AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

S. HRG. 107–46

TITLE I PROGRAM

HEARING

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

SPECIAL HEARING

APRIL 20, 2001—JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.access.gpo.gov/congress/senate

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

72–478 PDF WASHINGTON : 2002

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

TED STEVENS, Alaska, *Chairman*

THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi
ARLEN SPECTER, Pennsylvania
PETE V. DOMENICI, New Mexico
CHRISTOPHER S. BOND, Missouri
MITCH McCONNELL, Kentucky
CONRAD BURNS, Montana
RICHARD C. SHELBY, Alabama
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
ROBERT F. BENNETT, Utah
BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, Colorado
LARRY CRAIG, Idaho
KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, Texas
MIKE DEWINE, Ohio

ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia
DANIEL K. INOUYE, Hawaii
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, South Carolina
PATRICK J. LEAHY, Vermont
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
HARRY REID, Nevada
HERB KOHL, Wisconsin
PATTY MURRAY, Washington
BYRON L. DORGAN, North Dakota
DIANNE FEINSTEIN, California
RICHARD J. DURBIN, Illinois
TIM JOHNSON, South Dakota
MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana

STEVEN J. CORTESE, *Staff Director*
LISA SUTHERLAND, *Deputy Staff Director*
JAMES H. ENGLISH, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

ARLEN SPECTER, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
LARRY CRAIG, Idaho
KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, Texas
TED STEVENS, Alaska
MIKE DEWINE, Ohio

TOM HARKIN, Iowa
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, South Carolina
DANIEL K. INOUYE, Hawaii
HARRY REID, Nevada
HERB KOHL, Wisconsin
PATTY MURRAY, Washington
MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana
ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia
(Ex officio)

Professional Staff
BETTILOU TAYLOR
MARY DIETRICH
JIM SOURWINE
ELLEN MURRAY *(Minority)*

Administrative Support
CORREY DIVINEY
CAROLE GEAGLEY *(Minority)*

CONTENTS

	Page
Opening statement of Senator Thad Cochran	1
Statement of Dr. Richard Thompson, State Superintendent of Education, Mississippi Department of Education	2
Statement of Dr. Lynn House, bureau director, Office of Innovative Support, Mississippi Department of Education	4
Statement of Joyce B. McNair, superintendent, Humphreys County School District	5
Prepared statement	7
Statement of Dr. Therrell Myers, superintendent, Columbus Municipal School District	8
Prepared statement	10
Statement of Dr. Daniel Watkins, superintendent, Yazoo City Municipal School District	11
Prepared statement	13
Prepared statement of the Office of Research and Statistics, Mississippi Department of Education	21

TITLE I PROGRAM

FRIDAY, APRIL 20, 2001

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Jackson, MS.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., in the auditorium of the Central High School Building, Mississippi Department of Education, Hon. Thad Cochran presiding.

Present: Senator Cochran.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR THAD COCHRAN

Senator COCHRAN. Good morning. It's a pleasure for me to convene and welcome you to this hearing of the United States Senate Committee on Appropriations. The subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies is chaired by Senator Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania, who has authorized me to chair this hearing. This is the second hearing of the subcommittee we've had in Mississippi this week. The first, in Bay Saint Louis, examined the effectiveness of the National Writing Project in Mississippi schools, particularly schools on the Mississippi Gulf Coast.

We appreciate very much the assistance of Dr. Richard Thompson, superintendent of Mississippi Department of Education, and Dr. Susan Rucker, associate superintendent, and their staff members in preparation for this hearing and for allowing us to use this auditorium.

The purpose of today's hearing is to review the Title I Grants to LEAs (Title I) Program of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Title I is the largest Federal education program for elementary and secondary schools. It was enacted as part of the first comprehensive Federal education program in 1965. Since then, nearly $133 billion have been made available to States and school districts to improve opportunities for a good education of disadvantaged students.

In the first year, Mississippi schools received about $24 million from the Title I program. Last year, our State's share amounted to about $126 million. Out of the student population in Mississippi's public schools of about 500,000, about 150,000 are Title I eligible students. Most of the schools in Mississippi receive Title I funds.

This hearing provides the United States Senate with an opportunity to learn more about the Title I Program and how it is working in Mississippi. We're very pleased to have such a distinguished panel of witnesses today to discuss this with me, and I'm looking

forward to their testimony. Each witness has provided the subcommittee with written testimony, which we make a part of the hearing record. We also have written materials furnished to the committee and presented to me this morning by the State Department of Education about the Title I Program, and that will be made a part of the hearing record, as well. I invite the witnesses to make whatever comments, verbal testimony available to the committee that you think will assist us in understanding the issues before us.

[CLERK'S NOTE.—The material submitted is being retained in the Subcommittee files.]

Senator COCHRAN. Panel 1: Dr. Richard Thompson, State Superintendent of Education, Mississippi Department of Education; Dr. Lynn House, Bureau Director, Office of Innovative Support, Mississippi Department of Education; Ms. Joyce B. McNair, Superintendent, Humphreys County School District; Dr. Therrell Myers, Superintendent, Columbus Municipal School District; Dr. Daniel Watkins, Superintendent, Yazoo City Municipal School District.

Dr. Richard Thompson is the State superintendent of education for Mississippi. He earned his Doctorate of Education and Master's Degree from the University of North Carolina. Dr. Lynn House is the director of the Office of Innovative Support of the Mississippi Department of Education and administers the Title I Program in Mississippi. Dr. House has 26 years of experience as an educator. She's been a principal, teacher and a teacher educator. She holds a Ph.D from the University of Mississippi, a Master's Degree from Firmin University and a Bachelor's Degree from the University of New Orleans. Ms. Joyce McNair is the superintendent of the Humphreys County School District. She attended Humphreys County schools before earning her Bachelor's Degree at Tulane College and her Master's Degree from Delta State University. Ms. McNair is currently enrolled in a doctoral program at Delta State. She has 31 years of experience as a public educator. Dr. Therrell Myers is superintendent of the Columbus Municipal School District. He's been an educator for 27 years. He previously served as associate superintendent at the Mississippi Department of Education. He has a Ph.D from Mississippi State University. Dr. Daniel Watkins is the superintendent of the Yazoo City School District. He earned his Bachelor's, Master's and Ph.D in educational specialties at Jackson State University.

I welcome you all to our hearing and invite you to proceed. Dr. Thompson, we'll start with you. Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF DR. RICHARD THOMPSON, STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION, MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Dr. THOMPSON. Senator Cochran, thank you so much for being here and conducting this hearing, and we really appreciate the opportunity to present. As you have indicated, I have some literal information in support of our strong opinion of the value of Title I in the schools for the children in Mississippi.

My comments this morning will be not repetitious of the ones that I had submitted necessarily in writing, but I do want to try to make significant that since 1985, we believe that Mississippi has made more progress than any other State in the Nation in edu-

cation. And one of the unfortunate things is that we were so far behind. In fact, a former governor of the State once said that, in 1954, in the history of our State, only 1 in 4 white children will graduate from high school in Mississippi. At that same time, in the history of our State, 1 in 40 black children will graduate from high school.

To have the tremendous improvement we've had has only been made possible through the additional resources by this title. We were so pleased just last April 9th, just a few days ago, when a major press release was released by the name of the National Assessment of Educational Progress Report, that stated that Mississippi is one of 4 States in the Nation that had made the most progress with their bottom children and also their top children and had improved on more indicators than any other State, with the exception of Connecticut, Kentucky and North Carolina. So we felt very good about that.

Well, again, I would point out that it is the infusion of those dollars, such as Title I, that have allowed us to make this progress. And we continue to have great need, because, as you know, 65 percent of the children in Mississippi that are in public schools are on free or reduced lunch. And we know the poverty standard that's applied to Title I, and Title I allocation is different, and it only reflects 27 percent of our children in poverty. And it is somewhat conflicted, but we know that that standard does create some problems for us, because we believe that many of our children are actually in poverty that may not be reflected by that particular statistic.

There is no question that as we move into our new accountability system, that Title I funds will be more important than, perhaps, they have ever been. Our State struggles with the need to provide quality pre-kindergarten programs for our youngsters. And at this point, there is not a single State dollar that goes into that program. The brain research that's being developed indicates that one of the most significant things you could do for our children is to provide a quality program of pre-kindergarten. And the data is overwhelming. One research has indicated it may be as much as a 16.5 differential, based on that kind of experience. So what is happening is 61 of our locations have chosen to use Title I dollars to help with that significant problem, and it is making a difference.

In addition to that, we, in our new accountability system, are holding everyone accountable, teachers, principals, superintendents, school board members and, yes, students for improvement standards and increasing achievement. One of the things we know we must do is we must view this, not as a punitive measure, but a measure of diagnosing the needs of children early on and providing the kind of resources that help intervention, if you will, to meet those needs so these children can achieve and have an opportunity to the quality of life as any other child in America would have. And many of our districts have only this pot of money to look to provide that additional help, perhaps an after-school program, perhaps an early childhood program, for some of our youngsters at the high school level, even, the only remediation our districts can reach is Title I.

Again, Senator, we're so grateful to you for your leadership and what you're doing for our State, and we stand ready to assist you and your committee any way that we can.

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Thompson. We'll now turn to Dr. Lynn House. Welcome. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF DR. LYNN HOUSE, BUREAU DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INNOVATIVE SUPPORT, MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Dr. HOUSE. Thank you so much, Senator Cochran and thanks to your staff for helping us get everything organized for today and special thanks to the superintendents here today who will also be testifying.

First of all, I would like to emphasize the fact that the 152 school districts in our State all receive Title I funds. Every one of these districts spend literally months and many hours in the planning process, so that every single cent of that money is spent wisely. In fact, they're in the process now of completing their consolidated application that will be the fruit to bear from all that planning.

I also would like to say that we have received our preliminary allocation from the USDE. That preliminary allocation indicates that we will take a two to three percent cut in our funding for the coming year. When we reflect on what that means to our children and our district, this is the kind of scene that we predict: First of all, we believe that at least 6,500 students will no longer receive Title I services. We also believe that a minimum of 75 teachers will no longer be there to provide the instructional support that those Title I children need.

You heard Dr. Thompson mention the importance of pre-K programs. We really have emphasized to our districts how vital that aspect of Title I is. We believe that we will not only see districts failing to implement pre-K programs with Title I dollars, we're really concerned that some of those that are currently in existence will be cut. We also believe very strongly that extended days, extended year programs that are funded through Title I are providing that additional instructional time that so many youngsters need to be successful academically. Those programs will also suffer. Professional development is another area that we believe will be cut with this funding reduction. Professional development is the way we help our teachers grow in their profession, so that they, indeed, can truly meet the needs of these youngsters who are at risk. Parent centers and parent activities, we believe, will also be impacted negatively by these cuts. We know the importance of involving parents in the education of their children. Those activities are, of course, required by Title I and will continue in some degree, but we also believe that some of the innovations will be cut with this funding loss.

And lastly, I'd like to say that from the State perspective, we do a lot in trying to provide technical assistance to our districts. We believe we are a service agency, not just a regulatory agency. So we're in the district every year helping them with the planning process and doing some problem solving with them to help them understand how best to go about meeting the needs of their children through their Title I funding. We believe that because of the

cut, we, too, will have to cut back on providing those services in some form or fashion.

I'd like to close by just reading to you what Hilton Miller said about Title I. You might not know Hilton Miller, but he's one of our 2000 distinguished graduates for our Title I recognition program sponsored by the USDE. Hilton Miller said this: On this ladder that society calls life, I have come to realize that one step does not lead to another, it is the individual who decides whether or not to continue to climb, and if so, which step he or she must conquer. The Title I program helped me make my climb. Now, Hilton Miller, who was very recently the vice president of the University of Mississippi Law School student body is now a practicing attorney. He credited his success in many ways to the Title I program and what that program was able to do for him. His story is just one of thousands.

We know we're impacting our children positively, and with the loss of funding, we know that impact will be lessened. So we would certainly request that you do everything you can, as we know you will, to help Mississippi receive its fair share of funding so that we, too, can continue to impact students like Hilton Miller.

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you very much, Dr. House. Let's now turn to Ms. Joyce McNair. Welcome.

STATEMENT OF JOYCE B. McNAIR, SUPERINTENDENT, HUMPHREYS COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Ms. MCNAIR. Good morning. It's an honor to be here, and we thank you for coming to our State. And I would like to share with you, I am from Humphreys County, the Mississippi Delta. We are a rural community. Forty-five percent of the students in my district live in poverty. Seventy-five percent of those students come from single parent homes. Our district serves approximately 2,300 children from pre-K to 12. We were once a thriving farming community. We have very little industry. Our farms are disappearing, and our children are suffering because of the economics in our community. But it has been through the efforts of our Title I funds that we have been able to provide services to our children and our families, as well as our staff in enabling them to reach and teach those children.

We have, in our community, because of the educational level, 50-something percent of our population that's 25 or older who do not have high school degrees. Of our community, 12 percent have graduated from college or have higher degrees. So when our children come into our school districts because of this environment, they come language delayed, but through the efforts of Title I, our students are able to achieve and overcome this barrier because of the programs in our district that we use our Title I funds for.

Our reading initiative is one that I would like to share with you that we are doing with our Title I funds. If these are cut, it will have a devastating effect on our students served by our reading initiative. It is a statewide reading initiative, but for us, it is a crucial initiative, because we know the children cannot read, and they're not going to be successful. We use those funds in our reading initiative to diagnose children. We use an analytical reading inventory, and from this inventory, we are able to do prescriptive interven-

tion. And this is where our Title I teachers come in. They actually work with the students on their weaknesses and strengths. We prescribe and we help each other as teachers in our district to come up with intervention strategies that will work for these students. And this happens in our early grades, because if we do not start early, then they will not be successful in school. Not only do we use it with our reading initiative, but it enables us to hire extra teachers to reduce our class size, enable us to provide a lot of one-on-one attention that our children need.

