

This response was prepared for Rebecca Himschoot, Alaska State Legislature

Your Question:

You asked for examples of states that have established an oversight body to monitor and improve local implementation of state funding allocations.

Our Response:

States establish oversight boards or commissions to oversee local implementation of the state K-12 funding formula. These bodies are often established after the state has adopted a new K-12 funding formula or the state has made a large infusion of new state investments. The body is often charged with evaluating student outcomes and achievement gaps, reviewing local implementation plans, and evaluating performance of state funded programs, such as teacher preparation or community schools.

Membership on the oversight body typically includes legislative members (the chairs of the education committees), governor's office, state superintendent, state board of education president, commissioner of finance, and appointed members. The appointed members in **Alabama** must have experience in school turnaround and improvement. In **Maryland**, the members are appointed by the governor and confirmed by the senate.

Depending on the state, the body may have the authority to provide a range of interventions for districts that do not meet standards:

- Provide recommendations to the governor and legislature.
- Hold public hearings.
- Recommend corrective actions.
- Withhold state funds.

ECS has summarized the membership and responsibilities of several states that have recently established one or multiple school funding oversight bodies.

Alabama adopted the Renewing Alabama's Investment in Student Excellence (RAISE) Act ([S.B. 305](#)) during the 2025 legislative session creating a new state funding formula for K-12 schools. The RAISE Act establishes two bodies to oversee the implementation of the formula – an accountability and implementation board and a review committee.

The accountability and implementation board monitors the progress of school districts in reaching their goals for student achievement and ensures that funds are spent effectively. The implementation board is led by the chair of the house and senate appropriations committees with membership from the governor, state superintendent of education, legislators, and appointed members with experience in school turnaround and improvement. The board is charged with annually monitoring school district outcomes and reviewing accountability plans. After five years of implementation, the board will identify school districts or individual schools that have not made adequate progress on achievement goals, hold public hearings, and recommend corrective actions.

The review committee determines the effectiveness of the program and recommends revisions for continuous improvement. The committee will also be led by the chairs of the house and senate appropriations committees with representation from the governor and both chambers. The committee will meet annually to review the base funding levels and weighting allocation in the formula; review student achievement data from each student group receiving weighting allocations; and recommend revisions. The initial weighting allocation are [summarized here](#).

Maryland adopted the [Blueprint for Maryland's Future \(H.B. 1300\)](#) in 2021 creating a new funding formula for the state to be phased-in over a 10 year period. Blueprint also established an accountability and implementation board to oversee implementation of the new policies and funding. The [accountability and implementation board](#) is an independent unit of state government that exists throughout the full implementation of Blueprint (2021 – 2031). Board members are appointed by the governor and selected from a list put forward by a nominating committee and confirmed by the senate. The board is charged with developing a comprehensive implementation plan for the state and reviewing local implementation plans. The state and local implementation plans must be posted on a public website.

In addition, the board is charged with evaluating the outcomes achieved during implementation of blueprint and partnering with the state's longitudinal data system. The board is directed to examine the effects of Blueprint on student performance over time with an emphasis on closing achievement gaps between student groups by race, ethnicity, disability status, household income, and linguistic status. Student outcomes to be examined include absenteeism, disciplinary action, enrichment opportunities, and meaningful family involvement. The board is also charged with monitoring programs for teacher preparation, school-level diversity, and community schools, among others.

The board is also permitted to withhold state funds from school districts that fail to adopt a local implementation plan that is approved by the local school board.

Tennessee adopted the [Tennessee Investment in Student Achievement \(TISA\)](#) formula in 2022 ([H.B. 2143](#)) creating a new state K-12 funding formula. TISA also established new accountability measures for local school districts ([TISA Guide 2025-26](#) pg. 50), including the creation of two oversight bodies – a review committee and a progress review board.

The review committee meets quarterly to review funding levels for the base amount, weighted allocations, direct allocations, and the student outcome incentives and to recommend any needed revisions. The committee must provide an annual report to the governor, state board of education, and legislative appropriations committees. Membership for the committee must include the executive director of the state board, commissioner of education, commissioner of finance, comptroller, director of the commission on intergovernmental relations, and chairs of education committees in the legislature.

The progress review board sets minimum goals for local school districts to increase third-grade student performance on the English language arts portion of the state's annual assessment. The board is also charged with reviewing the accountability reports submitted by school districts and determining if further action is necessary, such as recommending to the commissioner that districts are required to take additional training on how to budget to increase student achievement. Membership for the board includes the commissioner of education, chair of the state board of education, and members appointed by the speaker of the senate and the house in the state legislature.