



○
Bringing Title I
into the
Twenty-first
Century

By Susan Pendergrass



Table of Contents

Foreword	3
Introduction	4
The Impact of Title I	5
On academic achievement.....	5
On reducing poverty.....	6
On eliminating the spending gaps between low-income and non-low-income districts.....	6
The Current Title I Formulas	8
Title I in Today’s Educational Landscape	10
Parental choice in education	10
Technological change and the distribution of federal aid	11
Potential Evolution for Title I Aid	12
Identifying eligible students.....	12
Determining the amount to be distributed per eligible student	13
Assessing the Impact of Title I Portability on the Distribution of Funds in Two States	14
The Impact of Changing Title I Distribution	15
Conclusion	15
Appendix	16

Foreword

The Foundation for Excellence in Education (ExcelinEd) and the American Federation for Children (AFC) are pleased to introduce Dr. Susan Pendergrass's seminal paper on the topic of modernizing Title I funding allocations. Dr. Pendergrass is the Director of Research and Education Policy at the Show-Me Institute in St. Louis, MO.

There are nearly 57 million elementary and secondary school-aged students in America attending both public and private schools. Many of these students are from low-income families and they do not have access to the same resources and educational opportunities as their more affluent peers. We believe that each student, regardless of his or her family's financial means, deserves access to a quality education that provides the knowledge, skills and values necessary to be prepared for a successful career and fulfilling life.

To this end, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), a cornerstone of President Lyndon B. Johnson's "War on Poverty," was designed to provide financial assistance to schools and school districts (i.e. local educational agencies—LEAs) with high numbers and percentages of students from low-income families.

A central objective of the Title I program was to improve the academic achievement of disadvantaged students. To ensure equitable educational opportunity for students from low-income families, Title I attempts to equalize educational resources for them by addressing spending gaps between low-income and non-low-income school districts and schools.

It has been over 50 years since ESEA was signed into law, so we believe it is time to ask – has ESEA met its stated objectives?

In this paper, Dr. Pendergrass explores the impact of Title I on reducing poverty, on the academic achievement of low-income students, and on the elimination of the spending gaps between low-income and non-low-income districts. Dr. Pendergrass also highlights the increasing complexity of Title I funding over the years.

Most importantly, this paper explores how the Title I program fits into today's educational landscape and how it can evolve to better meet the needs of the students the program was designed to serve.

Finally, Dr. Pendergrass posits that our federal lawmakers must improve the Title I program, given the rise of parental choice in education, the limited transparency in current Title I funding formulas, and the lack of evidence of the effectiveness of the Title I program as currently designed.

One innovative solution would be to make federal aid to low-income students portable to their school of choice – Dr. Pendergrass explores the potential impact of this approach in a state-based case study.

We are delighted to share Dr. Pendergrass's thoughts on this topic. At ExcelinEd and AFC, we believe all students should have access to a world-class education and that policy at all levels of government has a role to play in ensuring all students, especially children from low-income families, have that access.

Introduction

Like all things, the role of education in American public life is constantly evolving. What was originally a system for training men in religious doctrine gave way to assimilating immigrants into society, removing children from the labor force, and creating a skilled workforce.¹ In the middle of the twentieth century, public education in the US took on another role – that of solving the strife of civil unrest through eliminating poverty.

When President Lyndon B. Johnson took office in 1963, winning the “War on Poverty” became one of his central goals. He introduced the term in his State of the Union address and immediately began creating programs to win the “war.” In 1964, when the Civil Rights Act was passed and the poverty level was at 19 percent, the craftsmen behind the Great Society programs believed they could use federal policies to dramatically reduce or completely eliminate a host of social ills, including poverty.² Because the US Constitution gave the federal government no jurisdiction over public education, thereby delegating it to the states, earlier attempts at federal aid to education had failed. As civil unrest mounted, however, President Johnson created the Gardner Commission to figure out how the federal government could take a role in equalizing educational resources for low-income children.

In 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was passed just three months after it was introduced.³ The bill, largely designed by President Johnson’s Education Commissioner, Francis Keppel, was an attempt to reduce the resource gap between “educationally deprived” children and their wealthier peers via a compensatory aid program.⁴ “Educationally deprived” was a new term to describe a particular category of student who was to receive federal funding under Title I of the Act. The law was designed this way to satisfy concerns about federal overreach in education and it was pioneering, in that it provided categorical federal aid for the purpose of redress through additional funding for children living in poverty, rather than creating another general funding program.⁵ At the time, consideration was given to providing general federal aid, but only to public schools, which was expected to upset Catholic school leaders, or providing general federal aid to both public and private schools, which was expected to upset the National Education Association (NEA), the largest national teachers’ union at the time.⁶ Ultimately, it was determined that providing additional educational dollars based on the number of students who are living in poverty would have the broadest support amongst influential stakeholders.

To celebrate the signing of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) into law, President Johnson held an event in front of the one-room schoolhouse that he attended as a child, with his teacher, Miss Katie Dearth, by his side. In his speech, President Johnson asserted that, through ESEA and the Title I funding it established, America was “rekindling the revolution – the revolution of the spirit against the tyranny of ignorance. As a son of a tenant farmer, I know that education is the only valid passport from poverty.”⁷ In addition to addressing the need to equalize educational resources for low-income students, the law recognized that schools with high concentrations of students who live in poverty should receive higher levels of Title I funding, as they likely serve generally low-income neighborhoods with a milieu of poverty-related difficulties.⁸

Fifty years after passage of the original ESEA, we need to ask ourselves – did ESEA reduce poverty by improving the academic achievement of low-income students? Did ESEA equalize opportunity for low-income children by eliminating the spending gaps between low-income and non-low-income districts and schools? Is ESEA still an appropriate approach for the conditions of the current century? And, if not, what changes can be made to ensure that the Title I funds established by ESEA better serve the law’s purpose – to help low-income children access an excellent education? In today’s education landscape, in which parents have a wider variety of options, perhaps it’s time to make federal aid to low-income students portable to the school of their choice.

The Impact of Title I

On academic achievement

The original ESEA, as passed in 1965, was only 32 pages long (as a point of reference, the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 was 392 pages) and it included only one formula for determining the amount of Title I funds that should be allocated to each school district - the Basic Grant.⁹ The original grant formula was based on Census estimates of the number of children living below the poverty line in each district.¹⁰ Beyond that, the original legislation did not specify how states, districts, or schools should use the funds. At the time, the US Office of Education at the Department Health, Education and Welfare (now divided into the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Education), which administered federal education policy prior to the creation of the Department of Education in 1980, was likely not equipped to create program guidelines or to administer a program of such a large scope and size.¹¹

In addition, little research was available to inform schools about the best use of the funds to improve the academic achievement of low-income students. In fact, in 1966, the Coleman Report, authorized and financed by Congress under a mandate of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to study the “lack of availability of equal educational opportunities,” found that the impact of schools on reducing achievement gaps is very limited in comparison to the impact of a child’s home environment.¹²

Twice Congress has ordered national assessments of Title I as a condition of reauthorizing the legislation. The 1999 National Assessment and follow-up studies, which used the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) – a nationally representative student assessment administered by the US Department of Education - found that over the decade between 1988 and 1999, achievement gaps between low-income students and non-low-income students widened.¹³ Persistent achievement gaps can undermine even a high quality system of education if gains made by low-income students are smaller, or even the same, as those made by non-low-income students, therefore maintaining or increasing inequality. The report also found that achievement gaps between high-poverty students and low-poverty students remained substantial in the late 1990’s – equivalent to several grades of learning. For example, in 1999, the percentage of students in the highest poverty schools who met or exceeded the NAEP Basic level in reading was only 32 percent, about half of the national average of 61 percent. Finally, the 1999 National Assessment highlighted that about two-thirds of Title I funds go to students in elementary schools (through 6th grade), with middle and high schools receiving considerably less. This is likely due to the nearly universal use of the number or percentage of students in the USDA’s National School Lunch Program (NSLP) as the mechanism to distribute funds to schools, with high school students being the least likely to participate in the lunch program. Although the original law did not mention the use of participation in the lunch program as a proxy for identifying low-income students, it was later amended to make it one of the five allowable measures.¹⁴

In 1966, the Coleman Report, authorized and financed by Congress under a mandate of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to study the “lack of availability of equal educational opportunities,” found that the impact of schools on reducing achievement gaps is very limited in comparison to the impact of a child’s home environment.

The 2007 National Assessment and follow-up studies also found that Title I was largely ineffective in closing any achievement gaps for disadvantaged students.¹⁵ “State assessments and NAEP both provided some indications that achievement gaps between disadvantaged students and other students may be narrowing, but recent changes are small.” The report noted that the number of students being served through Title I had tripled – from 6.7 million to 20 million – due to the increasing use of the “schoolwide” designation for schools. This designation allows for an entire school to be considered Title I-eligible if 40 percent or more of enrolled students qualify for free or reduced-price lunch (FRPL). And, the study found, the percentage of funds going to elementary schools had increased to 74 percent, with 14 percent going to middle schools and just 10 percent to high schools.

A meta-analysis of the impact of Title I spending on academic achievement, conducted by Borman and D'Agostino, of 17 federal Title I evaluations between 1966 and 1993 found:

- The overall effect on Title I student academic performance is positive, but small.
- The effects are stronger in grades 1-6 and in mathematics.
- The effects decline to almost nothing from grades 7-12.¹⁶

The Prospects Study, which used a nationally-representative sample of 40,000 students, found that over four years, from 1991-1994, exposure to Title I did not have an impact on the size of the achievement gap between Title I participants and non-participants.¹⁷

A recent report by Sousa and Armor, which analyzed NAEP data from 1992 through 2013, but for individual students rather than for schools, confirmed that the size of achievement gaps between low-income and non-low-income students have remained steady for about 15 years.¹⁸ The authors concluded that Title I has been largely ineffective, given that it costs about \$15 billion per year and has had negligible impact on the academic performance of low-income students.

Title I has been largely ineffective, given that it costs about \$15 billion per year and has had negligible impact on the academic performance of low-income students.

On reducing poverty

While the rate of all persons living in poverty declined steadily in the latter half of the last century, from about 22 percent in 1960 to 11 percent in 2000, by 2014 it had increased to 15 percent.¹⁹ For children, the rate went from 21 percent in 1960 to 10 percent in 2000 and is now back up to 13 percent. At the same time, participation in the National School Lunch Program explained above, which provides subsidized meals to low-income students, increased from 38 percent in 2000-01 to 52 percent in 2013-14.²⁰ One significant reason that more than half of the public school students in the US now qualify for the program is that the US Department of Agriculture, which administers the program, now allows for a designation of “community eligibility” in which all students in a school, group of schools, or district in which at least 40 percent of children are identified as eligible, can participate in the program. As a result of this new definition, it is now harder to identify schools with actual concentrations of low-income students. In addition, schools with at least 40 percent of their students in the free or reduced-price lunch program can qualify for “school wide” Title I funding, in which all students are considered eligible for Title I. The creation of these two programs, while well-intentioned, has resulted in making it much more difficult to focus Title I funds on those students who are most in need of assistance.

On eliminating the spending gaps between low-income and non-low-income districts

As mentioned previously, when ESEA was passed in 1965, not much guidance was provided as to how to distribute the funds or administer any programs. Not surprisingly, early evaluations found that schools made little, if any, adjustments to the services offered to low-income students, districts often distributed the funds unequally, and money was often spent on non-low-income students.²¹ In 1970, Congress added a “supplement, not supplant” provision to the law, which prohibits states and districts from using Title I funds to balance their books.²² In other words, Title I money must be distributed in addition to (supplement) any other funding that a school would normally receive. Implementation of this provision, however, continues to be debated.

In FY2016, approximately **\$13.6 billion** (see Table 1) was appropriated for Title I under No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) – the reauthorized version of ESEA at the time.²³ In that same year, over 22.7 million students qualified for the free lunch program, which is intended for students whose household income is below 130 percent of the poverty threshold, and another 3.1 million students qualified for reduced-price lunch, which is intended for students whose household income is between 130 and 185 percent of the poverty threshold, for a total of over 25 million students. The Census estimated that, in 2016, approximately 9.6 million children were living in poverty.²⁴ Therefore, on a national basis, in 2015-16 the federal government appropriated Title I funds equivalent to approximately \$1,405 per child living in poverty, \$597 per free lunch student, and \$525 per free or reduced-price lunch student. Free or reduced-price lunch is what is generally used to distribute Title I funds.

The national numbers, however, lose much of their meaning when considering the substantial variation at the state, district, and school level. This variation is caused by a combination of politically negotiated rules in the grant formulas and discretion in the distribution of funds. Looking only at the state level (see Table 1), Utah received funding equivalent to \$262 per FRPL student, while North Dakota received over \$1,000 per FRPL eligible student. In fact, the “small state minimum,” which will be discussed in more detail later, results in states such as Vermont, with an estimated 11 percent poverty rate for children under the age of 18 in 2016, receiving almost \$1,000 per FRPL student, while some of the poorest states, such as Oklahoma (23 percent poverty rate), received just \$374 per FRPL student.