Many of our children, to share something else about our district, our children, the majority of them, we have students that ride as long as 45 minutes, one way, to school. And these are kindergartners that may be doing that. So when they arrive at school, we have to be there to provide them with all the necessary equipment and resources to enable them to have a good education.

We also use our Title I funds to offset, to work with our parents. We have a parent center, and in this parent center, we have liaisons that go out into our homes and work with our parents. We have found that, in our community, it is very difficult to get parents to come to the school. And through Title I, we're bridging that gap, we're seeing them become more involved, because we're sending our parent center people out to the homes, to their workplaces, and they're meeting with them. Our community businesses have been very good to us about letting us come into their businesses and meet with our parents, so we can share progress reports or any other information that they may need about school. Not only will the parent center do these things, but that parent center provides training for our parents, teaching them how to help with their children, how to be parents, parenting skills, how to help with homework. And we're also training them to be educators, because they are their children's first teachers.

We have used those funds over the years to—not only do we care about our underachieving students, but we do have some very bright children in our district. And to address those needs, we've taken our Title I funds to host a Saturday academy. And we brought in teachers from Mississippi schools of math and science to work with our students, these are eighth and ninth graders, also, and train our teachers in mathematics and science. Our parents were a part of this program, they came on Saturday also. And believe it or not, we targeted 40 students, and every Saturday, we had 40 students plus parents there, because there was an educational need.

PREPARED STATEMENT

And lastly but not least, I would like to say that, without these funds, districts like mine, well, the impact would be tremendous. And we use our dollars wisely to meet the needs of all of our children, because our children are our most precious resource. And in our district, we believe truly that the children of Humphreys County should be afforded every educational opportunity as children anywhere in America. Thank you.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOYCE B. MCNAIR

I am superintendent of the Humphreys County School District which serves approximately 2300 students from Pre-K to 12. We are the only public school in the county which is located in Belzoni, MS (the Heart of the MS Delta). The majority of our students are bused with many of them traveling at least 45 minutes one way to school. Our school is located in a county that is rural, agrarian, with a population of approximately 11,000. A county that was once a thriving farming community, but in recent years we have seen many farms disappear, industry leave, and many of our best and brightest minds leave our community due to the lack of jobs. Humphreys County has a high incidence of poverty 96 percent of our students qualify for free and reduced lunch, 75 percent come from single parent families, and 45 percent of our county live in poverty. The educational level of our community is low-53 percent of the population age 25 and above did not graduate from high school, while approximately 12 percent of the population have college degrees or higher. From these statistics you can see that the majority of our students are at-risk educationally, culturally, and economically.

The data reflects that our children live in an environment that is educationally and economically deprived. Also from experience in working with the students and parents as a teacher, school administrator, and now superintendent, I know that our children face many economic and educational challenges. Because of their environment many of our students enter school language delayed, and lack the proper early literacy skills necessary to be successful in school. The lack of these skills tend to keep our student behind, and constantly struggling to catch up and maintain. But with the proper assessment and interventions in the teaching and learning process due to Title I we are able to overcome many of these barriers. It is through our Title I dollars that we provide our staff with high quality, on-going professional development, purchase supplies/materials and equipment needed to enhance the learning environment, hire teachers to reduce teacher/pupil ratio and support staff (Assistant Teachers) to provide extra intervention/prevention for the students.

However, despite these statistics our school system has grown. Our students have some of the best and brightest minds of students anywhere in this state or country. Title I funds have aided the Humphreys County School District in its quest to provided services for our students and their parents, and staff. It has been the mainstay of support to help us improve teaching and learning, and increase literacy among our parents. We have used Title I funds to provide early literacy training for our Pre-K program, Headstart and other day care providers; provide teachers training on intervention/prevention strategies, and learning styles to increase student achievement; and expose our staff to best practices and reform models for school improvement; establish parent centers to provide training for our parents in areas such as parenting skills, early literacy intervention, and technology. Also funds are used to hire home-school liaisons to keep parents informed of the academic progress of their children, attendance, and any other pertinent information parents need to help their children and stay informed of school events and activities. We know that parent involvement is crucial in the education of a child, especially if we are to see increases in student achievement.

Funds also are used to provide after school tutorial to meet the needs of students who are low achievers or students who have fallen through the cracks along the way. This year we encountered a group of 7th graders who could not read. To meet the needs of these children, we hired an excellent remedial teacher through our Title I funds. Theses students were placed in a transitional class where instruction was modified to meet their needs. These students ability to read increased at least one grade level. Not only do we use Title I funds to meet the needs of our underachievers but also our average and above average students as well. To meet the needs of these students we sponsored a Saturday Academy where students and parents engaged in standards based math and science activities integrating technology.

To help ease the transition of our pre-schoolers, each year we sponsor a transitional program with our local Headstart agency during the extended year program. We will be blending many services with Headstart and other child care providers to promote early literacy (i.e. professional development, student shadowing programs, etc.)

Over the years Title I has made a tremendous impact on the quality of education our children receive. It is because of these funds, we have produced many products like my colleague and former student, Dr. Daniel Watkins, Superintendent of Yazoo City Schools.

Having grown up in this community and attended school there, I am fully aware of its needs, its culture, and its economical conditions. I know that we must offer our children hope and assure them that they too can achieve the American dream

if they prepare themselves educationally. I strongly believe that the children of Humphreys County, MS should be afforded the same educational opportunities as student in America's most affluent communities. They, too, deserve the best education possible and we are charged as a state, county, district, and nation to see that this goal is achieved. For without Title I funds, we, the Humphreys County School System would not be able to increase student achievement, motivate students, and instill them the love of learning and a since of pride.

STATEMENT OF DR. THERRELL MYERS, SUPERINTENDENT, COLUMBUS MUNICIPAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you very much, Ms. McNair. Let me now call on Dr. Therrell Myers.

Dr. MYERS. Thank you very much, Senator Cochran. It's indeed a privilege to be a part of this panel this morning on behalf of the Columbus School District. Title I provides assistance to children in high poverty schools and supports other district, State and Federal programs through its focus on school wide reform efforts that we have.

As you've already heard, parental involvement, professional development, standards and assessments are critical. They are supported through this initiative. The Columbus Municipal School District is a very progressive school district in innovating strategies, teaching and learning processes. The district is guided, we have a very simple vision center to where commitment and support equals the ultimate learning experience for our children. With this vision, we very much so indeed reflect that to providing admission, providing a quality education for every child.

I'm going to give you a little statistics about our district and about our children so you can kind of unfold the parameters of what's happening in the actual communities we live in. Our rolls are approximately 5,300 students. More and more of them, or 3,700 or 70 percent of these students live in poverty, which is based on free and reduced lunch criteria. We are a high poverty school district.

To illustrate a few of the challenges we face, allow me to profile a student from a family struggling to make ends meet. I want you, as a policy maker and other legislators or just ordinary people, to understand what Title I means to children who are growing up poor. Children of poverty face special burdens. Most of these children's parents grew up poorly and struggled in school themselves. So being in school is not really very important to them and to encourage their children. Some children have innate resourcefulness, and others do not. Some seem to sail through childhood oblivious of the parents' economic degree, others do not. Obtaining timely and good medical and dental care has often been a problem for these families. Some of these children go to bed hungry, particularly at the end of the month when the money the parents have set aside for food is diverted to pay high cost utility bills. Some of the children fall asleep to a parent reading to them, while others put themselves to bed on the floor, counting the minutes until their parents return home from a night-shift job. Fear is a common emotion among many of our students. Some children are doing well in school, others have failed several grades, or even on the verge of failing more grades, as we're getting our data together. Some have great plans for the future, as you've heard already testified, others have no plans at all for their future.

As a school leader, I must do everything in my power to ensure that public policy increases the prospect for all children in the State of Mississippi. The well-being of our Nation depends greatly upon our school's ability to provide meaningful and challenging educational experiences. For more than 14 million American children who are growing up in poor families, Title I supports that as an underlying thread.

Research and experience both show that poverty negatively impacts students' academic achievement. Students living in poverty are more likely to have lower test scores, more learning disabilities, increased special education needs and are at a greater risk of dropping out of school. Now, Title I focuses on meeting the expected educational needs of children living in poverty that you so well know. Using Title I district funds, additional State funds and other Federal funds coupled together, we provide the direct services to improve academic achievement. We also lower our student teacher pupil ratio. We're now 1 to 18 in our K through 6 schools. As you've heard Dr. Thompson already referenced it, we are using these dollars to impact early intervention areas. Our student, our Title I allocation is $1.6 million for this school year, and it is leveraged with other district, State and Federal funds to meet the needs of our children in K through 6. The services advance student achievement, enabling them to meet the State's challenging academic performance, as you've already heard the new accountability system. These funds also are lying in our district to counteract many of them from effects of poverty. Due to the Title I revenues, this is what happens: Students receive more direct instruction, extended learning opportunities and access to enriching instructional materials. Teachers are participating in professional development funded through Title I, which is infused with the most current research phase instructional practices, so that our students do have the chance, the aids and the desire to be successful.

Now, due to the early interventions made by Title I, our district's dropout rate and graduation rate has improved. Our dropout rate in Columbus has decreased to 3.7 percent this year, on the most recent data, from a previous year of 8.2 percent. Our graduation rate is now 78.35 percent. And we're not overjoyed with that, we're extremely pleased every student entering the ninth grade, four years later, 78.35 percent are successfully completing all the requirements in Mississippi schools.

In closing, according to the most recent National education goals report that Dr. Thompson has already referenced about Mississippi, Mississippi is showing gains in the fourth grade math and reading scores. In mathematics, Mississippi increased the top, the average, the bottom fortiles and became 1 of only 8 States to tighten the achievement gap between the top and bottom fortiles. These academic means are possible, in part, due to the Title I Program that is allowing us to move the lower fortile and lessen the number there to enhance the upper levels for our children in our State.

PREPARED STATEMENT

As we in Columbus continue to strive for excellence in education, not only through Title I, but through every effort that is made, we simply cannot lower our achievement goals and levels. The bench

mark has been raised, the bar has been raised to fully support high academic achievement for every child. Simply said, failure is not an option for children in Mississippi.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THERRELL MYERS

Title I provides assistance to at-risk children in high-poverty schools and supports other district, state, and Federal programs through its focus on school-wide reform efforts, parental involvement, professional development, standards, and assessments. Through Title I funds, local education agencies are improving basic programs to meet the needs of students in high poverty schools.

—The Columbus Municipal School District (CMSD) is a progressive school district committed to innovative strategies for teaching and learning. The district is guided by the vision, "Where Commitment and Support Equals the Ultimate Learning Experience . . . Level Five by 2005!" This vision reflects our deep commitment to becoming the top ranked school district in the state as well as the Nation. Our mission is "to provide a quality education for every child."

—Our enrollment is approximately 5300 students. More importantly, over 3,700 or 70 percent of these students live in poverty, so we are a high poverty school district. To illustrate the challenges we face, allow me to profile a student from a family struggling to make ends meet. I want you as policymakers, legislators, and ordinary people to understand what Title I means to children in poverty.

—Children, who are growing up poor, face special burdens. Most of these children's parents grew up poor and struggled in school themselves, so being in a school is not really comfortable for them. Some children have an innate resourcefulness and others do not. Some seem to sail through childhood oblivious to their parents' economic struggles, but this is seldom the case. Obtaining timely and good-quality medical and dental care is often a problem. Some of these children go to bed hungry, particularly at the end of the month, when the money their parents have set aside for food is diverted to keep the electricity on.

—Some of these children fall asleep to a parent reading to them; while others put themselves to bed on the floor, counting the minutes until their parent returns home from a night-shift job. Fear is a common emotion for many low-income children.

—Some children are doing well in school; others have failed several grades or are on the verge of failing. Some have great plans for their futures while others have no plans at all.

—As a school leader, I must do everything in my power to ensure that public policy increases the prospects for all of our children. The well-being of our Nation depends greatly upon our schools ability to provide meaningful and challenging educational experiences for the more than 14 million American children who are growing up in poor families.

—Research and experience both show that poverty negatively impacts students' academic achievement. Students living in poverty are more likely to have low test scores, more learning disabilities, increased special education needs, and are at a greater risk of dropping out of school.

—Title I focuses on meeting the expansive educational needs of children living in poverty. Using Title I, district, state, and other Federal funds, our district provides direct services to improve the academic achievement potential of these children living in poverty. In our K–6 schools, Title I funds allow our district to reduce class size (Our average class size is now 18). Title I provides supplementary instructional materials and research-based professional development for our teachers. Title I allows us to extend the school day and school year to provide these students a safe haven, filled with enriching educational experiences.

—The district's annual Title I allocation, $1.6 million in fiscal year 2000, is leveraged with other district, state, and Federal funds, to allow Columbus Schools to provide direct services to students in our low income Kindergarten through 6th grade schools. The services advance student achievement enabling them to meet the state's challenging academic performance standards.

—Title I funding is allowing our district to counteract many of the insurmountable affects of poverty. Due to Title I revenues, students receive more direct instruction, extended learning opportunities, and access to enriching instructional materials. Teachers, participating in professional development funded through Title I, are infusing research-based instructional practices into the classroom.

The evidence is clear; due to these direct services our lower quartile students are performing better on standardized tests and the special education placements are declining in the district, from 662 last year to 638 this year.

—Due to these early interventions made possible by Title I, our district's dropout and graduation rates are improving. Our dropout rate has decreased to 3.7 percent this year from previous years 8.2 percent and our graduation rate is now 78.35 percent.

