Appendix

School Districts’ Perspectives on the Economic Stimulus Package: Teaching Jobs Saved in 2009-10 But Teacher Layoffs Loom for Next School Year

Appendix 1: Confidence Intervals and Statistical Significance

Many of the tables, figures, and footnotes in the report provide information about whether the difference between estimated percentages is statistically significant. Statistical significance signals whether this difference is likely to be due to chance. If it appears that the difference in estimated percentages is due to chance (i.e., the difference is not statistically significant), then we cannot say that districts are more likely to do one thing than another. For example, 39% of districts would welcome the common core standards as a guiding framework, while 35% of districts felt it was too soon to tell how the common core standards would benefit them. The difference between 39% and 35% is not statistically significant, so we cannot say that a higher percentage of districts would welcome the standards than felt it was too soon to tell.

One the other hand, if the difference is larger than is likely to be explained by chance alone, then the estimated percentages can be compared. For example, we estimate that 19% of districts will have spent their ARRA IDEA funds by the end of the 2009-2010 school year, while 70% will spend the funds by the end of the 2010-2011 school year. The difference between the 19% and 70% is statistically significant, and so we can say that fewer districts will have spent all of their ARRA IDEA funds by the end of this school year than by the end of next school year.

One method of determining the statistical significance in the difference between two percentages is to compare the confidence intervals of the two percentages. Confidence intervals provide information about the accuracy of the estimated percentages. If the confidence intervals for two percentages do not overlap, then the difference is statistically significant. Figure A1 illustrates how ranges of estimated percentages (the confidence intervals) of districts experiencing funding increases or decreases are used to determine statistical significance.
Figure A1. Percentage of districts experiencing funding decreases or increases for school year 2009-10, excluding ARRA funds

Figure reads: In an estimated 69% of school districts, total funding from sources other than ARRA decreased in school year 2009-10 compared with school year 2008-09. Funding remained about the same during this period in an estimated 23% of districts and increased in an estimated 9% of districts.

Note: The 95% confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 9 (4, 16); 23 (15, 33); 69 (58, 78). This means, for example, that we are 95% certain that the actual percentage of districts that had their overall funding levels increase in the 2009-2010 school year is between 4% and 16%.

Source: CEP Survey of Local Education Agency Use of ARRA Education Funds, spring 2010.

In this case, the bars depicting the confidence intervals for the estimated percentages of districts which experienced an increase in funding and the confidence intervals for the estimated percentages of districts which experienced level funding overlap, indicating that the difference between these two percentages is not statistically significant. Conversely, the bars depicting the confidence intervals for the estimated percentage of districts which experienced level funding and the confidence intervals for the estimated percentage of districts which experienced a decrease in funding do not overlap, indicating the differences between these percentages is statistically significant.

Appendix 3 provides confidence intervals for all of the figures and tables in the main body of the report.
Appendix 2: Study Methods

This appendix describes the sampling procedures used to select potential districts to participate in CEP’s Survey of Local Education Agency Use of ARRA Education Funds. Also described are the methods used to develop and administer the survey and the analytic process used to obtain population estimates from the survey responses. The survey was developed, administered, and analyzed with support from Policy Studies Associates, CEP’s contractor for this project.

SURVEY SAMPLE

We started with the publicly accessible dataset from the 2007-2008 Common Core of Data Local Education Agency Universe Survey conducted by the National Center of Education Statistics (NCES). This dataset contains information on 18,090 elementary and secondary education agencies located in the 50 states and the District of Columbia; American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands; the Department of Defense schools; and the Bureau of Indian Education. We chose to use the 2007-08 edition of the survey because when we drew the sample, the 2008-2009 dataset was in preliminary form.

From the dataset of 18,090 education agencies, we removed the 4,778 agencies that did not match our study population criteria. Specifically, we removed the agencies that were located outside of the 50 states and the District of Columbia; that were not operating; or that were regional education service agencies, federally and state-operated agencies, charter agencies, or designated as “other education agencies.”