Table 1 - State-level comparison of per-student amounts in federal Title I aid for various categories of low-income students²⁵

State Name	Federal Title I Revenue FY2016	Free Lunch Eligible Students 2015-162	Reduced-price Lunch Eligible Students 2015-16	Total Free and Reduced Lunch Eligible Students 2015-16	Title I Revenue per FRPL Student 2015-16	Title I revenue per FL student 2015-16	(SAIPE) of children age 5-17 living in poverty 2016	Title I revenue per child in poverty 2016
AL	\$226,398,000	345,220	34,334	379,554	\$596	\$656	185,889	\$1,218
AK	43,804,000	51,274	5,338	56,612	774	854	16,061	2,727
AZ*	307,313,000	398,775	155,001	553,776	555	771	263,614	1,166
AR	156,662,000	274,439	38,038	312,477	501	571	112,376	1,394
CA	1,798,207,000	3,107,633	549,645	3,657,278	492	579	1,242,780	1,447
CO	151,971,000	309,990	66,167	376,157	404	490	115,917	1,311
CT	109,632,000	177,515	26,099	203,614	538	618	67,644	1,621
DE	40,942,000	50,459	-	50,459	811	811	23,942	1,710
DC	29,450,000	53,159	9,177	62,336	472	554	21,997	1,339
FL	808,874,000	1,340,255	118,049	1,458,304	555	604	594,181	1,361
GA	534,973,000	1,004,357	92,055	1,096,412	488	533	390,690	1,369
HI	51,530,000	72,911	17,387	90,298	571	707	21,877	2,355
ID	56,686,000	109,717	27,420	137,137	413	517	47,196	1,201
IL	681,879,000	940,380	66,520	1,006,900	677	725	356,538	1,913
IN	236,462,000	429,500	75,287	504,787	468	551	201,287	1,175
IA	91,089,000	171,899	35,219	207,118	440	530	67,487	1,350
KS	108,074,000	195,066	45,143	240,209	450	554	67,810	1,594
KY	222,318,000	373,673	34,324	407,997	545	595	164,086	1,355
LA	249,555,000	386,401	32,861	419,262	595	646	214,016	1,166
ME	50,600,000	69,890	11,273	81,163	623	724	28,137	1,798
MD	199,198,000	350,842	44,992	395,834	503	568	117,468	1,696
MA*	192,352,000	344,073	37,515	381,588	504	559	123,789	1,554
MI	378,384,000	600,138	85,125	685,263	552	630	297,400	1,272
MN	131,500,000	264,157	64,906	329,063	400	498	106,426	1,236
MS	192,037,000	338,667	26,442	365,109	526	567	151,716	1,266
MO	233,947,000	403,939	56,029	459,968	509	579	171,750	1,362
MT	52,316,000	57,034	8,005	65,039	804	917	24,064	2,174
NE	91,063,000	109,333	27,824	137,157	664	833	41,851	2,176
NV	120,606,000	230,426	37,366	267,792	450	523	88,913	1,356
NH	40,052,000	43,642	7,701	51,343	780	918	14,329	2,795
NJ	289,445,000	446,650	67,729	514,379	563	648	197,218	1,468
NM	112,519,000	225,462	14,078	239,540	470	499	93,042	1,209
NY	1,033,004,000	1,186,390	130,590	1,316,980	784	871	585,700	1,764
NC	421,247,000	812,363	73,835	886,198	475	519	336,152	1,253
ND	35,717,000	27,019	6,676	33,695	1,060	1,322	12,289	2,906
OH	485,088,000	689,546	76,914	766,460	633	703	348,713	1,391
OK	158,650,000	368,864	55,801	424,665	374	430	143,615	1,105
OR	150,273,000	242,386	40,120	282,506	532	620	97,096	1,548
PA	496,672,000	742,861	59,176	802,037	619	669	329,959	1,505
RI	44,748,000	58,303	7,692	65,995	678	768	25,687	1,742
SC	222,254,000	421,826	36,453	458,279	485	527	172,272	1,290
SD	43,698,000	45,362	10,334	55,696	785	963	22,601	1,933
TN*	289,968,000	511,210	67,647	578,857	501	567	226,833	1,278
TX	1,286,933,000	2,806,574	317,077	3,123,651	412	459	1,111,489	1,158
UT	61,731,000	187,749	48,111	235,860	262	329	65,123	948
VT	31,630,000	26,607	5,747	32,354	978	1,189	10,384	3,046
VA	232,425,000	448,798	75,174	523,972	444	518	180,953	1,284
WA	245,554,000	415,314	77,622	492,936	498	591	146,993	1,671
WV*	91,355,000	122,963	22,444	145,407	628	743	59,301	1,541
WI	199,475,000	293,837	48,388	342,225	583	679	132,061	1,510
WY	34,001,000	26,346	9,116	34,546	984	1,291	9,774	3,479
TOTALS:	\$13,554,261,000	22,711,194	3,085,966	25,797,160	\$525	\$597	9,648,486	\$1,405

Just looking at spending gaps in public school districts that enroll more than 15,000 students, in 2013-14 districts such as Sunnyside, AZ, with a poverty rate of 38 percent, spent a total of \$6,654 per student (in current expenditures), while districts such as Columbus, OH, with the same poverty rate, spent \$13,585 per student.²⁶ And Edison Township, NJ, with a poverty rate of just 7.1 percent, spent \$14,984 per student. Sunnyside, AZ received \$1,233 in Title I revenue per student living in poverty, Columbus, OH received \$1,794, and Edison Township, NJ received \$1,255. To be fair, there may be a higher cost of living in Edison Township, NJ than in Arizona, but probably no more than double.²⁷ And low-income students in rural areas have challenges of their own that require educational resources.²⁸

Further, districts have some discretion in distributing funds to schools. A recent analysis of district-level distribution found the four existing federal formulas to be “complicated and outdated.” More troubling, the study, conducted in 2014 by researchers at Georgetown University and the University of Washington, found that in nearly every mid-size and large school district, the poorest schools continue to “get the short end of the stick.” The study’s authors recommend giving districts flexibility in distributing funds, including making them portable, in exchange for complete transparency in how they are distributed.

It is likely that spending gaps will always exist, as different districts and states are committed and capable of different levels of effort. However, a fundamental purpose of the Title I program was to equalize these differences and that does not seem to have occurred. Allowing Title I funds to follow disadvantaged children to the public and private school of their parent’s choice would improve equity and transparency.

Allowing Title I funds to follow disadvantaged children to the public and private school of their parent’s choice would improve equity and transparency.

The Current Title I Formulas

When ESEA was passed in 1965 it contained a single formula for distributing the funds – the Basic Grant.²⁹ The Basic Grant uses Census estimates of the number of children living in poverty within the boundary of each public school district. To receive Basic Grant funds, a district must have at least 10 children who are eligible, based on the Census estimates, and these 10 children must account for at least two percent of the school-aged population in the district. A consistent 99 percent of the nearly 13,500 school districts in the US meet that threshold.

The amount of federal revenue to be allocated to each eligible student is then determined as 40 percent of the state per-pupil expenditure (SPPE), provided that this amount falls between 32 percent and 48 percent of the national SPPE average.³⁰ Using the SPPE is intended to create balance between states in which education spending is higher and those where it is lower. So, if a state spends less than 32 percent of the national average, their SPPE is brought up to the 32 percent threshold and if they spend more than 48 percent of the national average, their SPPE is reduced to the 48 percent threshold. The initial Title I Basic Grant allocation, therefore, is the number of eligible children in each district multiplied by 40 percent of the SPPE for their state.

Since the initial passage of ESEA, the Basic Grant has been joined by three others – the Concentration Grant, the Targeted Grant, and the Education Finance Incentive Grant (EFIG).³¹ These grants make the Basic Grant look simplistic and place further distance between the number of children in poverty and the funding a district receives. The Concentration and Targeted grants are more complicated than the Basic Grant and direct higher amounts per pupil to districts with higher percentages (or numbers) of students living in poverty. The EFIG is by far the most complicated. It involves a tighter restriction on the SPPE (between 34 and 46 percent of the national average), an “effort factor,” and an “equity factor.”

In the EFIG, the effort factor is based on comparing state education spending and state per-capita income to the national averages – to see how much effort, or percent of their per-capita income, a state is putting towards education.³² However, the effort factor does not consider other state issues like budget problems or less tax revenue, which may lead to further punishing disadvantaged students in economically struggling states. The equity factor is based on a weighted coefficient of variation, which measures the amount of variation, or dispersion, of numbers around their average, and is meant to reward states for distributing funds more evenly. Suffice it to say – it’s complicated. In the end, there are 60 weighting categories within EFIG used to determine the number and/or percentage of students eligible for funds

Once these calculations have been performed, and district-level allocations have been rolled up to a single number, the total ends up being higher than the amount that Congress appropriates. Therefore, the allocation has to be re-run several times – forcing “rate-able,” or proportionate, reductions across the 50 states, based on the total amount of money that Congress has made available for Title I.³³ In addition, several compromises were made during the legislative process of ESEA that make the allocation much more complicated.³⁴ First, small states were concerned that they would receive too small of an allocation to make a difference. So, any state that is set to receive less than 0.25 percent of the total federal Title I funds or less than the number of children times 150 percent of the national average per-pupil payment, has their allocation raised to meet the lowest of those two thresholds. Second, a hold-harmless provision was instated that guarantees that districts with up to 15 percent of children living in poverty will not receive less than 85 percent of what they received in the prior year, regardless of changes in enrollment and poverty levels, with a 90 percent guarantee of what a district received in the prior year for districts with between 15 and 30 percent poverty, and a 95 percent guarantee for districts with 30 percent or more of their children living in poverty. Clearly small-state and hold-harmless provisions further distance the relationship between funding and actual poverty levels in a district’s current student population. These provisions are based on maintaining the funding of a system, not funding the actual low-income children who Title I is intended to help.

These provisions are based on maintaining the funding of a system, not funding the actual low-income children who Title I is intended to help.

Once this process is complete, and the district-level results are finalized for the more than 13,500 districts in the US, they are rolled up to the state level. Funds are distributed to each state education agency (SEA), with notification of the amount that each district should receive. However, as discussed earlier, states have some discretion in their allocation. Districts are then given further discretion as to how they distribute the funds at the school level. In most cases, however, it is tied to the number of students who qualify for FRPL, which has a diminishing relationship with children living in poverty. Recall that over 50 percent of US students qualified for FRPL in 2013-14, and that FRPL includes students whose household income is up to 185 percent of the federal poverty threshold, or \$44,955 annual income for a family of four in 2016, as well as non-low-income students who attend a school in which at least 40 percent of students qualify for FRPL.

The result of this complicated process is that the original intent of the law – to distribute dollars to equalize resources for low-income students – has been lost. There is substantial disconnect between the number of low-income students, state per-pupil spending, and what is actually received in federal education revenue. The variation between states, mentioned earlier, is probably partly due to the small state minimum, partly due to lower state spending in those states and partly due to the number of students being educated. However, it is impossible to know the impact of each of these nuances, and the unpredictability and complexity created by the political process merits a consolidation and complete overhaul of the four formulas. In fact, for a district to know if they have received the “correct” amount in a given year, they would have to know the amounts received by every other district in the US, both this year and last year. Districts are probably aware of the hold-harmless rule, and maybe even the three thresholds, but that is based on a presumption that the prior year was correct. The incredible variation at the state, district and school levels defies explanation or understanding.

What we do know is that Title I dollars are spent on non-low-income children and many low-income children receive nothing through the program. We also know that the connection between living in poverty and receiving a free or reduced-price lunch is becoming more nebulous. This is part of the reason that only ten percent of the appropriated dollars are spent at the high school level – even though high school is a critically weak link in our system.³⁵ Further, we know that many students receive the equivalent of a few hundred dollars from the federal government, or somewhere in the 0-5 percent range of total per-pupil spending, rather than 40 percent as set by the original legislation. Unlike this deeply complicated and opaque process, in which the distribution of Title I funds is loosely related to disadvantaged children, states could be given the ability to design a system in which a consistent amount is received by each student living in poverty and those funds could follow the student to the school of their choice.

Title I in Today's Educational Landscape

There is a depressingly strong link between growing up in poverty and having no, or only downward, social mobility.³⁶ A high quality education, from the earliest years, likely holds the most promise for breaking that link. The War on Poverty was a noble effort and it is admirable that those who initiated the policies aimed to literally eliminate the condition of poverty. With fifty years of hindsight, however, knowing that many of these programs didn't work as intended and didn't produce measurable results, despite spending hundreds of billions of dollars, it's time for an overhaul.

In addition to the lack of equity and transparency in the current distribution of Title I funds, there have been major changes in education over the last several decades that render it outdated. These include parental choice in education, exponential growth in the rate of technological change with increasing access to data, and a growing body of research regarding what a "high quality" education looks like. Looking towards the future, we can only expect that these trends will continue.

In addition to the lack of equity and transparency in the current distribution of Title I funds, there have been major changes in education over the last several decades that render it outdated.

Parental choice in education

For most of the 20th century, public school students and their parents could expect to be assigned to a public school based on their address, with no other public options. Schools were largely locally funded and their quality was reflected by the property values of their district's boundaries. Those with the financial means moved to the neighborhood with the school of their choice. Ironically, just as the Civil Rights movement was gaining ground, this meant moving to the suburbs for many middle-class, White parents, which had a dramatically negative impact on urban property values.³⁷ Urban school districts struggled with increasingly disadvantaged student populations and fewer resources to serve them. And the parents and students who were stuck in them had few alternatives other than their low-performing neighborhood school.

In the 1970's and 1980's, however, change began to come to the student assignment system in many urban districts, as parents and students were given the option of choosing their child's public school through open enrollment.³⁸ Intra-district choice programs allow parents to choose a school within the district in which they lived. Inter-district choice programs allow students to cross district lines. And magnet schools were created with special instructional programs to serve students across a district.

A new form of public schools, charter schools, came on to the scene in the early 1990's and offered teachers and other stakeholders the opportunity to innovate by opening a public school that was not subject to the restrictions of most school board policies.³⁹ According to the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, there are now nearly 7,000 charter schools in 43 states, plus the District of Columbia, serving three million public school students.⁴⁰ One particular way that charter schools have innovated, which may not have been anticipated when the policy was proposed, is in serving low-income students in urban school districts. Some of the largest and most successful charter school networks focus directly on these students and they have been able to achieve incredible results.⁴¹

This has placed charter schools in high demand in the lowest performing urban districts where parents are not able to move to the neighborhood or school of their choice and, in these districts, they tend to serve disproportionately high percentages of low-income students. In 2015-16, approximately one-third of charter school students attended a school in which at least three-quarters of the students were eligible for FRPL, compared to 24 percent of students in non-charter public schools.⁴² And, there are now more than 19 urban school districts with at least 30 percent of their total public school enrollment in charter schools, many with long wait lists of students who would attend a charter school if they could.⁴³

In a recent nationally-representative survey of parents of school-aged children, when asked whether they favor or oppose allowing students and their parents to choose which public schools in the community the students attend, regardless of their address, 62 percent of parents with a household income of less than \$50,000 said they strongly favor it, as did 63 percent of Black parents.⁴⁴ These parents want what all parents want – access to high-quality schools.

In addition to increasing public school choice options, many parents now have access to publicly-funded private education choice. These programs include vouchers, tax-credit scholarships, and Education Savings Accounts, also known as Education Scholarship Accounts (ESAs). As of the 2016-17 school year, over 442,000 low-income students were benefiting from these programs.⁴⁵

A voucher is a publicly-funded scholarship that a parent can use to pay for a private school education. Vouchers were first enacted in Wisconsin in 1990 for low-income students only, and, as of 2016-17, 13 states and the District of Columbia had passed 23 voucher laws.⁴⁶ A tax-credit scholarship gives a full or partial tax credit to individuals or corporations that donate money to a nonprofit organization that provides scholarships to students to attend a private K–12 school. Tax credits are among the fastest growing private education choice programs. In 2016-17, 18 states offered parents 21 tax credit scholarship options. ESAs are accounts that parents can use to pay for state-approved education expenses, such as tutoring, to create an educational experience customized for their child. As of 2016-17, six states had enacted ESA programs.

