \$5 20,096,8990, 77,312,46645, 47,909,38000 Sei Vir. 63,08104 0,0009, 0,24679 0,66012 6,27650 0,64201	MS 2,798,54373 73 (9798 LUL -21,9798	UCL 229 total 0 0.0091 0.0091 0.0091 1.10992 0.00748	# Students of Co #-4006 (1,0000) # 1,01003 1,01003 1,01003 1,01003 1,0004 1,00	pumbs 0.10650 0.70550 0.76516 0.46756 0.4698 0.4698	Visite Student Visits Accepted Accepted Accepted Revisited Accepte	1371453		1.6 2 2 2 3		
ANGMA Programme Tree Anticopt Experiminate per ADA Student to Classroon Teacher Ratio Anticopt Experiminate per ADA Student to Classroon Teacher Ratio Anticopt Town of Experimina Percent of Teachers with Masterie- Local Tax Effort per ADA	#/ 8 974 9 12394 974 974 974 974 974 974 974 974 974 9	20,000,85300, 27,312,46445, 47,900,30000, 564 Err 65,00104 0,00058 0,24579 0,86025 0,4479 0,86025 0,4479 0,86025 0,4479 0,86025 0,4479 0,86025 0,44201 0,00030	MS 2,398,64371 73,09798 201,9798 201,9798 201,9798 4,07251 9,00000 6,02156 9,19960 9,00000	UCL 229 10510 1,00091 1,00091 1,00091 1,00091 1,00091 1,00091 1,00092	F Steel 1 Stee	pamia 0.10550 0.10550 0.10531 0.45756 E49916.6 0.54692 0.54692 0.54692	Her (5%) Accepted Acc	1371453		£1-£3 £3 2		

The initial test of districts' math scores showed that the variables chosen account for about 42% of the students' scores. A second F-test using only the significant variables, shown in Figure 4, accounted for about 28% of students' scores, as shown by the adjusted r-squared value.

Figure 4
Predicting the Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced in Math Using Reduced Inputs

Linear Regression											
Dependent version	79	ProBAck Militir	**								
Independent seriebles	(A)	renigo Balary, Yearn	of Experience, free	and Meduced Lunc	h Parcentage						
N	50	18									
Regression Statisten		in a second									
A.		0.53244 R	Squared			Aquated II-Squiend			0.2792		
MSE		107.22263 8			10.35485	MAPE			22.1004	1	
Distant-Western (DW)			ny linishirand		-1,506.23978						
Akale inf. criterion (A/C)		T.52063 : A			1.52072						
Servinarz ciritiirinin (BVC)			annes Quint colonce	n (HOLL)	7.53369						
		55,018 77712 FB	CHEST CHARTE		10 45036	Frenchister R. Steuprent			0.8700	2	
PRESS %Prof/Adv Math = 37,67391 + 0.000	109 * Average Salar			0.25863 * Free a	14.55400	Same School			27-117		
SProf/Adv Math = 37,67331 + 0.000	109 * Average Salar		rs of Experience -	0.25863 * Free s	14.55400	Same School					
%Prof/Adv Meth = 37,67331 + 0.000	009 * Average Salar	y + 1.15642 * Yea	rs of Experience -	*	nd Reduced La	Same School		-		H	
N-ProfilAdv Math = 37,67391 * 0.000 ANOVA	47.	y + 1.15642 * Yea 35 21.381.64691	AS 7.127.14697	0.25863 * Free a	nd Reduced Li	Same School					
Supression Supression Supression Supression Supression	47. 30A	y + 1.15642 * Yea 38 21,381,46631 54,040,30366	rs of Experience -	*	nd Reduced La	Same School					
ShProtitAdv Meth = 37,67391 = 0.006 ANOVA Shpresson Salatan	47. 5	y + 1.15642 * Yea 35 21.381.64691	AS 7.127.14697	*	nd Reduced La	Same School					
September 4 37,67391 * 0.000 ANOVA Pagression Radigler	47. 30A	y + 1.15642 * Yea 38 21,381,44631 54,040,30366	AS 7.127.14697	*	nd Reduced La	Same School	NO (994)		Vie		700
September 4 37,67391 * 0.000 ANOVA Pagression Radigler	97. 304 307	33 21,381,64691 54,040,30366 75,421,75077	MS 7.127.14897 107.22283	6) 47045	nd Reduced La	mich Perpentage	FIO (504) Reported				102
N-Prof/Adv Meth = 37,67391 + 0.000 ANOVA Regression Fastinal Total	st7. SAA SD7.	38 21,381,64601 54,040,30306 75,421,73077 31d Err	AfS 7,127,14897 107,22293	(6) 47045 DEL	p-value 0 00000	mch Percentage		1441			101
S-ProtitAdv Math = 37,67331 * 0.000 ANOVA Plageration Flanksian Intercept	37. 364 307 Chafficients 37.6/301	35 21,381,64691 54,040,30366 73,421,73077 31d Etr 4,05412	MS 7127, 14697 107, 22283 LCL 29, 70840	00,47045 00,47045 001 45,03830	Problem 0 00000	Perpentage	Keyected				101