—There is no doubt, Title I funding allows our district to better serve our children living in poverty. With an increase in Title I funding, our district will continue to offer direct services to students to decrease class size, offer enriching extended day and extended year academic based programs, and expand teacher capacity through research-based professional development. Our teachers need training in the use of technology, effective discipline methods, time management, and crisis intervention. Quality professional development at the local level is a tremendous need.

—In closing, according to the most recent National Education Goals Panel Report, Mississippi is showing gains in both 4th grade math and reading scores. In Mathematics, Mississippi increased the top, average, and bottom quartile scores and became one of only eight states to tighten the achievement gap between the top and bottom quartiles. In Reading, Mississippi also increased scores, especially in the lower quartile, further narrowing the gap between top and bottom quartiles. We feel that these gains are an express result of direct services provided to our students, services largely in part made possible through Title I funding.

—As we continue to strive for excellence in education, Columbus Municipal School District requests not only a continuation of Title I funding, but an increase in Title I funding, to further support the district's high achievement expectations for every student. By increasing Title I funding, all of our students, including the 3,700 living in poverty, will continue to be assured a quality education, and the ability, motivation, and confidence to learn throughout a lifetime.

STATEMENT OF DR. DANIEL WATKINS, SUPERINTENDENT, YAZOO CITY MUNICIPAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Myers. And we'll hear from Dr. Daniel Watkins.

Dr. WATKINS. Good morning.

Senator COCHRAN. Good morning.

Dr. WATKINS. I want to start by saying that, in Yazoo City, many of our parents work outside of Yazoo City, in Madison County, Hinds County, as well as Warren County. And I want to go on record as saying that without extended day and extended year, we would be in a terrible position, but I also have records and stats to support all of what I'm going to say, but I want to offer myself as a living testimony to what Title I has meant to Mississippi, to the Delta and my family.

My name is Daniel Watkins, and I am the superintendent of the Yazoo City public schools. I am a 1976 graduate of Humphreys County High School. I began my educational career in 1964 in Louise, my home town. It was 1971 that schools combined in Humphreys County, and my mother, I mention again, was a school bus driver. She was also a single parent with 7 children, and we would rise at 4 in the morning, and we would depart on the school bus at 4:30 to go all over Louise to drive to Belzoni.

I also wanted to mention that my first 3 years at elementary school, I had a severe speech impediment that allowed me to be quiet when I knew answers, but I do remember Title I funding, a speech pathologist, to bring me out of my shyness. Again, I grew up in a small delta town called Louise, with my mother being the mother, the father, a provider and whatever else she needed to be. Besides school, our work consisted of working in the cotton fields.

My mother drove a school bus and worked in the school's cafeteria. One of the happiest days of my mother's life was when she received her GED. Needless to say, she stressed education daily and yearly throughout my grade school life. There were many needs in our school system back then, to the extent that I did not quite understand, but I have since learned that through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Federal Government reduced many of these needs. In my later years, I have seen the happiness of my mother as she observes her daughter working with a parenting program in Louisville, Mississippi, and two of her sons receiving Ph.D's. Without the increasing help of Title I, none of these could have been achieved in the lives of a poor Delta family.

I had the opportunity in the mid 1990's to become principal of the middle school that is in an impoverished area here in Jackson. It was there that I experienced first hand the tremendous importance of Title I. This school is known for its athletics, discipline problems, low attendance and feeble parent support, not to mention low achievement. I was able to sit down with students, teachers, parents and community residents to address the question what can we do. We kept it very simple. We would use Title I money to tutor mornings and evenings in the areas of reading and math. In addition, we would enhance this process by simultaneously computerizing the whole school and offering computer literacy courses to teachers and parents. We then would utilize Title I money to address weaknesses of teachers through innovative professional development. A parent center was created on campus to aid parents in any way possible to get students to achieve. In a period of 4 years, all of the problems before mentioned decreased significantly. The morale sky-rocketed, and this school became one of the top achieving schools in Jackson, with students from disadvantaged areas. Without the increasing help of Title I, none of these things could have been achieved.

As superintendent of Yazoo City public schools, 15 miles south of where I grew up and 35 miles north of where I was principal, I see some disturbing problems. There's very little formal education from infants to 3 years old. Teen pregnancy is extremely high. There is an alarming single parent home percentage. There's very high poverty rates. And all of these variables sustain low student achievement. Though raising the achievement of this school system is a challenge, it is not insoluble. It will take efforts of all who are concerned. We must have programs early and extended day and extended year. We must have programs to address the many needs of this community and others. It is imperative that we continue in a progressive mode. The community of Yazoo City has not only become accustomed to certain programs, but has become dependent. The Title I programs are a continual and integral part in the life of a Yazoo City student. Without the increasing help of Title I, few of the previously mentioned variables that diminish student achievement could be challenged.

In closing, these are personal thoughts from one who has been educated, is an educator and has observed education for almost 37 years in Mississippi. This is Mississippi, it does contain a delta, it is ranked sometimes the number 50 or 49, depending on the year, in education. Whenever I hear of reductions in education, my heart

goes back to my experiences as a student, a teacher, principal, as well as superintendent. In my professional opinion, the forces that depress education are not giving in. The forces that propel education must be enhanced.

PREPARED STATEMENT

I ask myself what would I cut, how can I prioritize when lives hang in the balance. If a program can support 20 to 25, and 25 shows up, and all of my resources are exhausted, what criteria can I use. How do I face the 5 to tell them no. Somehow, through my life, I was always blessed to be between that number 20 and that number 25. There are a lot of 20 to 25's out there hoping and praying that all who are involved continue to march forward without a moment of retreat. Without the increasing help of Title I, we could lose success and achievement and lives. Thank you, Senator.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DANIEL WATKINS

My name is Daniel Watkins, and I am the superintendent of the Yazoo City Public Schools. I am a 1976 graduate of Humphreys County High School. I grew up in a small delta town called Louise with my mother being the mother, father, a provider and whatever else she needed to be. Besides school, our work consisted of working in the cotton fields. My mother drove a school bus and worked in the school's cafeteria. One of the happiest days in my mother's life was when she received her GED. Needless to say, she stressed education daily and yearly throughout my grade school life. There were many needs in our school system back then to the extent that I did not quite understand. But I have since learned that through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the Federal government reduced many of the needs. In my later years, I have seen the happiness of my mother as she observes her daughter working with a parenting program in Louisville, Mississippi, and two of her sons receiving Ph.D.s. Without the increasing help of Title I, none of these could have been achieved in the lives of a poor delta family.

I had the opportunity in the mid-nineties to become principal of a middle school that is in an impoverished area in Jackson, Mississippi. It was there that I experienced first hand the tremendous importance of Title I. This school was known for its athletics, discipline problems, low attendance, and feeble parent support, not to mention low achievement. I was able to sit down with students, teachers, parents, and community residents and address the question, "What can we do?" We kept it very simple. We would use Title I money to tutor mornings and evenings in the areas of reading and math. In addition, we would enhance this process by simultaneously computerizing the whole school and offering computer literacy courses to teachers and parents. We then would utilize Title I money to address weaknesses of teachers through innovative professional development. A parent center was created on campus to aid parents in any way possible to get students to achieve. In a period of four years, all of the problems aforementioned decreased significantly. The morale skyrocketed and this school became one of the top achieving schools in Jackson with students from disadvantaged areas. Without the increasing help of Title I, none of these things could have been achieved.

As superintendent of the Yazoo City Public Schools, fifteen miles south of where I grew up, and thirty-five miles north of where I was principal, I see some disturbing problems. There is very little formal education from infancy to three. Teen pregnancy is extremely high. There is an alarming single parent home percentage. There is a very high poverty rate. All of these variables sustain low student achievement.

Though raising the achievement of this school system is a challenge, it is not insurmountable. It will take the efforts of all who are concerned. We must have programs early and extended day. We must have an extended year. We must have programs to address the many needs of this community and others. It is imperative that we continue in a progressive mode. The community of Yazoo City has not only become accustomed to such programs, but has become dependent. The Title I programs are a continuing integral part in the life of a Yazoo City student. Without the increasing help of Title I, few of the previously mentioned variables that diminish student achievement could be challenged.

In closing, these are personal thoughts from one who has been educated, is an educator and has observed education for almost thirty-seven years in Mississippi. This is Mississippi, it does contain a delta, it is ranked sometimes number 50 or 49 depending on the year in education. Whenever I hear of reductions in education, my heart goes back to my experiences as a student, a teacher, principal as well as superintendent. In my professional opinion the forces that depress education are not giving in. The forces that propel education must be enhanced. I asked myself, what would I cut? How can I prioritize when lives hang in the balances? If a program can support twenty and twenty-five shows up and all of my resources are exhausted, what criteria can I use? How do I face the five to tell them no? Somehow, through my life, I was always blessed to be between twenty and twenty-five. There are a lot of twenty to twenty-fives' out there hoping and praying that all who are involved continues to march forward without a moment of retreat.

Without the increasing help of Title I, we could lose success in achievement and lives.

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Watkins. Very interesting and moving testimony that you've given us this morning. Your personal experiences are very helpful to us in understanding the real life consequences of this program and what it can do to broaden the horizons of a young student.

What was the name of the school? I know you said it, probably, and I just didn't write it down and remember it. When you were going to school, was there a Title I program in the school where you were going and what was the school?

Dr. WATKINS. Yes. My first 6 years was Montgomery Elementary and Louise. My last 6 years was at Humphreys County in Humphreys County. The school that I was principal of was Pineville Middle school here in Jackson.

Senator COCHRAN. In your experience as principal and now as a superintendent, do you have any suggestions for how the Title I Program could be improved? I ask that question because my father was a principal and later became superintendent of a county school district here in Hinds County, as a matter of fact, and I recall his saying one time, this was about when I was running for Congress, he wanted me to do something about this, that the Federal funds that were coming into schools were too tightly restricted in how that they could be used, that they needed to be more broadly available so that local administrators could have more discretion in the use of the funds. Have you found that to be of a problem, or is the modern Title I Program more flexible in how you can use the funds that are available to you?

Dr. WATKINS. In the last two years, it has become more flexible, but I do want to say that we do need more money in the way of bringing together the various elements in the community. Often times, we could do more things at night, we can do more things with the community leaders, we can do more things with clergy and single parents, a lot of preventative measures. One thing I would like to see in Yazoo City, and I'm sure in other communities, is that we can take Federal money and offer more programs between the ages of birth to three years old. A lot of practices occur in some school systems where there is some retention in K and 1 and 2, but it is disadvantageous in later years. Some people are adopting the philosophy that sometimes it takes two years to give a student one year of a sound educational start. I would like to see more money, more release of restrictions in the area to better benefit early childhood.

Senator COCHRAN. There is some suggestion now being made about the administration in Washington that we should use the head start program more aggressively for intervention and reading instruction or maybe diagnostic activity. What's your reaction to that?

Dr. WATKINS. There, Senator, I agree. In fact, there in Yazoo City, we have 3,000 students. We have two classrooms, one each at our K through 2 schools. It is a blended class, with head start students there, but we need more. Again, in Yazoo City, from infancy to three, the majority of these students have no formal education. And even that one or two years in head start, even those blended classrooms, it is simply just not enough.

Senator COCHRAN. Dr. Myers, your experience is similar in that you have a city school district that you are responsible for administering. Is your reaction to my question to Dr. Watkins about the same in terms of the flexibility that you have for using Title I funds, did you have any suggestions for how the program could be changed to make it more helpful to you as an administrator?

Dr. MYERS. Senator Cochran, the flexibility as described already has allowed us the ability to look at our needs through a comprehensive needs assessment, and it's really working tremendously better in terms of the opportunity that we can design for our restricted areas, our local areas in a restricted process. There is no doubt early intervention is where it must be focused to be able to head the early problems off, to be able to correct those.

In our school district, we can give you some sample of this, we have a $34 million operational budget. We spend between $8 and $9 million annually trying to help children catch up. And we simply, in this country, cannot continue, and in our school districts. We must be able to advance that in those areas of need and talk about higher level of functioning versus helping children catch up. So coming to school ready to learn is very important. The flexibility is there now to allow us to do that. And as you shared earlier, we have some entering into agreements with our head start.

Post communications are really functioning now. And to give you a prime example of how it works, we had 175 child care providers in our schools this past month that we're going to train so that they know what is expected for a child to be able to enter school ready to learn. This flexibility must continue. We must be able to make the local decisions, the decisions locally based on our population.

Senator COCHRAN. You mentioned that you received $1.6 million from the Title I Program in your district this year. What is that in terms of percentage of the total budget that you have to work with?

Dr. MYERS. Well, I think percentage wise, I mean, I can get it accurately, I gave you an operational budget of $34 million.

Senator COCHRAN. $34 million.

Dr. MYERS. And that 1.6 is only a small supplement to our total educational process. And, as prescribed, we use it to advance and build upon, if I can use those terms. That's where the continued funding and the enhanced funding is so critical, because if those dollars reduce, then you can see the impact that that begins having in our district.

Senator COCHRAN. You probably heard Dr. House when she was discussing the reductions that have been passed on from the Department of Education in Washington. Allocations were less than they were last year, I guess compared from last year. What impact has that had in your particular school district?

Dr. MYERS. The impact will be fewer people, fewer services, and then we'll have to re-prioritize our priorities to try to serve those students in numbers that will remain, and, ultimately, that amounts to about 80,000, between 58,000 and 80,000, based on that percentage formula. So in terms, there's fewer teachers, there's fewer diagnostic services made available, our professional development with our teachers and research-based practices, how to work with young children will be lessened. And in the end, we reduce our services to our customer.