The result of the emergence of these programs is that low-income parents in some of our worst-performing urban districts now have a variety of public and private options for their children and the demand for those is increasing. The current Title I formulas do not match well with a system that is moving away from school assignment towards parental choice. Even if they functioned well, they do not account for the different types of education environments that low-income parents are choosing for their children.

Technological change and the distribution of federal aid

At the same time that more parents expect to be able to choose their child's school, there is a lack of innovation in the distribution of federal public school funding through the Title I program. Technology-driven advancements are occurring in nearly every sector of the economy, and there is no valid reason that public education should not follow suit. Improvements in the administration of other government programs can provide important lessons for Title I reform.

For example, the Food Stamp Act of 1964 originally required participants to purchase orange and blue stamps equal to their normal expenditures for food, with the value of the stamps being equivalent to a “low-cost nutritionally adequate diet.”⁴⁷ Participants received “store due” receipts rather than cash as change and were required to have cooking facilities. Most of these provisions have since been eliminated with the advancement of technology. The “food stamp” program is now referred to as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and participants receive their benefits in an account by electronic benefits transfer (EBT) for which they have the equivalent of a debit card. This came about through the Electronic Benefit Transfer Interoperability and Portability Act of 2000.⁴⁸ EBT cards can be swiped at the register, require a PIN, and recognize there is no need to stigmatize participants by forcing them to look different than other customers. The individual participant, when they swipe their EBT card, in effect authorizes the transfer of government benefits to a private retailer. Some states are now using EBT cards for two other programs: USDA's Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) and Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) – a federal block grant program under the Department of Health and Human Services. In addition to improving the ease of use for participants, they reduce administrative costs and allow for greater accountability by providing an electronic record of each transaction.

The Pell Grant program, established under President Nixon in 1972, provides postsecondary aid that does not need to be repaid to low-income college students.⁴⁹ Like the debate around ESEA in 1965, consideration was given to enact formula-based federal aid that would go directly to the institution. However, according to Lawrence Gladieux, an historian on federal student aid, it was determined that “Funding aid to students was the more efficient and effective way to remove financial barriers for needy students and thus equalize opportunities for higher education. Congress also viewed student aid as a way to harness market forces for enhancing the quality of higher education. Students, voting with their feet, would take their federal aid to institutions that met their needs; less satisfactory institutions would wither.”⁵⁰ This same logic could be applied to Title I funds, with aid going directly to the school that a parent chooses.

Today, recipients of Pell Grants fill out the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) to determine eligibility. The FAFSA form is able to access, with permission, the student and/or parent's tax returns from the prior year. The student's FAFSA

is shared with the colleges that they designate on their form. Once a student's FAFSA is processed, the funds are distributed directly from the federal government to the student's account at the institution. Any funds beyond what is owed to the institution are distributed to the student directly via cash, check or electronic deposit.

These are just two examples of federal programs, implemented decades ago, that have evolved as technology and conditions have evolved. These programs are now able to more effectively, efficiently, and transparently distribute targeted public funds to those individuals whom the programs are intended to serve. Title I funding, however, has not changed in decades.

Some states have been innovating, however. For example, in one of Arizona's private school choice options, the Empowerment Scholarship Accounts, families are able to tailor their education spending by purchasing educational services from a limited list of options using a restricted-use debit card that draws on funds deposited by the state into their account.⁵¹

As states have been implementing programs similar to the SNAP consumer-directed, federally-supervised account that access public funds, so too could federal Title I funds flow into a state-supervised account that could be used at a parent-chosen public or private school or for pre-approved educational expenses. Alternatively, states could adopt a Pell grant approach and Title I funds could flow to the public school that a student chooses or to a private school scholarship program. Programs such as this prove that it is technologically possible to give parents both the ability to choose a school and control over the public funds for which their child qualifies.

Potential Evolution for Title I Aid

The growing presence of parental choice in education, the extreme lack of transparency in the Title I formulas, the lack of evidence that Title I has been effective up to this point, coupled with new research and available technology, suggest that innovation is needed in the Title I program. Title I clearly needs to be reformed at the federal level, but, initially, innovation could be tried at the state level, with an assumption that the total amount of Title I funding available to a state would continue to be calculated by the four grant formulas and the state would receive that amount as a block grant. If a few states opted to create more transparent and portable mechanisms for distributing Title I funds to low-income children, then the changes could ultimately be made at the federal level as well. Generally, the steps that would be required are:

- 1 Identify eligible students,
- 2 Determine the amount to be distributed per student, and
- 3 Use available technology to distribute the funds directly to the school or private education choice program an eligible student chooses.

Identifying eligible students

To make Title I funds more accountable and effective requires discontinuing the use of FRPL eligibility to identify children who qualify for the program. As previously mentioned, while over half of all public school students in the US qualify for the lunch program, only about 20 percent of children are living in poverty, according to the Census Bureau.⁵² As a result, Title I funds are being distributed according to a measure that no longer correctly identifies the children who were originally intended to benefit from the program. In addition, by using this measure, the amount of funding per students averages out to just \$527. This amount may be beneficial to students who have other resources, but those who are truly living in poverty and experiencing the negative impacts that come with it, are unlikely to have their educational outcomes impacted by that amount.

Title I funds are being distributed according to a measure that no longer correctly identifies the children who were originally intended to benefit from the program.

Title I funds would be more effective if they were directed at those children who are actually living in poverty—which in 2016 would have been an annual income of \$24,300 for a family of four—with an average benefit of over \$1,400 per student. Many

researchers assert that free or reduced-price lunch is used as a proxy for poverty because we have no better measure. However, the massive increase in administrative capacity created by the digital age makes it entirely possible that schools could identify students who qualify for federal compensatory aid separately from the school lunch program. Here are a few examples of how that might be done.

- **Use the FRPL form** - The form that is used to identify students for the FRPL program, which lists income limits, as well as sources of income that must be included, could be used. These forms, while somewhat burdensome for parents, would provide sufficient information, as long as the burden for completing the form is shifted to the school or private education choice program administrator.
- **Provide schools with access to existing eligibility documents** - Another option would be to provide access to existing eligibility documents, such as those for SNAP or TANF. Anyone who participates in these programs would have already provided the needed documentation and the information is stored digitally.
- **Collect additional eligibility documents** - Schools could request that parents provide documents such as two consecutive pay stubs, or an employer letter, similar to the approach used in Preschool Expansion Grants, a federal program that allows eligible children to access seats in privately-run preschools.⁵³
- **Access parent tax returns** - Finally, a FAFSA-like form could be developed to be completed by the school, with parental permission required to access the prior year's tax return.

If the school were responsible for collecting and validating the required documentation, and it were in their best interest to do so, eligibility for Title I funds could then be set at whatever level a state deemed appropriate – poverty or some multiplier of poverty.

Thus, to create a more portable Title I distribution would require schools to report the number of students who qualify and to provide the documentation. If a school or private education choice program were directly provided with a base amount of Title I funding per student identified, then it would be in their best interest to ensure that all eligible students are identified. Not only would this be more transparent, it would be more equitable for distributing funds at the middle and high school levels, where FRPL programs are often passed up. In addition, Title I funding would follow the child to the educational options of their choice and researchers would be able to more effectively assess the impact of the program on low-income students.

Determining the amount to be distributed per eligible student

As was previously described, there is substantial variation in per-student Title I funding between states, within states, and within districts. A portable Title I approach would set a base amount per student and distribute that amount to the students who are identified as eligible. In a scenario where a state is given a block grant to develop portable funding, the state could deposit the amount directly into a public school's account or, if a parent chooses a private school, into the account of the entity that administers the private education choice program, bypassing the district. This would create a direct relationship between students who qualify for Title I and their funding. This relationship has never existed, although focusing Title I funds on qualifying students fits wholly within the intent of the law.

One mainstay of the Title I program has been the assumption that schools with high concentrations of poverty face more difficult circumstances. The idea behind the Concentration, Targeted and FIG grants is that schools with higher percentages of low-income students should receive much higher amounts per student. The reality, however, is much less clear, as described above. A portable Title I program could award a base amount per student, with an additional concentration premium for students in schools in which at least half of the students qualify for the program and another for students in schools in which at least 75 percent qualify. Of course, this is just one way that a state could design the program.

A state could also choose to limit program participation to better target the funds once the eligibility documents are filed. If eligibility were restricted to only those students living below the poverty threshold, the base and premium amounts could likely be twice as high as they would be under a program that uses FRPL eligibility. For example, using Title I data from 2013-14 (the

latest year available) and using qualifying for free lunch for eligibility could result in a base amount of approximately \$500 per student, with premiums of \$250 per concentration level – resulting in a maximum dollar amount of \$1,000.⁵⁴ If Title I eligibility was limited to students living below the poverty line, a high-poverty school could receive as much as \$2,000 for each eligible student, given that the percentage of students who are living in poverty is less than half of the percentage of students who qualify for free lunch. This could be equated to nearly 3 hours of one-on-one tutoring per week for the entire school year, one of the approaches that has been found to be effective in improving the academic achievement of disadvantaged students.⁵⁵

From an equity standpoint, it is important that all students who qualify for the program receive some federal aid. Eligible students who attend schools with low levels of poverty, below 25 percent for example, could receive their aid directly. Much like the SNAP program or the Arizona ESA program, parents of students who qualify for the program, but attend a low-poverty school, could receive a \$500 debit card, to be spent on a limited number of educational services, such as tutoring, calculators, books, or other school supplies purchased from approved vendors. While a low-poverty school may not be able to do much with \$500, it could be a meaningful amount for a parent to use to equalize resources for their child. In fact, there is evidence that direct family support through programs such as the Earned Income Tax Credit can have a bigger impact on school readiness than preschool.⁵⁶ And an approach similar to the distribution of SNAP benefits ensures that there is a digital record of all transactions.

Assessing the Impact of Title I Portability on the Distribution of Funds in Two States

To assess the fiscal impact of re-tooling Title I fund distribution, before and after data have been analyzed on two states – Indiana and Louisiana.⁵⁶ These states were chosen because charter schools are their own LEA's in these state, with the exception of a small number of charter schools in Louisiana. Fiscal data for schools are collected at the district level, rather than the school level. Using data for states in which charter schools are their own LEA's allows for modeling the redistribution of funds while factoring in the parental choice of charter schools, since district-level data are essentially the same as school-level if a charter school is its own district. At the time of this analysis, the latest year of district-level fiscal data available from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) was 2013-14.

The number of students living below the poverty level is determined at the district level by the Census, but charter schools are not broken out separately. Therefore, for this analysis, eligibility for the program is based on free lunch participation, as these data are available at the school level. Free lunch participation is used because it is a better approximation of the poverty level than free or reduced-price lunch. However, it does limit the amount available per student.

Appendix A indicates the impact on both total Title I funding and per-student Title I funding at the district or charter school level in Indiana in 2013-14 if only free-lunch-eligible students qualified for funding and they each received \$500, with an additional \$250 for students in schools with at least 50 percent eligible enrollment and another \$250 for students in schools with at least 75 percent eligibility. These amounts were chosen based on the total Title I funding in Indiana in 2013-14 and the number of students eligible for free lunch. A state that decided to make Title I funds portable, and implemented an up-to-date system for determining eligibility, could set the thresholds and dollar amounts differently. For example, if the federal poverty threshold was used, the per-pupil amounts could be as much as double.

Clearly, there is a considerably less variability under the proposed changes – the minimum amount is \$500 and the maximum amount is \$1,000. Under the current system, some schools and districts received several thousand dollars per student and others received less than \$100 per student. Further, the correlation between the percentage of students who qualify for free lunch and the actual per-student Title I funding was just .15 in 2013-14, while the correlation between the percentage of students who qualify for free lunch and the proposed funding would have been .89. Over 230 schools and districts in Indiana would have received more funding per student in 2013-14 under this proposed portable system, while about 120 would have received less. This is due to the additional equity in the proposed system. If students in low-poverty schools were given the aid directly, then about 39,000 students would have received \$500 debit cards in that year.

Looking at the same analysis for Louisiana (Appendix B), once again there is substantially less variation across districts and charter schools under the proposed system, with about 80 schools and districts receiving more per student and about 40 receiving less. Similar correlation results were obtained for Louisiana, with the proposed funding system being nearly perfectly correlated to the percentage of students who qualify for free lunch. In 2013-14, less than 1,000 students in Louisiana who qualified for free lunch attended low-poverty schools and could have received their aid directly via a debit card.

The Impact of Changing Title I Distribution

Anything other than the status quo, meaning any changes to Title I program funding, will result in some schools and districts receiving more funding and other schools and districts receiving less. That's just a fact. Therefore, it is important that proposed changes do more than just shift money around - that they create additional value. Requiring schools and private education choice program administrators to identify eligible students, distributing the money directly to the school, private education choice program or parent, and providing an equal base amount per student, with two clear thresholds of additional compensation for poverty concentration, would provide several benefits.

An eligibility identification program similar to those used for other entitlement programs, such as SNAP or Pell, would de-couple Title I educational aid from the school lunch program and allow for better targeting of resources. Once the documentation is in place for students, income limits could be set independent of other programs. States would have the flexibility to set the income limits at an amount that is appropriate to their cost of living and that would allow for a meaningful amount of funding per student. Administrative databases that already exist could be used and more accurate measures of school-level poverty would be created.

Providing the funding directly to the schools encourages accurate and thorough identification of all eligible students, thereby expanding the reach of the program to middle and high schools, as well as to other schools with either lower or no participation in the lunch program. This also creates a more direct link between the student and their aid, with the aid following the student to the school of their choice. Finally, each student who is certified as eligible to receive aid through the Title I program should expect to receive at least an amount that can have an impact.

The current Title I system, which results in extreme variation, is nearly impossible to predict or to audit at the school level. A completely transparent system based on only three factors – number of eligible students, base amount per student, and concentration premiums, as described above, – would result in a system that reflects good governance. State and district funding systems would be independent of the federal compensatory aid program, greatly reducing the concern around “supplement not supplant,” or whether states and districts are using Title I funds to balance the books. Accountability would also greatly improve, as the funds could be directly traced.

Conclusion

The solution suggested here is just one potential scenario among many. Updating eligibility requirements and mechanisms, equalizing the aid, and having the aid follow the students would result in dramatically more equity, transparency and accountability. Any proposed changes will receive pushback from those who benefit from the status quo. However, it is incredibly difficult to follow the money under the status quo and little to no evidence exists that doing things the way we've been doing them has had any impact. The imperative is to replace a system of inexplicable winners and losers with one designed to target the funds in a way that can create lasting achievement effects for all students living in poverty and one that better reflects an environment of parental education choice, rather than school assignment. The infrastructure, skills, and knowledge to create such a system exist. It's just a matter of having the will to retire a broken fifty-year-old system.

