

THE EFFECTS OF CONSOLIDATION OF FEDERAL FUNDING PROGRAMS
ON SCHOOLS PARTICIPATING IN CHAPTER 2 OF ECIA
IN MISSISSIPPI: AN INVESTIGATIVE STUDY

by

Melvin Eugene Franks

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

Educational Research and Evaluation

APPROVED:

Karl T. Hereford, Chairman

Jim C. Fortune

James C. Impara

Richard G. Salmon

John A. Rohr

November 6, 1989

Blacksburg, VA

**THE EFFECTS OF CONSOLIDATION OF FEDERAL FUNDING PROGRAMS
ON SCHOOLS PARTICIPATING IN CHAPTER 2 OF ECIA
IN MISSISSIPPI: AN INVESTIGATIVE STUDY**

by

Melvin Eugene Franks

(Chairman: Dr. Karl Hereford)

(ABSTRACT)

The focus of the study was to observe changes brought about by the implementation of Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 in local jurisdictions of government when the disposition of federal funds were under local control. The study investigated the extent to which the six expressed intentions of Chapter 2, ECIA legislation were realized in 154 local education agencies in the state of Mississippi two years after implementation. Specifically, the six legislative concerns were to:

- * Reduce the amount of paperwork without reducing the quality of programs,
- * Equalize the distribution of federal funds without reducing the benefits to specific target populations,
- * Increase local discretion without diminishing prior program commitments to the original national priorities,
- * Increase the role of private education without raising the constitutional issue,

- * Reduce reporting and evaluation requirements without a commensurate loss of accountability, and
- * Reduce the constraints on SEAs in the planning of federally funded projects and programs without a loss of perceived quality in those programs.

Data sources collected for analysis included: a mail survey, interviews with state and local school personnel, and supportive documents from both the state education agency and local school districts. The data was analyzed using descriptive statistics.

From the study it was concluded that, while the goals of Chapter 2, ECIA legislation were admirable, they were replete with unintended consequences. Further, while many of the legislative objectives were met at the national level several of the objectives had differing effects in a state like Mississippi which exerted little SEA influence.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author acknowledges Dr. Karl Hereford for his endearing support. Further acknowledgement is given to Dr. Jim Fortune for the encouragement and suggestions throughout the development of the research and writing. A special thanks goes to _____ for all of her assistance.

An expression of appreciation is extended to my wife, _____, and her family for the support they provided me through out these difficult times. To my sister, _____, and the other members of my family for there encouragement I will ever be grateful.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my late father,
 , a man of great stature and courage.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 - AN OVERVIEW OF THE DISSERTATION	1
Statement Of The Problem	9
Purpose Of The Dissertation	10
Policy - Relevant Research Questions	12
Delimitations	13
Significance Of The Dissertation	13
Organization Of The Dissertation	14
CHAPTER 2 - REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	16
Federal Educational Policy: A Brief History. . .	16
Federalism Under The Nixon Administration . .	21
President Reagan's "New Federalism".	23
The Federal System For Distribution Federal Funds To State And Local Agencies	30
Categorical Grants	30
Formula Or Entitlement Grants	32
Block Grants	32
The Education Consolidation And Improvement Act Of 1981	34
Reduction Of The Amount Of Paperwork	35
Equalization Of The Distribution Of Federal Funds	38
Increase In Local Discretion	41
Provision For Equitable Participation Of Private School Students	42

Increase In Local Responsibility For Program Evaluations	45
The Limited Role Of The State Education Agencies	47
Summary	49
CHAPTER 3 - RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY.	51
Education System Of Mississippi, The Population For Study	52
Data Sources	56
Chapter 2 Of The Education Consolidation And Improvement Act (P. L. 97-35)	57
Mississippi State Department Of Education Policy Statements	58
LEA Chapter 2, Application For Funding	58
LEA Chapter 2, 1985-86 Allocation	59
LEA Antecedent Program Funding For 1980-81	59
Size And Wealth Of LEAs	59
Personal Interviews	59
Questionnaire	60
Design Of Questionnaire	61
Questionnaire Construction	61
Field Testing The Questionnaire	62
Final Questionnaire Composition	64
Characteristics Of Respondents And Nonrespondents	64
Limitations Of The Data	65
Data Collection Plan	66
Research Design And Analysis Plan	67
Summary	73

CHAPTER 4 - ANALYSIS OF THE DATA AND PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS	74
Applying The Data To The Research Questions . . .	74
Research Question 1	74
To what extent was adequate information available at the State Department Of Education in Mississippi which would support an analysis of the intended effects of Chapter 2, ECIA?	
Method	74
Discussion	75
Findings	78
Research Question 2	79
To what extent did the enactment of Chapter 2, ECIA reduce the paperwork burden for local education agencies?	
Method	79
Discussion	79
Findings	82
Research Question 3	83
To what extent did the level of funding for Chapter 2 program activities change from the level of funding for the consolidated antecedent programs?	
Method	83
Discussion	84
Districts That Gained Or Lost Funds . . .	87
Number Of Districts That Gained Or Lost Funds By Size Of District	88
Distribution Of Difference Between Chapter 2 Funds And Antecedent Program Funds According To Size Of District. . .	90
Chapter 2 Funds and Antecedent Program Funds According to Wealth of District.	93
Findings	97

Research Question 4	101
To what extent did the number of program activities under Chapter 2, ECIA change from the number of antecedent categorical programs?	
Method	101
Discussion	102
Size Of School District And The Number Of Antecedent Programs	106
Size Of School District And The Number Of Chapter 2 Program Activities	109
Wealth Of The School District And The Number Of Antecedent Programs	117
Wealth Of The School District And The Number Of Chapter 2 Program Activities	121
Difference In The Number Of Programs And The Wealth Of School District	125
Difference In The Number Of Programs Funded And The "Gainers" And "Losers" With Chapter 2 Funding	128
Findings	131
Research Question 5	134
What differences were there between the types of program activities funded under Chapter 2, ECIA and the types of programs funded under the consolidated antecedent programs?	
Method	134
Discussion	134
Findings	142

Research Question 6	143
To what extent did local school districts exercise their power to establish and implement Chapter 2 program activities?	
Method	143
Discussion	144
Findings	150
Research Question 7	150
To what extent was there a change in the sharing of authority between public and private school officials over the design and implementation of Chapter 2 program activities compared to the involvement in antecedent programs?	
Method	150
Discussion	151
Findings	154
Research Question 8	155
With the restructuring of the traditional evaluation requirements placed on federal project activities by Chapter 2 legislation, to what extent have local education agencies continued to evaluate Chapter 2 program activities?	
Method	155
Discussion	155
Findings	157
Research Question 9	158
To what extent has the Mississippi State Department Of Education allowed the LEAs to exercise complete discretion over Chapter 2, ECIA?	
Method	158
Discussion	158

Findings	161
Summary	162
CHAPTER 5 - POLICY IMPLICATIONS FROM THE STUDY OF CHAPTER 2, ECIA IN MISSISSIPPI	163
Background	163
Intended and Unintended Results Of The Implemen- tation Of Chapter 2, ECIA In Mississippi. . .	168
Paperwork Burden	170
Equalization Of The Distribution Of Federal Funds	173
Increase In Local Discretion	178
Provision For Equitable Participation Of Private School Students	181
Increase In Local Responsibility For Program Evaluations	184
The Limited Role Of The State Education Agencies	187
Summary	190
BIBLIOGRAPHY	193
APPENDICES	201
A--Mississippi State Department of Education Chapter 2 State-wide Questionnaire.	202
B--A Description of Mississippi's Education System	206
C--Determination Of Allocation Of Chapter 2 Funds To LEAs In Mississippi	246
D--Mississippi State Department Of Education' Chapter 2 Application Packet	250
E--Antecedent Programs Consolidated Into Chapter 2, ECIA	263

F--Sample of State ECIA, Chapter 2 Application - Project Narrative	266
G--LEA Chapter 2 Data - Size, Wealth, Chapter 2 Allocation, Antecedent Funds, Gain/Loss . .	299
H--Crosstabulations Supporting Research Questions	304
VITA	314

TABLE OF TABLES

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
2.1	FEDERAL FUNDING FOR ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION	28
3.1	COMPARISON OF STATE SET-ASIDE AND FORMULAS FOR DISTRIBUTING CHAPTER 2 FUNDS . . .	55
3.2	SOURCES OF DATA FOR THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS . . .	57
3.3	SURVEY QUESTIONS MATCHED TO THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS	62
3.4	COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDING AND NONRESPONDING LEAS BY RELEVANT CHARACTERISTICS	65
4.1	DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DISTRICTS THAT GAINED FUNDS WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CHAPTER 2, ECIA AND DISTRICTS THAT LOST FUNDS	86
4.2	TOTAL AMOUNT OF FUNDS GAINED OR LOST BETWEEN ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS AND CHAPTER 2, ECIA.	86
4.3	SIZE AND WEALTH OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS THAT GAINED FUNDS UNDER CHAPTER 2, ECIA	87
4.4	SIZE AND WEALTH OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS THAT LOST FUNDS UNDER CHAPTER 2, ECIA	88
4.5	NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS THAT GAINED OR LOST FUNDS WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CHAPTER 2, ECIA ACCORDING TO SIZE OF LEA	89
4.6	NET GAIN BETWEEN ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS AND CHAPTER 2, ECIA ACCORDING TO SIZE OF LEA. .	91
4.7	NET LOSS BETWEEN ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS AND CHAPTER 2, ECIA ACCORDING TO SIZE OF LEA. .	92
4.8	NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS THAT GAINED OR LOST FUNDS WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CHAPTER 2, ECIA ACCORDING TO WEALTH OF LEA	93
4.9	NET GAIN BETWEEN ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS AND CHAPTER 2, ECIA ACCORDING TO WEALTH OF LEA. . .	95
4.10	NET LOSS BETWEEN ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS AND CHAPTER 2, ECIA ACCORDING TO WEALTH OF LEA. . .	96

4.11	NUMBER OF ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS FUNDED BY LEAS IN MISSISSIPPI (1980-81)	102
4.12	NUMBER OF CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES FUNDED BY LEAS IN MISSISSIPPI (1985-86)	103
4.13	DIFFERENCE IN NUMBER OF PROGRAMS BETWEEN CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES AND ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS FUNDED BY LEAS IN MISSISSIPPI (1980-81 & 1985-86)	104
4.14	PAIRED T-TEST BETWEEN NUMBER OF CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES AND NUMBER OF ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS FUNDED BY LEAS IN MISSISSIPPI.	105
4.15	NUMBER OF ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS FUNDED ACCORDING TO SIZE OF LEA	107
4.16	FREQUENCY OF ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS FUNDED ACCORDING TO SIZE OF LEA	109
4.17	FREQUENCY OF CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES ACCORDING TO SIZE OF LEA	110
4.18	TOTAL NUMBER OF CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES ACCORDING TO SIZE OF LEA	112
4.19	DIFFERENCE IN NUMBER OF CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES AND ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS FUNDED IN MISSISSIPPI ACCORDING TO SIZE OF LEA	114
4.20	DIFFERENCE IN NUMBER OF ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS AND CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES FUNDED ACCORDING TO SIZE OF DISTRICT	117
4.21	TOTAL NUMBER OF ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS ACCORDING TO WEALTH OF LEA.	118
4.22	FREQUENCY OF ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS ACCORDING TO WEALTH OF LEA.	120
4.23	FREQUENCY OF CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES ACCORDING TO WEALTH OF LEA.	123
4.24	TOTAL NUMBER OF CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES ACCORDING TO WEALTH OF LEA.	124
4.25	DIFFERENCE IN NUMBER OF CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES AND ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS FUNDED IN MISSISSIPPI ACCORDING TO WEALTH OF LEA	127