In the test of students' proficiency in English Language Arts, the percent of students that are non-white was significant along with average teacher salaries and the percent of students receiving free or reduced lunch. The r-squared value for the test of districts' ELA scores was approximately 0.49 for both the original test and the test with reduced input variables. This shows that teachers' average salary, the percent of students receiving free or reduced lunch, and the percent of students that are non-white account for nearly 50% of the students' ELA scores, regardless of the inclusion of the other input variables, as shown in Figures 5 and 6.

Figure 5
Predicting the Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced in English Language Arts
Using All Inputs

inear Regression	- 1	Chall Acty Cogline										
rapporter of washing	5	pendiumo per ADA;	Student to Classroom			Espeirros, Peron	of Torchery w	th Minter	er Level !	las Effort	per ADA. F	fee:
	36	d Riedunied Lunish Pe	montage, % of Stains	start of Codes, Sired W	file Bludwes							
V		14										
agression Statisties												
		0,79752 R -	Squarna		2.53058 A	Stated R-Squared			0.498	450		
52		48.55790 5			6.96635 Al	APE			31, 128	973		
turbre-Watace (DW)		1.86517 Lb			-T-285.29554							
Aake of printer (AIC)		6.74633 At			8.74756							
Criwerz ordensy (B/C)			entar-Outen critision	MDC3	6.78714							
RESS		18:446:43472 PR	ESS WASE		7 11630 79	welcome At-Squared			11.400	522:		
	al.	- 68	MS	F	2-14/8	1,00002 * % or Wi	ille Souderta					
NOVA layrection tradition	77.07.00	SS 16,201,97679 19,990,96171 46,363,63747		F 41.66238		1,000002 ° % of 991	ille Souderts					
NOVA Synether methol	817 174 203	\$3 16,207,97676 18,980,86174 46,363,63747	MS 1,512,552M 40,51787	F-11,08238	0-19600 0-09000 1-55M	P1804	HG (5%)		WF	1.5	TEM.	
NOVA synuction continu day driversept	2617 9 1774 2637 Commiscoretts 139 6/609	\$5 16,290,97679 19,990,96171 46,363,63747 Shr Eir 51,49601	MS 1.012 552M 49.50702 40.50702	F 41,08238 689 228,18006	p-vel/ar 0.08000 1.55a/ 2.48455	201326	eti (Th) Rajecker	u	WF	-	and .	
NOVA Ingression continue continue	67 374 383 Comficents 138 (600s 1 387476-6	\$3 16,200,97576 18,980,86171 46,360,60747 50,400032	MS 2.612.55246 40.55747 28.66241 -0.00062	F 41,58238 505 225,15006 6,05062	2 +8655 5 00748	p-185m 0.01326 0.03854	HG (5%) Repoled Acrested	u.	WF	4	TEQ:	
NOVA synction control orientept Expenditure per AliA Shaker to Classroom Teacher Ratio	017 303 174 303 126 00008 1367476-6 0.2503	\$3 16,207,97679 15,960,86777 46,363,63747 807,57 51,43657 5,96532 5,26642	MS 1,512,552M 48,55787 28,66241 -0,00062 0,14077	F 41,66238 41,66238 228,15005 4,00069 6,04742	p-value 0.00000 1.55a ² 2.48655 3.00746 1.29390	0.0136 0.0136 0.9464 0.07703	eti (DN) Rajinkor Accepted Accepted		W	4 4	THE STATE OF	
SOVA Syncholic Spanish of the Topper Source Spanish of State on Teacher Reso	81 9 174 943 194 0000 1 367476-6 0,25303 0,00008	\$3 16,201,97674 15,910,96171 36,362,62747 87,557 51,43951 5,96632 5,26962 0,00018	MS 1,452,552,66 49,557,82 25,662,51 -0,66062 0,146,77 5,35006	F 41,58238 228,15005 6,04522 6,04742 2,00677	2-1958 0-08000 1-55at 1-4865 0-02748 1-29390 5-72773	p-usin 0.01326 0.99454 0.27703 2.09796-4	eth (TNs) Reproduct Accressed Accepted Outpected	1	W	(Web)	TEN:	
NOVA Approximation Orders and the Exponditures per ASIA Student to Clauseoon Tractor Ratio Awarage Salary Years of Expositions	1174 1174 1183 1180 00000 1 1874 TE-6 0 115001 0 250000	53 16,305,67574 16,960,86777 46,960,80747 80f Err 51,49601 0,96632 0,26942 0,00018 0,22548	MS 1.022.553M 48.55787 26.6622 0.16002 0.16077 0.00000 0.16078	F 41,66238 225,16006 0,00062 0,04742 0,00077 0,70127	2-19/5e 0 09000 1 55at 2 49655 0 00748 1 29396 5 72728 1 14450	0.01326 0.01326 0.99454 1.20703 2.04278-1 3.25330	His (7%) Repelsor Accorded Accorded Accorded Accorded	11.1.1	W	(96) (60)	THE STATE OF THE S	