Appendix A - Analysis of the impact of changing the distribution of Title I funds in Indiana in 2013-14 to a per-student distribution

DISTRICT OR CHARTER SCHOOL	AGENCY TYPE 2013-14 (REGULAR OR CHARTER)	% OF STUDENTS WHO QUALIFY FOR FREE LUNCH	# OF STUDENTS WHO QUALIFY FOR FREE LUNCH	TOTAL 2013-14 TITLE I FUNDING			PER STUDENT 2013-14 TITLE I FUNDING		
				ACTUAL	WITH PROPOSED CHANGES	DIFFERENCE	ACTUAL	WITH PROPOSED CHANGES	DIFFERENCE
EDISON LEARNING ROOSEVELT	Regular	100%	599	\$1,099,000	\$599,000	(\$500,000)	\$1,835	\$1,000	(\$835)
ENLACE ACADEMY	Charter	95%	101	60,000	101,000	41,000	594	1000	406
THURGOOD MARSHALL LEADERSHIP ACAD	Charter	95%	119	78,000	119,000	41,000	655	1000	345
PADUA ACADEMY	Charter	94%	219	290,000	219,000	(71,000)	1,324	1000	(324)
EDPOWER ARLINGTON	Regular	94%	419	1,937,000	419,000	(1,518,000)	4,623	1000	(3,623)
TIMOTHY L JOHNSON ACADEMY	Charter	93%	283	165,000	283,000	118,000	583	1000	417
FLANNER HOUSE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Charter	91%	174	244,000	174,000	(70,000)	1,402	1000	(402)
FALL CREEK ACADEMY	Charter	90%	440	357,000	440,000	83,000	811	1000	189
CSUSA HOWE	Regular	89%	574	2,041,000	574,000	(1,467,000)	3,556	1000	(2,556)
SCHOOL CITY OF EAST CHICAGO	Regular	88%	4,461	3,172,000	4,461,000	1,289,000	711	1000	289
ASPIRE CHARTER ACADEMY	Charter	88%	610	1,030,000	610,000	(420,000)	1,689	1000	(689)
SE NEIGHBORHOOD SCH OF EXCELLENCE	Charter	87%	361	379,000	361,000	(18,000)	1,050	1000	(50)
CSUSA MANUAL	Regular	87%	482	2,199,000	482,000	(1,717,000)	4,562	1000	(3,562)
PARAMOUNT SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE INC	Charter	86%	453	428,000	453,000	25,000	945	1000	55
EAST CHICAGO LIGHTHOUSE CHARTER	Charter	86%	367	412,000	367,000	(45,000)	1,123	1000	(123)
KIPP INDPLS COLLEGE PREPARATORY	Charter	85%	250	268,000	250,000	(18,000)	1,072	1000	(72)
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS PREPARATORY ACD	Charter	84%	193	1,192,000	193,000	(999,000)	6,176	1000	(5,176)
ANDREW ACADEMY	Charter	84%	184	314,000	184,000	(130,000)	1,707	1000	(707)
INDIANAPOLIS METROPOLITAN HIGH SCH	Charter	84%	250	369,000	250,000	(119,000)	1,476	1000	(476)
MONUMENT LIGHTHOUSE CHARTER SCHOOL	Charter	83%	515	621,000	515,000	(106,000)	1,206	1000	(206)
JOSHUA ACADEMY	Charter	83%	216	82,000	216,000	134,000	380	1000	620
INDPLS LIGHTHOUSE CHARTER SCHOOL	Charter	83%	590	652,000	590,000	(62,000)	1,105	1000	(105)
IMAGINE LIFE SCIENCES ACAD - WEST	Charter	82%	468	592,000	468,000	(124,000)	1,265	1000	(265)
IN MATH & SCIENCE ACADEMY - SOUTH	Charter	82%	169	104,000	169,000	65,000	615	1000	385
21ST CENTURY CHARTER SCH OF GARY	Charter	81%	514	538,000	514,000	(24,000)	1,047	1000	(47)
ANDREW J BROWN ACADEMY	Charter	81%	550	575,000	550,000	(25,000)	1,045	1000	(45)
CHRISTEL HOUSE ACADEMY SOUTH	Charter	80%	519	557,000	519,000	(38,000)	1,073	1000	(73)
PHALEN LEADERSHIP ACADEMY - IN INC	Charter	80%	120	302,000	120,000	(182,000)	2,517	1000	(1,517)
DAMAR CHARTER ACADEMY	Charter	78%	124	76,000	124,000	48,000	613	1000	387
INDIANAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Regular	77%	23,738	22,787,000	23,738,000	951,000	960	1000	40
EAST CHICAGO URBAN ENTERPRISE ACAD	Charter	77%	323	472,000	323,000	(149,000)	1,461	1000	(461)
SMITH ACADEMY FOR EXCELLENCE	Charter	76%	65	44,000	65,000	21,000	677	1000	323
SCHOOL CITY OF HAMMOND	Regular	76%	10,339	6,989,000	10,339,000	3,350,000	676	1000	324
IMAGINE MASTER ON BROADWAY	Charter	73%	1,613	10,000	1,209,750	1,199,750	6	750	744
LAKE RIDGE NEW TECH SCHOOLS	Regular	73%	1,505	1,322,000	1,128,750	(193,250)	878	750	(128)
THEA BOWMAN LEADERSHIP ACADEMY	Charter	73%	1,056	1,786,000	792,000	(994,000)	1,691	750	(941)
INDIANA MATH SCIENCE ACADEMY NORTH	Charter	72%	428	238,000	321,000	83,000	556	750	194
CSUSA DONNAN	Regular	72%	233	1,574,000	174,750	(1,399,250)	6,755	750	(6,005)
CHARTER SCHOOL OF THE DUNES	Charter	72%	386	469,000	289,500	(179,500)	1,215	750	(465)
GARY LIGHTHOUSE CHARTER SCHOOL	Charter	72%	1,073	956,000	804,750	(151,250)	891	750	(141)
XAVIER SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE	Charter	71%	230	194,000	172,500	(21,500)	843	750	(93)
RIVER FOREST COMMUNITY SCH CORP	Regular	70%	1,033	523,000	774,750	251,750	506	750	244
LAKE STATION COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	69%	1,031	480,000	773,250	293,250	466	750	284
ANDERSON COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	69%	4,889	3,038,000	3,666,750	628,750	621	750	129
MARION COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	69%	2,573	2,282,000	1,929,750	(352,250)	887	750	(137)
M S D WAYNE TOWNSHIP	Regular	69%	10,953	6,059,000	8,214,750	2,155,750	553	750	197
CHALLENGE FOUNDATION ACADEMY	Charter	69%	331	564,000	248,250	(315,750)	1,704	750	(954)
MICHIGAN CITY AREA SCHOOLS	Regular	68%	4,049	2,495,000	3,036,750	541,750	616	750	134
RICHMOND COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	68%	3,616	1,995,000	2,712,000	717,000	552	750	198
MUNCIE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	68%	4,440	3,429,000	3,330,000	(99,000)	772	750	(22)
CANNELTON CITY SCHOOLS	Regular	66%	163	146,000	122,250	(23,750)	896	750	(146)
SOUTH BEND COMMUNITY SCH CORP	Regular	65%	12,844	8,186,000	9,633,000	1,447,000	637	750	113
COMMUNITY SCHOOLS OF FRANKFORT	Regular	64%	2,028	861,000	1,521,000	660,000	425	750	325
MEDORA COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	63%	161	51,000	120,750	69,750	317	750	433
GARY COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	63%	5,396	7,755,000	4,047,000	(3,708,000)	1,437	750	(687)
LAFAYETTE SCHOOL CORPORATION	Regular	63%	4,560	2,346,000	3,420,000	1,074,000	514	750	236
VERITAS ACADEMY	Charter	62%	75	47,000	56,250	9,250	627	750	123
FORT WAYNE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	62%	19,067	11,262,000	14,300,250	3,038,250	591	750	159
M S D WARREN TOWNSHIP	Regular	61%	7,428	3,025,000	5,571,000	2,546,000	407	750	343
KOKOMO SCHOOL CORPORATION	Regular	61%	4,056	2,290,000	3,042,000	752,000	565	750	185
TINDLEY RENAISSANCE ACADEMY	Charter	61%	169	143,000	126,750	(16,250)	846	750	(96)
SCOTT COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1	Regular	60%	755	447,000	566,250	119,250	592	750	158
CENTRAL NINE CAREER CENTER	Other	60%	5,094	8,000	3,820,500	3,812,500	2	750	748
ELWOOD COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	58%	954	1,079,000	715,500	(363,500)	1,131	750	(381)
ELKHART COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	58%	7,623	4,104,000	5,717,250	1,613,250	538	750	212
M S D PIKE TOWNSHIP	Regular	58%	6,369	3,555,000	4,776,750	1,221,750	558	750	192
NORTH WHITE SCHOOL CORP	Regular	57%	488	230,000	366,000	136,000	471	750	279
CAREER ACADEMY HIGH SCHOOL	Charter	56%	214	133,000	160,500	27,500	621	750	129
GOSHEN COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	56%	3,643	1,671,000	2,732,250	1,061,250	459	750	291
WEST NOBLE SCHOOL CORPORATION	Regular	56%	1,389	862,000	1,041,750	179,750	621	750	129
BEECH GROVE CITY SCHOOLS	Regular	56%	1,611	664,000	1,208,250	544,250	412	750	338

Appendix A - Analysis of the impact of changing the distribution of Title I funds in Indiana in 2013-14 to a per-student distribution

DISTRICT OR CHARTER SCHOOL	AGENCY TYPE 2013-14 (REGULAR OR CHARTER)	% OF STUDENTS WHO QUALIFY FOR FREE LUNCH	# OF STUDENTS WHO QUALIFY FOR FREE LUNCH	TOTAL 2013-14 TITLE I FUNDING			PER STUDENT 2013-14 TITLE I FUNDING		
				ACTUAL	WITH PROPOSED CHANGES	DIFFERENCE	ACTUAL	WITH PROPOSED CHANGES	DIFFERENCE
DR ROBERT H FAULKNER ACADEMY	Charter	56%	105	\$76,000	\$78,750	\$2,750	\$724	\$750	\$26
WASHINGTON COM SCHOOLS	Regular	56%	1,430	846,000	1,072,500	226,500	592	750	158
SCHOOL CITY OF WHITING	Regular	55%	639	206,000	479,250	273,250	322	750	428
RANDOLPH EASTERN SCHOOL CORP	Regular	54%	496	398,000	372,000	(26,000)	802	750	(52)
CLARKSVILLE COM SCHOOL CORP	Regular	54%	718	302,000	538,500	236,500	421	750	329
EDINBURGH COMMUNITY SCH CORP	Regular	54%	510	321,000	382,500	61,500	629	750	121
FAYETTE COUNTY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	54%	2,029	1,020,000	1,521,750	501,750	503	750	247
SCHOOL CITY OF MISHAWAKA	Regular	54%	2,787	1,275,000	2,090,250	815,250	457	750	293
M S D DECATUR TOWNSHIP	Regular	54%	3,289	1,374,000	2,466,750	1,092,750	418	750	332
VINCENNES COMMUNITY SCH CORP	Regular	53%	1,428	979,000	1,071,000	92,000	686	750	64
M S D LAWRENCE TOWNSHIP	Regular	53%	7,929	3,546,000	5,946,750	2,400,750	447	750	303
CRAWFORDSVILLE COM SCHOOLS	Regular	53%	1,231	654,000	923,250	269,250	531	750	219
TINDLEY COLLEGIATE ACADEMY	Charter	53%	163	130,000	122,250	(7,750)	798	750	(48)
RURAL COMMUNITY SCHOOLS INC	Charter	53%	74	18,000	55,500	37,500	243	750	507
M S D WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP	Regular	53%	5,886	2,877,000	4,414,500	1,537,500	489	750	261
CARPE DIEM - MERIDIAN CAMPUS	Charter	53%	90	56,000	67,500	11,500	622	750	128
SOUTHWEST PARKE COM SCH CORP	Regular	52%	517	251,000	387,750	136,750	485	750	265
MISSISSINEWA COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	52%	1,329	496,000	996,750	500,750	373	750	377
NEIGHBORS' NEW VISTAS HIGH SCHOOL	Charter	52%	96	9,000	72,000	63,000	94	750	656
CLOVERDALE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	52%	637	409,000	477,750	68,750	642	750	108
KNOX COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	52%	1,017	578,000	762,750	184,750	568	750	182
TINDLEY PREPARATORY ACADEMY	Charter	52%	144	124,000	108,000	(16,000)	861	750	(111)
PERU COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	51%	1,116	502,000	837,000	335,000	450	750	300
SHOALS COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	51%	303	199,000	227,250	28,250	657	750	93
NEW CASTLE COMMUNITY SCH CORP	Regular	51%	1,796	950,000	1,347,000	397,000	529	750	221
MERRILLVILLE COMMUNITY SCHOOL	Regular	51%	3,430	1,813,000	2,572,500	759,500	529	750	221
LOGANSPOUT COMMUNITY SCH CORP	Regular	50%	2,087	1,419,000	1,565,250	146,250	680	750	70
EVANSVILLE VANDERBURGH SCH CORP	Regular	50%	11,340	11,149,000	8,505,000	(2,644,000)	983	750	(233)
CRAWFORD CO COM SCHOOL CORP	Regular	49%	770	410,000	385,000	(25,000)	532	500	(32)
SOUTH NEWTON SCHOOL CORP	Regular	49%	434	109,000	217,000	108,000	251	500	249
SCHOOL TOWN OF SPEEDWAY	Regular	49%	810	396,000	405,000	9,000	489	500	11
WABASH CITY SCHOOLS	Regular	48%	707	322,000	353,500	31,500	455	500	45
SWITZERLAND COUNTY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	48%	715	524,000	357,500	(166,500)	733	500	(233)
TIPPECANOE VALLEY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	48%	949	316,000	474,500	158,500	333	500	167
WESTERN WAYNE SCHOOLS	Regular	47%	485	224,000	242,500	18,500	462	500	38
CULVER COMMUNITY SCHOOLS CORP	Regular	47%	414	289,000	207,000	(82,000)	698	500	(198)
ALEXANDRIA COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	47%	734	1,757,000	367,000	(1,390,000)	2,394	500	(1,894)
VIGO COUNTY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	47%	7,298	4,722,000	3,649,000	(1,073,000)	647	500	(147)
CHARLES A TINDLEY ACCELERATED SCHL	Charter	47%	102	236,000	51,000	(185,000)	2,314	500	(1,814)
JENNINGS COUNTY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	47%	2,196	983,000	1,098,000	115,000	448	500	52
PAOLI COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	47%	732	338,000	366,000	28,000	462	500	38
CONCORD COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	47%	2,415	1,069,000	1,207,500	138,500	443	500	57
MACONAQUAH SCHOOL CORP	Regular	46%	1,053	440,000	526,500	86,500	418	500	82
IRVINGTON COMMUNITY SCHOOL	Charter	46%	467	535,000	233,500	(301,500)	1,146	500	(646)
BLACKFORD COUNTY SCHOOLS	Regular	46%	838	405,000	419,000	14,000	483	500	17
GREATER CLARK COUNTY SCHOOLS	Regular	46%	4,881	2,873,000	2,440,500	(432,500)	589	500	(89)
MITCHELL COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	46%	789	542,000	394,500	(147,500)	687	500	(187)
RANDOLPH CENTRAL SCHOOL CORP	Regular	46%	709	405,000	354,500	(50,500)	571	500	(71)
ATTICA CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL CORP	Regular	46%	390	226,000	195,000	(31,000)	579	500	(79)
SOUTHWESTERN-JEFFERSON CO CON	Regular	46%	614	197,000	307,000	110,000	321	500	179
LINTON-STOCKTON SCHOOL CORP	Regular	46%	622	190,000	311,000	121,000	305	500	195
PLYMOUTH COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	45%	1,706	586,000	853,000	267,000	343	500	157
OREGON-DAVIS SCHOOL CORP	Regular	45%	271	263,000	135,500	(127,500)	970	500	(470)
INDIANA MATH AND SCIENCE ACADEMY	Charter	45%	265	458,000	132,500	(325,500)	1,728	500	(1,228)
SOUTH RIPLEY COM SCH CORP	Regular	45%	522	245,000	261,000	16,000	469	500	31
SEYMOUR COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	45%	1,917	1,057,000	958,500	(98,500)	551	500	(51)
SHELBYVILLE CENTRAL SCHOOLS	Regular	44%	1,801	704,000	900,500	196,500	391	500	109
SPENCER-OWEN COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	44%	1,210	619,000	605,000	(14,000)	512	500	(12)
MADISON CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS	Regular	44%	1,329	633,000	664,500	31,500	476	500	24
SCOTT COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 2	Regular	44%	1,195	681,000	597,500	(83,500)	570	500	(70)
WHITE RIVER VALLEY SCH DIST	Regular	44%	358	450,000	179,000	(271,000)	1,257	500	(757)
M S D SHAKAMAK SCHOOLS	Regular	44%	362	211,000	181,000	(30,000)	583	500	(83)
UNION SCHOOL CORPORATION	Regular	44%	162	110,000	81,000	(29,000)	679	500	(179)
NORTH JUDSON-SAN PIERRE SCH CORP	Regular	43%	519	288,000	259,500	(28,500)	555	500	(55)
ANDERSON PREPARATORY ACADEMY	Charter	43%	391	306,000	195,500	(110,500)	783	500	(283)
WEST WASHINGTON SCHOOL CORP	Regular	43%	362	269,000	181,000	(88,000)	743	500	(243)
JAY SCHOOL CORPORATION	Regular	43%	1,487	869,000	743,500	(125,500)	584	500	(84)
NORTH KNOX SCHOOL CORP	Regular	43%	572	263,000	286,000	23,000	460	500	40
SALEM COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	43%	839	508,000	419,500	(88,500)	605	500	(105)
PORTAGE TOWNSHIP SCHOOLS	Regular	43%	3,397	1,129,000	1,698,500	569,500	332	500	168
NORTH CENTRAL PARKE COMM SCHL CORP	Regular	43%	519	485,000	259,500	(225,500)	934	500	(434)