4.26	DIFFERENCE IN NUMBER OF ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS AND CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES FUNDED ACCORDING TO WEALTH OF LEA.	128
4.27	THE NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS THAT GAINED OR LOST FUNDS WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CHAPTER 2 ECIA	130
4.28	PROGRAM "LABELS" USED FOR ANALYSIS PURPOSES. . .	136
4.29	PAIRED T-TEST BETWEEN ANTECEDENT TITLE IV-B PROGRAM EXPENDITURE AND CHAPTER 2 "TITLE IV-B TYPE" PROGRAM ACTIVITY EXPENDITURE.	138
4.30	PAIRED T-TEST BETWEEN ANTECEDENT ESAA PROGRAM EXPENDITURE AND CHAPTER 2 "ESAA TYPE" PROGRAM ACTIVITY EXPENDITURE.	138
4.31	PAIRED T-TEST BETWEEN ANTECEDENT GIFTED & TALENTED PROGRAM EXPENDITURE AND CHAPTER 2 "GIFTED & TALENTED TYPE" PROGRAM ACTIVITY EXPENDITURE	140
4.32	PAIRED T-TEST BETWEEN ANTECEDENT CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROGRAM EXPENDITURE AND CHAPTER 2 "CRIMINAL JUSTICE TYPE" PROGRAM ACTIVITY EXPENDITURE	140
4.33	PAIRED T-TEST BETWEEN ANTECEDENT BASIC SKILLS PROGRAM EXPENDITURE AND CHAPTER 2 "BASIC SKILLS TYPE" PROGRAM ACTIVITY EXPENDITURE	141
4.34	PAIRED T-TEST BETWEEN ANTECEDENT CAREER EDUCATION PROGRAM EXPENDITURE AND CHAPTER 2 "CAREER EDUCATION TYPE" PROGRAM ACTIVITY EXPENDITURE	141
4.35	LEA CHAPTER 2 COORDINATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF LEA DISCRETION OVER CHAPTER 2 FUNDS AS COMPARED TO ANTECEDENT FUNDS.	146
4.36	DISTRIBUTION OF LEA CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES BY ANTECEDENT PROGRAM FUNDING FOR LEAS THAT PERCEIVED CHAPTER 2 FUNDS TO BE MORE FLEXIBLE THAN ANTECEDENT FUNDS	149
4.37	RESPONSES TO SEA SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING EVALUATING CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES.	156

CHAPTER 1

AN OVERVIEW OF THE DISSERTATION

In 1981, with the election of President Reagan and a Republican controlled Senate, federal policy toward education changed significantly. Shortly after taking office Reagan proposed a substantial reduction in the federal presence in elementary and secondary education. This policy change was consistent with the Administration's overall goal to reduce the role of government in the economy. In his address to Congress in 1981 the President stated that he planned to "put the nation on a fundamentally different course" and pledged to revive the economy, improve the nation's defense capabilities, and transfer significant powers and responsibilities to state and local governments.

When President Reagan took office, he inherited several national problems. These included: double-digit inflation, lagging productivity, high unemployment, and a tremendous budget problem which consisted of large federal spending and a big tax burden. In response to these problems the Reagan administration proposed "The Program for Economic Recovery" which was designed to limit the federal role in the control of the economy and in other areas of government. The plan called for a stable and restrictive monetary policy, a reduction in personal and business taxes, a cut in domestic spending, an increase in defense spending, and a substantial relaxation of regulatory controls.

The Administration's economic program was based on a fundamentally conservative social philosophy. By yoking its social and educational agenda to the economic policy, the administration secured a degree of public and legislative support for its programs that otherwise might not have been forthcoming. Social and structural reform was a secondary goal of the Program for Economic Recovery. The Administration argued that economic recovery and long-term growth were important prerequisites to achieving other goals. Therefore, programs aimed at developing human resources (e.g. education, training, and social services) were disproportionately cut rather than maintained or reformed (Palmer and Sawhill, 1981).

In response to President Reagan's plan, Congress passed "The Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981" which included major portions of the Administration's economic program. This act was intended to: (1) provide tax relief from inflation-induced bracket creep, (2) promote economic growth, and (3) reduce the size of the federal government. The immediate result was a 25% across-the-board tax reduction in personal income tax resulting in an estimated revenue loss of over \$1 trillion for the first six years. (Palmer & Sawhill, 1981) The tax cut reduced rates for everyone; however, the cut was not evenly distributed across all income levels. The maximum tax rate on unearned income was reduced from 70 percent to 50 percent while minimizing the cuts to low-

income families. With inflation, the net result was an increased tax burden for many low-income families and greater tax relief for higher-income taxpayers.

In an effort to offset the reduced federal revenue brought about by the tax cut, the Administration recommended drastic reductions in the growth of federal spending in non-defense activities. This was reflected in the President's budget package presented to Congress in March of 1981 in which he proposed a reduction in non-defense program outlays of 15 to 20 percent in real terms with major targets to include: being means-tested entitlement programs, and annually funded grants to states and local levels of government. (Palmer & Sawhill, 1981)

Congress responded by passing the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (P.L. 97-35) which contained large cuts in domestic programs. The bill was passed in spite of the Democratic majority in the House and a potential split in the ranks of Senate Republicans. It was supported by Republican solidarity and a key group of conservative southern Democrats in the House called "Boll Weevils". (Stockman, 1986)

A major contributing factor to the success of the Reagan Administration in persuading Congress to pass the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act was the "reconciliation process" itself. This process included a complicated feature of the 1974 Congressional Budget Act intended originally to

enable congressional Budget Committees to enforce spending targets in the final stages of the appropriations process. The Reagan administration, however, succeeded in moving a binding reconciliation measure to the beginning of the process. This successfully wrapped the entire Administration budget and program reform package into one massive piece of legislation - the Omnibus Budget and Reconciliation Act of 1981. By so doing, the Act could be moved as one piece through the Congress under deadlines set by the congressional budget process and under the oversight of the Congressional Budget committees, rather than -- as was commonly done -- having the Act split into thirteen separate appropriation bills amid scattered authorizing legislation. (Stockman, 1986)

Beyond reducing federal spending, the Reagan Administration's initiative included a restructuring of the system of distributing federal aid to state and local jurisdictions of government. Consistent with the Reagan philosophy was a plan to consolidate a large number of categorical grants into fewer, broad-based grants. According to the administration, it trimmed the number of separate grant programs by more than a quarter during its first term (OMB, 1984). The largest consolidation was a part of the FY 1982 block grant reforms in which the administration obtained congressional approval for nine block grants combining sixty-six different categorical grants. Seven of the nine block grants were new

block grants in the areas of health and social services, with one combining a number of smaller educational programs and another providing community development grants (Pettersson, 1984).

Under earlier administrations -- both Democratic and Republican -- federal aid to public schools had grown to as much as eight percent of total public expenditure for education. Much of the federal aid was divided into discrete "categories" of assistance, each designed to benefit a specific target group (e.g. disadvantaged pupils), program (e.g. metric education), or budget category (e.g. supplies, services, research, etc.).

The Reagan Administration's philosophy (i.e. cutting federal spending, reducing the federal role, and transferring control from the federal level to local jurisdictions of government) also was applied to the federal government's support of education. From the Administration's perspective, the Federal Constitution left education as an uncontested state and local responsibility. Under this interpretation, the administration's overall objective was to eliminate, or severely reduce, the role of the federal government in the support of public education (Clark & Amiot, 1983). As a means of accomplishing this goal the President recommended:

- (1) The reduction, consolidation, and/or elimination of federal education programs,
- (2) A substantial reduction in the funding of federal program, and

(3) The abolition of the Department of Education.

The Administration requested that Congress reduce the budget authorization for elementary, secondary, and vocational education by 33 percent below the FY 1981 levels. Further, in an attempt to make the drastic cuts politically viable, the Administration proposed "blocking" the several categorical programs. Forty-two categorical programs and titles were consolidated into one education block grant, in effect, eliminating various categories of aid -- the principal instrument of Federal control of funding priorities -- while retaining the original purposes to which each of the several categorical aid programs were designed to achieve. In addition, blocking the 42 funding programs into a single fund extended the Administration's objectives, namely: (1) reducing the amount of separate applications, reports, and evaluations imposed on states and local school districts, (2) extending aid to more LEAs, (3) providing private schools with a greater share in the authority over public funds, and (4) allowing the LEAs, rather than the federal government, to determine how to allocate available funds in accordance with local needs and priorities. The education agenda was thus transferred from the federal government to local school districts.

In response to this request, Congress enacted Chapter 2 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (Title V,

Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, Chapter 2, Subtitle D of P.L. 97-35). Consistent with the administration's proposal, Congress merged the forty-two categorical education programs/titles into one education block grant. The act maintained the Reagan philosophy of reducing the federal presence in the schools and returning control of the schools to the local levels of government. However, the original purposes for which the federal funds from the 42 funding sources were intended remained intact. By "blocking" the funding programs into a single fund, the framers hoped to retain the basic purposes of the earlier legislation, but free each LEA to choose among the several purposes in accordance with its own needs and priorities.

Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 exemplified all of the Reagan Administration's fundamental objectives. Specifically, the legislation was designed to achieve six immediate objectives:

(1) To reduce the amount of paperwork. It was "the intent of Congress that this responsibility be carried out with a minimum of paperwork. . ." [Sec. 561 (a)].

(2) To equalize the distribution of the Federal funds. The funds are distributed to the local educational agencies "according to the relative enrollments in public and nonpublic schools within the school district . . ." [Sec. 565 (a)].

(3) To increase local discretion in the disposition of the Federal funds. Funds are to be used "in accordance with the needs and priorities of . . . local educational agencies as determined by those agencies" [Sec. 561(a)]. To reinforce this message, the law adds the following stipulation regarding the funds that flow directly to districts: "Each local educational agency shall have complete discretion, subject only to the

provisions of this chapter, in determining how the funds the agency receives under this section shall be divided among the purposes of this chapter..." [Sec. 566(c)].

- (4) To provide in the Federally supported activities equitable participation of private school students. In addition to the stated intention of improving education for private school students, the law spells out numerous provisions that "will assure equitable participation of such children in the purposes and benefits of the chapter..." [Sec. 586(a)(1)]. In particular, the law states that if the needs of the children enrolled in private schools are different from the needs of children enrolled in public schools, the LEA shall provide Chapter 2 services for the private school children that address their needs on an equitable basis. [Sec. 586] Further, if an SEA or LEA is prohibited by law from providing Chapter 2 services for private school children on an equitable basis or has substantially failed, or is unwilling, to provide services for private school children on an equitable basis, the Secretary can implement a by-pass thereby serving private school children directly from the federal government. [Sec. 586 (d), (e), and (g)].
- (5) To increase local responsibility for program evaluations. The local education agency "agrees to keep records, and provide such information to the State educational agency as may be required for fiscal audit and program evaluation, consistently with the responsibilities of the State agency." [Sec. 566 (a)(3)]
- (6) To limit the role of the State educational agencies. The SEA is "responsible for the administration and supervision of programs assisted with Chapter 2 funds". However, each LEA has "complete discretion, subject only to the provisions of [Chapter 2], in determining how the funds shall be divided among the purposes of [Chapter 2]" [Sec. 564(a) and Sec. 566(c)].

In summary, with the election of President Reagan and a Republican controlled Senate, federal education policy was changed significantly. The Reagan Administration's philosophy was to cut federal spending, reduce the role of the federal government and transfer control from the federal

level to the local levels of government. One of the major tools used to achieve the new federal policy in education was the education block grant: Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The changes brought about by Chapter 2, ECIA raised several potential issues. These included: (1) The impact of the reduced paperwork on the accountability of state and local education agencies (OIG, 1983; Bartell, 1981; Darling-Hammond, 1983; Department of Education, 1982); (2) the loss of services to target groups whose needs were addressed by specific categories of aid, and consequently, a loss in equalization effects of Chapter 2 on the distribution of federal funds (Palmer and Sawhill, 1982; CGS, 1983; ECS, 1982 Fries, 1983; Nathan and Doolittle, 1983; Franks and Fortune, 1981; Verstegen, 1983); (3) the shift in the locus of decision making in educational program design to reflect local priorities (Corbett, et. al., 1983; Henderson, 1983 b; Kyle, 1983; Turnbull, 1983); (4) the impact on both public and private schools of the increased Federal support for private school students AASA, 1984; Knapp and Cooperstein, 1984; OIG, 1983; Darling-Hammond and Marks, 1983); (5) the change in accountability procedures and evaluation requirements and the resulting effects (Darling-Hammond and Marks, 1983; Hickey, 1983); and, (6) the effect of restrict-

ing the influence state education agencies on local education agencies while increasing the control of local education agencies over federal funds (Knapp, et. al., 1986; Turnbull, 1983; Darling-Hammond and Marks, 1983).