The dataset also included agencies that were component(s) of a supervisory union sharing a superintendent and administrative services with other local school districts. In these cases, we retained the agency defined as the “supervisory union” and removed the component agencies associated with the unions. Finally, we removed the local education agencies (LEAs) that did not directly educate students through the employment of teachers and the operation of school buildings; many of these agencies represented towns that sent their students to neighboring districts or cooperative districts. We also removed agencies that solely served special segments of the population, such as vocational centers, correctional facilities, schools for the blind or deaf, and schools of performing arts. Exhibit 1 summarizes the edits that we made to the dataset to arrive at our sample frame.
Exhibit 1. Variables Used to Build Sample Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>Use*</th>
<th>LEAs Subtracted</th>
<th>Unduplicated Deletions**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIPST</td>
<td>Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) state code</td>
<td>Eliminated LEAs from locations outside of the 50 states and the District of Columbia (X&gt;56; n=42).</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOUND07</td>
<td>The boundary change indicator is a classification of changes in an education agency's boundaries since the last report to NCES</td>
<td>Eliminated LEAs that had closed (X=2; n=149), were temporarily closed (X=6; n=35), or were scheduled to be operational in the future (X=7; n=56).</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE07</td>
<td>Agency type code</td>
<td>Eliminated agencies defined as &quot;regional education service agencies&quot; (X=4; n=1,203), &quot;state-operated agencies&quot; (X=5; n=275), &quot;federally operated agencies&quot; (X=6; n=36), &quot;charter agencies&quot; (X=7; n=2,126), and &quot;other education agencies&quot; (X=8; n=195).</td>
<td>3,835</td>
<td>3,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION07</td>
<td>Indicator linking supervisory units and component agencies</td>
<td>Eliminated agencies that were represented in the dataset by a &quot;supervisory union.&quot; Eliminated LEAs from CA (n=12), IN (n=3), NH (n=175), NYC (n=34), VT (n=291), and VA (n=56).</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>4,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH07</td>
<td>Number of schools associated with the agency</td>
<td>Eliminated LEAs that did not directly educate students or that served special populations of students.</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>4,778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit reads: The FIPST variable eliminated LEAs that existed outside the 50 states and the District of Columbia; this variable netted 42 deletions, which brought the total number of unduplicated deletions to 42.

* The "X" stands for the variable name in each row.

** The unduplicated count is cumulative from top to bottom.

We used the “ULOCAL07” variable in the NCES dataset, which is an indicator of a district’s location relative to a populous area, to stratify the sample frame by geographic location and area population density. The NCES dataset contained four main location types, as well as three subtypes with each location type. We used the four main types but not the subtypes in our stratification—in other words, we used the main location type “city” as a stratum, but we did not create additional strata to distinguish among the subtype locations of “large,” “medium,” or “small.” Exhibit 2 presents definitions for the main location types, identifies the number of districts in the sample frame in each location type, reports the number of students who attend school in the districts in the sample frame, and identifies the number of districts in each location type that we sampled. We used disproportional stratification in order to include sufficient numbers of large districts in our analyses.
Exhibit 2. Definitions and Frequencies of Sample Strata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locale Type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Number (and percent) of districts in the sample frame</th>
<th>Number (and percent) of K-12 students in the sample frame</th>
<th>Number (and percent) of districts in the sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Territory inside an urbanized area (a &quot;densely settled area that has a census population of at least 50,000&quot;) and inside a principal city (the “largest city inside the urbanized area”)</td>
<td>751 (5.6)</td>
<td>13,447,851 (28.8)</td>
<td>180 (30.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>Territory inside an urbanized area (a &quot;densely settled area that has a census population of at least 50,000&quot;) and outside a principal city (the “largest city inside the urbanized area”)</td>
<td>2,741 (20.6)</td>
<td>18,384,606 (39.4)</td>
<td>180 (30.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Territory inside an urban cluster (a “densely settled area that has a census population of 2,500 to 49,999”)</td>
<td>2,502 (18.8)</td>
<td>5,904,016 (12.6)</td>
<td>120 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Territory outside of urbanized areas (&quot;densely settled areas that have a census population of at least 50,000&quot;) and urban clusters (&quot;densely settled areas that have a census population of 2,500 to 49,999&quot;)</td>
<td>7,318 (55.0)</td>
<td>8,967,808 (19.2)</td>
<td>120 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,312 (100.0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>46,704,281 (100.0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>600 (100.0)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit reads: Locales defined as "city" consist of 5.6% of the districts in the sample frame, contain 28.8% of the students who attend the districts in the sample frame, and represent 30% of the districts sampled for the study.