Appendix A - Analysis of the impact of changing the distribution of Title I funds in Indiana in 2013-14 to a per-student distribution

DISTRICT OR CHARTER SCHOOL	AGENCY TYPE 2013-14 (REGULAR OR CHARTER)	% OF STUDENTS WHO QUALIFY FOR FREE LUNCH	# OF STUDENTS WHO QUALIFY FOR FREE LUNCH	TOTAL 2013-14 TITLE I FUNDING			PER STUDENT 2013-14 TITLE I FUNDING		
				ACTUAL	WITH PROPOSED CHANGES	DIFFERENCE	ACTUAL	WITH PROPOSED CHANGES	DIFFERENCE
LAKELAND SCHOOL CORPORATION	Regular	43%	922	\$606,000	\$461,000	\$(145,000)	\$657	\$500	(157)
CLAY COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	43%	1,855	806,000	927,500	121,500	435	500	65
HAMMOND ACADEMY OF SCIENCE & TECH	Charter	42%	238	57,000	119,000	62,000	239	500	261
UNION-NORTH UNITED SCHOOL CORP	Regular	42%	478	165,000	239,000	74,000	345	500	155
EAST WASHINGTON SCHOOL CORP	Regular	42%	644	333,000	322,000	(11,000)	517	500	(17)
SOUTH VERMILLION COM SCH CORP	Regular	42%	754	272,000	377,000	105,000	361	500	139
GREENSBURG COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	42%	955	508,000	477,500	(30,500)	532	500	(32)
SOUTHEAST FOUNTAIN SCHOOL CORP	Regular	42%	478	189,000	239,000	50,000	395	500	105
WEST CENTRAL SCHOOL CORP	Regular	41%	353	133,000	176,500	43,500	377	500	123
SPRINGS VALLEY COM SCHOOL CORP	Regular	41%	378	167,000	189,000	22,000	442	500	58
MONROE CENTRAL SCHOOL CORP	Regular	41%	405	149,000	202,500	53,500	368	500	132
TAYLOR COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	41%	524	308,000	262,000	(46,000)	588	500	(88)
DELPHI COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	41%	616	223,000	308,000	85,000	362	500	138
NORTHEAST SCHOOL CORP	Regular	41%	521	272,000	260,500	(11,500)	522	500	(22)
ROCHESTER COMMUNITY SCH CORP	Regular	41%	767	330,000	383,500	53,500	430	500	70
BROWN COUNTY SCHOOL CORPORATION	Regular	41%	865	427,000	432,500	5,500	494	500	6
GARRETT-KEYSER-BUTLER COM	Regular	41%	715	204,000	357,500	153,500	285	500	215
SOUTH DEARBORN COM SCHOOL CORP	Regular	41%	1,114	457,000	557,000	100,000	410	500	90
LAPORTE COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	40%	2,736	1,413,000	1,368,000	(45,000)	516	500	(16)
RANDOLPH SOUTHERN SCHOOL CORP	Regular	40%	202	73,000	101,000	28,000	361	500	139
NORTH GIBSON SCHOOL CORP	Regular	40%	844	374,000	422,000	48,000	443	500	57
SOUTHWEST SCHOOL CORP	Regular	40%	712	326,000	356,000	30,000	458	500	42
FRANKLIN COUNTY COM SCH CORP	Regular	40%	1,119	552,000	559,500	7,500	493	500	7
ORLEANS COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	40%	343	215,000	171,500	(43,500)	627	500	(127)
WARSAW COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	40%	2,842	1,211,000	1,421,000	210,000	426	500	74
LIBERTY-PERRY COM SCHOOL CORP	Regular	40%	436	132,000	218,000	86,000	303	500	197
M S D MARTINSVILLE SCHOOLS	Regular	40%	2,023	808,000	1,011,500	203,500	399	500	101
NORTH LAWRENCE COM SCHOOLS	Regular	40%	2,055	986,000	1,027,500	41,500	480	500	20
TELL CITY-TROY TWP SCHOOL CORP	Regular	40%	592	176,000	296,000	120,000	297	500	203
GRIFFITH PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Regular	40%	950	363,000	475,000	112,000	382	500	118
M S D BLUFFTON-HARRISON	Regular	40%	584	200,000	292,000	92,000	342	500	158
OPTIONS CHARTER SCH - NOBLESVILLE	Charter	40%	64	46,000	32,000	(14,000)	719	500	(219)
RUSH COUNTY SCHOOLS	Regular	39%	972	385,000	486,000	101,000	396	500	104
NORTH VERMILLION COM SCH CORP	Regular	39%	287	146,000	143,500	(2,500)	509	500	(9)
GREENCASTLE COMMUNITY SCH CORP	Regular	38%	788	359,000	394,000	35,000	456	500	44
EAST NOBLE SCHOOL CORP	Regular	38%	1,451	570,000	725,500	155,500	393	500	107
C A BEARD MEMORIAL SCHOOL CORP	Regular	38%	490	234,000	245,000	11,000	478	500	22
NEW ALBANY-FLOYD CO CON SCH	Regular	38%	4,315	2,172,000	2,157,500	(14,500)	503	500	(3)
NORTH NEWTON SCHOOL CORP	Regular	38%	549	153,000	274,500	121,500	279	500	221
SOUTH HENRY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	38%	306	81,000	153,000	72,000	265	500	235
RENSSELAER CENTRAL SCHOOL CORP	Regular	38%	637	172,000	318,500	146,500	270	500	230
MANCHESTER COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	38%	626	258,000	313,000	55,000	412	500	88
TWIN LAKES SCHOOL CORP	Regular	38%	923	315,000	461,500	146,500	341	500	159
HUNTINGTON CO COM SCH CORP	Regular	38%	2,103	771,000	1,051,500	280,500	367	500	133
NORTH ADAMS COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	38%	689	364,000	344,500	(19,500)	528	500	(28)
LAWRENCEBURG COM SCHOOL CORP	Regular	38%	748	405,000	374,000	(31,000)	541	500	(41)
UNION CO/CLG CORNER JOINT SCH DIST	Regular	38%	551	243,000	275,500	32,500	441	500	59
GREENWOOD COMMUNITY SCH CORP	Regular	37%	1,407	816,000	703,500	(112,500)	580	500	(80)
INDIANA CONNECTIONS ACADEMY	Charter	37%	1,110	572,000	555,000	(17,000)	515	500	(15)
SOUTHWEST DUBOIS CO SCH CORP	Regular	37%	646	428,000	323,000	(105,000)	663	500	(163)
SOUTH SPENCER COUNTY SCH CORP	Regular	37%	492	166,000	246,000	80,000	337	500	163
DEKALB CO EASTERN COM SCH DIST	Regular	37%	506	205,000	253,000	48,000	405	500	95
DECATUR COUNTY COM SCHOOLS	Regular	36%	775	175,000	387,500	212,500	226	500	274
BENTON COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	36%	686	306,000	343,000	37,000	446	500	54
SOUTH ADAMS SCHOOLS	Regular	36%	488	1,236,000	244,000	(992,000)	2,533	500	(2,033)
M S D STEUBEN COUNTY	Regular	36%	1,082	476,000	541,000	65,000	440	500	60
CROTHERSVILLE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	36%	195	87,000	97,500	10,500	446	500	54
SCHOOL CITY OF HOBART	Regular	36%	1,455	538,000	727,500	189,500	370	500	130
EASTERN GREENE SCHOOLS	Regular	36%	460	110,000	230,000	120,000	239	500	261
MADISON-GRANT UNITED SCH CORP	Regular	35%	482	295,000	241,000	(54,000)	612	500	(112)
NETTLE CREEK SCHOOL CORP	Regular	35%	397	158,000	198,500	40,500	398	500	102
WAWASEE COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	35%	1,083	337,000	541,500	204,500	311	500	189
NEW COMMUNITY SCHOOL	Charter	35%	73	63,000	36,500	(26,500)	863	500	(363)
BARTHOLOMEW CON SCHOOL CORP	Regular	35%	4,008	2,257,000	2,004,000	(253,000)	563	500	(63)
MILAN COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	35%	408	100,000	204,000	104,000	245	500	255
WHITKO COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	34%	556	419,000	278,000	(141,000)	754	500	(254)
FLAT ROCK-HAWCREEK SCHOOL CORP	Regular	34%	312	114,000	156,000	42,000	365	500	135
CLINTON PRAIRIE SCHOOL CORP	Regular	34%	360	93,000	180,000	87,000	258	500	242
NORTH PUTNAM COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	34%	536	237,000	268,000	31,000	442	500	58
EASTERN PULASKI COM SCH CORP	Regular	34%	433	126,000	216,500	90,500	291	500	209
CASTON SCHOOL CORPORATION	Regular	34%	260	278,000	130,000	(148,000)	1,069	500	(569)

Appendix A - Analysis of the impact of changing the distribution of Title I funds in Indiana in 2013-14 to a per-student distribution