PURPOSE OF THE DISSERTATION

The purpose of this dissertation was to determine the extent to which the six expressed intentions of Chapter 2, ECIA legislation were actually realized in 154 local education agencies (LEAs) in the state of Mississippi. Specifically, six policy concerns were addressed:

- (1) To what extent, if any, has Chapter 2, ECIA effectively reduced the paperwork burden placed on local education agencies?
- (2) To what extent, if any, has Chapter 2, ECIA equalized the distribution of funds to LEAs?
- (3) To what extent, if any, have LEAs exercised local discretion in the design and implementation of Chapter 2 program activities?
- (4) To what extent, if any, have public schools shared the control over Chapter 2 program activities with private school authorities?
- (5) To what extent, if any, have local school authorities accepted responsibility for the accountability of Chapter 2 program activities?
- (6) To what extent, if any, has the State Department of Education permitted LEAs to exercise local control over Chapter 2, ECIA?

The focus of the study was to observe changes brought about by the implementation of Chapter 2, ECIA in local jurisdictions of government when the disposition of federal funds were under local control. This required the selection of local sites with as little influence as possible from state or other governmental agencies. The state of Mississippi and its 154 local education agencies met the requirement for selection. At a time when most states increased their role in policy making, the Mississippi State Department of Education continued to limited its role in local policy making, thus maximizing local control over federal funds.

POLICY-RELEVANT RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Nine specific questions were addressed in this study:

1. To what extent was adequate information available at the State Department of Education in Mississippi which would support an analysis of the intended effects of Chapter 2, ECIA?
2. To what extent did the enactment of Chapter 2, ECIA reduce the paperwork burden for local education agencies?
3. To what extent did the level of funding for Chapter 2 program activities change from the level of funding for the consolidated antecedent programs?

How did the distribution of funds change by size (ADA) and wealth (APU) of LEAs?

4. To what extent did the number of program activities under Chapter 2, ECIA change from the number of antecedent categorical programs?

How did the distribution of programs change by size (ADA) of LEA; wealth (APU) of LEA; and the net gain or loss of Chapter 2 funds of the LEA?

5. What differences were there between the types of program activities funded under Chapter 2, ECIA and the types of programs funded under the consolidated antecedent programs?
6. To what extent did local school districts exercise their power to establish and implement Chapter 2 program activities?
7. To what extent was there a change in the sharing of authority between public and private school officials over the design and implementation of Chapter 2 program activities compared to the involvement in antecedent programs?
8. With the restructuring of the traditional evaluation requirements placed on federal project activities by Chapter 2 legislation, to what extent have local education agencies continued to evaluate Chapter 2 program activities?
9. To what extent has the Mississippi State Department of Education allowed the LEAs to exercise complete discretion over Chapter 2, ECIA?

DELIMITATIONS

There were two major boundaries to the study. First, the survey was confined to the local education agencies of a single state, albeit a state in which the least amount of state influence was exerted in shaping local use of Chapter 2, ECIA funds. Second, only policy issues at the local level of government are addressed, leaving the issues in the state and federal jurisdictions of government for future study.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

There have been numerous research studies and reports of the impact of the implementation of Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981. Many of these reports merely identified the effects of one aspect of the legislation on a particular interest group (e.g. the fiscal impact on large school districts). Other studies were designed to identify the effects of the change in the distribution system on state and local education agencies. In addition, a national study was commissioned to study the impact of Chapter 2, ECIA in local school districts (Knapp, et. al., 1987). Although the goals of these reports and studies may have been admirable, the methods used and the interpretations provided often were not reflective of actual changes that occurred in many local and state agencies (Franks and Fortune, 1982; Mandel, 1983; Knapp and Cooperstein, 1984).

The significance of this study is two-fold. First, by electing to study policy concerns at the local level without the confounding effects of state or other governmental agencies, the dissertation may provide insights into the local control of federally funded activities that might not be evident in other states. Second, open-ended programs that do not have specific goals and objectives, such as Chapter 2, ECIA, do not lend themselves to study by traditional research methodology. For example, it is infeasible to identify either the "treatment" or "criterion variables" by which to estimate the "effects" of Chapter 2. This dissertation illuminates some of the inherent problems of policy research and provides a model for collecting potentially useful data from several sources, thus providing a better understanding of the policy process.

ORGANIZATION OF THE DISSERTATION

The dissertation is divided into five chapters. Chapter two provides the background for the dissertation, including the review of the Chapter 2, ECIA literature. It also provides a description of the restructuring of the flow of federal funds brought about by Chapter 2, ECIA and the intended changes in the federal-state-local relationships. Chapter three provides a description of the dissertation design including: the study plan, description of the population, field testing, implementation of the survey

instrument, and the analysis plan. In chapter four the analysis of the data are discussed along with the supportable conclusions for each finding. Finally, chapter five presents policy implications from the study of Chapter 2, ECIA in Mississippi and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Included in this chapter is a discussion of the history of federal educational policy focusing on changes which have occurred in the past three decades. This is followed by a review of Chapter 2, ECIA literature, concentrating on the intent of the legislation. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the nine research questions addressed by this study.

FEDERAL EDUCATIONAL POLICY: A BRIEF HISTORY

Education policy has changed significantly throughout the course of U.S. history. During the early years of the Republic, education was mostly regarded as a parental and church responsibility. (Cuberley, 1934) This was the prevailing thought until Horace Mann, in the mid-eighteenth century, founded a movement in support of mass public education, resulting in making education a public concern and a widely accepted state responsibility. With continued labor shortages in the expanding industrial sector, brought about by the Industrial Revolution, the federal government began to assume a role in education. In 1917, for the first time, with the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act, federal funds were provided to public elementary and secondary schools. These

funds were assigned specifically for vocational education in response to the growing need of a better educated work force.

Although there was interest in expanding federal aid to education beyond vocational programs, no new major initiatives were passed until just prior to the United States' entry into World War II. In 1941 Congress passed the Lanham Act which provided aid to local governments for the construction, maintenance, and operation of community facilities in areas swollen by an influx of military personnel and defense workers. However, it was not until September 30, 1950 when Congress enacted Title II of Public Law 815 and 874 that federal aid for the maintenance and operation of public schools in federally impacted areas was provided to local school agencies. This program was established to provide funds in lieu of taxes to the local school district where a substantial federal presence, for example, a military base, increased school enrollment or reduced local tax revenues.

Federal aid to education was further expanded with the enactment of the Library Services Act of 1956 (P.L. 597) and the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The Library Services Act provided \$7,500,000 in grants to the States for the extension and improvement of public libraries serviced in rural areas. The National Defense Education Act (NDEA)

established a new federal policy of financial support for education. In general the act provided for: (1) Federal contribution of ninety percent of the capital loan funds at institutions of higher education for low interest loans to students for the pursuit of a higher education, and, (2) Grants to State Education Agencies for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction in public elementary and secondary schools and junior colleges. (Quattlebaum, 1968)

The first major change in the role of the federal government in elementary and secondary education occurred in the early 1960's. With the increased interest in social concerns that characterized the early 1960's, federal educational policy began to focus on issues of educational equity at the local school district level. There was an acknowledgment of the fact that equal educational opportunity was denied to a substantial minority of pupils. The role of government in all jurisdictions (i.e. local, state, and federal) was in the form of programs with clear, fairly narrow purposes, designed to achieve specific objectives related to national interest. Broadly defined, federal goals in education were: (Ward and Gaeta, 1979)

- (1) To provide an equal educational opportunity for all students,
- (2) To encourage and guarantee specific education services deemed to be in the national interest for targeted groups, and

- (3) To compensate for resource capacity inequities caused by specific federal actions, e.g., the reduction of the local tax base by locating a federal facility in that jurisdiction.

The focus of the federal education agenda in the 1960's was directed toward providing a residual service to the state and local jurisdictions of government by providing federal programs for disadvantaged children. Such aid was appropriated on behalf of needy children regardless of residence on the assumption that many state and local jurisdictions were unwilling or unable to provide these services.

One of the largest federal education programs was the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA, 1965). This act provided funds to address the federally-recognized needs of educationally and economically disadvantaged children. It was designed to "respect" the established relationship between the state and local education agencies. Further, it set the stage for the expansion of federal educational policy and the extension of the authority of the federal government to establish a national agenda for education and to set national goals for education. (Quattlebaum, 1968)

The increased role of the federal government in establishing educational policy ultimately had an impact on the entire educational system of America. By 1968, nearly

600 separate legislative provisions were identified in the federal government, each permitting or mandating an expenditure of some type for education. (Quattlebaum, 1968)

With the proliferation of educational programs came a significant increase in federal education expenditures. In 1960, the federal government spent \$490 million, increasing to \$3.2 billion in 1970. Between 1970 and 1979, federal funding for education doubled to \$6.7 billion. As the number of federal programs increased, the amount of funding also increased and the role of the federal government continued to expand.

In short, with the advent of the Social Revolution of the 1960's, the federal government became increasingly involved in setting national policy and addressing issues of national concern. For example, during the Johnson years (1963 - 1968), federal aid to education increased to a level approximately equal to eight percent of total public expenditure for education and remained largely categorical. This led to debate regarding the role of the federal government in education (Baratz, Berk, & Hartle, 1979). Discussions centered primarily around three issues: (1) Should the federal government play a primary or residual role in financing public education? (2) Should the federal, state, or local school districts set program objectives and funding priorities (e.g. general aid versus categorical

aid)? and, (3) How should federal education aid be structured? (e.g. Who should benefit from federal revenues? How should the funds be distributed? What should be the proper mix of federal, state, and local funds?) These and other issues were continually debated at the federal level with the premise that the federal government had a responsibility for establishing national educational priorities and should distribute tax dollars for such priorities. (Clark, Astuto, & Rooney, 1983)

Federalism Under the Nixon Administration

In 1973, President Nixon introduced the "New Federalism", an attempt to control federal education aid to the states. Included in his plan for Education Revenue Sharing was a request for the consolidation of 33 categorical grant programs into one entitlement program containing five broad areas: (1) Education of the disadvantaged; (2) Education of handicapped children; (3) Vocational education; (4) Impact aid; and (5) Supporting materials and services. Funds were to be apportioned among the states on the basis of a formula, taking into account the total school-aged population in each state, the number of students whose families resided on federal property, and the number of low income families in the district. (C. Q. Almanac, 1973)

Although the 92nd Congress virtually ignored Nixon's special revenue sharing bills, including his education bill, Congress passed the General Revenue Sharing Act which provided for a transfer of federal revenue collections to the states to be used for a variety of purposes. Congress also passed the Education Amendments of 1974 which included portions of President Nixon's request to consolidate categorical programs into broad grants-in-aid. The Education Amendments of 1974 consolidated several categorical grant programs into two broad areas to be administered by the state education agencies. The areas were: (1) the library and instructional resource programs which merged the school library program, the equipment program, and guidance and counseling program; and (2) innovative and support services program which included metric conversion education, education of the gifted and talented, community schools, career education, consumer education, women's equity education, and arts education. This consolidation was passed with the stipulation that it would not take effect unless the total appropriation for the new programs exceeded the aggregate amount for all of the previous fiscal year. (C. Q. Almanac, 1974)

The changes brought about during the Nixon years, in effect, shifted the educational agenda from the federal government to state jurisdictions. However, the main thrust

of the federal government's aid to schools remained largely categorical.

From 1974 to 1981 there was little substantive change in federal education policy. In 1974 President Ford sent a proposal to Congress to consolidate 24 categorical elementary and secondary education programs. Although the bill was never reported out of committee it signaled a change in direction for federal education policy. In 1978 the Domenici-Bellmon bill proposed the Optional Educational Simplification Act. This bill proposed a form of "procedural consolidation" which would be superimposed over existing program structure with state participation made optional. Finally, in 1981 President Carter created the Department of Education giving education cabinet level status.

President Reagan's "New Federalism"

In 1981, with the election of President Reagan and a Republican controlled Senate, federal educational policy again underwent significant changes. The changes included: a substantial reduction in the federal presence in elementary and secondary education; a restructuring of the federal distribution of funds; and, an extension of services to private school students.