Senator COCHRAN. Ms. McNair, you mentioned that very eloquently, all the different programs that you have in your school district are designed to try to reach out to those who are disadvantaged and maybe don't have the right kind of leadership at home or in their community. The 45 percent figure you gave us, people in poverty in the district, is that the student population, that's the student population, so that helps determine the amount of Title I funds that you get. Do you have a figure for the amount of money that you actually get in Humphreys County?

Ms. MCNAIR. In Title I?

Senator COCHRAN. In Title I.

Ms. MCNAIR. $1.3 million.

Senator COCHRAN. $1.3 million. What is your reaction to the questions that I've asked to both Dr. Watkins and Dr. Myers, and that is the flexibility in the way the program is designed, do you have any suggestions about changes in the program, except for increases in money? I know we need more money, generally, we can use it in our State, but are there any program changes that you would recommend?

Ms. MCNAIR. I think in the recent years, we've had a lot more flexibility. And like Dr. Myers, we do our needs assessment and we prioritize on these needs, and we prioritize based on those needs. So we appreciate that flexibility, but I, too, would like to see more emphasis on early childhood education. That if we can bridge that gap in our district, we can have a transition piece with our head start program. This past week, well, yesterday, as a matter of fact, we brought in all of our head start staff, head start staff and early pre-K providers into a training on what they should be doing with educating preschool children, but we need a lot more in my community. Education is not a top priority. We have a lot of homes where our parents are functionally illiterate. So if we can intervene in the lives of those children early on from birth, then that child will enter school ready to learn and come with those social skills and those other prerequisites necessary to be successful. So if we could do a lot more with early childhood, and I also would like to see something done with literacy within the community, if we can do that in my community, we can see student achievement.

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you. Dr. House, what do you consider to be the most beneficial aspect of the Title I Program, if you can single out one or two things?

Dr. HOUSE. You really already addressed it, again, the flexibility of the program. Twenty years ago, I was a Title I teacher. And at that point in time, the program was run like targeted assistance programs are run now, and that really tied your hands in doing some things that would benefit children in schools. The fact that we now have school wide programs, I believe, is a wonderful benefit. And seeing that comprehensive change taking place throughout the schools really support what Title I is intended to do. So if I could say anything that's beneficial, that would be the number one thing, and I hope all superintendents and principals would agree with that.

I also think the fact that we, as a State, are working collaboratively under the umbrella of Title I. It is extremely beneficial, you've heard mentioned already, about the blending of services with Title I and pre-K and head start. And the fact that that's encouraged through Title I office in Washington is a real benefit. That flexibility with funding of those programs and allowing those programs to work collaboratively is, indeed, meeting the needs of our children. So I definitely think that that is a benefit, as well.

One other benefit, if I may mention, that's really a State concern, is the waiver system that is in use for Title I. As you may well know, this State has been working for several years to design assessment accountability system that we believe is premier. That does not occur quickly. And the fact that the USDE was willing to provide us a waiver of time to allow us to do this the right way has been most beneficial for us as a State. We're doing all the right steps and not rushing what the system is going to look like, so that all of the players have a part, the system is being taken apart and reviewed in every possible way to make it be appropriate and really, really top quality. So the waiver system certainly has been a benefit for our State.

Senator COCHRAN. Have you sought waivers, and if you have, have they been approved to help the State meet the goals of Title I?

Dr. HOUSE. Yes, sir, we have, and they have been approved. And we really appreciate the way the USDE has worked with us. They've been most helpful.

Senator COCHRAN. Can you identify any Title I requirements that are too cumbersome?

Dr. HOUSE. Yes, sir. I'm sorry.

Senator COCHRAN. You have a long list or a short list?

Dr. HOUSE. It's about two or three items. This is almost contradictory, but I don't want it to be. School requirement used to be a wonderful way to approach Title I services, but having a 50 percent requirement on free and reduced lunches leaves out a lot of schools that have 48 percent free and reduced lunches, 46 percent free and reduced lunch. And I believe that I read in President Bush's No Child Left Behind was a consideration of lowering that to 40 percent. And we certainly believe that that can really dramatically improve the programs that are being provided in the schools that are currently operating target assistance programs and allow them to really get after that comprehensive school reform.

One of the other issues that the staff in my office deals with on a daily basis is how private schools are included with the Title I Program. What we would like to suggest, as an office, is that there would be some consideration of having the private schools actually be held a little more accountable for how they utilize their funds. Right now, as you know, the funding follows the student. The funding is really not given to the private school, per say, but, rather, is taken from the public school arena and sent with the student to attend the private school. Right now, as the regulation stands, the public schools have been held accountable for every aspect of the utilization of those funds. We do have all of our public schools going to the private schools to monitor the use of those funds, but they cannot be there every day. And sometimes they are cited for regulatory exceptions that really were the cause of how the private school utilized the funding. We aren't proposing that the funds don't follow the students to the private schools, but we do believe they should have a more significant role in being held accountable for those funds than they currently are.

The last thing that I would like to emphasize today is the importance of early childhood education. And the more we can do with Title I funds to give our youngsters the program head start, the stronger our program's going to be for our State.

Senator COCHRAN. Do you have any suggestions about the way allocations to our State are made? Should there be changes in what Dr. Thompson referred to as the standard that is used for determining allocation? How would you suggest changing that, so that our State would get our fair share of funding?

Dr. HOUSE. Well, I'm certainly not a statistician, so I cannot get into all the specifics of the statistical formula, but I would like to say a couple of things about that. One, we know that there's a huge discrepancy in what the poverty data indicate and what our free and reduced lunch data indicate, and we know that there's some differences in how those are calculated. We do have the fortune of having a wonderful statistician here on staff, Dr. Steve Hegler, who I believe is right behind me. And Dr. Hegler has prepared an extensive report that is provided for you as part of the official record. He's actually spent the last month doing some very extensive research on looking at funding formulas through a variety of different avenues and how those funding formulas could, perhaps, be reutilized to allowing Mississippi to, indeed, get a share of the funding that better represents the numbers that we're seeing on our free and reduced lunch programs, because there is a tremendous discrepancy right now.

Senator COCHRAN. That would be very helpful to us as we're in the process of reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Thank you very much for that.

Dr. Thompson, how does the accountability model used by the Department of Education measure the adequate yearly progress of student achievement as required by Title I regulations?

Dr. THOMPSON. Senator, as you can tell, there's great people in this building, great people in the State department, I don't have to do much of that, but we started this concept two and a half years ago, and what we know is really important is that there's so many of our children come to school with great deprivation, as you heard

from all of our folks. It was important for us to develop a model that did two things, that, one, measured progress over time, same students. That's very important. Lots of people that have been measuring, you know, last year's fourth grade versus this year's fourth grade, that is not the kind of progress we want to monitor. We monitor that so we have that information, but it's much more important to measure that child coming at the end of second grade, how much did they grow from the second grade to third grade. So the very essence of our accountability system and our assessment system is based on, number one, what should Mississippi children know. And we brought in our teachers from all over the State, and everything we're testing new, that curriculum has been reviewed, revised and it reflects our high National standard, we used all of the National standards, National math standards, english, reading, all of those things, and reflected it in our curriculum.

And then we've done something else a lot of States haven't done, we built the support system for that. We didn't just go out and tell those teachers you're on your own. We developed training, we have resources that were put into that, and then we've developed standards, how much of that should students know. Again, we're using our teachers that are out there every single day, looking at the National standards, coming in, helping with the assessment standards. We chose the assessment system that parallels exactly what that curriculum is. In other words, there should be no surprises. Children should know. But what we're doing, we're changing our system so that now we're not looking at the system as a whole, we're looking at each individual school. So every school in the State of Mississippi will be held accountable for two things; one, the amount of growth. We will give each school a growth expectation, and based on where the children are when they get here, and that's fate, because we expect them to learn. Whether they're high achievement, low achievement, middle achievement, this is where the children are when you got them, this is how much you are expected to move them. That reflects a reasonable amount of growth, basically correlated with one year's worth of achievement and one year's worth of school wherever they are.

The second thing we're looking at is each school and each child, so that every child in grades 3 through 8 will have this kind of information to actually start the first test at the end of second grade to set the bench mark so we can measure that growth. The second thing to look at is proficiency levels. I know you know, when we started this, they were not required in the Federal legislation. Now since we've been doing this, I don't think the Federal Government took it from us, necessarily, but that is a part of what we have to do. We will be setting proficiency levels for every child, and so we'll be able to report to you and everyone else, every parent walks in the door, we can show them how much that child grew during the year, we can show them at what proficiency level they are functioning. The four levels that we've chosen are at the highest level, which is advanced, and then we use the proficient, and we use the basic, and then the last one is minimum. So we'll be able to tell the parent where their child is functioning. We will also be able to tell, in each school, what percentage of children in that school are performing at grade level. And so we're measuring it two different

ways, we're measuring the growth of each school and each child, and we're measuring it by the number of students proficient at that school. We think that's really the right way to do it.

Senator COCHRAN. We know that the amount of dollars that come to Mississippi is very substantial, I think $126 million is the figure that I mentioned in my opening statement. What would be the practical result if those funds were substantially reduced or limited and you weren't getting those funds, what would be the consequences for the State of Mississippi?

Dr. THOMPSON. My mind is racing for an appropriate word, and it's coming up, tragedy doesn't do it. I mean, you could just think of the most devastating word you can think of, because so many, these people sitting at this table, I know what sort of circumstances they work in, I go out and I see, and they're making incredible progress with limited resources. And while 1.6 million may not sound like a whole lot when it's close to 34 million, I know what that means to the total piece, because all of these administrators are incredible at leverage, and they're using dollars from every which way. And for them to have to reduce that is going to reduce direct services to children. And as we move into this new model of accountability, they're going to be dependent more on Title I funds than they ever did, because those are the funds they're going to use to help these children meet these higher standards that, quite frankly, are going to change these children's lives. It's going to give our children the same opportunity that every other child in America has. It would just be unfortunate, Senator, if these funds were cut.

Senator COCHRAN. My staff member, Ann Copland, wrote me a note a while ago when Dr. House was talking about the fact that during the current year, there has been some changes by the Department of Education, and the amount of money we thought we were going to get. We had written into the Federal law a hold harmless provision, so that funds wouldn't be reduced, but in spite of that, this pro rata reduction is being made in all States, and that has been brought to the attention of our subcommittee and our Chairman, Senator Arlen Specter, and I'm advised that we're probably going to request that the appropriations committee provide a supplemental appropriation and try to address that problem by restoring those funds. Whether that will be successful or not, I can't predict right now, but it does have the attention of our committee and efforts have already begun.

Let me say that my impression of the information that we've received this morning through the testimony and statements that have been provided to the committee, the very helpful information that's been compiled and provided, which is part of the record, will be very helpful and persuasive to our committee as we proceed through the appropriations process this year and the reauthorization process of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. So I personally appreciate your willingness to help me, and on behalf of the committee, get a better understanding of the practical consequences of the benefits of these programs and your sharing information and your experiences, personal in many cases, about how important this program can be. I think this has given us an impressive and important body of information to help us seek ways

to get continued funding for Title I approved in Washington and specifically for States like Mississippi, Mississippi included, that have high percentages of disadvantaged students.

I'm also going to make sure that we keep our hearing record open so that those who want to submit additional information, those in the audience who may want to write a letter or make a statement, can do so in writing and submit it to me, Thad Cochran, United States Senate, Washington, D.C., I'll get it, and we'll make it a part of our hearing record. We do appreciate the attendance of many here in the audience today. I had a chance to talk, for example, to Ms. Gail Warner from Tupelo, who's the Title I coordinator in Tupelo, who had written a letter, which we'll make a part of the record, and invite her to furnish even more information about how the Title I Program works in the Tupelo School District. And others who have experiences of that kind can be helpful to us in compiling an impressive body of information and facts to support our articles in behalf of the Title I Program.

[The information follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND STATISTICS, MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

This report was prepared to help answer questions concerning the formulas used by the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) to make allocations of Title 1 funds to states and individual school districts. An examination of printed materials related to the Title 1 allocation process revealed that much work has been done to develop useful methods for determining the number of school-age children in poverty in counties and school districts throughout the nation. There are, however, efforts underway to improve those estimates. In addition to the review of the literature, several sources of data were collected and analyses were conducted to examine differences and relationships in the data used for allocating Title 1 funds to school districts in Mississippi.

This report is divided into two sections. The first section is a review of the literature and is comprised, mainly, of text extracted or adapted from reports of the National Research Council. The reports are available from the National Academy Press in Washington, D.C. The second section of the report comprises a presentation of the analysis of poverty and population data for Mississippi school districts.

SECTION 1: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Background

The U.S. Department of Education uses estimates of school-age children in poverty to allocate Federal funds under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for education programs to aid disadvantaged children. Historically, the allocations have been made by a two-stage process: the department's role has been to allocate Title I funds to counties; the states have then distributed these funds to school districts. Until recently, the department has based the county allocations on the numbers and proportions of poor school-age children in each county from the most recent decennial census. States have used several different data sources, such as the decennial census and the National School Lunch Program, to distribute the department's county allocations to districts.

In late 1992, the U.S. Census Bureau organized the Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) Program to develop methods for producing postcensal income and poverty estimates for states and counties by using multiple data sources and innovative statistical methods.

The development of accurate county-level estimates of population and poverty is very challenging. For Title I allocations, there is no single administrative or survey data source that provides sufficient information with which to develop reliable direct estimates. The March Income Supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS) can provide reasonably reliable annual direct estimates of population characteristics such as the number and proportion of poor children at the national level and possibly for the largest states. However, the CPS cannot provide direct estimates for

the majority of counties. The CPS data are used as the basis for creating usable estimates for counties through the application of statistical estimation techniques. These estimates are called "model-based" or "indirect" estimates. The model-based estimators use data from several areas, time periods, or data sources, including the previous census, to improve the precision of estimates for small areas.