DISTRICT OR CHARTER SCHOOL	AGENCY TYPE 2013-14 (REGULAR OR CHARTER)	% OF STUDENTS WHO QUALIFY FOR FREE LUNCH	# OF STUDENTS WHO QUALIFY FOR FREE LUNCH	TOTAL 2013-14 TITLE I FUNDING			PER STUDENT 2013-14 TITLE I FUNDING		
				ACTUAL	WITH PROPOSED CHANGES	DIFFERENCE	ACTUAL	WITH PROPOSED CHANGES	DIFFERENCE
CLARK-PLEASANT COM SCHOOL CORP	Regular	34%	2,133	\$677,000	\$1,066,500	\$389,500	\$317	\$500	\$183
JAC-CEN-DEL COMMUNITY SCH CORP	Regular	34%	296	137,000	148,000	11,000	463	500	37
SOUTH HARRISON COM SCHOOLS	Regular	34%	1,052	455,000	526,000	71,000	433	500	67
M S D WARREN COUNTY	Regular	34%	381	117,000	190,500	73,500	307	500	193
NORTH HARRISON COM SCHOOL CORP	Regular	34%	737	222,000	368,500	146,500	301	500	199
WES-DEL COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	33%	284	107,000	142,000	35,000	377	500	123
SOUTH PUTNAM COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	33%	383	124,000	191,500	67,500	324	500	176
ARGOS COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	33%	205	209,000	102,500	(106,500)	1,020	500	(520)
CLINTON CENTRAL SCHOOL CORP	Regular	33%	343	124,000	171,500	47,500	362	500	138
PIONEER REGIONAL SCHOOL CORP	Regular	33%	311	104,000	155,500	51,500	334	500	166
TRITON SCHOOL CORPORATION	Regular	33%	314	178,000	157,000	(21,000)	567	500	(67)
JOHN GLENN SCHOOL CORPORATION	Regular	33%	609	249,000	304,500	55,500	409	500	91
BAUGO COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	33%	617	279,000	308,500	29,500	452	500	48
PRAIRIE HEIGHTS COM SCH CORP	Regular	32%	444	300,000	222,000	(78,000)	676	500	(176)
M S D WABASH COUNTY SCHOOLS	Regular	32%	701	411,000	350,500	(60,500)	586	500	(86)
EAST CENTRAL EDUCATION SERVICE CTR	Other	32%	207	273,000	103,500	(169,500)	1,319	500	(819)
LEAD COLLEGE PREP CHARTER	Charter	32%	509	35,000	254,500	219,500	69	500	431
FRANKLIN COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	32%	1,609	835,000	804,500	(30,500)	519	500	(19)
NORTH DAVIESS COM SCHOOLS	Regular	32%	381	364,000	190,500	(173,500)	955	500	(455)
DELAWARE COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	32%	822	265,000	411,000	146,000	322	500	178
WEST GARY LIGHTHOUSE CHARTER	Charter	32%	361	17,000	180,500	163,500	47	500	453
TRI-CENTRAL COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	32%	271	84,000	135,500	51,500	310	500	190
LEBANON COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	31%	1,111	465,000	555,500	90,500	419	500	81
LOOGOOTE COMMUNITY SCH CORP	Regular	31%	296	108,000	148,000	40,000	365	500	135
M S D MOUNT VERNON	Regular	31%	687	268,000	343,500	75,500	390	500	110
MONROE COUNTY COM SCH CORP	Regular	31%	3,412	1,828,000	1,706,000	(122,000)	536	500	(36)
CENTERVILLE-ABINGTON COM SCHS	Regular	31%	556	148,000	278,000	130,000	266	500	234
M S D OF NEW DURHAM TOWNSHIP	Regular	31%	283	117,000	141,500	24,500	413	500	87
MOORESVILLE CON SCHOOL CORP	Regular	31%	1,437	389,000	718,500	329,500	271	500	229
BLUE RIVER VALLEY SCHOOLS	Regular	31%	189	144,000	94,500	(49,500)	762	500	(262)
IMAGINE LIFE SCIENCES ACAD - EAST	Charter	31%	568	60,000	284,000	224,000	106	500	394
RISING SUN-OHIO CO COM	Regular	31%	260	90,000	130,000	40,000	346	500	154
HAMILTON COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	31%	131	292,000	65,500	(226,500)	2,229	500	(1,729)
TRI-COUNTY SCHOOL CORPORATION	Regular	31%	233	104,000	116,500	12,500	446	500	54
NORTHEASTERN WAYNE SCHOOLS	Regular	31%	387	206,000	193,500	(12,500)	532	500	(32)
OAK HILL UNITED SCHOOL CORP	Regular	31%	505	203,000	252,500	49,500	402	500	98
GARY MIDDLE COLLEGE	Charter	31%	87	53,000	43,500	(9,500)	609	500	(109)
SOUTH MONTGOMERY COM SCH CORP	Regular	30%	521	392,000	260,500	(131,500)	752	500	(252)
BROWNSTOWN CNT COM SCH CORP	Regular	30%	505	207,000	252,500	45,500	410	500	90
DEKALB CO CTL UNITED SCH DIST	Regular	30%	1,130	317,000	565,000	248,000	281	500	219
TIPPECANOE SCHOOL CORP	Regular	30%	3,724	1,461,000	1,862,000	401,000	392	500	108
COVINGTON COMMUNITY SCH CORP	Regular	30%	299	120,000	149,500	29,500	401	500	99
EASTBROOK COMMUNITY SCH CORP	Regular	30%	488	142,000	244,000	102,000	291	500	209
SHENANDOAH SCHOOL CORPORATION	Regular	30%	420	181,000	210,000	29,000	431	500	69
MONROE-GREGG SCHOOL DISTRICT	Regular	30%	453	126,000	226,500	100,500	278	500	222
SCHOOL TOWN OF HIGHLAND	Regular	30%	971	304,000	485,500	181,500	313	500	187
BLOOMFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT	Regular	30%	274	168,000	137,000	(31,000)	613	500	(113)
CENTRAL NOBLE COM SCHOOL CORP	Regular	30%	379	176,000	189,500	13,500	464	500	36
CARROLL CONSOLIDATED SCH CORP	Regular	30%	334	85,000	167,000	82,000	254	500	246
PERRY CENTRAL COM SCHOOLS CORP	Regular	30%	355	89,000	177,500	88,500	251	500	249
IMAGINE MASTER ACADEMY	Charter	30%	8	26,000	4,000	(22,000)	3,250	500	(2,750)
TIPTON COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	29%	510	193,000	255,000	62,000	378	500	122
SHERIDAN COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	29%	308	157,000	154,000	(3,000)	510	500	(10)
NORTH MIAMI COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	29%	291	144,000	145,500	1,500	495	500	5
RICHLAND-BEAN BLOSSOM C S C	Regular	29%	821	333,000	410,500	77,500	406	500	94
GREENFIELD-CENTRAL COM SCHOOLS	Regular	29%	1,343	449,000	671,500	222,500	334	500	166
NEW PRAIRIE UNITED SCHOOL CORP	Regular	29%	840	522,000	420,000	(102,000)	621	500	(121)
KANKAKEE VALLEY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	29%	1,024	411,000	512,000	101,000	401	500	99
BREMEN PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Regular	29%	424	166,000	212,000	46,000	392	500	108
FRANKLIN TOWNSHIP COM SCH CORP	Regular	29%	2,477	846,000	1,238,500	392,500	342	500	158
HOOSIER ACAD VIRTUAL CHARTER	Charter	29%	1,185	100,000	592,500	492,500	84	500	416
NORTH MONTGOMERY COM SCH CORP	Regular	28%	550	211,000	275,000	64,000	384	500	116
FRANKTON-LAPEL COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	28%	846	327,000	423,000	96,000	387	500	113
SOUTHWESTERN CON SCH SHELBY CO	Regular	28%	171	117,000	85,500	(31,500)	684	500	(184)
EAST GIBSON SCHOOL CORPORATION	Regular	28%	256	176,000	128,000	(48,000)	688	500	(188)
SHELBY EASTERN SCHOOLS	Regular	27%	361	117,000	180,500	63,500	324	500	176
WEST CLARK COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	27%	1,294	344,000	647,000	303,000	266	500	234
SOUTHEASTERN SCHOOL CORP	Regular	27%	401	151,000	200,500	49,500	377	500	123
WESTERN BOONE CO COM SCH DIST	Regular	27%	476	124,000	238,000	114,000	261	500	239
TRI-TOWNSHIP CONS SCHOOL CORP	Other	27%	96	42,000	48,000	6,000	438	500	63
MILL CREEK COMMUNITY SCH CORP	Regular	26%	415	84,000	207,500	123,500	202	500	298

Appendix A - Analysis of the impact of changing the distribution of Title I funds in Indiana in 2013-14 to a per-student distribution

DISTRICT OR CHARTER SCHOOL	AGENCY TYPE 2013-14 (REGULAR OR CHARTER)	% OF STUDENTS WHO QUALIFY FOR FREE LUNCH	# OF STUDENTS WHO QUALIFY FOR FREE LUNCH	TOTAL 2013-14 TITLE I FUNDING			PER STUDENT 2013-14 TITLE I FUNDING		
				ACTUAL	WITH PROPOSED CHANGES	DIFFERENCE	ACTUAL	WITH PROPOSED CHANGES	DIFFERENCE
SOUTHERN WELLS COM SCHOOLS	Regular	26%	220	\$95,000	\$110,000	15,000	\$432	\$500	\$68
NORTHWESTERN CON SCHOOL CORP	Regular	26%	370	118,000	185,000	67,000	319	500	181
HERRON CHARTER	Charter	26%	178	185,000	89,000	(96,000)	1,039	500	(539)
FREMONT COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	25%	246	104,000	123,000	19,000	423	500	77
COWAN COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	25%	189	78,000	94,500	16,500	413	500	87
WESTERN SCHOOL CORP	Regular	25%	664	78,000	332,000	254,000	117	500	383
YORKTOWN COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	25%	600	277,000	300,000	23,000	462	500	38
WHITLEY CO CONS SCHOOLS	Regular	25%	892	294,000	446,000	152,000	330	500	170
NINEVEH-HENSLEY-JACKSON UNITED	Regular	24%	450	196,000	225,000*	29,000	436	500	64
M S D BOONE TOWNSHIP	Regular	24%	288	115,000	144,000*	29,000	399	500	101
THE BLOOMINGTON PROJECT SCHOOL	Charter	24%	65	46,000	32,500*	(13,500)	708	500	(208)
HAMILTON HEIGHTS SCHOOL CORP	Regular	24%	551	229,000	275,500*	46,500	416	500	84
WARRICK COUNTY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	24%	2,420	932,000	1,210,000*	278,000	385	500	115
VALPARAISO COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	24%	1,537	658,000	768,500*	110,500	428	500	72
SOUTH CENTRAL COM SCHOOL CORP	Regular	23%	215	100,000	107,500*	7,500	465	500	35
NORTH SPENCER COUNTY SCH CORP	Regular	23%	454	184,000	227,000*	43,000	405	500	95
EASTERN HOWARD SCHOOL CORPORATION	Regular	23%	329	95,000	164,500*	69,500	289	500	211
NORTHERN WELLS COM SCHOOLS	Regular	23%	544	258,000	272,000*	14,000	474	500	26
GREATER JASPER CON SCHS	Regular	22%	720	224,000	360,000*	136,000	311	500	189
M S D NORTH POSEY CO SCHOOLS	Regular	22%	314	121,000	157,000*	36,000	385	500	115
WA-NEE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	22%	671	855,000	335,500*	(519,500)	1,274	500	(774)
DUNELAND SCHOOL CORPORATION	Regular	22%	1,307	546,000	653,500*	107,500	418	500	82
WESTVIEW SCHOOL CORPORATION	Regular	22%	519	1,339,000	259,500*	(1,079,500)	2,580	500	(2,080)
SOUTH KNOX SCHOOL CORP	Regular	22%	263	91,000	131,500*	40,500	346	500	154
DANVILLE COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	22%	567	236,000	283,500*	47,500	416	500	84
FRONTIER SCHOOL CORPORATION	Regular	22%	158	84,000	79,000*	(5,000)	532	500	(32)
PENN-HARRIS-MADISON SCH CORP	Regular	22%	2,259	1,045,000	1,129,500*	84,500	463	500	37
PLAINFIELD COMMUNITY SCH CORP	Regular	22%	1,125	357,000	562,500*	205,500	317	500	183
DALEVILLE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	22%	181	59,000	90,500*	31,500	326	500	174
HOOSIER ACADEMY - MUNCIE	Charter	21%	433	22,000	216,500*	194,500	51	500	449
HANOVER COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	21%	467	148,000	233,500*	85,500	317	500	183
SMITH-GREEN COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	21%	255	105,000	127,500*	22,500	412	500	88
MIDDLEBURY COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	21%	927	645,000	463,500*	(181,500)	696	500	(196)
BATESVILLE COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	20%	444	194,000	222,000*	28,000	437	500	63
NORTHEAST DUBOIS CO SCH CORP	Regular	20%	199	44,000	99,500*	55,500	221	500	279
SOUTH GIBSON SCHOOL CORP	Regular	19%	388	119,000	194,000*	75,000	307	500	193
ADAMS CENTRAL COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	19%	236	901,000	118,000*	(783,000)	3,818	500	(3,318)
NORTHWESTERN SCHOOL CORP	Regular	19%	332	213,000	166,000*	(47,000)	642	500	(142)
TRI-CREEK SCHOOL CORPORATION	Regular	19%	656	314,000	328,000*	14,000	479	500	21
SUNMAN-DEARBORN COM SCH CORP	Regular	19%	759	238,000	379,500*	141,500	314	500	186
MT VERNON COMMUNITY SCH CORP	Regular	19%	667	257,000	333,500*	76,500	385	500	115
AVON COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	19%	1,665	270,000	832,500*	562,500	162	500	338
NOBLESVILLE SCHOOLS	Regular	19%	1,831	666,000	915,500*	249,500	364	500	136
CROWN POINT COMMUNITY SCH CORP	Regular	18%	1,462	155,000	731,000*	576,000	106	500	394
ROSSVILLE CON SCHOOL DISTRICT	Regular	18%	180	84,000	90,000*	6,000	467	500	33
BROWNSBURG COMMUNITY SCH CORP	Regular	17%	1,397	89,000	698,500*	609,500	64	500	436
DISCOVERY CHARTER SCHOOL	Charter	17%	82	46,000	41,000*	(5,000)	561	500	(61)
PORTER TOWNSHIP SCHOOL CORP	Regular	16%	243	134,000	121,500*	(12,500)	551	500	(51)
BARR-REEVE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS INC	Regular	16%	120	442,000	60,000*	(382,000)	3,683	500	(3,183)
HOOSIER ACADEMY - INDIANAPOLIS	Charter	16%	72	31,000	36,000*	5,000	431	500	69
NORTH WEST HENDRICKS SCHOOLS	Regular	16%	298	96,000	149,000*	53,000	322	500	178
LAKE CENTRAL SCHOOL CORP	Regular	15%	1,507	906,000	753,500*	(152,500)	601	500	(101)
FAIRFIELD COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	15%	316	334,000	158,000*	(176,000)	1,057	500	(557)
UNION TOWNSHIP SCHOOL CORP	Regular	15%	230	103,000	115,000*	12,000	448	500	52
EAST PORTER COUNTY SCHOOL CORP	Regular	15%	365	185,000	182,500*	(2,500)	507	500	(7)
ROCK CREEK COMMUNITY ACADEMY	Charter	15%	67	31,000	33,500*	2,500	463	500	37
SOUTHERN HANCOCK CO COM SCH CORP	Regular	14%	476	165,000	238,000*	73,000	347	500	153
CENTER GROVE COM SCH CORP	Regular	14%	1,099	411,000	549,500*	138,500	374	500	126
SOUTHEAST DUBOIS CO SCH CORP	Regular	14%	192	65,000	96,000*	31,000	339	500	161
WESTFIELD-WASHINGTON SCHOOLS	Regular	14%	938	452,000	469,000*	17,000	482	500	18
SCHOOL TOWN OF MUNSTER	Regular	13%	530	240,000	265,000*	25,000	453	500	47
WEST LAFAYETTE COM SCHOOL CORP	Regular	12%	260	440,000	130,000*	(310,000)	1,692	500	(1,192)
NORTHWEST ALLEN COUNTY SCHOOLS	Regular	11%	778	395,000	389,000*	(6,000)	508	500	(8)
M S D SOUTHWEST ALLEN COUNTY SCHLS	Regular	11%	773	315,000	386,500*	71,500	408	500	92
GEIST MONTESSORI ACADEMY	Charter	9%	31	5,000	15,500*	10,500	161	500	339
HAMILTON SOUTHEASTERN SCHOOLS	Regular	9%	1,922	445,000	961,000*	516,000	232	500	268
CARMEL CLAY SCHOOLS	Regular	8%	1,214	454,000	607,000*	153,000	374	500	126
ZIONSVILLE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Regular	3%	213	100,000	106,500*	6,500	469	500	31

* Money would be distributed directly to the student's family.