Many states divide their densely populated areas into “elementary school districts” and “union high school districts.” For a densely populated area, we retained the elementary and secondary school districts in the sample frame. When drawing the sample, we excluded districts if the sample already included another district from the same Core Based Statistical Area (CBSA).

**SURVEY DEVELOPMENT**

The challenge in developing the survey was to strike a reasonable balance between collecting enough data to describe how LEAs are using ARRA education funds and minimizing the response burden. To that end, the survey included 29 close-ended items that ask about (1) current and projected funding for elementary and secondary education, (2) the use of State Fiscal Stabilization Funds, (3) the use of ARRA Title I funds, (4) the use of ARRA IDEA funds, (5) district efforts to address the four ARRA assurances and involvement in preparing state applications for Race to the Top grants, and (6) challenges and assistance needs associated with using ARRA education funds. A final question asked districts if they were better off with ARRA education funds than they would have been without them. Some of these items had multiple
response options, and four items included space for respondents to provide additional information about their strategies and experiences in using ARRA education funds.

As part of survey development, we sent a draft of the instrument to central office administrators in LEAs in three states. We asked the administrators to review the instrument and provide feedback on the appropriateness and clarity of the wording and on the focus of the survey questions. We also asked them to estimate the amount of time required to complete the survey and to indicate who else in their districts might be involved in responding to individual items. The final version of the survey reflects the feedback we received.

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION

Our recruitment of survey respondents from the districts in our sample involved multiple steps. In February 2010, CEP contacted the superintendents of the districts in the sample to explain the purpose of the survey and to provide background information on CEP and its previous report and research on state-level implementation of ARRA. In addition, CEP asked superintendents to identify the person in their district who would be responsible for completing the survey. In some districts, for example, the appropriate respondent was the chief financial officer, while in others it was the director of federal programs or the director of research and/or accountability. Many districts found it necessary to ask several members of the staff to complete various parts of the survey.

We gave superintendents approximately one week to respond to the initial invitation before initiating follow-up calls to request the contact information for the designated survey respondent. We made up to three telephone attempts about a week apart to each non-responding superintendent before sending a final attempt letter. Through the contacts that we made with the superintendents of the districts in the sample, we received 450 responses (75.0% of the sample). Of those who responded, 290 (48.3%) agreed to participate and designated a district administrator to complete the survey, while 160 (26.7%) declined to participate.

Beginning in March 2010, we sent the survey to the designated respondents. Within two days of receiving the name of the designated respondent from the superintendent, we sent an email message to the respondent, with the survey attached, asking him or her to respond to the survey. Respondents could complete the survey as an electronic form or as a paper-and-pencil instrument that could be returned by fax or regular mail.

We began following up with non-respondents one week after the initial distribution of the surveys. This process continued in one-week intervals. After the third call, we sent letters asking non-respondents to complete the survey. The completed surveys were submitted between March and May of 2010. We received completed survey documents from 233 districts, for a response rate of 80.3% of the districts that agreed to participate and 38.8% of the original sample of 600 districts.
DATA ANALYSES

To obtain the population estimates from the sample responses, we multiplied each sample response by a weighting factor specific to that particular stratum and question. The weighting factors were stratum-specific because the proportion of districts included in the sample from each stratum was not equal (i.e., we used a disproportional stratified sample). The weighting variables were also question-specific because we dealt with missing responses by eliminating the cases from the set of responses used in the analysis. This approach to treating missing data has the advantage of simplifying the reporting of results; it has the disadvantage of increasing the estimated standard errors.