In 1994 Congress authorized the Bureau of the Census to provide updated estimates of poor school-age children every 2 years, to begin in 1996 with estimates for counties and in 1998 with estimates for school districts. The Department of Education is to use the school district estimates to allocate Title I basic and concentration grants directly to districts for the 1999–2000 and later school years, unless the Secretaries of Education and Commerce determine that they are "inappropriate or unreliable" on the basis of a study by the National Research Council. That study was carried out by the Committee on National Statistics' Panel on Estimates of Poverty for Small Geographic Areas.

Under a direct allocation procedure, there would be no allocations to counties and, hence, no need for states to distribute them to school districts. However, a provision in the 1994 legislation permits states to aggregate the department's allocation amounts for all districts in a state that have fewer than 20,000 people and to redistribute the aggregate amount among those districts by using some other method that the department approves.

School District Estimates

As a result of the lack of data at the school district level, the Census Bureau has been constrained to use for school districts a very simple model-based method referred to as synthetic estimation. This method for producing updated school district estimates of poor school-age children is a basic synthetic shares approach, in which the proportions of poor school-age children in school districts within each county in 1989 (as measured by the 1990 census) are applied to updated estimates of numbers of poor school-age children from a statistical model for counties. The Census Bureau decided that the most recent school district estimates it could produce by the end of 1998 (for the Title I allocations in spring 1999) were for school-age children in 1996 who were living in and related to a family in poverty in 1995. Reasons for this decision included the time required to ascertain the changes in school district boundaries since the 1990 census and the 1–2 year lag in the availability of the data sources used in the county statistical model.

The synthetic shares method assumes that the shares of poor school-age children among school districts in each county in 1995 are the same as they were in 1989. Consequently, the synthetic estimates reflect only the changes in school-age poverty from 1989 to 1995 that occurred in each county as a whole. The estimates do not capture any variation in school-age poverty among the districts within each county that occurred since the 1990 census.

The synthetic shares method was used because no administrative data are available for a model for school districts (which would be similar to the Census Bureau's county model) that could capture changes in poverty for school districts within counties. There are several reasons for the lack of data and the difficulties of developing estimates for school districts: most districts are small in size, many district boundaries do not coincide with the boundaries for counties or other governmental units, district boundaries can and often do change, and some districts do not serve all elementary and secondary grades.

Evaluation of Small-Area Estimates of School-Age Children in Poverty

The National Research Council (NRC) was charged with evaluating the methods used by the Census Bureau for producing estimates for counties and school districts. To accomplish this task, the NRC formed the Panel on Estimates of Poverty for Small Geographic Areas. The panel comprises members of the NRC Committee on National Statistics.

In assessing the Census Bureau's 1995 school district estimates of the numbers of poor school-age children for use in Title I allocations for the 1999–2000 school year, the panel first examined the 1995 county estimates that were produced by the Census Bureau's statistical model. Although the Department of Education would not use the county estimates for Title I allocations if it were to make allocations directly to school districts, the county estimates are central to the synthetic shares method for district estimates.

The model that was used to produce the 1995 county estimates is essentially the same model that was used to produce county estimates of poor school-age children for 1993. On the basis of internal and external evaluations that were conducted on alternative 1993 county models, which resulted in some changes in the Census Bureau's original 1993 county model, the panel supported the use of revised 1993 coun-

ty estimates for Title I allocations for the 1998–1999 school year. Additional evaluations of the 1995 county model, which focused on its behavior when estimated for several time periods, confirmed that the county model is performing well. A separate estimation procedure for Puerto Rico, which is treated as a single county and school district for Title I allocations, also appears to be reasonable, given the available data.

Evaluations of the Census Bureau's synthetic procedure for school districts over the 1980–1990 period revealed large differences for many districts between the synthetic estimates of poor school-age children and the comparison estimates from the 1990 census; the large differences occur mainly for small districts. In contrast, the estimates for school districts with 40,000 or more people in 1990 are not markedly worse than the county model estimates. Also, a number of districts are coterminous with counties, so that their estimates come from the county model. Together, these two groups of districts comprise only 13 percent of the districts (as of 1990), but they contain 62 percent of all school-age children.

Although the Census Bureau's 1995 estimates of poor school-age children have potentially large errors for many school districts, the panel nonetheless concluded that they are not inappropriate or unreliable to use for direct Title I allocations to districts as intended by the 1994 legislation. In reaching this conclusion, the panel interpreted "inappropriate and unreliable" in a relative sense. Some set of estimates must be used to distribute Title I funds to school districts. The panel concluded that the Census Bureau's 1995 estimates are generally as good as and, in some instances, better than estimates that are currently being used. Also, while further research is needed, a limited evaluation suggested that school lunch data are not appreciably better than the 1990 census for constructing within-county school district shares of poor school-age children.

A benefit of using the synthetic shares estimates is that the department is able to determine eligibility of school districts for both basic and concentration Title I grants on the basis of a consistent set of estimates nationwide. Also, use of the synthetic shares estimates for direct allocation of concentration grants responds to the intent of the 1994 legislation that eligible districts be able to receive concentration grants even when they are in counties that would not be eligible under the two-stage allocation process.

The Census Bureau's updated estimates of poor school-age children for counties are the only postcensal small-area estimates of poverty that have been thoroughly evaluated. It is important that they be considered in the direct allocations to school districts, as is done when the allocations are based on the synthetic estimates. If a state chooses to reallocate the amounts for school districts with less than 20,000 population, the county estimates can be reflected in the allocations by grouping the allocations for small size districts by county and redistributing the county totals to those districts.

Some Characteristics of Funding Formulas

For purposes of allocating funds or other related program purposes, it is important that poverty and population estimates be sufficiently reliable. Even with estimates that exhibit an adequate degree of reliability, there are generally tradeoffs among competing funding goals or purposes. For fund allocation, it is important to consider features of the specific allocation formula, some of which may be sensitive to the level of accuracy in the estimates.

Studies have shown that, in general, a higher sampling error together with a threshold, a hold harmless provision, or both, tend to equalize the funding amount per eligible person (poor child in the Title I program) across areas. This result is counter to the goal of a program, such as Title I concentration grants, that is designed to provide extra funding (beyond the basic grant) to needier areas.

It has been suggested that moving-average estimates could serve the goal of cushioning budgets against fund decreases without misallocating funding as much as a hold-harmless provision.

The NRC Committee on National Standards is planning to conduct additional work on issues regarding the interactions among data sources, estimation procedures, and allocation formulas.

NRC Recommendations for Small Area Estimates and Title 1 Funding

Any state plan approved by the Department of Education for redistributing the sum of the department's allocations for school districts with under 20,000 population should maintain the county total amounts for such districts to the extent possible.

The Department of Education should undertake a thorough study of the direct allocation of Title I funds to school districts that was begun in 1999–2000. The study should examine the allocation methods used and assess the results.

It is important to continue an active program of research and development for methods of estimating poverty for school-age children at the county and school district levels. The county model is performing well, but, like other models, it can probably be improved. Work should also be pursued to improve the current synthetic shares method for school district estimates. Research on ways to produce the estimates with data that are closer in time to the year for which the allocations are to be made should also be pursued.

Improving school district estimates so that they reflect within-county, as well as between-county, changes in school-age poverty over time will require a substantial research and development effort. It is particularly important to obtain relevant administrative records data for districts, such as income tax return data coded to the district level. Such administrative data, together with data from the 2000 census and the planned American Community Survey, could provide the means for developing a much improved model-based approach for estimating school-age poverty at the district level.

For its work in small-area poverty estimation, the Census Bureau needs to provide adequate staff and other resources on a continuing basis. Because small-area estimates of poverty support a range of important public policy needs for Federal, state, and local governments, the Bureau's program should include not only data and model development and production, but also thorough evaluation and detailed documentation of each set of estimates produced.

While it may be possible, in the future, to develop more accurate and timely income and poverty estimates for small areas by using new improved sources of data from household surveys and administrative records, none of the existing or planned surveys or administrative records can, by itself, provide direct estimates of sufficient reliability, timeliness, and quality. Therefore, in the near future, the SAIPE program should continue to use models that combine data from more than one source to produce indirect estimates.

Looking to the future, as more data become available from such sources as the American Community Survey and the 2000 census, the use of time-series and multivariate modeling techniques that make use of multiple years of data from the same survey, separate surveys, or both, could be advantageous. Work on such models should proceed, building on the Census Bureau's previous efforts along these lines.

A process for geo-coding school districts using addresses would assist in the development of direct income and poverty estimates for school districts. Currently, IRS, Food Stamp, and other administrative records can only be associated with a particular county, not with a particular school district.

Note: Most of the text in the above section was extracted from Small-Area Estimates of School-Age Children in Poverty—Interim Report 3: Evaluation of 1995 County and School District Estimates for Title I Allocations, Panel on Estimates of Poverty for Small Geographic Areas, Committee on National Statistics, National Research Council, Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press (1999).

Additional information in this section came from a subsequent report—Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates: Priorities for 2000 and Beyond, Panel on Estimates of Poverty for Small Geographic Areas, Committee on National Statistics, National Research Council, Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press (2000).

SECTION 2: TITLE I FUNDS ALLOCATION IN MISSISSIPPI

For the 2000–2001 school year, Title I Basic Grant and Concentration Grant allocations were made by USDE for each state and for individual school districts in each state based on the SAIPE estimates described in Section 1. Each state had to adjust the allocations to provide for state administration and school improvement and to account for eligible school districts that did not receive an allocation. In order to compare the values used by the USDE for allocating funds to school districts in Mississippi to other data related to student population and student poverty, several sets of data were compiled. The 5–17 population estimates and the estimated poverty n-counts for Mississippi school districts were extracted from the allocation spreadsheets from the USDE. These data were matched by district to K–12 enrollment and free and reduced lunch eligibility counts from October 1999, and to 1999–2000 school year cumulative free and reduced lunch participation data. This section of the report presents findings from analyses conducted on those data.

USDE POPULATION ESTIMATES AND DISTRICT ENROLLMENT FIGURES

There are differences between the USDE estimates of the student population (ages 5–17) and the K–12 enrollment figures reported by Mississippi school districts. While it would be expected that the statewide population estimate would be relatively accurate, there is a difference of approximately 50,000 students between the

USDE estimates and the reported enrollment. The statewide USDE estimate for the 1999–2000 school year was 551,315 students, while the reported statewide enrollment for the end of October 1999 was 501,417 students. The difference of 49,898 students represents approximately 10 percent of the actual statewide K–12 enrollment.

On a district by district basis, there were varying differences between the USDE estimate and the K–12 enrollment figure (an average difference of 19 percent of the actual K–12 enrollment with absolute differences for individual districts ranging from 0 percent to 143 percent).

For 56 districts (38 percent of the 149 public school districts) the USDE estimate was within 10 percent of the actual K–12 enrollment. These differences are comparable to the overall statewide difference of approximately 10 percent.

For 30 districts (20 percent), the USDE estimate was 10–19 percent greater than the actual enrollment.

For 37 districts (32 percent) the USDE estimate was greater by at least 20 percent, with differences exceeding 50 percent for 11 districts (4 percent).

In practically all cases where the USDE estimates disagreed with the official K–12 enrollment, the USDE values were greater. However, there were 13 cases (9 percent) where the USDE estimates were lower than the actual enrollment by 10–19 percent. There were only 3 cases (2 percent) where the USDE estimate was smaller than the actual enrollment by 20 percent or more.

The USDE estimates are expected to be somewhat greater than the actual public school enrollment because the USDE value is an estimate of all students between the ages of 5 and 17 residing within the school district. The K–12 enrollment includes only public school students—students attending non-public schools and students being home schooled are not included. While the 10 percent variance at the state level may be a reasonable difference due to non-public school attendance, the population estimate differences from district to district far exceed that expected due to this factor. Since the Title 1 allocation formula includes thresholds based on poverty rates, the estimated 5- 17 enrollment (used as a denominator in the poverty rate calculation) plays a critical role in determining a district's Title 1 allocation (prior to any adjustment due to the hold harmless provision). If the population estimates are unreliable, the poverty rates will also be unreliable.

Free Lunch Eligibility and Participation

The SAIPE small area estimates used by the USDE for making Title 1 allocations do not include information about the National School Lunch Program (NSLP). The main reason is the lack of usable data. The only Federal agency that has attempted to obtain school lunch data for school districts is the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). NCES collects school lunch counts as part of its Common Core of Data system in which state educational agencies report a large number of data items for public school systems. However, the center does not follow up with states when there is no information provided for a school district or to evaluate the accuracy of the reports. So, the quality of the data is not established and they are not complete. The Department of Agriculture obtains aggregate free and reduced price lunch counts each October at the state level for purposes of reimbursing states for meals served, but it does not collect data for individual school districts.

While accurate data on free lunch eligibility and participation at the school district level would be a useful measure of student economic status, it would not be directly comparable to the data used for the SAIPE estimates. That is because the SAIPE values are estimates of the number of students in families that are below the poverty level while free lunch eligibility is based on a threshold set at 130 percent of the annual poverty threshold. That is, the population of students eligible for free lunch includes both poor students and those that are near-poor. Since both the SAIPE poverty counts and the free lunch participation counts are based on numbers of students reaching a different eligibility threshold, there is no way to ascertain the underlying degree of poverty within the free lunch data. For example, if 100 students were eligible for free lunch under the NSLP, all 100 of the students could be part of families that are below the poverty threshold. Or, all 100 students could be part of families with incomes between the poverty threshold and 130 percent of the poverty threshold—it would be possible for none of the students to be living below the poverty level. Given accurate family income values and the number of family members for each student in the National School Lunch Program, these data could be used within the Title 1 funding formula. Although this information is included on the forms completed annually by families applying for NSLP participation, the results are transformed into an eligibility status at the school district level and the raw data are generally not provided to state educational agencies.