From the Reagan administration's perspective, the Constitution left responsibility for education to the

individual states and their local school districts. Using this interpretation, the administration's overall objective was to eliminate, or markedly reduce, the role of the federal government in education. (Clark & Amiot, 1983) The President recommended:

- (1) Abolishing the Department Of Education;
- (2) Substantially reducing the level of funding of federal education programs by reduction, consolidation and/or elimination; and,
- (3) Restructuring the delivery system of federal aid to state and local levels of government.

The policy changes were consistent with President Reagan's overall goals to reduce the role of the federal government in state and local matters, cut the federal budget, and transfer control of funds that were to be provided by the federal government from the federal bureaucracies to the state and local government recipients.

The Reagan Administration recommended drastic reductions in the growth of federal spending in an effort to offset the reduced federal revenue brought about by the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981. Reagan's radical tax cut created pressure to substantially reduce federal spending. This reduction was part of the overall Republican objective to reduce the role of the federal government by transferring control to other jurisdictions of government. The President focused his attention in three areas:

- (1) Legislative action (e.g. consolidation of current programs, refusal to reauthorize programs as they cycle around; and failure to introduce new legislation that would expand the influence of the federal government in education);
- (2) Administrative action (e.g. influence the rule-making process and the administrative officers responsible for implementing the law); and,
- (3) Budget process (reduce budget levels for out-years, propose current budget reductions, and rescind budget authorizations, when possible).

The Reagan administration was skilled in using the legislative process to meet the overall goals. In an effort to streamline the federal system of financial assistance to state and local jurisdictions and return greater authority to state and local policy makers, President Reagan proposed the consolidation of programs in the social, education, and health services into block grants. Program consolidation was followed by a reduction of funding levels which was then justified partially on the savings presumed to be derived from lowered administrative costs and more efficiently delivered services.

The President used the administration's authority to establish the rules and regulations for implementing legislation to further advance his goals. This strategy included: (1) a reduction in the degree to which the federal government attempted to impose national social preference on states and localities through regulation and (2) a shift in

the responsibility for regulation to units of government closer to the citizens. This policy was intended to achieve two important results: (1) to reduce the number of federal rules and regulations and (2) to reshape the relationship between federal, state, and local jurisdictions.

The Reagan administration also used the budget process to bring about a redirection of federal education policy. Customarily, Congress debates substantive education matters in the House education committees and the Senate Education and Labor Committee where Congress sets limits of authority for spending in support of policy objectives. Independently of these committees, the appropriation committees of the House and Senate set levels on funds to be appropriated for the various programs. The appropriation committees also set priorities for the use of the appropriated funds and prescribe the methods to be used by the federal government in allocation funds to recipient state and local governments.

Rather than allowing for national needs to be debated in the various House and Senate committees and at public hearings, as was customary with prior administrations, the Reagan administration chose to use the budget reconciliation process to make sweeping policy changes and to reduce the burgeoning federal budget. (Stockman, 1986). As a part of that process, categorical programs were

"consolidated" into one block grant and made a part of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (P.L. 97-35). By using the budget process in this manner, the traditional political process in which substantive program needs set federal funding priorities was reversed. The level of the appropriations for education dictated program decisions. By so doing, the Reagan administration was asked to withstand pressure from powerful education lobbies in Washington. It also established a potentially disturbing precedent, namely; shaping major public policy in the absence of public debate on the merits of the proposed changes.

In the President's budget message to Congress in March of 1981, he proposed a reduction in non-defense program outlays of 15 to 20 percent in real terms with major targets being the several means-tested entitlement programs and annually funded grants to states and local levels of government. The proposed changes included: (Palmer & Sawhill, 1981)

- (1) An overall reduction in budget outlays including the diminution of allocations of federal funds for education,
- (2) A consolidation of sixty-six categorical grants into nine block grants, and
- (3) A significant change in the regulations governing the expenditure of federal funds.

The changes were reflected in the President's budget package in which he proposed that Congress reduce the budget authority for elementary, secondary, and vocational education. The authorized outlay of federal funds for education was reduced so that by FY 1986 there was nearly a thirty percent reduction relative to the FY 1981 program levels (See Table 2.1).

TABLE 2.1
FEDERAL FUNDING FOR ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY,
AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
(In \$ millions)

	Funding Necessary to Maintain FY 1981/82			
	Policy Levels		Actual Appropriations	
	Budget		Budget	
	Authority	Outlays	Authority	Outlays
1982 Total	8,271	7,427	6,143	3,006
1983 Total	6,592	6,413	4,415	5,576
1984 Total	6,952	6,618	3,807	4,591
1985 Total	7,469	7,002	3,807	3,907
1986 Total	8,027	7,497	3,807	3,811

Note. From Palmer & Sawhill; (1982), pp. 337, 339

For the most part, Congress accepted the President's proposed spending reductions in non-defense programs, which included the consolidation of sixty-six different categorical grants into nine broad-based grants. Seven of these new block grants were in the areas of health and social services, with one combining a number of smaller educational programs and another providing community

development grants. (Petterson, 1984) According to the administration, it trimmed the number of separate grant programs by more than a quarter during its first term. (OMB, 1984)

For FY 1984, the appropriations for health services "block grants" was \$1.3 billion. These grants went to states to support a multitude of public health services (e.g., rodent control), medical care services for specific populations (e.g., persons living in under served areas and victims of hypertension), and developmental programs (e.g., for home health care and emergency medical services)

The Administration applied the same strategy to the education programs as was applied to the funding of certain health and social services programs with one noticeable difference: education was particularly targeted with an overarching aim of eliminating the Department of Education. (Stockman, 1986; Palmer & Sawhill, 1982)

Congress responded by passing the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (P.L. 97-35) which contained large cuts in domestic programs and significantly changed the way in which the Federal government funded elementary and secondary education. Forty-two categorical programs/titles were consolidated into one education block grant under Chapter 2 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981. The bill passed in spite of the Democratic majority in

the House and a potential split in the ranks of Senate Republicans. It was supported by Republican solidarity and a key group of conservative southern Democrats in the House called the "Boll Weevils". (Stockman, 1986)

**The Federal System For Distributing
Federal Funds To State And Local Agencies**

The Reagan administration's objective to reduce the role of the Federal government in education went beyond reducing federal spending and was directed toward restructuring the system of distributing federal aid. In general, Federal funds have been dispensed to state and local jurisdictions in three basic methods: (1) Project based (i.e. competitive) categorical grants; (2) Formula (i.e. entitlement); and, (3) Block grants. The Reagan Administration favored the use of block grants because of the method's effectiveness in transferring control in the use of the funds to local levels of government. A brief description of the three methods of dispensing funds is given.

Categorical Grants

Over eighty percent of the federal aid to state and local jurisdictions is provided in the form of categorical grants. (Palmer & Sawhill, 1981) Proponents of categorical

aid argue that the characteristics of this mode of funding make it the most desirable. They point to the "targeting" capability which allows specifying in some detail eligible purposes, priorities, and recipients. This permits the federal government to compensate for deficiencies in the fiscal capacity of regions, states and local jurisdictions while attempting to equalize resources and service levels. The heavily conditional nature of this mode of funding stimulates and supports programs designed to meet national goals which might not be undertaken without a federal impetus. Assurance that such needs are being served can only be maintained by rigidly restricted aid programs enforced by detailed accountability procedures, and closely supervised by federal monitors.

Categorical funding also permits a high degree of recipient accountability to grantor agencies and Congressional committees for the uses of federal funds. It is wholly in harmony with the heavily pluralistic nature of American politics reflecting the impact of executive branch agencies, legislative committees and interest groups on the processes for formulating, implementing and changing public policies and programs. (Stenberg, 1979)

Formula Or Entitlement Grants

Another method of funding federal programs is by formula or entitlement. With this method a predetermined amount of funds is distributed to a defined population based on certain characteristics of the population. An example of an entitlement program was Title II, P.L. 815 in which federal aid was provided to public schools for maintenance and operation in lieu of taxes where a substantial federal presence, such as a military installation, had increased school enrollment and reduced local tax revenues. Schools received aid in proportion to the number of pupils who resided on or whose parents worked at a federal installation. Virtually no strings were attached to these funds.

Block Grants

A third method of funding federal programs is the block grant. This method has at least five features that differentiate it from other federal assistance funding mechanisms: (ACIR, 1977)

- (1) Funds are authorized for a wide range of activities within a broadly defined functional area,
- (2) Recipients have substantial discretion in identifying problems and needs, and in designing programs and allocating resources to meet them,

- (3) Administrative planning, application development, fiscal reporting, and other federal requirements are kept to the minimal amount necessary to ensure recipient compliance and accountability,
- (4) Federal aid is distributed on a formula basis, and
- (5) General purpose governments and their elected chief executive and legislative officials are accorded preferential treatment as recipients.

With the Reagan administration's block grants, regulatory or administrative rules that limit state and local discretion in the implementation of grant-supported programs were removed. Further, many of the smaller categorical programs, which had been sustained primarily by federal dollars, were packaged so that local school districts were given the option of withdrawing altogether from these program areas if they desired without reducing their total federal support. This action transferred the authority of establishing educational priorities from the federal to the local jurisdiction of government.

Although the Reagan Administration was initially successful with block granting, it failed to make substantial changes in the grant structure from categorical program funding to broad-based block grants. Indeed, Congress seemed to cooperate with the administration by cutting the appropriation of the "consolidated" programs.

But it resisted attempts to cut aid to politically sensitive programs, particularly its favorite categorical programs, such as Chapter 1, ECIA. In FY 1984, general purpose grants constituted only 20.2 percent of the federal grants budget a figure less than the 20.7 percent in FY 1980, the year prior to the Reagan administration. (Palmer, 1984) The administration recommended further block-grant consolidation in each of its budget proposals; however, with the exception of a consolidation of job training programs, these proposals were rejected by Congress.

THE EDUCATION CONSOLIDATION AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1981

In Chapter 2 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (Title V, Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, Chapter 2, Subtitle D of P.L. 97-35) forty-two categorical programs/titles were consolidated into one education block grant. The act, in effect, eliminated most small categorical programs, the principal instrument of Federal control of funding priorities, while retaining the laudable purposes to which the categorical aid was intended. Blocking the 42 funding programs into a single fund was intended to meet the Reagan Administration's objectives which included: (1) Radically reducing the amount of paperwork imposed on states and local school districts; (2) Extending aid to more LEAs; (3) Providing private schools with a greater share in the authority over public funds;

and, (4) Allowing the LEAs, rather than the federal government, to determine how to allocate available funds in accordance with local needs and priorities. By "blocking" the funding programs into a single fund, the framers hoped to retain the basic purposes of the earlier legislation, but free each LEA to choose among the several purposes in accordance with its own needs and priorities. Specifically, the Chapter 2 legislation was designed to achieve six immediate objectives. Following is a discussion of each objective.

Reduction Of The Amount Of Paperwork

The framers of the act sought to reduce radically the amount of paperwork and administrative burden imposed on states and local school districts by the 42 categorical finding programs. The act eliminated the need for a separate application for each of the 42 antecedent programs, reduced the fiscal reporting to state and federal agencies, eliminated evaluation reports for the first two years, and reduced the local progress reports to one annual rather than four quarterly reports. In addition, only one administrative system was required to manage the budgeting, accounting, auditing, inventory, and evaluation required of the Act rather than a separate system for each categorical program as before.

The reduction in reporting requirements reduced the burden on state and local governments. But it also threatened to deny the federal government legitimate access to data needed to judge the effectiveness of the federally funded activities. This policy change raised questions such as; What is the role of the federal government in gathering and providing pertinent educational information? What is the consequence of not having access to information across the various states and localities?

Accompanying the argument for a reduction in federal government paperwork is the contention that with less paperwork there will be less need for administrative personnel, thus providing another savings to the federal budget. Such an argument assumes an even distribution of the paperwork load and raises additional personnel issues. For example: the reduction in requirements has been generally accompanied by a loss of district-level administrative staff. These people not only provided support for the program but also performed a number of staff support functions ranging from routine monitoring to instructional leadership. This has been especially true in smaller states and local school districts. (OIG, 1983) If a reduction in force is implemented to reap the benefits of less paperwork what will be the consequence to the remaining staff?