NOVA Synthetic Experiment Experiment per ADA Student to Classroom Tracher Ratio Awage Salary Years of Experiment Percent of Trachers with Madeine	01 3 174 343 500 500 5 2 360 600 6 2 360 600 6 0 250 600 6 0 250 600 6 0 250 600 6	\$3 16,305,97076 15,190,86171 46,190,86174 60,0052 51,43601 6,9052 5,20642 0,00016 0,2546 0,03467	MS 1.452.552M 49.57742 28.66241 -0.00002 -0.46774 5.05009 -0.46744	F 41,66238 6001 226,15005 6,0007 6,04742 6,0007 6,74127 7,00258	2-1950 0-09000 1-756 2-4955 0-02748 1-2939 3-7277 1-14490 0-196088	p-st/m 0.013/h 0.9945/h 1.2010/3 2.094746-4 5.25330 0.87227	elo (7%) Repelor Accopia Accopia Accopia Accopia Accopia	11111	WP	(94) (4)	:IEE:	
NOVA synaction control creaming Experiments par AIIA Shuder's to Clausnoon Traches Ratio Average Salary Years of Experience Percent of Teachers with Madeira Local Sta Effort per ADA	11 5 174 943 15 6000 13 15 17 17 16 0000 13 15 17 17 16 0000 13 15 17 17 16 0000 15 17 14 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	\$3 16,303,67579 15,960,86777 46,360,63747 50,45057 5,45057 5,25645 5,25645 5,25645 5,25645 5,25645 5,256524	MS 1.002.652M 48.50782 25.66221 -0.00003 5.14077 5.05008 -0.16003 -0.17374 -0.07374 -0.07374 -0.0008	#1.66238 41.66238 225.15005 6.00562 6.4742 6.66474 6.76127 6.76127 6.76127 6.76127	2-16/8 0.08000 1.55a 2.48655 0.02748 1.29390 5.72727 1.14400 0.48090 3.42004	0.01326 0.99854 0.99854 0.07003 0.07297 0.07297 0.07455	eti (7%) Rejestor Acceptor Acceptor Acceptor Acceptor Acceptor Acceptor	11.1.1	WF	(98) 46 46	100	
INOVA Ingression Ingression Expenditures per AIIA Student to Cleatingson Teacher Ratio Awage Salary Years of Experience Percent of Teachers with Maderia- Local Tax Effort per AIIA Fine and Resized Lanch Percentage	01 3 174 343 174 343 116 0000 1 367 8-6 0 25704 0 25704 0 00008 0 00008 0 00008	\$5 16,281,97676 19,180,86177 26,360,63747 897 EP 51,43901 5,96052 5,25462 0,00018 0,25462 0,00018 0,00018 0,00018 0,00018 0,00018 0,00018	MS 1402 503M 49 50782 25 662 C 20 66002 20 54077 20 5000 4 1802 20 7374 3 0000 4 1802 3 0000 4 1802 3 0000 4 1802 3 0000 4 1802 4 1802 4 1802 4 1802 4 1802 4 1802 4 1802 4 1802 4 1802 4 1802 5 1802 6 1802	6852 228 19000 4.00002 6.04742 0.0007 0.70127 0.00250 0.00553 4.11205	2 4865 0 0000 1 756 2 4865 0 00746 1 29346 1 7472 1 1445 0 9508 0 4204 6 8006	0.04326 0.94636 0.94636 0.95530 0.87227 0.87227 0.87425	Hi (5%) Rejector Accepted Accepted Accepted Accepted Accepted Accepted Accepted Accepted Accepted Accepted	1111111	WE	(64) (4) (4) (4)	7100	
ANOVA Paymenton Translate Othersept Expenditures per AIIA Student to Classroom Toacher Ratio Awrage Balary Yaars of Expension Percent of Teachers with Masters Local Tas Effort per AIIA	11 5 174 943 15 6000 13 15 17 17 16 0000 13 15 17 17 16 0000 13 15 17 17 16 0000 15 17 14 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	\$3 16,303,67579 15,960,86777 46,360,63747 50,45057 5,45057 5,25645 5,25645 5,25645 5,25645 5,25645 5,256524	MS 1.002.652M 48.50782 25.66221 -0.00003 5.14077 5.05008 -0.16003 -0.17374 -0.07374 -0.07374 -0.0008	#1.66238 41.66238 225.15005 6.00562 6.4742 6.66474 6.76127 6.76127 6.76127 6.76127	2-16/8 0.08000 1.55a 2.48655 0.02748 1.29390 5.72727 1.14400 0.48090 3.42004	0.01326 0.99854 0.99854 0.07003 0.07297 0.07297 0.07455	eti (7%) Rejestor Acceptor Acceptor Acceptor Acceptor Acceptor Acceptor	11111	WP	(98) 46 46	/IDE	