We calculated both the standard error and confidence interval for each of the estimated response frequencies presented in CEP’s report describing the survey findings. The estimated standard error of a proportion provides information about the accuracy of the percentage estimate. The size of the standard error is influenced by the distribution of responses, the number of respondents, and the size of the population. Estimated standard errors are used to construct confidence intervals for the estimated percent. The confidence interval for a proportion indicates the degree of certainty that the true value for the population of all districts in the nation is included in a particular range. For proportions, the confidence interval is not symmetric relative to the estimated percent (except in the case where the estimated percent equals 50); this is because a proportion has a lower and upper bound (0 and 1, respectively), and the boundary affects the calculation of the interval. Additional information about the confidence intervals for specific responses is available in appendix 3 accompanying CEP’s report.

Across all of the estimated response frequencies, the median standard error is 4.2%; the standard errors range from 0.0% to 7.3%. The standard errors result in 95% confidence intervals that have a median lower bound 7.1 percentage points below the estimate and a median upper bound 9.2 percentage points above the estimate; the lower bound of the confidence intervals range from 0.0% to 14.4% of the estimate, while the upper bound of the confidence intervals range from 0.0% to 14.1% above the estimate. The size of the interval does not affect the level of certainty (95%) that the interval captures the true population value.
Appendix 3: Confidence Intervals for Survey Responses

Figure A1. Percentage of districts experiencing funding decreases or increases for school year 2009-10, excluding ARRA funds

Figure reads: In an estimated 69% of school districts, total funding from sources other than ARRA decreased in school year 2009-10 compared with school year 2008-09. Funding remained about the same during this period in an estimated 23% of districts and increased in an estimated 9% of districts.

Note: The 95% confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 9 (4, 16); 23 (15, 33); 69 (58, 78). This means, for example, that we are 95% certain that the actual percentage of districts that had their overall funding levels increase in the 2009-2010 school year is between 4% and 16%.

Source: CEP Survey of Local Education Agency Use of ARRA Education Funds, spring 2010.

Figure A2. Status of districts’ SFSF funding as of spring 2010

Figure reads: At the time of CEP’s survey in spring 2010, about 89% of school districts had received SFSF grants, an estimated 7% had a firm commitment for SFSF funds from their state but had not yet received them, and about 5% did not expect to receive SFSF funds.

Note: Percentages do not total 100% due to rounding.

Note: The 95% confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 89 (80, 94); 7 (3, 15); 5 (2, 12). This means, for example, that we are 95% certain that the actual percentage of districts that had already received their SFSF funds in spring 2010 is between 80% and 94%.

Source: CEP Survey of Local Education Agency Use of ARRA Education Funds, spring 2010.
Figure A3. Percentage of districts expecting funding decreases or increases for school year 2010-11, excluding ARRA funds

Figure reads: About 68% percent of school districts expected their total funding from sources other than ARRA to decrease in school year 2010-11, while an estimated 13% expected their funding to remain about the same as in the previous year and about 6% expected funding to increase. In approximately 14% of school districts, funding levels for 2010-11 had not yet been determined at the time of CEP’s survey.

Note: Percentages do not total 100% due to rounding.

Note: The 95% confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 68 (57, 77); 13 (7, 21); 6 (2, 13); 14 (8, 23). This means, for example, that we are 95% certain that the actual percentage of districts that expect their funding level will decrease in school year 2010-2011 is between 57% and 77%.

Source: CEP Survey of Local Education Agency Use of ARRA Education Funds, spring 2010.

Figure A4. Districts’ timelines for spending all of their SFSF funds

Figure reads: An estimated 60% of school districts with SFSF grants had spent or expected to spend all of these funds by the end of school year 2009-10, while about 37% will deplete all of these funds by the end of 2010-11 and about 4% by the end of 2011-12.

Note: Percentages do not total 100% due to rounding.

Note: The 95% confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 60 (49, 69); 37 (28, 48); 4 (2, 6). This means, for example, that we are 95% certain that the actual percentage of districts that expect to spend all of their SFSF funds by the end of the 2009-2010 school year is between 49% and 69%.