While the problems above make NSLP data unusable for establishing Title 1 allocations nationally, individual states can propose using these data in formulas for reallocating Title 1 funds, with certain restrictions, among school districts. Any state desiring to use alternative data for allocating fund must apply to the USDE for approval. The state must justify the use of the alternative data and show that the data are accurate and reliable enough for allocation purposes.

For purposes of the following analyses, cumulative free lunch participation data for 1999–2000 were compiled for the 149 public school districts in Mississippi. The average percentage of daily meals that were free lunch meals was used as a relative measure of student poverty within each school district. The reported October K–12 enrollment for each school district was used along with the average free lunch participation rate to obtain an estimate of the number of students living in poverty or near-poverty.

In addition to actual free lunch participation rates, the reported numbers of students who were designated eligible for free lunch in October 1999 (based on applications submitted during the summer or at the beginning of the school term) in each school district were collected. The eligibility numbers included students whose families later received a request for income verification. Students whose verification form indicated an income above the NSLP free lunch eligibility threshold and students whose verification forms were not returned were dropped from participation in the free lunch component. So, while the figures for free lunch participation and free lunch eligibility are similar for each district, they are not usually equal. One additional source of variance associated with the use of NSLP data is the fact that some eligible students or their parents do not apply for participation in the program. Reasons for this include a perceived stigma associated with participation in the program (especially at the higher grade levels) and failure of some districts' to reach and inform eligible families.

USDE Poverty Estimates and District Free Lunch Participation

Using free lunch (FL) as a relative measure of student poverty in Mississippi, there are only small differences between free lunch eligibility and average free lunch participation for the 1999–2000 school year. The two values are highly related (r=.98, N=149) and differ by only 7 percent at the state level.

The reported average rate of free lunch participation statewide was 61 percent (307,237 students within the K–12 total enrollment of 501,417). In contrast the USDE poverty n-count estimate for the state was 28 percent (155,334 students within the 5–17 population estimate of 551,315 students). Part of the difference between these values is due to the fact that the USDE poverty estimate is based on the annual poverty threshold while the FL participation rates are based on eligibility set at 130 percent of the annual poverty threshold. So, a direct comparison of these two figures is not meaningful.

However, it is useful to determine the relationship between the USDE poverty estimates and the free lunch participation values. If the underlying income distribution of students is somewhat linear from a point below the poverty threshold to the poverty +30 percent NSLP criterion, a strong relationship would be expected between the USDE and FL values. The relationship between the USDE poverty estimates for the 149 school districts in Mississippi and FL participation in those districts is moderately high (r=.85). Since there is no accurate external administrative data on which to substantiate the accuracy of either the USDE poverty estimates or the FL-based poverty rates, there is no compelling reason, at this time, to select one data source over the other for purposes of sub-allocating state funds to school districts within counties.

Analyses were conducted to determine whether the USDE poverty estimates or the FL participation rates for districts were correlated with district size. The relationships between the USDE 5–17 population estimates and the poverty measures (USDE poverty rate estimate and FL participation rate) were r=−.16 and r=−.18, respectively (both N=149). This indicates that the poverty rate is not systematically higher or lower depending on the size of the school district as estimated by the USDE. The relationships between actual district K–12 enrollment figures and the poverty measures were slightly greater (r=−.25 for both the USDE poverty estimates and the FL participation rates). These data indicate a relatively weak relationship between the poverty rates and enrollment with higher poverty rates associated with smaller districts.

CONCLUSION

There is already much work underway to improve population, income, and poverty estimates for small areas and to develop procedures to allow direct measures of these values for counties and school districts. It is important for legislators and oth-

ers who use this kind of information to stay current on this work and anticipate its impact on program funding. The agencies involved in this work include the U.S. Census Bureau and the National Research Council.

Funding formulas with inherent characteristics that produce results that are counter to those intended should be avoided. The effect of certain formula characteristics such as thresholds and hold harmless provisions should be studied carefully before being adopted.

While the data collection for the 2000 census is already completed, one can hope that the attempts to inform citizens of the importance of responding accurately was successful and that the data are reliable and free from the excessive variability that characterized the 1990 census data.

APPENDIX

Listings of Population N-Counts, Poverty Rates, and Differences by School District for each of the three sorted lists that follow (Appendix A, Appendix B, and Appendix C), the following data column headings are used:

DIST.—The Mississippi school district code number.

District Name.—The name of the school district.

USDE N517.—The SAIPE small area estimate of the population of children ages 5–17 within the school district.

K–12 Enrol.—The October 1999 enrollment for grades K–12 as reported by school districts.

Diff as percent of Enrol.—The difference between the SAIPE 5–17 population estimate and the reported K–12 enrollment stated as a percentage of the K–12 enrollment value.

USDE percent Pov.—The SAIPE small area estimate of the percentage of the estimated 5–17 population that are in families living below the annual poverty threshold.

Percent FL Partic.—The average percentage free lunch participation rate for the district (i.e., the average percentage meals served that were free lunch meals during 1999–2000).

Diff as percent FL Part.—The difference between the SAIPE estimated poverty rate and the relative poverty rate based on free lunch participation stated as a percentage of the free lunch participation rate. Note: Differences are expected between these values because of differences in the eligibility thresholds.

Diff as percent USDE Pov.—The difference between the SAIPE estimated poverty rate and the relative poverty rate based on free lunch participation stated as a percentage of the SAIPE poverty rate estimate. Note: Differences are expected between these values because of differences in the eligibility thresholds.

APPENDIX A.—SORTED BY DISTRICT NAME

DIST	District name	USDE/N517	K–12/Enrol	Diff as percent of enrol	USDE/percent pov	Percent FL partic	Diff as percent USDE pov	Diff as percent FL part
4820	Aberdeen	2,569	2,169	18	33	79	−139	−58
200	Alcorn	3,634	3,800	−4	16	44	−175	−64
300	Amite County	2,845	1,650	72	29	84	−190	−65
4821	Amory	1,803	1,819	−1	17	48	−182	−65
400	Attala County	1,602	1,367	17	30	78	−160	−62
5920	Baldwyn	1,009	1,035	−3	21	52	−148	−60
2320	Bay St. Louis	3,723	2,416	54	25	55	−120	−55
612	Benoit	477	300	59	55	94	−71	−41
500	Benton County	1,739	1,291	35	33	86	−161	−62
2420	Biloxi	7,983	6,096	31	29	58	−100	−50
5921	Booneville	830	1,622	−49	19	46	−142	−59
4320	Brookhaven	3,865	3,218	20	31	59	−90	−47
700	Calhoun County	2,789	2,509	11	24	65	−171	−63
4520	Canton	5,524	3,737	48	39	93	−138	−58
800	Carroll County	2,014	1,270	59	24	76	−217	−68
900	Chickasaw County	537	530	1	15	64	−327	−77
1000	Choctaw County	2,052	1,929	6	29	64	−121	−55
1100	Claiborne County	2,388	2,011	19	36	93	−158	−61
1420	Clarksdale	4,931	4,175	18	41	79	−93	−48
1300	Clay County	661	272	143	30	93	−210	−68
614	Cleveland	4,683	3,979	18	35	74	−111	−53
2521	Clinton	5,198	4,933	5	15	34	−127	−56

APPENDIX A.—SORTED BY DISTRICT NAME—Continued

DIST	District name	USDE/N517	K–12/Enrol	Diff as percent of enrol	USDE/percent pov	Percent FL partic	Diff as percent USDE pov	Diff as percent FL part
1400	Coahoma County	2,648	2,032	30	53	94	−77	−44
8111	Coffeeville	1,095	856	28	37	80	−116	−54
4620	Columbia	2,263	1,849	22	33	63	−91	−48
4420	Columbus	7,206	5,384	34	30	69	−130	−57
1500	Copiah County	3,733	3,225	16	32	70	−119	−54
220	Corinth	2,328	1,722	35	32	58	−81	−45
1600	Covington County	3,778	3,601	5	29	77	−166	−62
1700	DeSoto County	17,611	18,909	−7	11	35	−218	−69
6720	Drew	1,133	924	23	39	86	−121	−55
2620	Durant	670	621	8	51	83	−63	−39
3111	East Jasper	1,767	1,300	36	28	86	−207	−67
6811	East Tallahatchie	1,885	1,643	15	34	77	−126	−56
1211	Enterprise	675	870	−22	14	37	−164	−62
6220	Forest City	1,692	1,814	−7	34	67	−97	−49
1800	Forrest County	2,405	2,546	−6	16	57	−256	−72
1900	Franklin County	1,718	1,733	−1	35	64	−83	−45
2000	George County	4,011	4,084	−2	24	46	−92	−48
2100	Greene County	2,479	1,955	27	28	69	−146	−59
7620	Greenville	9,580	7,811	23	42	85	−102	−51
4220	Greenwood	4,267	3,864	10	44	85	−93	−48
2220	Grenada	4,539	4,583	−1	25	60	−140	−58
2421	Gulfport	7,421	6,778	9	26	61	−135	−57
2300	Hancock County	3,558	4,134	−14	25	57	−128	−56
2400	Harrison County	12,181	12,657	−4	21	50	−138	−58
1820	Hattiesburg	7,846	5,108	54	33	81	−145	−59
1520	Hazlehurst City	2,332	1,818	28	33	86	−161	−62
2500	Hinds County	5,307	5,969	−11	29	55	−90	−47
7611	Hollandale	1,343	1,188	13	50	93	−86	−46
4720	Holly Springs	2,428	1,820	33	33	82	−148	−60
2600	Holmes County	4,616	4,088	13	56	97	−73	−42
920	Houston Separate	2,062	1,941	6	23	61	−165	−62
2700	Humpreys County	2,876	2,334	23	47	95	−102	−51
6721	Indianola	3,284	3,196	3	42	83	−98	−49
2900	Itawamba County	3,676	3,708	−1	13	43	−231	−70
3000	Jackson County	7,140	8,498	−16	13	35	−169	−63
2520	Jackson Public	37,019	31,594	17	31	74	−139	−58
3300	Jeff.Davis Co	2,130	2,414	−12	44	87	−98	−49
3200	Jefferson Co	3,139	1,731	81	38	96	−153	−60
3400	Jones County	8,742	7,918	10	23	50	−117	−54
3500	Kemper County	2,206	1,424	55	29	85	−193	−66
420	Kosciusko	1,981	2,158	−8	31	61	−97	−49
3600	Lafayette Co	2,354	2,073	14	17	50	−194	−66
3700	Lamar County	6,007	6,570	−9	23	31	−35	−26
3800	Lauderdale Co	6,911	6,715	3	19	45	−137	−58
3420	Laurel	3,645	3,338	9	38	79	−108	−52
3900	Lawrence Co	2,822	2,437	16	27	60	−122	−55
4000	Leake County	3,947	3,143	26	30	67	−123	−55
4100	Lee County	5,442	5,945	−8	20	50	−150	−60
4200	Leflore County	4,024	3,047	32	44	92	−109	−52
7612	Leland	2,109	1,471	43	43	86	−100	−50
4300	Lincoln County	2,696	2,786	−3	22	44	−100	−50
2422	Long Beach	3,841	3,616	6	15	36	−140	−58
8020	Louisville	4,123	3,420	21	33	72	−118	−54
4400	Lowndes County	5,074	5,602	−9	25	55	−120	−55
3711	Lumberton	1,116	991	13	37	70	−89	−47
4500	Madison	8,130	8,634	−6	18	40	−122	−55
4600	Marion County	3,571	2,976	20	35	74	−111	−53
4700	Marshall County	4,296	3,364	28	33	78	−136	−58
5720	McComb	3,726	2,992	25	41	80	−95	−49
3820	Meridian	7,990	7,129	12	35	76	−117	−54
4800	Monroe County	2,439	2,653	−8	13	38	−192	−66
4900	Montgomery Co	1,223	693	76	32	80	−150	−60
3020	Moss Point	6,420	5,233	23	24	68	−183	−65