Figure 6
Predicting the Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced in English Language Arts
Using Reduced Inputs

Deputy digital control for a c	76.7	ProtiAcu Englisti eraga Salary, Francisch	Salama I and Comme	tank to all the state of	Paris .						
N.	784	rege salery, Free arts	Guerra Creat Letter	ode, 20 mano o	Lane.						
Regression Stattleton					- Innovation Inno						
ft.		STEETS R-S	gover			cornel (f-Squared			D.44		
MSE		46.52146-8			8.00573 864	WE			11.21	740	
Durtim-Walten (DW)		1.87397 Ling			-1.289.20750						
Akades int solverion (AIC) Schwarz critation (BIC)		8.73025 A/O	trae-Quien utherion (H	no	6.79041 6.74957						
PRESS		18.778.6H10H 240		90)		estated R-Squarest			D 46	mar.	
COMMO		- Inches and the Com-	Contraction -		2 8000000000	STATE OF STREET					
% Prof/Adv English = 11.28236 + 0.09051	- servinge among the serving	Haze Crist State Contr.	age amount of the	after a resident of the	Camping of 6 6 6						
ANOVA			10								
	el.	55 17 956 M/105	IE Entrese	Forman	press.						
Regression	al 3	55 17,935 49203 W.(30 15544	E.975 VOIGE	F-129 F6479	0.00000						
Regression	97 380 363	55 17,936 48203 58,438 15544 38,383 61747	##6 E.975 VIDES #8.52146	F 121 FMZ4	0.0000)						
Regression President	8) 340 363 Goetholents	58,438,15544	E.975 VOIGE	For tears	(F-786/8) (1.0000))	p-value	HO (SSN)		-		JO.
Represent Principal Tribe	Gradiciants 33,28236	58,638 15544 38 383 61747 38 6# 3 50294	E 975 VISES #6 52146 LCL 26 31464	-DEZ 40.19887	(2003)	0.00000	(Noperted)	7	· See	_	tol
Readons Take Intercept Average Salary	Gradficlarets 33.28236 8.00862	58,638 15544 38 383 61747 38 66 3 50294 4 09307	1.075 visies 46.52140 1.03. 26.33454 3.00048	DEZ 40.16967 6.00075	- (.23a) - (.23a) - (.23a) - (.23a) - (.23a) - (.23a)	0.00000 0.00000	Playerant Hayerant	104	w		Jal
Represent Policies Intercept	Gradiciants 33,28236	58,638 15544 38 383 61747 38 6# 3 50294	E 975 VISES #6 52146 LCL 26 31464	-DEZ 40.19887	(2003)	0.00000	(Noperted)		w	0.00	VO.