Source: CEP Survey of Local Education Agency Use of ARRA Education Funds, spring 2010.
Figure A5. Percentages of districts making or anticipating reductions in teaching staff, 2009-10 and 2010-11

Figure reads: Of districts that received SFSF grants, an estimated 45% reduced teaching staff to compensate for funding decreases in 2009-10, compared with about 75% of these districts that expected to cut these types of teaching positions in 2010-11.

Note: The 95% confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 45 (32, 59); 75 (63, 84). This means, for example, that we are 95% certain that the actual percentage of districts that received SFSF grants and reduced teaching staff to compensate for funding decreases in 2009-2010 is between 32% and 59%.

Source: CEP Survey of Local Education Agency Use of ARRA Education Funds, spring 2010.

Figure A6. Percentage of districts receiving SFSF funding whose spending choices have been influenced by the one-time nature of the funding

Figure reads: In approximately 67% of districts that received SFSF grants, spending choices for these funds have been influenced to a great extent by the fact that these funds represent one-time resources.

Note: The 95% confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 67 (56, 76); 23 (15, 33); 10 (6, 19). This means, for example, that we are 95% certain that the actual percentage of districts that received SFSF grants and reported that their spending choices were influenced to a great extent by the one-time nature of the funding is between 56% and 76%.

Source: CEP Survey of Local Education Agency Use of ARRA Education Funds, spring 2010.
Figure A7. District perceptions of the benefits of ARRA funds

![Bar chart showing district perceptions of benefits of ARRA funds]

Figure reads: About 83% of school districts reported that they were better off with ARRA funds than they would have been without these funds.

Note: The 95% confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 83 (74, 90); 7 (3, 15); 10 (5, 19). This means, for example, that we are 95% certain that the actual percentage of districts that were better off with ARRA than they would have been without these funds is between 74% and 90%.

Source: CEP Survey of Local Education Agency Use of ARRA Education Funds, spring 2010.

Figure A8. Districts' timelines for spending ARRA funding for Title I and IDEA

![Bar chart showing timelines for ARRA funding spending]

ARRA Title I

- By end of 2009-10: 21% (weighted estimates: 21%, confidence interval 19%-21%)
- By end of 2010-11: 71% (weighted estimates: 71%, confidence interval 69%-71%)
- By end of 2011-12: 9% (weighted estimates: 9%, confidence interval 7%-11%)

ARRA IDEA

- By end of 2009-10: 19% (weighted estimates: 19%, confidence interval 16%-21%)
- By end of 2010-11: 70% (weighted estimates: 70%, confidence interval 67%-74%)
- By end of 2011-12: 12% (weighted estimates: 12%, confidence interval 10%-14%)

Figure reads: An estimated 21% of school districts with Title I ESEA grants had spent or expected to spend all of these funds by the end of school year 2009-10, while about 71% expected to deplete all of these funds by the end of 2010-11 and about 9% by the end of 2011-12.

Note: Percentages do not total 100% due to rounding.
Note: The 95% confidence intervals for the estimates in the ARRA Title I figure are as follows: 21 (13, 31); 70 (60, 80); 9 (5, 16). The 95% confidence intervals for the estimates in the ARRA IDEA figure are as follows: 19 (11, 30); 70 (59, 79); 12 (7, 19). This means, for example, that we are 95% certain that the actual percentage of districts that will have spent all of its ARRA Title I funds by the end of the current school year is between 13% and 31%.

Source: CEP Survey of Local Education Agency Use of ARRA Education Funds, spring 2010.

Figure A9. Percentage of districts receiving ARRA Title I or IDEA money whose spending choices were influenced by the one-time nature of the funding

ARRA Title I

Percent of LEAs that received ARRA Title I funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Level</th>
<th>Weighted Estimates</th>
<th>Confidence Intervals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ARRA IDEA

Percent of LEAs that received ARRA IDEA funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Level</th>
<th>Weighted Estimates</th>
<th>Confidence Intervals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure reads: In about 73% of the districts that received Title I grants through ARRA, spending choices have been influenced to a great extent by the fact that these funds represent one-time resources.