APPENDIX A.—SORTED BY DISTRICT NAME—Continued

DIST	District name	USDE/N517	K–12/Enrol	Diff as percent of enrol	USDE/percent pov	Percent FL partic	Diff as percent USDE pov	Diff as percent FL part
616	Mound Bayou	1,032	882	17	47	93	−98	−49
130	Natchez-Adams	6,997	5,180	35	35	86	−146	−59
5000	Neshoba County	4,113	2,879	43	24	45	−88	−47
4111	Nettleton	1,351	1,392	−3	21	53	−152	−60
7320	New Albany	1,886	2,028	−7	22	48	−118	−54
5130	Newton City	2,168	1,212	79	22	65	−195	−66
5100	Newton County	1,478	1,634	−10	27	46	−70	−41
613	North Bolivar	1,041	1,089	−4	56	97	−73	−42
5411	North Panola	2,807	2,080	35	42	89	−112	−53
5711	North Pike	1,495	1,622	−8	19	50	−163	−62
7011	North Tippah	1,290	1,332	−3	29	50	−72	−42
5200	Noxubee County	2,901	2,354	23	44	89	−102	−51
3021	Ocean Springs	4,354	4,851	−10	14	24	−71	−42
921	Okolona Separate	1,272	940	35	24	85	−254	−72
5300	Oktibbeha Co	2,082	1,420	47	34	81	−138	−58
3620	Oxford	2,725	3,031	−10	18	64	−256	−72
3022	Pascagoula	8,983	7,489	20	25	53	−112	−53
2423	Pass Christian	1,810	1,788	1	23	51	−122	−55
6120	Pearl	4,737	4,144	14	13	38	−192	−66
5500	Pearl River	2,273	2,533	−10	26	51	−96	−49
5600	Perry County	1,801	1,409	28	30	66	−120	−55
1821	Petal	3,248	3,737	−13	16	32	−100	−50
5020	Philadelphia	1,472	1,275	15	33	62	−88	−47
5520	Picayune	4,506	3,920	15	27	61	−126	−56
5820	Pontotoc City	1,928	2,220	−13	19	43	−126	−56
5800	Pontotoc County	2,751	2,920	−6	18	35	−94	−49
5530	Poplarville	2,135	2,114	1	27	53	−96	−49
5900	Prentiss County	2,905	2,453	18	26	49	−88	−47
1212	Quitman	3,027	2,593	17	25	61	−144	−59
6000	Quitman County	2,320	1,748	33	48	89	−85	−46
6100	Rankin County	15,699	15,028	4	13	33	−154	−61
5620	Richton	849	952	−11	30	51	−70	−41
6200	Scott County	3,590	3,913	−8	25	64	−156	−61
6920	Senatobia	1,289	1,708	−25	24	46	−92	−48
615	Shaw	915	847	8	47	93	−98	−49
6400	Simpson County	5,342	4,507	19	27	67	−148	−60
6500	Smith County	3,026	3,146	−4	27	56	−107	−52
6312	South Delta	2,030	1,638	24	52	95	−83	−45
5412	South Panola	4,539	4,577	−1	28	66	−136	−58
5712	South Pike	3,095	2,576	20	41	81	−98	−49
7012	South Tippah	2,671	2,817	−5	19	47	−147	−60
5320	Starkville	4,111	4,108	0	27	64	−137	−58
6600	Stone County	2,528	2,650	−5	34	50	−47	−32
6700	Sunflower County	2,904	2,156	35	49	87	−78	−44
6900	Tate County	3,470	3,278	6	24	62	−158	−61
7100	Tishomingo Co	3,028	3,201	−5	20	46	−130	−57
7200	Tunica County	2,133	1,999	7	44	86	−95	−49
4120	Tupelo	7,625	7,476	2	15	51	−240	−71
5131	Union City	793	814	−3	27	50	−85	−46
7300	Union County	2,475	2,602	−5	14	37	−164	−62
7500	Vicksburg-Warren	10,520	9,207	14	24	61	−154	−61
7400	Walthall Co	3,279	2,777	18	44	74	−68	−41
8113	Water Valley	1,318	1,347	−2	32	56	−75	−43
7700	Wayne County	4,448	4,069	9	35	68	−94	−49
7800	Webster County	2,064	2,017	2	25	50	−100	−50
611	West Bolivar	1,475	1,401	5	53	93	−75	−43
3112	West Jasper	2,125	1,864	14	28	69	−146	−59
1320	West Point	4,115	3,773	9	31	75	−142	−59
6812	West Tallahatchie	1,611	1,447	11	49	92	−88	−47
7613	Western Line	2,763	2,386	16	27	75	−178	−64
7900	Wilkinson Co	1,962	1,726	14	47	89	−89	−47
4920	Winona	1,310	1,481	−12	36	59	−64	−39
8220	Yazoo City	2,825	3,201	−12	51	89	−75	−43

APPENDIX A.—SORTED BY DISTRICT NAME—Continued

DIST	District name	USDE/N517	K–12/Enrol	Diff as percent of enrol	USDE/percent pov	Percent FL partic	Diff as percent USDE pov	Diff as percent FL part
8200	Yazoo County	2,968	1,701	74	38	75	−97	−49

APPENDIX B.—SORTED BY PERCENTAGE DIFFERENCE IN ENROLLMENT

DIST	District name	USDE/N517	K–12/Enrol	Diff as percent of enrol	USDE/percent pov	Percent FL partic	Diff as percent USDE pov	Diff as percent FL part
1300	Clay County	661	272	143	30	93	−210	−6
3200	Jefferson Co	3,139	1,731	81	38	96	−153	−6
5130	Newton City	2,168	1,212	79	22	65	−195	−6
4900	Montgomery Co	1,223	693	76	32	80	−150	−6
8200	Yazoo County	2,968	1,701	74	38	75	−97	−4
300	Amite County	2,845	1,650	72	29	84	−190	−6
612	Benoit	477	300	59	55	94	−71	−4
800	Carroll County	2,014	1,270	59	24	76	−217	−6
3500	Kemper County	2,206	1,424	55	29	85	−193	−6
2320	Bay St. Louis	3,723	2,416	54	25	55	−120	−5
1820	Hattiesburg	7,846	5,108	54	33	81	−145	−5
4520	Canton	5,524	3,737	48	39	93	−138	−5
5300	Oktibbeha Co	2,082	1,420	47	34	81	−138	−5
7612	Leland	2,109	1,471	43	43	86	−100	−5
5000	Neshoba County	4,113	2,879	43	24	45	−88	−4
3111	East Jasper	1,767	1,300	36	28	86	−207	−6
500	Benton County	1,739	1,291	35	33	86	−161	−6
220	Corinth	2,328	1,722	35	32	58	−81	−4
130	Natchez-Adams	6,997	5,180	35	35	86	−146	−5
5411	North Panola	2,807	2,080	35	42	89	−112	−5
921	Okolona Separate	1,272	940	35	24	85	−254	−7
6700	Sunflower County	2,904	2,156	35	49	87	−78	−4
4420	Columbus	7,206	5,384	34	30	69	−130	−5
4720	Holly Springs	2,428	1,820	33	33	82	−148	−6
6000	Quitman County	2,320	1,748	33	48	89	−85	−4
4200	Leflore County	4,024	3,047	32	44	92	−109	−5
2420	Biloxi	7,983	6,096	31	29	58	−100	−5
1400	Coahoma County	2,648	2,032	30	53	94	−77	−4
8111	Coffeeville	1,095	856	28	37	80	−116	−5
1520	Hazlehurst City	2,332	1,818	28	33	86	−161	−6
4700	Marshall County	4,296	3,364	28	33	78	−136	−5
5600	Perry County	1,801	1,409	28	30	66	−120	−5
2100	Greene County	2,479	1,955	27	28	69	−146	−5
4000	Leake County	3,947	3,143	26	30	67	−123	−5
5720	McComb	3,726	2,992	25	41	80	−95	−4
6312	South Delta	2,030	1,638	24	52	95	−83	−4
6720	Drew	1,133	924	23	39	86	−121	−5
7620	Greenville	9,580	7,811	23	42	85	−102	−5
2700	Humpreys County	2,876	2,334	23	47	95	−102	−5
3020	Moss Point	6,420	5,233	23	24	68	−183	−6
5200	Noxubee County	2,901	2,354	23	44	89	−102	−5
4620	Columbia	2,263	1,849	22	33	63	−91	−4
8020	Louisville	4,123	3,420	21	33	72	−118	−5
4320	Brookhaven	3,865	3,218	20	31	59	−90	−4
4600	Marion County	3,571	2,976	20	35	74	−111	−5
3022	Pascagoula	8,983	7,489	20	25	53	−112	−5
5712	South Pike	3,095	2,576	20	41	81	−98	−4
1100	Claiborne County	2,388	2,011	19	36	93	−158	−6
6400	Simpson County	5,342	4,507	19	27	67	−148	−6
4820	Aberdeen	2,569	2,169	18	33	79	−139	−5
1420	Clarksdale	4,931	4,175	18	41	79	−93	−4
614	Cleveland	4,683	3,979	18	35	74	−111	−5
5900	Prentiss County	2,905	2,453	18	26	49	−88	−4
7400	Walthall Co	3,279	2,777	18	44	74	−68	−4

APPENDIX B.—SORTED BY PERCENTAGE DIFFERENCE IN ENROLLMENT—Continued

DIST	District name	USDE/N517	K–12/Enrol	Diff as percent of enrol	USDE/percent pov	Percent FL partic	Diff as percent USDE pov	Diff as percent FL part
400	Attala County	1,602	1,367	17	30	78	−160	−6
2520	Jackson Public	37,019	31,594	17	31	74	−139	−5
616	Mound Bayou	1,032	882	17	47	93	−98	−4
1212	Quitman	3,027	2,593	17	25	61	−144	−5
1500	Copiah County	3,733	3,225	16	32	70	−119	−5
3900	Lawrence Co	2,822	2,437	16	27	60	−122	−5
7613	Western Line	2,763	2,386	16	27	75	−178	−6
6811	East Tallahatchie	1,885	1,643	15	34	77	−126	−5
5020	Philadelphia	1,472	1,275	15	33	62	−88	−4
5520	Picayune	4,506	3,920	15	27	61	−126	−5
3600	Lafayette Co	2,354	2,073	14	17	50	−194	−6
6120	Pearl	4,737	4,144	14	13	38	−192	−6
7500	Vicksburg-Warren	10,520	9,207	14	24	61	−154	−6
3112	West Jasper	2,125	1,864	14	28	69	−146	−5
7900	Wilkinson Co	1,962	1,726	14	47	89	−89	−4
7611	Hollandale	1,343	1,188	13	50	93	−86	−4
2600	Holmes County	4,616	4,088	13	56	97	−73	−4
3711	Lumberton	1,116	991	13	37	70	−89	−4
3820	Meridian	7,990	7,129	12	35	76	−117	−5
700	Calhoun County	2,789	2,509	11	24	65	−171	−6
6812	West Tallahatchie	1,611	1,447	11	49	92	−88	−4
4220	Greenwood	4,267	3,864	10	44	85	−93	−4
3400	Jones County	8,742	7,918	10	23	50	−117	−5
2421	Gulfport	7,421	6,778	9	26	61	−135	−5
3420	Laurel	3,645	3,338	9	38	79	−108	−5
7700	Wayne County	4,448	4,069	9	35	68	−94	−4
1320	West Point	4,115	3,773	9	31	75	−142	−5
2620	Durant	670	621	8	51	83	−63	−3
615	Shaw	915	847	8	47	93	−98	−49
7200	Tunica County	2,133	1,999	7	44	86	−95	−49
1000	Choctaw County	2,052	1,929	6	29	64	−121	−55
920	Houston Separate	2,062	1,941	6	23	61	−165	−62
2422	Long Beach	3,841	3,616	6	15	36	−140	−58
6900	Tate County	3,470	3,278	6	24	62	−158	−61
2521	Clinton	5,198	4,933	5	15	34	−127	−56
1600	Covington County	3,778	3,601	5	29	77	−166	−62
611	West Bolivar	1,475	1,401	5	53	93	−75	−43
6100	Rankin County	15,699	15,028	4	13	33	−154	−61
6721	Indianola	3,284	3,196	3	42	83	−98	−49
3800	Lauderdale Co	6,911	6,715	3	19	45	−137	−58
4120	Tupelo	7,625	7,476	2	15	51	−240	−71
7800	Webster County	2,064	2,017	2	25	50	−100	−50
900	Chickasaw County	537	530	1	15	64	−327	−77
2423	Pass Christian	1,810	1,788	1	23	51	−122	−55
5530	Poplarville	2,135	2,114	1	27	53	−96	−49
5320	Starkville	4,111	4,108	0	27	64	−137	−58
4821	Amory	1,803	1,819	−1	17	48	−182	−65
1900	Franklin County	1,718	1,733	−1	35	64	−83	−45
2220	Grenada	4,539	4,583	−1	25	60	−140	−58
2900	Itawamba County	3,676	3,708	−1	13	43	−231	−70
5412	South Panola	4,539	4,577	−1	28	66	−136	−58
2000	George County	4,011	4,084	−2	24	46	−92	−48
8113	Water Valley	1,318	1,347	−2	32	56	−75	−43
5920	Baldwyn	1,009	1,035	−3	21	52	−148	−60
4300	Lincoln County	2,696	2,786	−3	22	44	−100	−50
4111	Nettleton	1,351	1,392	−3	21	53	−152	−60
7011	North Tippah	1,290	1,332	−3	29	50	−72	−42
5131	Union City	793	814	−3	27	50	−85	−46
200	Alcorn	3,634	3,800	−4	16	44	−175	−64
2400	Harrison County	12,181	12,657	−4	21	50	−138	−58
613	North Bolivar	1,041	1,089	−4	56	97	−73	−42
6500	Smith County	3,026	3,146	−4	27	56	−107	−52
7012	South Tippah	2,671	2,817	−5	19	47	−147	−60