Although there may be fewer restrictions on the use of program funds, state and local agencies remain accountable for the administration of the funds. The ambiguity of the law and the accompanying rules and regulations raise additional questions such as: Who is responsible for program audits? What type of audit requirements are imposed in the absence of a standard requirement? Will the fear of future audits and evaluation bring about more documentation thus defeating the original intent? What is the consequence of failing to provide clear and concise accountability procedures?

Previous research studies have looked at the paper reduction issue in a broad sense (Bartell, 1981; Darling-Hammond, 1983; Department of Education, 1982). These studies used sampling techniques designed to make broad generalizations. Although it is beyond the scope of this study to investigate all of the effects brought about by the reduction in paperwork, this study will focus on the extent to which Chapter 2, ECIA reduced the paperwork burden for local education agencies. In addition, this study was not designed to be representative of all LEAs but rather to investigate the reduction in paperwork at the local level in one unique state.

Equalization Of The Distribution Of Federal Funds

Prior to the enactment of Chapter 2, ECIA 42 educational programs were made available to state and local jurisdictions in the form of competitive and categorical grants. Categorical aid was provided to address special needs of specific populations deemed to be in the national interest, e.g. Ethnic Heritage Studies, Metric Education). This method of providing funds for educational purposes permitted the federal government to specify, in some detail, the national purposes or goals for which the categorical funds would be expended, the educational agencies that would be supported in pursuing the national goals, the precise programs and activities to be involved, and the basis on which the aid recipient agency's performance would be evaluated. Further, it allowed the government to compensate for inequities in the fiscal capacity of regions, states, and local jurisdictions. The heavily conditional nature of this mode of funding stimulated and supported programs designed to meet national goals that might not be undertaken without a federal initiative. Assurance that such needs were being served was enforced by detailed accountability procedures and closely monitored by federal officers or their agents in the SEAs.

When Congress passed Chapter 2, the intent to equalize the distribution of federal funds was achieved by changing

the manner in which the funds were distributed to local education agencies. One block grant was created by consolidating 20 FY 81 appropriations, repealing legislative authorizations of 42 categorical programs, and reducing the FY 82 appropriation by over ten percent. (Palmer and Sawhill, 1982) The new federal funds were distributed "to the local educational agencies . . . according to the relative enrollments in public and nonpublic schools within the school districts adjusted, in accordance with criteria approved by the Secretary, to provide higher per pupil allocations to local educational agencies which have the greatest numbers or percentages of children whose education imposes a higher than average cost per child". [Sec. 565 (a)] The method of distributing federal funds to LEAs was changed from a competitive and categorical funding method to an entitlement method in which LEAs received a specified amount of funds based upon the number of students they served. The net effect of consolidating the 42 categorical programs into an entitlement program was an equalization of the distribution of federal funds in four ways:

- (1) Large urban and suburban school districts received a drastic reduction of federal funds while small, rural, poor school districts received a significant increase (CGCS, 1983; ECS, 1982; Fries, 1983; and Nathan and Doolittle, 1983);

- (2) There was a significant shift from the frost states with larger, more populated areas to areas with fewer students (e.g. the sunbelt and the far west)(ECS, 1982; Knapp, et. al., 1986);
- (3) The median level of program funding decreased significantly (Franks and Fortune, 1981; McLaughlin, 1982; Darling-Hammond and Marks, 1983); and,
- (4) The number of programs funded changed from a few larger programs to many smaller programs (Knapp, et.al. 1986; Franks and Fortune, 1981; Kyle,1983).

Although distributing funds in a block grant may seem to be more even handed, studies have shown that Chapter 2, ECIA funds have been distributed quite unevenly. For example: Verstegen, (1983) found that the larger the number of children in poverty, the greater the loss in aid a state sustained under Chapter 2, ECIA. Knapp, et. al. (1986) found that Chapter 2 funds tended to shift from larger, more populated states to those with fewer students. Therefore, the issue of equitable distribution of funds may be questioned.

While it is beyond the scope of this study to investigate all of the issues surrounding the effects Chapter 2 on the distribution of federal funds, this study examines the issue of equalization of federal funds by focusing on three aspects of the distribution of Chapter 2 funds:

- (1) The extent to which the level of funding for Chapter 2 program activities changed from the level of funding for the consolidated antecedent programs,
- (2) The extent to which the number of program activities under Chapter 2, ECIA changed from the number of antecedent categorical programs, and
- (3) The extent to which the types of program activities funded under Chapter 2, ECIA changed compared to the types of programs funded under the consolidated antecedent programs.

Increase In Local Discretion

Chapter 2, ECIA legislation intended to provide local school districts an increased discretion over the establishment of program objectives and funding priorities. Under the prior categorical method of funding educational programs, an explicit purpose and imposed federal priority was included within each program. With Chapter 2, ECIA a list of twenty-eight program topics defined as legitimate program titles were provided to LEAs as categories from which to choose programs to be funded. Under these program titles local school authorities were given flexibility to design programs to address local priorities and authority to establish funding priorities. Local school districts were given the option of completely withdrawing from prior program commitments if they so desired. This change in the authority to establish program priorities transferred the education agenda from the federal level of government to the

local school districts, thus causing considerable concern for the fate of national priorities (Corbett, et. al., 1983; Henderson, 1983; Henderson, 1983 b; Kyle, 1983; Turnbull, 1983).

A focus of this study was to establish the extent to which local administrators of Chapter 2 funds perceived changed in local school district discretion in the design and implementation of Chapter 2 program activities.

Provision For Equitable Participation Of Private School Students

Chapter 2, ECIA legislation extended to private school students access to federally funded programs that previously excluded their participation. (AASA, 1984; Jordan and Irwin, 1981; and, Kyle, 1983) Prior to the Chapter 2 consolidation of 42 categorical programs, only one of the programs mandated private school participation. Four others made specific provisions for their voluntary participation. If private school officials desired their students to receive benefits from programs they were entitled to receive, local school officials had to include these activities as a legitimate part of the LEA's total program.

Chapter 2, ECIA broadened the scope of federal programs available to private school students and increased private school authority over the funds by providing for equitable

participation of private school students. Four special provisions were made by Chapter 2, ECIA. First, local school districts were to provide private school children with benefits and services equitable to those provided to public school children. This required LEAs to consult with appropriate private school officials regarding the development and implementation of the Chapter 2 program before making any decision that affected the opportunities of private school children to participate in the program. Second, if the needs of children enrolled in private schools were different from the needs of those enrolled in public schools, the LEAs were to provide Chapter 2 services for the private school children that addressed their needs on an equitable basis. Third, the LEAs could not require assurances from private schools regarding compliance with Chapter 2 requirements, such as Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as a condition to receiving services. Fourth, if an LEA did not provide equitable benefits and services to private school children, then the SEA or the federal government were to make arrangements, such as through a by-pass contract with a nonprofit agency or organization, under which private school children were provided with services and materials equitable with those provided to public school children.

The increased access to federally funded programs provided by Chapter 2, ECIA encouraged a significant increase in the participation rate of private school pupils (AASA, 1984). The greater authority given to private school officials over the use of federal funds often altered the public and private school relationship (Knapp and Cooperstein, 1984; OIG, 1983; Darling-Hammond and Marks, 1983). Public school officials were required to share authority over purposes and priorities established for private school students, however LEAs could not require private school officials to provide compliance assurances as a condition of receiving federal funds. Thus the potential existed for the misuse of public funds.

In addition to broadening the scope of federal programs available to private school students and increasing private authority over the funds, the actual dollar value of services was increased. It is estimated that private school students received nearly three times as much federal aid under Chapter 2 than was available to them earlier under the several categorical programs (AASA, 1984).

The increased access of private schools to federal funds through Chapter 2, ECIA raises several questions: To what extent should the federal government be funding private education? Are private schools that receive federal support required to meet the same standards as their counterparts in

the public schools? What assurance is provided that Civil Rights requirements are being met? How has Chapter 2, ECIA changed the relationship between public and private school administrators?

Although this study could not address all of the public/private school issues, it did investigate the extent to which public school officials shared with private school officials in the design and implementation of Chapter 2 program activities.

Increase In Local Responsibility For Program Evaluations

Chapter 2, ECIA departed significantly from the well established pattern of federal program evaluations. Until Chapter 2, program evaluation was mandated by the federal government. Structured program evaluations were required for each of the antecedent categorical programs, with the exception of ESEA Title IV-B.

With the enactment of Chapter 2, ECIA oversight responsibilities of Chapter 2 were shifted from the federal agencies to state agencies, thereby making the SEAs accountable for the management of Chapter 2 programs. Program evaluations became a prerogative of the state and local education agencies, with annual required state evaluations commencing in 1984. The issue of who would be

accountable for programmatic as well as fiscal oversight was unclear. The establishment of expected and reasonable outcomes and the monitoring or evaluation of program operations were left to be decided by government agencies below the federal level (e.g. state and local education agencies). (Darling-Hammond and Marks, 1983; Hastings and Bartell, 1983; Hickey, 1983; Kearney, 1983; Knapp, 1984; Education Daily, 1983).

The intent to increase local responsibility for program evaluations was achieved with Chapter 2 as LEAs were no longer required to perform the structured program evaluations earlier required by the federal government. LEAs only had to "provide such information to the state education agency as reasonably may be required for fiscal audit and program evaluation [566 (a)(3)]". In practice SEAs determined how much or how little evaluation districts had to do under the block grant. Beyond that, what districts did to evaluate Chapter 2 reflected local traditions and beliefs in the value of the activity. The responsibility for program evaluations changed from federally mandated program evaluations to volunteer local evaluations. LEAs no longer had to report evaluations to the federal government, but only to the SEAs. By removing the federal requirements for structured evaluation procedures there was no method for attributing funding levels to specific program activities.

evaluation mechanisms at the state level have been developed? How do state and local evaluation systems balance accountability and flexibility? What evaluation measures are being used to measure effectiveness of program activities in the absence of standard program purposes and definition?

Although this study could not address all of the program evaluation concerns raised by the enactment of Chapter 2, ECIA, it did focus on one central point - the extent to which local school districts in Mississippi accepted responsibility for the evaluation of their Chapter 2 program activities.

The Limited Role Of The State Education Agencies

The role of the state education agency as it pertained to the categorical antecedent programs that were consolidated into Chapter 2, ECIA was to provide technical assistance to local education agencies, monitor program compliance, and assure fiscal responsibility. With the enactment of Chapter 2, the role of state education agencies was severely curtailed. Under Chapter 2, local education agencies had full discretion over local program design and implementation. Essentially, the role of the SEAs was reduced to that of trustee of federal funds. A SEA might

influence the formula to be used in the state to distribute Chapter 2 funds but, it had no authority to amend local decisions concerning program design, implementation, or evaluation. Further, SEAs were no longer authorized to conduct site visits in order to monitor program activity and assure compliance with the law. Nor were SEAs authorized to evaluate local programs. Rather, SEAs were instructed to rely upon reports provided by the LEAs. The net effect of these changes was two fold, namely: an overall reduction in the role of the SEA to make or enforce educational policy within the state, and a transfer of programmatic decisions from the federal level directly to the local school districts without SEA intervention. The issues raised by such changes at the state level have been addressed earlier by Darling-Hammond and Mark (1983) and by Turnbull (1983). In these studies, attention was focused on the impact of the changes at the state level rather than on the local school districts. Knapp, et.al. (1986) also looked at the changes in the relationship between the state and local education agencies, and again the focus was on the role of the SEA. This study was designed to provide information from a local perspective about the extent to which the state department of education allowed local school districts discretion over Chapter 2, ECIA.