Discussion and Recommendations

The Annual Performance Report is a measure of Missouri district's overall success that considers a variety of data points. "Included in the data are [achievement scores], as well as updated markers on a district or charter school's college and career readiness, attendance and graduation rates" (Madsen, 2019). The results of this F-test show that all input data accounts for approximately 34% of districts' APR scores, regardless of the significance of each individual input variable. Likewise, all input variables account for about 42% of students' mathematics scores. Both tests comparing input data to students' ELA scores show that the inputs considered account for 49% of students' scores. In a perfectly linear study, the F-tests would have a 100% relationship to the output data, as measured by the adjusted r-squared value. In that case, the input data would account for 100% of student or district scores. While each of these F-tests show a significant relationship between the variables, the adjusted r-squared values imply there are factors not included in this study that also impact student and district scores. Still, there are two variables that prove to be consistently significant among these studies. Districts' average teacher salary and the percent of students that receive free or reduced-price lunches within each district are variables that are significant when assessed against all three output variables.

The percent of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches was chosen as an input variable because it speaks to poverty and its presence within each district. In each of the F-tests, this percent was significant, and the corresponding coefficient of the variable was negative. The negative coefficient in each of the studies shows that poverty negatively influences student outcomes. Put simply, this model shows that districts with lower percentages of their students receiving free or reduced priced lunches have higher APR scores and a higher percentage of students that are proficient or advanced in ELA and mathematics. Unfortunately, there is no simple fix to this finding. While this is a significant variable, and one that should be acknowledged in funding formulas and funding conversations, school districts cannot control the percent of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches, like they might other variables. However, this should be considered an important conversation piece in the state, as the Missouri

funding formula includes dollar value modifiers that attempt to account for the difficulties present in schools with higher percentages of students in poverty.

Districts' average teacher salary was another variable that was significant throughout the final series of F-tests. Interestingly, the coefficient for average teacher salaries was consistently positive, showing that districts with higher average teacher salaries tend to also have higher APR scores and percentages of students that are proficient or advanced in ELA and mathematics. Unlike the percentage of students that receive free or reduced-price lunches, this is a variable that is controlled by districts. This should be a consideration in every Missouri district, as they make yearly budget considerations. Likewise, this is a variable that can be considered when the state is assessing the funding formula, as it includes state adequacy targets. The adequacy target within the Missouri funding formula attempts to ensure all districts have adequate funding for each student; these are funds that pay for teacher salaries, among other line items. Knowing that schools with higher salaries tend to have higher scores, the state can focus their efforts around targeting teacher salaries as an area of discussion, rather than focusing their efforts on per-pupil expenditures alone. This data gives reason for the state to target school funding in a way that will impact student outcomes.

The other significant school-controlled variables found in the F-tests were the average number of years of experience for teachers, which had a positive coefficient, and the student to classroom teacher ratio, with a negative coefficient. When Missouri school districts are discussing funding needs, this study suggests that simply using per-pupil expenditures to improve student outcomes does not necessarily correlate to improved scores across multiple measures. Instead, prioritizing teacher salaries, as well as using funding to decrease the student to classroom teacher ratio and improve the average years of experience value, will improve student outcomes as measured by the Annual Performance Report and the percent of students who score proficient or advanced on their English Language Arts and Mathematics tests. In finding ways to impact student outcomes through their spending habits, this study should be strongly considered by Missouri school districts

Conclusions

We see from the World Population Review article that student scores in the United States fall behind the student scores of 23 other countries ("Education Rankings by Country 2020", 2020). While Education Week shows that Missouri falls just shy of the national average per-pupil expenditure amount, as compared to other states ("Map: How Much Money Each State Spends Per Student", 2019), Courtenay Stevens' work showed that Missouri is nearly last when comparing the average starting teacher salary to the average salary of all occupations, teachers included, across the nation (Stevens, 2019). Clearly there are some significant variations in spending both across the nation and within the state of Missouri.