Note: The 95% confidence intervals for the estimates in the ARRA Title I figure are as follows: 73 (64, 81); 24 (16, 33); 3 (1, 10). The 95% confidence intervals for the estimates in the ARRA IDEA figure are as follows: 74 (65, 82); 22 (15, 31); 4 (1, 10). This means, for example, that we are 95% certain that the actual percentage of districts that had their spending choices for their ARRA Title I grant influenced to a great extent by the one-time nature of the funding is between 64% and 81%.

Source: CEP Survey of Local Education Agency Use of ARRA Education Funds, spring 2010.
Table A1. Percentage of districts experiencing problems with various ARRA implementation issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Percent of all LEAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balancing long-term spending priorities and the shorter-term availability of ARRA funds</td>
<td>50% (40, 60); 50% (40, 60); 38 (28, 48); 27 (19, 37); 22 (16, 32); 8 (4, 15); 7 (3, 14); 7 (3, 14).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundant and/or overlapping reporting requirements</td>
<td>62% (52, 72); 73 (63, 81); 78 (68, 86); 92 (85, 96); 93 (86, 97); 93 (86, 97).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delays in communications about state and/or federal requirements for administration and reporting on the uses of ARRA funds</td>
<td>27% (19, 37); 22% (16, 32); 8 (4, 15); 7 (3, 14); 7 (3, 14).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity limits that constrain the LEA in absorbing and using ARRA funds</td>
<td>7% (3, 14); 7% (3, 14); 7% (3, 14); 7% (3, 14); 7% (3, 14).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of capacity to report on spending details for each vendor contract</td>
<td>8% (3, 14); 8% (3, 14); 8% (3, 14); 8% (3, 14); 8% (3, 14).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate resources for technical assistance related to ARRA and related federal requirements</td>
<td>92% (85, 96); 93 (86, 97); 93 (86, 97); 93 (86, 97).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of capacity to report on school-level spending</td>
<td>93% (86, 97); 93% (86, 97); 93% (86, 97); 93% (86, 97).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table reads: Balancing long-term spending priorities and the shorter-term availability of ARRA funds was a major problem for about 50% of districts and a minor problem or not a problem for the remaining 50%.

Note: The 95% confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure for districts identifying an issue as a major problem are as follows: 50 (40, 60); 38 (28, 48); 27 (19, 37); 22 (16, 32); 8 (4, 15); 7 (3, 14); 7 (3, 14). The 95% confidence intervals for the estimates of districts identifying an issue as a minor problem or not a problem are as follows: 50 (40, 60); 62 (52, 72); 73 (63, 81); 78 (68, 86); 92 (85, 96); 93 (86, 97); 93 (86, 97). This means, for example, that we are 95% certain that the actual percentage of districts that experienced problems balancing long-term spending priorities and the short-term availability of ARRA funds is between 40% and 60%.

Source: CEP Survey of Local Education Agency Use of ARRA Education Funds, spring 2010.
Table A2. Percentage of districts needing assistance with specific aspects of ARRA implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Percent of all LEAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relief from particular requirements as established by ARRA or other federal education authorities</td>
<td>26% 74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely dissemination of regulations and guidance that clarify federal intent and/or state and local responsibilities under ARRA</td>
<td>24% 76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of good practices for implementing the four ARRA reform priorities</td>
<td>11% 89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of good practices for dealing with ARRA-related challenges</td>
<td>10% 90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table reads: About 26% of school districts had a major need for assistance with relief from particular requirements established by ARRA or other federal authorities, while about 74% had a minor need or no need for assistance with this aspect of ARRA implementation.

Note: The 95% confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure for districts identifying an issue as a major need are as follows: 26 (18, 36); 24 (17, 34); 11 (6, 19); 10 (6, 16). The 95% confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure for districts identifying an issue as a minor need or not a need are as follows: 74 (64, 82); 76 (66, 83); 89 (81, 94); 90 (84, 95). This means, for example, that we are 95% certain that the actual percentage of districts that need relief from particular requirements as established by ARRA or other education authorities is between 18% and 36%.

Source: CEP Survey of Local Education Agency Use of ARRA Education Funds, spring 2010.