SOURCE: US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), 2013-14 Common Core of Data (CCD), Fiscal and Non-fiscal surveys.

Appendix B - Analysis of the impact of changing the distribution of Title I funds in Louisiana in 2013-14 to a per-student distribution

DISTRICT OR CHARTER SCHOOL	AGENCY TYPE 2013-14 (REGULAR OR CHARTER)	% OF STUDENTS WHO QUALIFY FOR FREE LUNCH	# OF STUDENTS WHO QUALIFY FOR FREE LUNCH	TOTAL 2013-14 TITLE I FUNDING			PER STUDENT 2013-14 TITLE I FUNDING		
				ACTUAL	WITH PROPOSED CHANGES	DIFFERENCE	ACTUAL	WITH PROPOSED CHANGES	DIFFERENCE
FRANKLIN PARISH	Regular	73%	2,302	\$2,244,000	\$1,726,500	\$(517,500)	\$975	\$750	\$(225)
EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH	Regular	73%	30,476	24,631,000	22,857,000	(1,774,000)	808	750	(58)
CONCORDIA PARISH	Regular	72%	2,590	1,976,000	1,942,500	(33,500)	763	750	(13)
TANGIPAHOA PARISH	Regular	72%	14,289	10,174,000	10,716,750	542,750	712	750	38
ST. LANDRY PARISH	Regular	71%	10,459	9,209,000	7,844,250	(1,364,750)	880	750	(130)
RSD-CHOICE FOUNDATION	Charter	70%	1,311	4,456,000	983,250	(3,472,750)	3,399	750	(2,649)
UNION PARISH	Regular	69%	1,563	1,388,000	1,172,250	(215,750)	888	750	(138)
RSD-RENEW-REINVENTING EDUCATION INC.	Charter	69%	2,292	2,707,000	1,719,000	(988,000)	1,181	750	(431)
MOREHOUSE PARISH	Regular	69%	3,100	4,220,000	2,325,000	(1,895,000)	1,361	750	(611)
NATCHITOCHE PARISH	Regular	69%	4,627	3,946,000	3,470,250	(475,750)	853	750	(103)
JEFFERSON PARISH	Regular	68%	31,679	24,837,000	23,759,250	(1,077,750)	784	750	(34)
WEST CARROLL PARISH	Regular	68%	1,490	687,000	1,117,500	430,500	461	750	289
EVANGELINE PARISH	Regular	67%	4,123	2,402,000	3,092,250	690,250	583	750	167
ST. MARY PARISH	Regular	66%	6,193	3,099,000	4,644,750	1,545,750	500	750	250
WINN PARISH	Regular	66%	1,671	1,115,000	1,253,250	138,250	667	750	83
VOICES FOR INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS & EDUCATION	Charter	66%	314	114,000	235,500	121,500	363	750	387
ST. MARTIN PARISH	Regular	65%	5,420	3,409,000	4,065,000	656,000	629	750	121
CATAHOULA PARISH	Regular	65%	955	994,000	716,250	(277,750)	1,041	750	(291)
BIENVILLE PARISH	Regular	65%	1,456	873,000	1,092,000	219,000	600	750	150
V. B. GLENCOE CHARTER SCHOOL	Charter	65%	237	130,000	177,750	47,750	549	750	201
ST. JAMES PARISH	Regular	65%	2,443	1,118,000	1,832,250	714,250	458	750	292
IBERIA PARISH	Regular	65%	9,032	5,075,000	6,774,000	1,699,000	562	750	188
SABINE PARISH	Regular	64%	2,818	1,581,000	2,113,500	532,500	561	750	189
RSD-FIRSTLINE SCHOOLS INC.	Charter	64%	1,789	2,285,000	1,341,750	(943,250)	1,277	750	(527)
WEST BATON ROUGE PARISH	Regular	64%	2,498	903,000	1,873,500	970,500	361	750	389
RSD-AKILI ACADEMY OF NEW ORLEANS	Charter	64%	300	387,000	225,000	(162,000)	1,290	750	(540)
ST. BERNARD PARISH	Regular	63%	4,529	2,201,000	3,396,750	1,195,750	486	750	264
NORTHSHORE CHARTER SCHOOL INC.	Charter	63%	102	55,000	76,500	21,500	539	750	211
WEBSTER PARISH	Regular	62%	4,091	2,237,000	3,068,250	831,250	547	750	203
RAPIDES PARISH	Regular	61%	14,705	7,983,000	11,028,750	3,045,750	543	750	207
TERREBONNE PARISH	Regular	61%	11,220	6,373,000	8,415,000	2,042,000	568	750	182
SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY LAB SCHOOL	Other	60%	335	-	251,250	251,250	-	750	750
GRANT PARISH	Regular	60%	1,885	964,000	1,413,750	449,750	511	750	239
ASSUMPTION PARISH	Regular	60%	2,301	1,001,000	1,725,750	724,750	435	750	315
ACADIA PARISH	Regular	59%	5,979	3,487,000	4,484,250	997,250	583	750	167
CALDWELL PARISH	Regular	59%	959	507,000	719,250	212,250	529	750	221
CADDO PARISH	Regular	59%	23,997	19,610,000	17,997,750	(1,612,250)	817	750	(67)
DESOTO PARISH	Regular	59%	2,976	2,181,000	2,232,000	51,000	733	750	17
JACKSON PARISH	Regular	58%	1,357	749,000	1,017,750	268,750	552	750	198
LINCOLN PARISH	Regular	58%	3,329	2,155,000	2,496,750	341,750	647	750	103
LOUISIANA KEY ACADEMY	Charter	58%	72	42,000	54,000	12,000	583	750	167
ORLEANS PARISH	Regular	56%	6,992	15,062,000	5,244,000	(9,818,000)	2,154	750	(1,404)
RSD-KNOWLEDGE IS POWER PROGRAM (KIPP) N.O.	Charter	54%	2,028	2,624,000	1,521,000	(1,103,000)	1,294	750	(544)
LAFAYETTE PARISH	Regular	54%	16,648	8,744,000	12,486,000	3,742,000	525	750	225
ALLEN PARISH	Regular	54%	2,333	1,067,000	1,749,750	682,750	457	750	293
JEFFERSON CHAMBER FOUNDATION ACADEMY	Charter	53%	48	21,000	36,000	15,000	438	750	313
LAFOURCHE PARISH	Regular	53%	7,833	5,075,000	5,874,750	799,750	648	750	102
COMMUNITY SCHOOL FOR APPRENTICESHIP LEARNING INC.	Charter	53%	1,099	355,000	824,250	469,250	323	750	427
RSD-ARISE ACADEMY	Charter	53%	477	616,000	357,750	(258,250)	1,291	750	(541)
OUACHITA PARISH	Regular	52%	10,438	5,277,000	7,828,500	2,551,500	506	750	244
CALCASIEU PARISH	Regular	51%	16,530	9,902,000	12,397,500	2,495,500	599	750	151
JEFFERSON DAVIS PARISH	Regular	50%	2,937	1,610,000	2,202,750	592,750	548	750	202
VERMILION PARISH	Regular	50%	4,750	2,933,000	3,562,500	629,500	617	750	133
RSD-MORRIS JEFF COMMUNITY SCHOOL	Charter	49%	198	179,000	99,000	(80,000)	904	500	(404)
PLAQUEMINES PARISH	Regular	49%	1,986	725,000	993,000	268,000	365	500	135
NEW ORLEANS MILITARY/MARITIME ACADEMY	Charter	49%	176	96,000	88,000	(8,000)	545	500	(45)
LASALLE PARISH	Regular	49%	1,298	514,000	649,000	135,000	396	500	104
RECOVERY SCHOOL DISTRICT-LDE	Regular	48%	1,593	7,145,000	796,500	(6,348,500)	4,485	500	(3,985)
WEST FELICIANA PARISH	Regular	47%	1,008	275,000	504,000	229,000	273	500	227
RSD-COLLEGIATE ACADEMIES	Charter	46%	395	1,080,000	197,500	(882,500)	2,734	500	(2,234)
D'ARBONNE WOODS CHARTER SCHOOL	Charter	44%	322	162,000	161,000	(1,000)	503	500	(3)
VERNON PARISH	Regular	44%	4,253	2,046,000	2,126,500	80,500	481	500	19
ST. CHARLES PARISH	Regular	44%	4,225	1,532,000	2,112,500	580,500	363	500	137
BEAUREGARD PARISH	Regular	43%	2,575	1,403,000	1,287,500	(115,500)	545	500	(45)
DELHI CHARTER SCHOOL	Charter	42%	392	166,000	196,000	30,000	423	500	77
INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF LOUISIANA	Charter	42%	350	136,000	175,000	39,000	389	500	111
ASCENSION PARISH	Regular	41%	8,817	4,238,000	4,408,500	170,500	481	500	19

Appendix B - Analysis of the impact of changing the distribution of Title I funds in Louisiana in 2013-14 to a per-student distribution

DISTRICT OR CHARTER SCHOOL	AGENCY TYPE 2013-14 (REGULAR OR CHARTER)	% OF STUDENTS WHO QUALIFY FOR FREE LUNCH	# OF STUDENTS WHO QUALIFY FOR FREE LUNCH	TOTAL 2013-14 TITLE I FUNDING			PER STUDENT 2013-14 TITLE I FUNDING		
				ACTUAL	WITH PROPOSED CHANGES	DIFFERENCE	ACTUAL	WITH PROPOSED CHANGES	DIFFERENCE
GRANT PARISH	Regular	60%	1,885	964,000	1,413,750	449,750	511	750	239
ASSUMPTION PARISH	Regular	60%	2,301	1,001,000	1,725,750	724,750	435	750	315
ACADIA PARISH	Regular	59%	5,979	3,487,000	4,484,250	997,250	583	750	167
CALDWELL PARISH	Regular	59%	959	507,000	719,250	212,250	529	750	221
CADDO PARISH	Regular	59%	23,997	19,610,000	17,997,750	(1,612,250)	817	750	(67)
DESOTO PARISH	Regular	59%	2,976	2,181,000	2,232,000	51,000	733	750	17
JACKSON PARISH	Regular	58%	1,357	749,000	1,017,750	268,750	552	750	198
LINCOLN PARISH	Regular	58%	3,329	2,155,000	2,496,750	341,750	647	750	103
LOUISIANA KEY ACADEMY	Charter	58%	72	42,000	54,000	12,000	583	750	167
ORLEANS PARISH	Regular	56%	6,992	15,062,000	5,244,000	(9,818,000)	2,154	750	(1,404)
RSD-KNOWLEDGE IS POWER PROGRAM (KIPP) N.O.	Charter	54%	2,028	2,624,000	1,521,000	(1,103,000)	1,294	750	(544)
LAFAYETTE PARISH	Regular	54%	16,648	8,744,000	12,486,000	3,742,000	525	750	225
ALLEN PARISH	Regular	54%	2,333	1,067,000	1,749,750	682,750	457	750	293
JEFFERSON CHAMBER FOUNDATION ACADEMY	Charter	53%	48	21,000	36,000	15,000	438	750	313
LAFOURCHE PARISH	Regular	53%	7,833	5,075,000	5,874,750	799,750	648	750	102
COMMUNITY SCHOOL FOR APPRENTICESHIP LEARNING INC.	Charter	53%	1,099	355,000	824,250	469,250	323	750	427
RSD-ARISE ACADEMY	Charter	53%	477	616,000	357,750	(258,250)	1,291	750	(541)
OUACHITA PARISH	Regular	52%	10,438	5,277,000	7,828,500	2,551,500	506	750	244
CALCASIEU PARISH	Regular	51%	16,530	9,902,000	12,397,500	2,495,500	599	750	151
JEFFERSON DAVIS PARISH	Regular	50%	2,937	1,610,000	2,202,750	592,750	548	750	202
VERMILION PARISH	Regular	50%	4,750	2,933,000	3,562,500	629,500	617	750	133
RSD-MORRIS JEFF COMMUNITY SCHOOL	Charter	49%	198	179,000	99,000	(80,000)	904	500	(404)
PLAQUEMINES PARISH	Regular	49%	1,986	725,000	993,000	268,000	365	500	135
NEW ORLEANS MILITARY/MARITIME ACADEMY	Charter	49%	176	96,000	88,000	(8,000)	545	500	(45)
LASALLE PARISH	Regular	49%	1,298	514,000	649,000	135,000	396	500	104
RECOVERY SCHOOL DISTRICT-LDE	Regular	48%	1,593	7,145,000	796,500	(6,348,500)	4,485	500	(3,985)
WEST FELICIANA PARISH	Regular	47%	1,008	275,000	504,000	229,000	273	500	227
RSD-COLLEGIATE ACADEMIES	Charter	46%	395	1,080,000	197,500	(882,500)	2,734	500	(2,234)
D'ARBONNE WOODS CHARTER SCHOOL	Charter	44%	322	162,000	161,000	(1,000)	503	500	(3)
VERNON PARISH	Regular	44%	4,253	2,046,000	2,126,500	80,500	481	500	19
ST. CHARLES PARISH	Regular	44%	4,225	1,532,000	2,112,500	580,500	363	500	137
BEAUREGARD PARISH	Regular	43%	2,575	1,403,000	1,287,500	(115,500)	545	500	(45)
DELHI CHARTER SCHOOL	Charter	42%	392	166,000	196,000	30,000	423	500	77
INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF LOUISIANA	Charter	42%	350	136,000	175,000	39,000	389	500	111
ASCENSION PARISH	Regular	41%	8,817	4,238,000	4,408,500	170,500	481	500	19
BOSSIER PARISH	Regular	41%	8,993	\$5,874,000	\$4,496,500	\$(1,377,500)	\$653	\$500	\$(153)
CENTRAL COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	Regular	40%	1,766	1,191,000	883,000	(308,000)	674	500	(174)
LIVINGSTON PARISH	Regular	40%	10,231	4,577,000	5,115,500	538,500	447	500	53
ST. TAMMANY PARISH	Regular	40%	15,046	5,826,000	7,523,000	1,697,000	387	500	113
LOUISIANA CONNECTIONS ACADEMY	Charter	40%	474	295,000	237,000	(58,000)	622	500	(122)
RSD-CRESCENT CITY SCHOOLS	Charter	39%	359	1,402,000	179,500	(1,222,500)	3,905	500	(3,405)
AVOYELLES PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL	Charter	36%	261	193,000	130,500	(62,500)	739	500	(239)
CAMERON PARISH	Regular	35%	446	157,000	223,000	66,000	352	500	148
ZACHARY COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	Regular	30%	1,649	493,000	824,500	331,500	299	500	201
HOWARD SCHOOL	Other	29%	30	-	15,000	15,000	-	500	500
RSD-NEW ORLEANS COLLEGE PREPARATORY ACADEMIES	Charter	28%	332	1,300,000	166,000	(1,134,000)	3,916	500	(3,416)
BELLE CHASSE ACADEMY INC.	Charter	26%	245	214,000	122,500	(91,500)	873	500	(373)
NEW ORLEANS CENTER FOR CREATIVE ARTS	Other	24%	42	-	21,000*	21,000	-	500	500
THE MAX CHARTER SCHOOL	Charter	23%	27	11,000	13,500*	2,500	407	500	93
LYCEE FRANCAIS DE LA NOUVELLE-ORLEANS	Charter	18%	72	34,000	36,000*	2,000	472	500	28
LOUISIANA SCHOOL FOR MATH SCIENCE & THE ARTS	Other	9%	27	-	13,500*	13,500	-	500	500
A.E. PHILLIPS LABORATORY SCHOOL	Other	3%	12	-	6,000*	6,000	-	500	500
LSU LABORATORY SCHOOL	Other	1%	20	-	10,000*	10,000	-	500	500
DELTA CHARTER GROUP	Charter	0%	-	71,000	-	(71,000)	-	500	500
RSD-MILLER-MCCOY ACADEMY FOR MATH AND BUSINESS	Charter	0%	-	392,000	-	(392,000)	-	500	500

Endnotes

¹Sloan, Willona M. (2012, July). What is the Purpose of Education? ASCD Education Update, 54(7). Retrieved September 16, 2016, from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/newsletters/education-update/jul12/vol54/num07/What-Is-the-Purpose-of-Education%C2%A2.aspx>.