APPENDIX B.—SORTED BY PERCENTAGE DIFFERENCE IN ENROLLMENT—Continued

DIST	District name	USDE/N517	K–12/Enrol	Diff as percent of enrol	USDE/percent pov	Percent FL partic	Diff as percent USDE pov	Diff as percent FL part
6600	Stone County	2,528	2,650	−5	34	50	−47	−32
7100	Tishomingo Co	3,028	3,201	−5	20	46	−130	−57
7300	Union County	2,475	2,602	−5	14	37	−164	−62
1800	Forrest County	2,405	2,546	−6	16	57	−256	−72
4500	Madison	8,130	8,634	−6	18	40	−122	−55
5800	Pontotoc County	2,751	2,920	−6	18	35	−94	−49
1700	DeSoto County	17,611	18,909	−7	11	35	−218	−69
6220	Forest City	1,692	1,814	−7	34	67	−97	−49
7320	New Albany	1,886	2,028	−7	22	48	−118	−54
420	Kosciusko	1,981	2,158	−8	31	61	−97	−49
4100	Lee County	5,442	5,945	−8	20	50	−150	−60
4800	Monroe County	2,439	2,653	−8	13	38	−192	−66
5711	North Pike	1,495	1,622	−8	19	50	−163	−62
6200	Scott County	3,590	3,913	−8	25	64	−156	−61
3700	Lamar County	6,007	6,570	−9	23	31	−35	−26
4400	Lowndes County	5,074	5,602	−9	25	55	−120	−55
5100	Newton County	1,478	1,634	−10	27	46	−70	−41
3021	Ocean Springs	4,354	4,851	−10	14	24	−71	−42
3620	Oxford	2,725	3,031	−10	18	64	−256	−72
5500	Pearl River	2,273	2,533	−10	26	51	−96	−49
2500	Hinds County	5,307	5,969	−11	29	55	−90	−47
5620	Richton	849	952	−11	30	51	−70	−41
3300	Jeff.Davis Co	2,130	2,414	−12	44	87	−98	−49
4920	Winona	1,310	1,481	−12	36	59	−64	−39
8220	Yazoo City	2,825	3,201	−12	51	89	−75	−43
1821	Petal	3,248	3,737	−13	16	32	−100	−50
5820	Pontotoc City	1,928	2,220	−13	19	43	−126	−56
2300	Hancock County	3,558	4,134	−14	25	57	−128	−56
3000	Jackson County	7,140	8,498	−16	13	35	−169	−63
1211	Enterprise	675	870	−22	14	37	−164	−62
6920	Senatobia	1,289	1,708	−25	24	46	−92	−48
5921	Booneville	830	1,622	−49	19	46	−142	−59

APPENDIX C.—SORTED BY PERCENTAGE DIFFERENCE IN PROVERTY RATE

DIST	District name	USDE/N517	K–12/Enrol	Diff as percent of enrol	USDE/percent pov	Percent FL partic	Diff as percent USDE pov	Diff as percent FL part
3700	Lamar County	6,007	6,570	−9	23	31	−35	−26
6600	Stone County	2,528	2,650	−5	34	50	−47	−32
2620	Durant	670	621	8	51	83	−63	−39
4920	Winona	1,310	1,481	−12	36	59	−64	−39
612	Benoit	477	300	59	55	94	−71	−41
7400	Walthall Co	3,279	2,777	18	44	74	−68	−41
5100	Newton County	1,478	1,634	−10	27	46	−70	−41
5620	Richton	849	952	−11	30	51	−70	−41
2600	Holmes County	4,616	4,088	13	56	97	−73	−42
7011	North Tippah	1,290	1,332	−3	29	50	−72	−42
613	North Bolivar	1,041	1,089	−4	56	97	−73	−42
3021	Ocean Springs	4,354	4,851	−10	14	24	−71	−42
611	West Bolivar	1,475	1,401	5	53	93	−75	−43
8113	Water Valley	1,318	1,347	−2	32	56	−75	−43
8220	Yazoo City	2,825	3,201	−12	51	89	−75	−43
6700	Sunflower County	2,904	2,156	35	49	87	−78	−44
1400	Coahoma County	2,648	2,032	30	53	94	−77	−44
220	Corinth	2,328	1,722	35	32	58	−81	−45
6312	South Delta	2,030	1,638	24	52	95	−83	−45
1900	Franklin County	1,718	1,733	−1	35	64	−83	−45
6000	Quitman County	2,320	1,748	33	48	89	−85	−46
7611	Hollandale	1,343	1,188	13	50	93	−86	−46
5131	Union City	793	814	−3	27	50	−85	−46

APPENDIX C.—SORTED BY PERCENTAGE DIFFERENCE IN PROVERTY RATE—Continued

DIST	District name	USDE/N517	K–12/Enrol	Diff as percent of enrol	USDE/percent pov	Percent FL partic	Diff as percent USDE pov	Diff as percent FL part
5000	Neshoba County	4,113	2,879	43	24	45	−88	−47
4320	Brookhaven	3,865	3,218	20	31	59	−90	−47
5900	Prentiss County	2,905	2,453	18	26	49	−88	−47
5020	Philadelphia	1,472	1,275	15	33	62	−88	−47
7900	Wilkinson Co	1,962	1,726	14	47	89	−89	−47
3711	Lumberton	1,116	991	13	37	70	−89	−47
6812	West Tallahatchie	1,611	1,447	11	49	92	−88	−47
2500	Hinds County	5,307	5,969	−11	29	55	−90	−47
4620	Columbia	2,263	1,849	22	33	63	−91	−48
1420	Clarksdale	4,931	4,175	18	41	79	−93	−48
4220	Greenwood	4,267	3,864	10	44	85	−93	−48
2000	George County	4,011	4,084	−2	24	46	−92	−48
6920	Senatobia	1,289	1,708	−25	24	46	−92	−48
8200	Yazoo County	2,968	1,701	74	38	75	−97	−49
5720	McComb	3,726	2,992	25	41	80	−95	−49
5712	South Pike	3,095	2,576	20	41	81	−98	−49
616	Mound Bayou	1,032	882	17	47	93	−98	−49
7700	Wayne County	4,448	4,069	9	35	68	−94	−49
615	Shaw	915	847	8	47	93	−98	−49
7200	Tunica County	2,133	1,999	7	44	86	−95	−49
6721	Indianola	3,284	3,196	3	42	83	−98	−49
5530	Poplarville	2,135	2,114	1	27	53	−96	−49
5800	Pontotoc County	2,751	2,920	−6	18	35	−94	−49
6220	Forest City	1,692	1,814	−7	34	67	−97	−49
420	Kosciusko	1,981	2,158	−8	31	61	−97	−49
5500	Pearl River	2,273	2,533	−10	26	51	−96	−49
3300	Jeff.Davis Co	2,130	2,414	−12	44	87	−98	−49
7612	Leland	2,109	1,471	43	43	86	−100	−50
2420	Biloxi	7,983	6,096	31	29	58	−100	−50
7800	Webster County	2,064	2,017	2	25	50	−100	−50
4300	Lincoln County	2,696	2,786	−3	22	44	−100	−50
1821	Petal	3,248	3,737	−13	16	32	−100	−50
7620	Greenville	9,580	7,811	23	42	85	−102	−51
2700	Humpreys County	2,876	2,334	23	47	95	−102	−51
5200	Noxubee County	2,901	2,354	23	44	89	−102	−51
4200	Leflore County	4,024	3,047	32	44	92	−109	−52
3420	Laurel	3,645	3,338	9	38	79	−108	−52
6500	Smith County	3,026	3,146	−4	27	56	−107	−52
5411	North Panola	2,807	2,080	35	42	89	−112	−53
4600	Marion County	3,571	2,976	20	35	74	−111	−53
3022	Pascagoula	8,983	7,489	20	25	53	−112	−53
614	Cleveland	4,683	3,979	18	35	74	−111	−53
8111	Coffeeville	1,095	856	28	37	80	−116	−54
8020	Louisville	4,123	3,420	21	33	72	−118	−54
1500	Copiah County	3,733	3,225	16	32	70	−119	−54
3820	Meridian	7,990	7,129	12	35	76	−117	−54
3400	Jones County	8,742	7,918	10	23	50	−117	−54
7320	New Albany	1,886	2,028	−7	22	48	−118	−54
2320	Bay St. Louis	3,723	2,416	54	25	55	−120	−55
5600	Perry County	1,801	1,409	28	30	66	−120	−55
4000	Leake County	3,947	3,143	26	30	67	−123	−55
6720	Drew	1,133	924	23	39	86	−121	−55
3900	Lawrence Co	2,822	2,437	16	27	60	−122	−55
1000	Choctaw County	2,052	1,929	6	29	64	−121	−55
2423	Pass Christian	1,810	1,788	1	23	51	−122	−55
4500	Madison	8,130	8,634	−6	18	40	−122	−55
4400	Lowndes County	5,074	5,602	−9	25	55	−120	−55
6811	East Tallahatchie	1,885	1,643	15	34	77	−126	−56
5520	Picayune	4,506	3,920	15	27	61	−126	−56
2521	Clinton	5,198	4,933	5	15	34	−127	−56
5820	Pontotoc City	1,928	2,220	−13	19	43	−126	−56
2300	Hancock County	3,558	4,134	−14	25	57	−128	−56
4420	Columbus	7,206	5,384	34	30	69	−130	−57

APPENDIX C.—SORTED BY PERCENTAGE DIFFERENCE IN PROVERTY RATE—Continued

DIST	District name	USDE/N517	K–12/Enrol	Diff as percent of enrol	USDE/percent pov	Percent FL partic	Diff as percent USDE pov	Diff as percent FL part
2421	Gulfport	7,421	6,778	9	26	61	−135	−57
7100	Tishomingo Co	3,028	3,201	−5	20	46	−130	−57
4520	Canton	5,524	3,737	48	39	93	−138	−58
5300	Oktibbeha Co	2,082	1,420	47	34	81	−138	−58
4700	Marshall County	4,296	3,364	28	33	78	−136	−58
4820	Aberdeen	2,569	2,169	18	33	79	−139	−58
2520	Jackson Public	37,019	31,594	17	31	74	−139	−58
2422	Long Beach	3,841	3,616	6	15	36	−140	−58
3800	Lauderdale Co	6,911	6,715	3	19	45	−137	−58
5320	Starkville	4,111	4,108	.....	27	64	−137	−58
2220	Grenada	4,539	4,583	−1	25	60	−140	−58
5412	South Panola	4,539	4,577	−1	28	66	−136	−58
2400	Harrison County	12,181	12,657	−4	21	50	−138	−58
1820	Hattiesburg	7,846	5,108	54	33	81	−145	−59
130	Natchez-Adams	6,997	5,180	35	35	86	−146	−59
2100	Greene County	2,479	1,955	27	28	69	−146	−59
1212	Quitman	3,027	2,593	17	25	61	−144	−59
3112	West Jasper	2,125	1,864	14	28	69	−146	−59
1320	West Point	4,115	3,773	9	31	75	−142	−59
5921	Booneville	830	1,622	−49	19	46	−142	−59
3200	Jefferson Co	3,139	1,731	81	38	96	−153	−60
4900	Montgomery Co	1,223	693	76	32	80	−150	−60
4720	Holly Springs	2,428	1,820	33	33	82	−148	−60
6400	Simpson County	5,342	4,507	19	27	67	−148	−60
5920	Baldwyn	1,009	1,035	−3	21	52	−148	−60
4111	Nettleton	1,351	1,392	−3	21	53	−152	−60
7012	South Tippah	2,671	2,817	−5	19	47	−147	−60
4100	Lee County	5,442	5,945	−8	20	50	−150	−60
1100	Claiborne County	2,388	2,011	19	36	93	−158	−61
7500	Vicksburg-Warren	10,520	9,207	14	24	61	−154	−61
6900	Tate County	3,470	3,278	6	24	62	−158	−61
6100	Rankin County	15,699	15,028	4	13	33	−154	−61
6200	Scott County	3,590	3,913	−8	25	64	−156	−61
500	Benton County	1,739	1,291	35	33	86	−161	−62
1520	Hazlehurst City	2,332	1,818	28	33	86	−161	−62
400	Attala County	1,602	1,367	17	30	78	−160	−62
920	Houston Separate	2,062	1,941	6	23	61	−165	−62
1600	Covington County	3,778	3,601	5	29	77	−166	−62
7300	Union County	2,475	2,602	−5	14	37	−164	−62
5711	North Pike	1,495	1,622	−8	19	50	−163	−62
1211	Enterprise	675	870	−22	14	37	−164	−62
700	Calhoun County	2,789	2,509	11	24	65	−171	−63
3000	Jackson County	7,140	8,498	−16	13	35	−169	−63
7613	Western Line	2,763	2,386	16	27	75	−178	−64
200	Alcorn	3,634	3,800	−4	16	44	−175	−64
300	Amite County	2,845	1,650	72	29	84	−190	−65
3020	Moss Point	6,420	5,233	23	24	68	−183	−65
4821	Amory	1,803	1,819	−1	17	48	−182	−65
5130	Newton City	2,168	1,212	79	22	65	−195	−66
3500	Kemper County	2,206	1,424	55	29	85	−193	−66
3600	Lafayette Co	2,354	2,073	14	17	50	−194	−66
6120	Pearl	4,737	4,144	14	13	38	−192	−66
4800	Monroe County	2,439	2,653	−8	13	38	−192	−66
3111	East Jasper	1,767	1,300	36	28	86	−207	−67
1300	Clay County	661	272	143	30	93	−210	−68
800	Carroll County	2,014	1,270	59	24	76	−217	−68
1700	DeSoto County	17,611	18,909	−7	11	35	−218	−69
2900	Itawamba County	3,676	3,708	−1	13	43	−231	−70
4120	Tupelo	7,625	7,476	2	15	51	−240	−71
921	Okolona Separate	1,272	940	35	24	85	−254	−72
1800	Forrest County	2,405	2,546	−6	16	57	−256	−72
3620	Oxford	2,725	3,031	−10	18	64	−256	−72
900	Chickasaw County	537	530	1	15	64	−327	−77

[CLERK'S NOTE.—Additional material submitted is being retained in the subcommittee files.]

CONCLUSION OF HEARING

Senator COCHRAN. Let me say, again, thank you to all of you and to my staff, Ann Copland and others, Win Ellington, who's here, Rachel Spence, and Mark Laisch is the staff member of the subcommittee who works directly for Senator Specter, who's chairman of the subcommittee, who's here and has been helpful to us, as well. Thank you all for attending.

Thank you all very much for being here, that concludes our hearing. The subcommittee will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

[Whereupon, at 11:03 a.m., Friday, April 20, the hearing was concluded, and the subcommittee was recessed, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.]

○