SUMMARY

The passage of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (P.L. 97-35) and the implementation of Chapter 2, ECIA raised important policy issues, some of which have been studied and their effects documented: (AASA 1983; AASA, 1984; CGCS, 1983; Corbett, et. al. 1983; Darling-Hammond & Mark, 1983; Hastings & Bartell, 1983; Henderson, 1983a; Henderson, 1983b; Henderson, 1984; Henderson, 1985; IEL, 1985; Jung & Bartell, 1983; NASBE, 1981; Nathan & Doolittle, 1983; Weinheimer, 1984). This chapter has documented several conclusions drawn from these studies. They include:

- (1) There has been a reduction in the paperwork burden for the local education agencies (OIG, 1983; Bartell, 1981; Darling-Hammond, 1983; Department of Education, 1982),
- (2) There has been a shift in the distribution of Chapter 2 funds from larger urban and affluent suburban school districts to smaller rural and poorer disadvantaged school districts (McLaughlin, 1982; CGCS, 1983; AASA, 1983),
- (3) There has been a shift in the locus of decision making in educational program design to reflect local priorities. (Corbett, et al., 1983; Henderson, 1983 b; Kyle, 1983; Turnbull, 1983),
- (4) There has been a change in the number of private schools participating in Chapter 2 and a change in the relationship between public and private school authorities (AASA, 1984; Jordan, 1981; Kyle, 1983),
- (5) There has been a change in accountability procedures and evaluation practices

(Darling-Hammond and Marks, 1983; Hickey, 1983; Hickey, 1983), and

- (6) The role of the state education agency has changed from an entity that provides technical assistance to local education agencies, monitors for program compliance, and assures fiscal responsibility to a trustee of federal funds. This change resulted in an overall reduction of the role of the SEA in making and enforcing educational policy within the state and a transfer of programmatic decisions from the federal level directly to the local school districts without SEA intervention (Darling-Hammond and Mark, 1983; Turnbull, 1983; Knapp, et.al. 1986).

A number of pressing questions remain unanswered, or only answered in part. It is these questions (earlier identified in Chapter 1 of this study) to which this research is addressed. They are:

- (1) To what extent, if any, has Chapter 2, ECIA effectively reduced the paperwork burden placed on local education agencies?
- (2) To what extent, if any, has Chapter 2, ECIA equalized the distribution of funds to LEAs?
- (3) To what extent, if any, have LEAs exercised local discretion in the design and implementation of Chapter 2 program activities?
- (4) To what extent, if any, have public schools shared the control over Chapter 2 program activities with private school authorities?
- (5) To what extent, if any, have local school authorities accepted responsibility for the accountability of Chapter 2 program activities?
- (6) To what extent, if any, has the State Department of Education permitted LEAs to exercise local control over Chapter 2, ECIA?

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

In this chapter the methodology used to address the research questions is described. The chapter is divided into six principal parts: (1) Education system of Mississippi, the population for study, (2) Data sources, (3) Characteristics of respondents and nonrespondents, (4) Limitations of the data, (5) Data collection plan, and (6) Research design and analysis plan.

This study was not designed to be an evaluation of Chapter 2, ECIA but rather to collect policy-relevant information that could be useful for policy makers at all levels of program impact from the local school board to the federal Department of Education. In addition, the information and the methodology used in this study have implications for future study of, not only Chapter 2, ECIA but other federal and state funded programs.

The initial information for this study was collected in the fall and spring of the 1984-85 school year. This included historical information from 1980-81 school-year and 1984-85 school year information from both the Mississippi State Department of Education and local school districts. Additional information, including a mail survey, was collected in the spring of 1986 for the school year 1985-86.

EDUCATION SYSTEM OF MISSISSIPPI, THE POPULATION FOR STUDY

The focus of the study was to observe changes brought about by the implementation of Chapter 2, ECIA in local jurisdictions of government when federal funds were under local control. This required selecting local sites with as little influence from state or other governmental agencies as possible. The state of Mississippi and its 154 local education agencies (LEAs) seemed best to meet the requirements for selection in two ways: (1) Historically, the Mississippi State Department of Education (MSDE) has limited its role in local policy making, thus maximizing local control of federal funds, and (2) Mississippi chose to influence the distribution of Chapter 2 funds to the local education agencies in the least possible way.

According to Chapter 2, ECIA legislation, State Education Agencies (SEAs) were restricted in control and influence over Chapter 2 program activities operating in the local education agencies. The SEA could influence Chapter 2 indirectly in three ways: (Sec. 565 (a))

- (1) The SEA could keep up to 20% of the state allocation but must transfer at least 80% to the LEAs,
- (2) The SEA could choose to distribute a portion of the allocation it kept as competitive grants,

- (3) The SEA could influence the allocation of the remaining 80% through the creation of a distribution "formula". This decision was made by the State Chapter 2 Advisory Council to which the SEA was only one of several members.

A review of the distribution patterns of the fifty states showed that forty-five SEAs kept the full twenty percent allocation allowed by the law. The range was from ten percent to twenty percent with a mean of nineteen and one half percent. (See Table 3.1) In addition, a state-by-state analysis of Chapter 2 distribution formulas revealed that the weight for the "high cost factor" ranged from five percent to seventy-nine percent, with a mean factor of thirty-one percent. (See Table 3.1) This high-cost weighting factor was seen as an indication of the level of influence an SEA exerted over the LEAs within its jurisdiction.

Chapter 2, ECIA legislation required that each SEA "distribute not less than 80 per centum to local educational agencies within such State according to the relative enrollments in public and nonpublic schools" (Sec. 565 (a)). The funds were to be distributed to the LEAs within the SEA's jurisdiction based on a formula established by the State Chapter 2 Advisory Council. The distribution formula was to "provide higher per pupil allocations to local educational agencies which have the greatest numbers or percentages of children whose education imposes a higher than average cost per child, such as: (1) children from low-income families, (2) children living in economically depressed urban and rural

areas, and (3) children living in sparsely populated areas."
(Sec. 565 (a))

The state of Mississippi chose the least possible factor, five percent, for the weighting factor and distributed Chapter 2 funds according to the following policy (1983-84 MSDE Policy Statement):

- (1) Five per centum of money designated to go to local educational agencies was reserved for them to meet Section 565. The factors of low- income students (free lunch), the percentage of special education students, the percentage of vocational educational students, and sparseness was used,
- (2) Ninety-five per centum of money designated to go to local educational agencies was reserved and distributed on a per pupil basis,
- (3) The first month's enrollment in the local educational agency plus the number of students enrolled in private schools was the basis for the distribution of Chapter 2 funds.

All 154 local school districts in Mississippi were chosen for the study rather than a sample of districts. This was determined by a pilot study which established that a sample of LEAs could not be representative of "typical" LEA choices. Because Chapter 2 allowed LEAs to determine the type of program activity and the level of funding for each activity, LEAs were encouraged to be different rather than the same. Also, due to the nature of the topic, the diversification of Chapter 2 program activities was as important as the "typical" LEA.

TABLE 3.1
COMPARISON OF STATE SET-ASIDE AND
FORMULAS FOR DISTRIBUTING CHAPTER 2 FUNDS

State	State Set-aside	Formula For Distributing Funds By Enrollment/ Special Needs
Alabama	10.0	80/20
Alaska	20.0	30/70
Arizona	10.0	N/A
Arkansas	20.0	90/10
California	19.5	42/58
Colorado	20.0	83/17
Connecticut	20.0	21/79
Delaware	20.0	70/30
Florida	17.5	64/36
Georgia	20.0	50/50
Hawaii*	20.0	100/0
Idaho	20.0	85/15
Illinois	20.0	70/30
Indiana	20.0	83/17
Iowa	20.0	75/25
Kansas	20.0	88/12
Kentucky	20.0	84/16
Louisiana	20.0	85/15
Maine	20.0	60/40
Maryland	20.0	80/20
Massachusetts	20.0	40/60
Michigan	20.0	58/42
Minnesota	20.0	85/15
Mississippi	20.0	95/05
Missouri	20.0	78.5/21.5
Montana	20.0	71/29
Nebraska	20.0	75/25
Nevada	20.0	90/10
New Hampshire	20.0	50/50
New Jersey	20.0	30/70
New Mexico	20.0	70/30
New York	20.0	86.5/13.6
North Carolina	20.0	70/30
North Dakota	20.0	87/13
Ohio	20.0	77/23
Oklahoma	20.0	80/20
Oregon	20.0	70/30
Pennsylvania	17.0	60/40
Rhode Island	20.0	60/40
South Carolina	20.0	70/30
South Dakota	20.0	90/10
Tennessee	20.0	N/A
Texas	20.0	73/27
Utah	20.0	77/23
Vermont	20.0	60/40
Virginia	20.0	65/35
Washington	20.0	50/50
West Virginia	20.0	90/10
Wisconsin	20.0	50/50
Wyoming	20.0	58/42

Note. *Hawaii has only one school district.

From: National Committee for Citizens in Education. (1982)

DATA SOURCES

Information from eight sources, identifying twenty-one types of data, were used to address the research questions in this study. The sources were:

- (1) Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, P.L. 97-35,
- (2) Mississippi State Department of Education Policy Statements,
- (3) LEA Chapter 2, Application For Funding,
- (4) LEA Chapter 2, 1985-86 Allocation,
- (5) Superintendent's 1980-81 Audit Report: LEA Antecedent Program Funding,
- (6) Superintendent's 1985 Annual Report: Size and Wealth of LEAs,
- (7) Personal Interviews, and
- (8) Survey Questionnaire.

Table 3.2 presents the sources of data used to address each research question. Following the table each source and corresponding types of data are discussed.

TABLE 3.2
 SOURCES OF DATA FOR THE
 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Sources Of Data								
Research Questions	P.L. 95-135	MSDE Policy	Chapter 2 Applications	Chapter 2 Allocations 1985-86	Audit Report 1980-81	Annual Report 1985	Interviews	Chapter 2 Survey
1	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
3		X	X	X	X	X		
4		X	X	X	X	X		
5		X	X	X	X	X		
6	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
7	X	X	X					X
8	X	X	X					X
9	X	X	X	X	X	X		X

Chapter 2 Of The Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, (P. L. 97-35)

The law enacted by Congress in 1981, P.L. 97-35 Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, was the first source of information. From the law six specific objectives of Chapter 2, ECIA were derived and defined. They were investigated as to their impact at the local school district level. The objectives were:

- (1) To reduce the amount of paperwork,
- (2) To equalize the distribution of the Federal funds,

- (3) To increase local discretion in the disposition of the Federal funds,
- (4) To provide in the Federally supported activities equitable participation of private school students,
- (5) To increase local responsibility for program evaluations, and
- (6) To limit the role of the State Educational Agencies.

**Mississippi State Department Of
Education Policy Statements**

Policy statements from the Mississippi State Department of Education provided guidelines for Chapter 2, ECIA. From these statements definitions and information were obtained concerning the state's expectations from the local school districts, requirements for participating LEAs, and the LEA's obligation to private schools.

LEA Chapter 2, Application For Funding

The LEA Chapter 2 Applications filed with the Mississippi State Department of Education were used for information regarding: (1) the LEA's selection of supported program activities, (2) the amount of support for each program activity, (3) a brief description of each program activity, (4) a brief description of the evaluation for each program activity, (5) a statement concerning private schools in the LEA district and, (6) an attachment of private school requests for program support.

LEA Chapter 2, 1985-86 Allocation

The LEA Chapter 2 1985-86 Allocation for LEAs in Mississippi, provided by the Mississippi State Department of Education, was another data source. The LEA allocation was determined by the MSDE using the local school district's student enrollment and a "weighting factor" developed by the State Chapter 2 Advisory Council.

LEA Antecedent Program Funding For 1980-81

The "Superintendent's 1980-81 Audit Report", kept at the Mississippi State Department of Education, was a source of information that contained the 1980-81 antecedent programs funded in the 154 LEAs and the funding level for each program.

Size and Wealth Of LEAs

The "Superintendent's 1985 Annual Report" was utilized to determine LEA demographic information, such as the average daily attendance and the wealth of the district as measured by the average per-pupil unit (APU).

Personal Interviews

A variety of personal interviews were conducted by the researcher. These included: (1) Allen King, Assistant

Secretary of Education, U.S. Department of Education, (2) Mississippi State Department of Education personnel including: the Deputy Superintendent of Education, the Director of Policy and Planning, the Chapter 2 Coordinator, the Director of Finance and Statistics, the Director of Special Programs and, the Chairman of the Chapter 2 Advisory Council, (3) Public School Personnel including: the Chairman of the Mississippi Superintendent's Association, the President of the Mississippi Library Association, several LEA Superintendents, Chapter 2 Coordinators, Librarians, and classroom teachers and, (4) Private School Personnel including: Acting Superintendent of the Jackson Catholic Diocese, Superintendent of the Biloxi Catholic Diocese, President of the Mississippi Private School Association, and several private school headmasters.