²The Great Society programs were a series of federal interventions to eliminate poverty and racial injustice. Major initiatives included the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Food Stamp Act of 1964, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and the Social Security Act of 1965, that created Medicare and Medicaid.

³Lee, Katelyn and Andrea Boyle. (2015). Title I at 50: A Retrospective. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research (AIR). Retrieved September 2016, from <https://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/Title-I-at-50-rev.pdf>.

⁴Fowler, Glenn. (1990, February 21). Francis Keppel Dies at Age of 73; Was Commissioner of Education. New York Times. Retrieved September 2016, from <http://www.nytimes.com/1990/02/21/obituaries/francis-keppel-dies-at-age-of-73-was-commissioner-of-education.html>.

⁵Lee, Katelyn and Andrea Boyle. (2015). Title I at 50: A Retrospective. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research (AIR). Retrieved September 2016, from <https://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/Title-I-at-50-rev.pdf>.

⁶Zelizer, Julian E. (2015, April 10). How Education Policy Went Astray. The Atlantic. Retrieved September 2016, from <http://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2015/04/how-education-policy-went-astray/390210/>.

⁷The concentration of poverty, particularly in neighborhoods in which at least 40 percent of residents live below the poverty line, has been shown to be associated with lower levels of social capital, a lack of positive role models, higher rates of high school dropouts, and higher rates of crime. (see <https://tcf.org/content/report/architecture-of-segregation/>; <http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2015/9/concentrated-poverty-is-the-new-urban-panic.html>; <http://www.press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/G/bo5514383.html>)

⁸Johnson, Lyndon B. (1965, April 11). Johnson's Remarks on Signing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Johnson City, Texas. Retrieved September 2016, from <http://www.lbjlibrary.org/lyndon-baines-johnson/timeline/johnsons-remarks-on-signing-the-elementary-and-secondary-act>.

⁹Every Student Succeeds Act. PL 114-95. (2015, December 10). Retrieved September 2016, from <https://www.congress.gov/114/plaws/publ95/PLAW-114publ95.pdf>.

¹⁰Sloan, Willona M. (2012, July). What is the Purpose of Education? ASCD Education Update, 54(7). Retrieved September 16, 2016, from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/newsletters/education-update/jul12/vol54/num07/What-Is-the-Purpose-of-Education%C2%A2.aspx>.

¹¹Lee, Katelyn and Andrea Boyle. (2015). Title I at 50: A Retrospective. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research (AIR). Retrieved September 2016, <https://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/Title-I-at-50-rev.pdf>.

¹²Coleman, James. et al. (1966). Equality of Educational Opportunity. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. Retrieved September 2016, from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED012275.pdf>.

¹³US Department of Education. Office of the Under Secretary, Planning and Evaluation Service. (1999). Promising Results, Continuing Challenges: The Final Report of the National Assessment of Title I. US Department of Education. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. Retrieved September 2016. <https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/disadv/promisingresults/natirpt.doc>.

¹⁴The law now states that "(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a local educational agency shall use the same measure of poverty, which measure shall be the number of children aged 5 through 17 in poverty counted in the most recent census data approved by the Secretary, the number of children eligible for a free or reduced price lunch under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.), the number of children in families receiving assistance under the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act, or the number of children eligible to receive medical assistance under the Medicaid Program, or a composite of such indicators, with respect to all school attendance areas in the local educational agency—"

¹⁵Stullich, Stephanie. et al. (2007, October). National Assessment of Title I Final Report - Volume 1: Implementation. US Department of Education. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. Retrieved September 2016, from https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pdf/20084012_rev.pdf.

¹⁶Borman, Geoffrey and Jerome V. D'Agostino. (1996, December 21). Title I and Student Achievement: A Meta-Analysis of Federal Evaluation Results. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 18(4), 309-326.

¹⁷Puma, Michael J. (1999). The "Prospects" Study of Educational Growth and Opportunity: Implications for Policy and Practice. The Urban Institute. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. Retrieved September 2016, from https://ia601304.us.archive.org/8/items/ERIC_ED429355/ERIC_ED429355.pdf.

¹⁸Armor, David and Sonia Souza. (2015). The Effectiveness of Title I: Synthesis of National-level Evidence from 1966 to 2013. George Mason University, School of Public Policy. Fairfax, VA: George Mason University. Retrieved September 2016, from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2350037.

¹⁹Snyder, Tom. et al. (2015). US Digest of Education Statistics 2015. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. Table 102.50. Retrieved September 2016, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/tables/dt15_102.50.asp?current=yes.

²⁰Snyder, Tom. et al. (2015). US Digest of Education Statistics 2015. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. Table 204.10. Retrieved September 2016, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/tables/dt15_204.10.asp?current=yes.

²¹Lee, Katelyn and Andrea Boyle. (2015). Title I at 50: A Retrospective. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research (AIR). Retrieved September 2016, from <https://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/Title-I-at-50-rev.pdf>.

²²For more information on "supplement, not supplant," see the US Department of Education Fact Sheet, <http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/fact-sheet-supplement-not-supplant-under-title-i-every-student-succeeds-act>.

²³The original law was reauthorized as the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) in 1981, then as the Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Act (ESSIA) in 1988, the Improving America's School Act (IASA) in 1994, and the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) in 2001. Snyder, Tom. et al. (2015). US Digest of Education Statistics 2015. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. Table 401.30. Retrieved September 2016, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/tables/dt15_401.30.asp?current=yes.

²⁴This number is derived from the Small Area Income Poverty Estimates (SAIPE), which is what is used for the Title I grant calculations. (see <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/saipe.html>)

²⁵US Census Bureau, 2016 Public Elementary-Secondary Education Finance Data, Summary Tables, last revised May 17, 2018. <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2016/econ/school-finances/secondary-education-finance.html>; US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), 2015-16 Common Core of Data (CCD). Note: States with asterisks (*) are 2014-15 data, due to data quality issues. <https://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/statetables/17stbyprogram.pdf>; US Census Bureau, SAIPE State and County Estimates for 2016, last revised November 30, 2017, <https://www.census.gov/data/datasets/2016/demo/saipe/2016-state-and-county.html>.

²⁶Snyder, Tom. et al. (2015). US Digest of Education Statistics 2015. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. Table 215.20. Retrieved September 2016, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/tables/dt15_215.20.asp?current=yes.

²⁷CNN Money. (2015). Cost of living: How far will my salary go in another city? Retrieved September 2016. <http://money.cnn.com/calculator/pf/cost-of-living/>.

²⁸Smarick, A. (2014). The Challenges Facing Struggling Rural Schools. Education Next. Retrieved September 2016, from <http://educationnext.org/challenges-facing-struggling-rural-schools/>.

- ²⁹Sonnenberg, William. (2016). Allocating Grants for Title I. National Center for Education Statistics, US Department of Education. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. Retrieved September 2016. <http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/AnnualReports/pdf/title120160111.pdf>.
- ³⁰Ibid.
- ³¹Ibid.
- ³²Ibid.
- ³³Ibid.
- ³⁴Ibid.
- ³⁵Zernike, Kate. (2016, April). Test Scores Show a Decline in Math Among High School Seniors. The New York Times. Retrieved September 2016. <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/27/us/math-test-scores-decline-high-school-seniors.html>.
- ³⁶Greenstone, Michael. et. al. (2013, July). Thirteen Economic Facts about Social Mobility and the Role of Education. The Brookings Institution. Washington, DC. Retrieved September 2016. <https://www.brookings.edu/research/thirteen-economic-facts-about-social-mobility-and-the-role-of-education/>.
- ³⁷Samuels, Alana. (2016, August 25). Good School, Rich School; Bad School, Poor School - The inequality at the heart of America's education system. The Atlantic. Retrieved September 2016, from <http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2016/08/property-taxes-and-unequal-schools/497333/>.
- ³⁸Hurst, David. et. al. (2003, July). Overview and Inventory of State Education Reforms: 1990 to 2000. National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). US Department of Education. Washington, DC. Retrieved September 2016. <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2003/2003020.pdf>.
- ³⁹Kahlenberg, Richard, and Halley Potter. (2014, August). The Original Charter School Vision. The New York Times. Retrieved September 2016. <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/31/opinion/sunday/albert-shanker-the-original-charter-school-visionary.html>.
- ⁴⁰National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. (2016, November). A Growing Movement: America's Largest Charter Public School Communities and Their Impact on Student Outcomes. National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. Washington, DC. Retrieved September 2016. <http://www.publiccharters.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/CharterSchoolEnrollmentShareReport2016.pdf>.
- ⁴¹Tuttle, Christina Clark. et. al. (2015, September). Final Report – Understanding the Effect of KIPP as it Scales: Volume I, Impacts on Achievement and Other Outcomes. Mathematica Policy Research. Washington, DC. Retrieved September 2016. <https://www.mathematica-mpr.com/our-publications-and-findings/publications/understanding-the-effect-of-kipp-as-it-scales-volume-i-impacts-on-achievement-and-other-outcomes>.
- ⁴²Snyder, Tom. et. al. (2017). US Digest of Education Statistics 2017. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. Table 216.30. Retrieved May 2018, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d17/tables/dt17_216.30.asp?current=yes.
- ⁴³National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. (2017, October). A Growing Movement: America's Largest Charter Public School Communities. National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. Washington, DC. Retrieved May 2018 2016. http://www.publiccharters.org/sites/default/files/documents/2017-10/Enrollment_Share_Report_Web_0.pdf.
- ⁴⁴National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. (2016, April). Demanding a Chance: Parents' Demand for Charter Schools Continues to Grow. National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. Washington, DC. Retrieved September 2016. <http://www.publiccharters.org/publications/demanding-chance-parents-demand-charter-schools-continues-grow/>.
- ⁴⁵American Federation for Children. (2017). 2016-2017 School Choice Yearbook. American Federation for Children Growth Fund. Washington, DC. Retrieved May 2018. <https://www.federationforchildren.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/AFC-2016-17-Yearbook-FINAL.pdf>
- ⁴⁶Ibid.
- ⁴⁷US Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Service. (2015). Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP): A Short History of SNAP. US Department of Agriculture. Washington, DC. Retrieved September 2016. <http://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/short-history-snap>.
- ⁴⁸Electronic Benefit Transfer Interoperability and Portability Act of 2000. PL 106-171. (2000, February 11). Retrieved September 2016. http://www.fns.usda.gov/sites/default/files/PL_106-171.pdf.
- ⁴⁹Gladieux, Lawrence E. (1995, October). Federal Student Aid Policy: A History and Assessment. US Department of Education. Washington, DC. Retrieved September 2016. <https://www2.ed.gov/offices/OPE/PP/FinPostSecEd/gladieux.html>.
- ⁵⁰Ibid.
- ⁵¹Arizona Department of Education. (2016). Empowerment Scholarship Account Handbook: A Guide to Utilizing Your Empowerment Scholarship Account. Department of Education. Arizona. Retrieved on September 2016. <https://cms.azed.gov/home/GetDocumentFile?id=5786c524aadebe17ecd0b310>.
- ⁵²Proctor, Bernadette D. et. al. (2015) Income and Poverty in the United States: 2015. US Census Bureau. Washington, DC. Retrieved September 2016. <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2016/demo/income-poverty/p60-256.html>.
- ⁵³Agenda for Children. (2016). Preschool Expansion Grant Partnership Handbook. Agenda for Children...a voice for Louisiana's children and families. Louisiana. Retrieved September 2016. <http://www.agendaforchildren.org/uploads/documents/PEG/Preschool%20Expansion%20Grant%20Handbook%20FINAL%20Sept.%202015.pdf>.
- ⁵⁴Snyder, Tom. et. al. (2015). US Digest of Education Statistics 2015. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. Table 401.70. Retrieved September 2016, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/tables/dt15_401.70.asp?current=yes.
- ⁵⁵Chabrier, Julia. et. al. (2016, July). What Can We Learn from Charter School Lotteries? National Bureau of Economic Research. Working paper No. 22390. Washington, DC. Retrieved September 2016. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w22390.pdf>.
- ⁵⁶Whitehurst, Grover J. (2016, April). Family support or school readiness? Contrasting models of public spending on children's early care and learning. Brookings Institute. Evidence Speaks Reports. Volume 1. No. 16. Retrieved September 2016. <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Family-support3.pdf>.
- ⁵⁷For the purpose of this analysis, the total amount of Title I funds received by Indiana and Louisiana in 2013-14 were used, as was the number of students who qualified for FRPL in that year. Although somewhat arbitrary, the base and premium amounts are feasible for those two states in that year.