Politicians and educators are constantly looking for ways to improve the nation's schools. If schools are to be held accountable for student outcomes, politicians and educators should target school funding toward the specific line items that will affect student outcomes. As shown in this research, districts that use their funding to prioritize the education, the experience, and the salaries of teachers, see statistically significant improvement in student outcomes, as measured by districts' APR scores and the percent of students scoring proficient or advanced in English

Language Arts and Mathematics. When yearly budget conversations are happening in Missouri school districts, teacher salaries should be prioritized. In lieu of salary increases, districts could also consider expanding non-salary benefits; increasing funding for graduate school assistance or for further certifications. Likewise, the state could consider expanding their loan forgiveness programs or offering other similar incentives for educators. If schools with higher salaries tend to have higher scores, focusing state and local efforts around targeting teacher salaries, either through direct increases or other related benefits, can impact student outcomes, as measured by districts' APR scores and the percent of students scoring proficient or advanced in English Language Arts and Mathematics

Implications for Future Research

This study leads to the conclusion that targeting Missouri's school funding can impact student outcomes. While significant variables were identified in this study, the adjusted r-squared values imply that there are other variables not yet included. One area that this study could not capture, using data pulled from Missouri's Department of Elementary and Secondary Education website primarily, was whether or not the student outcome data would be related to the districts' locations. Further studies could be done, for example, to see if a district's location, whether rural, urban, or otherwise, has a significant relationship to districts' APR scores and students' mathematics and ELA scores. Likewise, this study is limited by its focus on one year. Expanding this research by looking at Missouri trends over time, or even assessing other states to see if these trends are true across the country, would add to the discussion on targeting school funding to improve student outcomes. Further, while poverty was addressed within this study by including students receiving free or reduced-price lunches in each district, studies could continue to examine this data set. This study shows that the percent of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches is negatively related to student outcomes. Further research could examine factors that mitigate this tendency.

References

- Della Sala, M. R., Knoeppel, R. C., & Marion, R. (2016). Modeling the Effects of Educational Resources on Student Achievement: Implications for Resource Allocation Policies. *Education and Urban Society*, 49(2), 180–202. Retrieved from https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0013124516643757
- Education Rankings by Country 2020. (2020, April 6). Retrieved from https://worldpopulationreview.com/countries/education-rankings-by-country/
- Jackson, C. K., Johnson, R. C., & Persico, C. (2015). Boosting Educational Attainment and Adult Earnings: Does school spending matter after all? Retrieved May 7, 2020, from https://www.educationnext.org/boosting-education-attainment-adult-earnings-school-spending/
- Madsen, T. (2019, October 17). Missouri Releases 2019 Annual Performance Reports. Retrieved May 7, 2020, from https://dese.mo.gov/communications/news-releases/missouri-releases-2019-annual-performance-reports
- Map: How Much Money Each State Spends Per Student. (2019, June 4). Retrieved April 24, 2020, from https://www.edweek.org/ew/collections/quality-counts-2019-state-finance/map-per-pupil-spending-state-by-state.html
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2018). Current Expenditure per ADA 2009-10 to 2017-18. [Data file]. Retrieved from: https://apps.dese.mo.gov/MCDS/home.aspx?categoryid=1&view=2
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2018). District Faculty Information. [Data file]. Retrieved from: https://apps.dese.mo.gov/MCDS/home.aspx?categoryid=1&view=2
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2018). District -- content area all and disag 2018. [Data file]. Retrieved from: https://apps.dese.mo.gov/MCDS/home.aspx?categoryid=1&view=2
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2018). District Demographic Data. [Data file]. Retrieved from: https://apps.dese.mo.gov/MCDS/home.aspx?categoryid=1&view=2
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2018). District Student Staff Ratios. [Data file]. Retrieved from: https://apps.dese.mo.gov/MCDS/home.aspx?categoryid=1&view=2
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2018). Finance Data and Statistics Summary for All Districts/Charters. [Data file]. Retrieved from: https://apps.dese.mo.gov/MCDS/home.aspx?categorvid=1&view=2

- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2018). Local Tax Effort 2010 2020. [Data file]. Retrieved from: https://apps.dese.mo.gov/MCDS/home.aspx?categoryid=1&view=2
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2018). Missouri 2018 APR Summary by Districts. [Data file]. Retrieved from: https://apps.dese.mo.gov/MCDS/home.aspx?categoryid=1&view=2
- Stevens, C. (2019, April 6). The Best States for Teachers in 2019. Retrieved May 8, 2020, from https://www.business.org/hr/employees/best-us-states-for-teachers/
- Stoneberg, Bert. (2015). "Cost-Benefit Analysis Is Needed in American Public Education". *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*: Vol. 20, Article 15. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7275/t2ba-a657. Available at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/pare/vol20/iss1/15
- The Best Place in America to Raise Kids. (n.d.). Retrieved September 29, 2020, from https://nicolegalloway.com/best-place-america-raise-kids