Questionnaire

A mailed questionnaire was sent to the 154 LEAs in Mississippi. The purpose of the questionnaire was to obtain information from individual Chapter 2 administrators. Survey information included: Chapter 2 Coordinators' perceptions of local school discretion; local evaluations of Chapter 2 program activities; local involvement of private schools; and, LEA relationships with the Mississippi State Department of Education.

Design of Questionnaire

A panel of experts was chosen to provide professional guidance in the development of the survey and to serve as consultants in their respective areas of expertise. This panel included professors of educational research at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, a public school administrator, a federal programs director, and an LEA Chapter 2 program coordinator.

The development of the questionnaire was completed in three stages: (1) questionnaire construction, (2) field testing and, (3) final questionnaire composition.

Questionnaire Construction

The questionnaire was constructed to: (1) meet the objectives of the study, (2) obtain the most complete and accurate information possible and, (3) remain within the limits of available time and resources.

Survey questions were developed to provide information about research questions six through nine. Table 3.3 presents the research questions with the appropriate questions. The survey questionnaire can be found in the Appendix.

TABLE 3.3
 SURVEY QUESTIONS MATCHED
 TO THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Research Questions	Survey Questions
6	1A-F
7	2A-F
8	11 A-J
9	11 A-J

A draft of the questionnaire was first presented to the advisory panel for comment. The panel reviewed the questionnaire for wording of the questions, response stem additions and/or deletions, directions for completing the questionnaire, and overall appropriateness. The suggestions of the panel were incorporated into the questionnaire and the format of the questionnaire (i.e. the layout of the questions, the content and appearance of the cover letter, the coding scheme, etc.) was decided.

Field Testing The Questionnaire

The approved questionnaire was printed and sent to selected school administrators for pilot testing. Returned questionnaires were reviewed for:

- (1) questions left unanswered,
- (2) questions answered inappropriately,
- (3) instructions not followed as intended, and
- (4) comments made by the respondent.

The questionnaire was critiqued and redesigned to address concerns identified during the field test. Each question was scrutinized and appropriate changes were made. In several cases, where the respondent had made constructive criticism, a telephone call was made to further clarify the concern. A copy of the revised questionnaire was then presented to each member of the advisory panel for review. Comments of advisory panel members were used to construct the final copy of the survey questionnaire. Finally, the questionnaire was presented to the advisory panel and approved.

The next step was to obtain the support of the Mississippi State Department of Education (MSDE). Contact was made with the State Department of Education and a meeting was arranged with the Deputy Assistant Superintendent of Education, the Director of Planning, Policy, and Evaluation, and the Coordinator of Chapter 2. At the conference, the plan for studying Chapter 2, ECIA at the local level and the survey questionnaire was discussed. The Deputy Superintendent agreed to send the questionnaire to all 154 LEAs, accompanied by a letter showing his support. However, the questionnaire had to be revised and approved by the Director of Planning, Policy, and Evaluation before SEA final approval was granted.

Final Questionnaire Composition

The final questionnaire was a compromise between information needed to answer the research questions of the study and the needs of the State Department of Education. The original questionnaire was designed to ask each local Chapter 2 coordinator a series of questions addressing the funding levels of antecedent programs as well as current expenditure of Chapter 2 funds by program activity. This questionnaire was redesigned after Mississippi State Department officials disapproved of its use. It was then decided that secondary sources of information would be used rather than relying primarily upon the response from the local school districts.

CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS AND NONRESPONDENTS

In the spring of 1986, a questionnaire was sent to Chapter 2 Coordinators in the 154 local school districts in Mississippi. After several follow-up calls ninety-six local school agencies (LEAs) returned usable surveys. A comparison between the responding and nonresponding districts was made on four characteristics of the districts: average daily attendance (ADA), wealth of school district, ad valorem tax, and total school revenue. These comparisons are presented in Table 3.4. It was concluded that those responding to the survey questionnaire were reasonably representative of the 154 LEAs in Mississippi.

TABLE 3.4
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDING
AND NONRESPONDING LEAS BY
RELEVANT CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristics of District	Respondents		Nonrespondents	
	N	Mean	N	Mean
Average Daily Attendance	90	2,966	68	2,480
Wealth Of District	88	19,472	66	17,427
Ad Valorem Tax	88	347	66	301
Total School Revenue	88	6,185,897	66	5,066,891

Source:Mississippi State Department Of Education

LIMITATIONS OF THE DATA

There are five limitations of the data that need to be taken into consideration:

- (1) Antecedent program data collected from the SEA were aggregated in ways that made comparisons difficult. For example: ESEA Title IV, Parts B and C were reported as one aggregated sum.
- (2) Antecedent program data collected from the SEA did not include program funds that were channeled directly from the federal government to the LEAs (e.g. Teacher Corps funds) making comparisons between antecedent programs and Chapter 2 program activities incomplete.
- (3) Data collected from reports of antecedent programs were by funding source and not by program objectives, making comparisons between antecedent programs objectives and objectives of Chapter 2 program activities impossible.

- (4) Chapter 2 expenditures were reported by program activities without appropriate links to program objectives or program out-comes; therefore, it was not possible to measure change between Chapter 2 program activities and antecedent programs.
- (5) Definitions for the twenty-eight program activities in Chapter 2 were left to LEA administrators to formulate; accordingly, there were no standard definitions of programs.
- (6) Local school data were not available due to SEA restrictions.

DATA COLLECTION PLAN

The collection of data for the study included disseminating the questionnaire, collecting information from the Mississippi State Department of Education, and organizing the data for analysis.

The distribution of the questionnaire involved several steps: (1) a computerized mailing list of the 154 Chapter 2 Coordinators was generated, (2) all names and addresses were error checked, (3) envelopes, including return envelopes, were printed, (4) an authorized cover letter from the Mississippi State Department of Education was requested, drafted, and printed, (5) an instruction sheet was prepared and printed, and (6) the completed package was assembled, stamped, and distributed.

The creation of a comprehensive survey data management system was necessary. The management system included: (1) a systematic design for the collection of data, (2) a methodical system for storing and retrieving data, and (3) a flexible database for the manipulation of the data. In designing the system, special attention was given to coordinating the survey coding form with the questionnaire and all additional data. Each school district was given an identification code and each question, along with its response stem, was coded with an appropriate code. The information from the coding sheet was entered into an AT&T PC-6300 personal computer. Dummy data were generated for the survey questionnaire as well as the additional sources of data, and then tested with the computer program.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND ANALYSIS PLAN

The computer program Statistical Package for the Social Sciences - Personal Computer version (SPSS-PC+) was used for the statistical analysis of the data. The analysis included descriptive statistics and crossbreak analysis. Each research question was answered using the responses from the questionnaire and additional data collected from the secondary sources according to the established plan. A separate research design was implemented for each of the research questions.

To answer the first research question, it was necessary to determine the extent to which adequate information was available to support an analysis of the intended effects of Chapter 2, ECIA. This was begun by identifying the six specific intentions of the law. Key personnel at the Mississippi State Department of Education (MSDE) were interviewed to ascertain the type of data collected by the State Department and to obtain policy statements reflecting MSDE position on key issues. Five sources of secondary information were identified: (1) LEA antecedent program funding levels for 1980-81, (2) LEA Chapter 2, ECIA allocations for 1985-86, (3) Chapter 2 application forms submitted for funding, (4) The size of the LEA as measured by the average daily attendance, and (5) A measure of the wealth of the LEA using the standard developed by the state - the ability per-pupil unit (APU).

After analyzing the available data sources it was determined that additional information from the local school districts would be necessary in order to complete the study. With this in mind, the state-wide, mailed questionnaire earlier discussed, was designed.

The second research question investigated the extent to which the enactment of Chapter 2, ECIA reduced the paperwork burden for local education agencies. In order to answer this question, it was necessary to analyze the required paperwork for Chapter 2. A comparison was made between this paperwork

and the general required paperwork for the antecedent programs. Interviews with key personnel were scheduled to obtain first-hand information regarding paperwork reduction.

The third research question analyzed the extent to which the level of funding for Chapter 2 program activities changed from the level of funding for the antecedent programs. The distribution of funds by size (ADA) of LEA; wealth (APU) of LEA; and the net gain or loss of funds was analyzed. In order to answer the question the funding levels for each LEA were identified. The State Department of Education's Chapter 2, ECIA application form was used to obtain information concerning the level of funding of Chapter 2 program activities supported by each LEA. As a part of the application packet, LEA Chapter 2 Coordinators were asked to select, from among twenty-eight different categories, the activities in which they planned to expend Chapter 2 funds and the level of support for each activity. The funds expended for each antecedent program were also kept at the State Department of Education.

The difference between the funding levels of antecedent programs and Chapter 2 was then determined and tested for differences in the size of district (ADA) by wealth of district (APU) and net gain or loss of funds using crosstabulation.

The fourth research question was designed to examine the extent to which the number of program activities under Chapter 2, ECIA changed from the number of antecedent categorical programs. The number of Chapter 2 program activities and the number of antecedent programs funded for each LEA were identified. The difference between the number of antecedent programs and the number of Chapter 2 program activities was established. The results were analyzed by crosstabulation according to characteristics of the LEAs by size, wealth, and net gain or loss.

Question five addressed the change at the local school level in funding priorities between the antecedent programs and Chapter 2 program activities. This was determined by comparing the LEAs' selection of Chapter 2 program activities, as presented in the LEA Chapter 2 application, to the number of LEA funded antecedent programs. A paired t-test with an alpha of .10 was used to determine if there was a significant difference between the number of programs funded.

Question six was intended to measure the extent to which local school authorities exercised their discretion in establishing and implementing Chapter 2 program activities. "Local discretion" was determined in three ways: (1) An analysis of Chapter 2 Coordinators' responses to a questionnaire in which they were asked to register their perceived changes anchored against antecedent program

restrictions, (2) Descriptions of funded Chapter 2 program activities taken from a fifteen percent random sample of Chapter 2 activities reported to the Mississippi State Department of Education, and (3) Actual changes in the number of program activities selected for funding with 1985-86 Chapter 2 funds as compared to comparable programs funded with the antecedent programs in 1980-81.

The method of measuring the discretion exercised by the local school district consisted of: (1) asking LEA Chapter 2 Coordinators, via a mailed questionnaire, if they perceived a change in the flexibility in the use of Chapter 2 funds as compared to the more restrictive antecedent program funds, (2) a descriptions of funded Chapter 2 program activities taken from a sample of Chapter 2 activities reported to the Mississippi State Department of Education, and (3) measuring actual changes in the number of program activities and the amount expended on programs selected for funding with 1985-86 Chapter 2 funds as compared to programs funded with the antecedent funds in 1980-81.

Question seven was designed to identify the extent to which LEAs accepted responsibility for the evaluation of their Chapter 2 program activities. Information was collected from the survey of Chapter 2 Coordinators. In the survey Coordinators were asked to identify the methods used by their districts to evaluate Chapter 2 program activities.

Information was also obtained from a fifteen percent random sample of Chapter 2 applications in which the LEAs described their plan for evaluating Chapter 2 program activities.

Question eight was designed to measure the extent to which LEAs shared their authority over the design and implementation of Chapter 2 program activities with private school officials. Information was gathered from Mississippi State Department of Education policy, LEA Chapter 2 applications, and interviews with public and private school officials. A descriptive analysis of the information was completed and conclusions concerning the sharing of authority were made.

The final question dealt with the extent to which the Mississippi State Department of Education allowed the LEAs to exercise discretion over Chapter 2, ECIA as required by provisions in the Act. Information was obtained from three sources: (1) The Chapter 2, ECIA law (P.L. 97-35), (2) the Mississippi State Department of Education policy statements and, (3) The LEA Chapter 2 applications. A descriptive analysis of the available information was completed and appropriate conclusions were drawn.

SUMMARY

This chapter included: the methodological considerations given to the study design which included the population to be studied, a discussion of the data used in the study, a description of respondents and nonrespondents, the limitations of the data, the development, field testing, and implementation of the survey questionnaire and the collection of the data used in the study and the research design and analysis plan for each research question. The next chapter will include the findings of the study.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The nine policy- relevant research questions set forth in the study are examined in this chapter. The method of analysis is presented for each question, followed by a discussion and general conclusions. The analysis is different for each question depending upon the available data and the appropriate comparison.

APPLYING THE DATA TO THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

RESEARCH QUESTION 1

To what extent was adequate information available at the State Department of Education in Mississippi which would support an analysis of the intended effects of Chapter 2, ECIA?

METHOD

In order to determine the intended effects of Chapter 2, a careful review of the law was necessary. This included the legislative history of Chapter 2, ECIA, testimony presented in both the House and Senate and other relevant literature. From this review six specific congressional intents were identified.

DISCUSSION

After the specific congressional intents were defined, an inventory of available information at the Mississippi State Department of Education was made. Each source of information was evaluated to determine the extent to which the data could be used to identify the impact of Chapter 2 at the local school level. Eight sources of information were identified: (1) Public Law 97-35, Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, (2) Mississippi State Department Of Education Policy Statements, (3) Chapter 2, ECIA application forms submitted for funding, (4) LEA Chapter 2, ECIA allocations for 1985-86, (5) LEA antecedent program funding levels from the Superintendent's 1980-81 Audit Report, (6) The size and wealth of the LEA from the Superintendent's 1985 Annual Report, (7) A questionnaire mailed to all 154 LEAs, and (8) Personal interviews with key individuals at all three levels of government. People interviewed included: Deputy Secretary of Elementary and Secondary Education for United State Department of Education, Deputy Superintendent of Education for Mississippi State Department Education, President of the Chief State School Officers, and a local school superintendent.

After identifying the intents of the law and the available information at the Mississippi State Department Of Education, specific information was collected. This included

policy statements regarding the administration of Chapter 2 from the Division of Policy and Planning. Explained within these statements were the distribution policy, requirements for LEA participation and, expectations of participating LEAs.

In addition to the policy statements, five other sources of information were identified. First, six important elements of information were gathered from each LEA Chapter 2 application. These included: (1) the LEA's selection of supported program activities, (2) the amount of support for each activity, (3) a brief description of each program activity, (4) a brief description of the evaluation for each program activity, (5) a statement concerning private schools in the LEA district and, (6) an attachment of private school requests for program support. Second, the individual allocations for each LEA were collected. This amount was calculated by the MSDE using the local school district's student enrollment and a "weighting factor" developed by the State Advisory Council. Third, the LEA antecedent program funding levels were obtained from the "Superintendent's 1980-81 Audit Report". Fourth, the size of the LEA as measured by the average daily attendance was obtained from the "Superintendent's 1985 Annual Report". The fifth source of information was the wealth of the LEA as measured by the ability per-pupil unit, a standard established by the by the

Division of Finance and Statistics. Finally, the sixth set of information collected was a series of personal informal interviews. These interviews were representative of the various types of personnel that dealt with the implementation of Chapter 2 and included federal, state, and local policy makers; local and state Chapter 2 coordinators; and local classroom teachers.

After analyzing the available data sources from the Mississippi State Department of Education, it was apparent that this information would only provide an analysis of the intended effects of Chapter 2, ECIA at the local level as reported by secondary sources. While this reporting procedure provided standard information aggregated at a collective state level it did not provide for direct information about the specific impact on local schools. Therefore, it was decided that a mail questionnaire to all 154 local school districts was necessary to obtain additional information concerning the direct impact of Chapter 2, ECIA on the local school district.

In short, information from eight sources identifying twenty-one types of data were used to address the research questions in this study. This included six secondary sources (e.g. state level data), personal interviews, and a questionnaire of 154 local education agencies.

FINDINGS

Three conclusions were drawn from an analysis of available data concerning the impact of legislative intent of the federal program, Chapter 2, ECIA on local school districts. First, it was evident that secondary sources of information collected by the state department would not provide a complete and accurate picture of local level effects. This was especially true for a program like Chapter 2 where major policy decisions affecting program design, implementation, and evaluation were decided at the local level. Second, due to the inadequacy of state level information it was concluded that additional information from local school districts would be necessary and that the supplemental information would be collected via a mail questionnaire. Finally, a systematic data management system had to be designed in order to accommodate the diversity of data.

In summary, information available at the Mississippi State Department of Education alone was not adequate to provide an analysis of the intended effects of Chapter 2, ECIA at the local school level. However, when supplemented with additional information collected from local school districts and restructuring the reported data, adequate information was sufficient to support an analysis of the intended effects of Chapter 2, ECIA on local school districts.

RESEARCH QUESTION 2

To what extent did the enactment of Chapter 2, ECIA reduce the paperwork burden for local education agencies?

METHOD

The second research question investigated the expressed intent of the legislation of Chapter 2, ECIA to reduce the paperwork burden for local education agencies. This required an establishment of the required paperwork for Chapter 2, ECIA and the consolidated antecedent programs and the appropriate comparison between the two different modes of funding.

DISCUSSION

Several previous studies documented the fact that paperwork requirements for LEAs were reduced significantly with consolidation, especially for those districts that had several antecedent programs. (Hastings and Bartell, 1983; Kyle, 1983; OIG, 1983; Knapp et al., 1983; Corbett, et al., 1983) This was due, in part, to the fact that districts with multiple programs now had a single funding source requiring a single application.

By comparison to the consolidated antecedent programs, the application and administration of Chapter 2 was more like ESEA Title IV-B, the least burdensome of all the

consolidated programs. (Fries, 1983; Hastings and Bartell, 1983) Application for Title IV-B required minimal justification, assurance of compliance and required only single school district involvement. By contrast, other antecedent programs, such as, ESAA Title VI and Teacher Corps often required pages of justification, rational, evaluation procedures, and joint efforts between several governing bodies.

The Chapter 2 application for local school districts in Mississippi consisted of a five page standard form. By comparison to antecedent program applications, especially the competitive programs, this form was simpler to complete, allowed for more discretion in the required responses, was less restrictive in the evaluation requirements, and took less overall administrative time to complete. This simplification becomes clearer when compared to the application procedures of the eight consolidated antecedent programs funded in Mississippi.

All but four LEAs applied for and received Title IV-B funds in 1980-81. The results of this study are consistent with earlier research in that the application for Chapter 2, ECIA was similar to the Title IV-B application (Bartell, 1981; Darling-Hammond, 1983; U.S. Department of Education). It consisted of about the same amount of paper work and was not considered to be very burdensome.

With the exception of ESEA, Title II (Basic Skills) less than thirty percent of the LEAs (55) applied for and received funds from one or more of the following antecedent programs: Career Education, Gifted and Talented, Emergency School Aid Act, ESEA Title VI-C, Teacher Corps, and Criminal Justice.

By comparison to other antecedent programs, the application procedure for Career Education programs was much simpler than the other six antecedent programs because Career Education funds were allocated according to population rather than on a competitive basis.

Less than seventeen percent of the LEAs in Mississippi applied for and received any of the competitive antecedent programs (19 LEAs received ESEA, Title III Criminal Justice programs; 18 LEAs received Gifted and Talented programs; 17 LEAs received ESAA, Desegregation Assistants programs; 7 LEAs received ESEA, Title IV-C Innovative Practices; and, 5 LEAs received Teacher Corps programs). Each of these programs required extensive application procedures all of which consisted of much more paperwork than was required by Chapter 2, ECIA.

FINDINGS

From an analysis of the available information in the state of Mississippi it is concluded that, in general, the enactment of Chapter 2, ECIA has brought about a reduction of paperwork for most LEAs. This conclusion is based, in part, on the fact that all but four LEAs in Mississippi applied for and received ESEA, Title IV-B, the antecedent program in which more closely represented Chapter 2, ECIA. The findings of this study concur with earlier studies that the required paperwork for Chapter 2, ECIA is much less burdensome than that of the consolidated programs. However, when analyzed from the local school district perspective there exists considerable variability. For example, some LEAs' paperwork increased because they never had applied for federal programs in the past while other LEAs' paperwork was reduced because they applied for several antecedent programs. Further, comparing paperwork reduction based on programs funded omits a substantial amount of paperwork that is not considered, such as the many applications that were submitted but not funded.

RESEARCH QUESTION 3

To what extent did the level of funding for Chapter 2 program activities change from the level of funding for the consolidated antecedent programs?

How did the distribution of funds change by size (ADA) and wealth (APU) of LEAs?

METHOD

The third research question analyzed the extent to which the level of funding for Chapter 2 program activities changed from the level of funding for the antecedent programs. The distribution of funds was then analyzed by size as measured by the Average Daily Attendance (ADA) and wealth of district as measured by the Ability Per-pupil Unit (APU) of LEA.

The information used to answer this question consisted of the funding levels allocated to each LEA for Chapter 2, ECIA and for all antecedent programs. The State Department of Education's Chapter 2, ECIA application form was used to obtain information concerning the level of funding of Chapter 2 program activities supported by each LEA. As a part of the application packet, LEAs were asked to select, from among twenty-eight different categories, the activities they planned to expend Chapter 2 funds and the level of support for each activity. The funds expended for each antecedent program were taken from the Superintendent's 1980-81 Annual Report.

The difference between the amount of funds received under Chapter 2, ECIA funding and the amount received under the combined antecedent program funds was calculated for each LEA. A summary of these differences is presented in Tables 4.1 and 4.2. The individual differences are provided in the appendix.

The net gain or loss was tested using the Chi-square test statistic with an alpha of .10 to identify differences by size of school district as measured by the Average Daily Membership (ADA) and wealth of district as measured by the Ability Per-pupil Unit (APU).

DISCUSSION

After the data were collected the difference between the level of funding with Chapter 2, ECIA and the level of funding from the total antecedent programs was calculated. This difference was the total net gained or net lost. An independent t-test was then used to test for differences between the two groups. As shown in Table 4.1 there was a significant difference ($p < .10$) between school districts that gained funds with Chapter 2, ECIA and school districts that lost. Eighty-five districts or 55% gained funds with the implementation of Chapter 2 while sixty-nine or 45% lost funds.

Although there were more districts that gained funds than lost funds, the total amount of funds lost exceeded the total amount of funds gained by 10 to 1. The total amount gained was \$1,127,186 with an average gain of \$13,261, a minimum gain of \$797 and a maximum gain of \$45,568. This represented a gain from 5% to over 200%. The total amount lost was \$11,448,633 with an average loss of \$165,922, a minimum loss of \$5.00 and a maximum of \$6,981,603. This represented a negligible percentage loss (e.g. \$5.00) to over 99% loss.

TABLE 4.1

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DISTRICTS THAT GAINED FUNDS WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CHAPTER 2, ECIA AND DISTRICTS THAT LOST FUNDS

	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GAINED	85	\$ 13,261	8659.23
LOST	69	-\$165,922	843325.84

TABLE 4.2

TOTAL AMOUNT OF FUNDS GAINED OR LOST BETWEEN ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS AND CHAPTER 2, ECIA

	Total Gained	Total Lost
Number	85	69
Mean	\$13,261	\$165,922
Median	\$12,883	\$23,539
Minimum	\$797	\$5
Maximum	\$45,568	\$6,981,603
Sum	\$1,127,186	\$11,448,633

Note: From Mississippi State Department of Education, Division of Policy and Planning.

** Some LEAs received Chapter 2 funds but did not receive antecedent funds.

DISTRICTS THAT GAINED OR LOST FUNDS

Descriptive statistics of the 85 school districts that gained funds with the implementation of Chapter 2, ECIA are presented in Table 4.3. The median size of the school districts that gained funds was 2,253 ADA with a minimum size of 226 and a maximum size of 7,746. The median wealth of school districts that gained was 15,740 APU with a minimum of 4,010 and a maximum of 48,845.

There were 69 districts that lost funds with the implementation of Chapter 2, ECIA. (See Table 4.4) The median size of the school district that lost funds was 1,874 ADA with a minimum of 500 and a maximum of 27,218. The median wealth was 16,412 APU with a minimum of 6,274 and a maximum of 198,665.

TABLE 4.3

SIZE AND WEALTH OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS
THAT GAINED FUNDS UNDER CHAPTER 2, ECIA

N = 85	Size (ADA) ^a	Wealth (APU) ^b
Mean	2,700	16,670
Median	2,253	15,740
Minimum	226	4,010
Maximum	7,746	48,835

Note: From Mississippi State Department of Education, Division of Administration and Finance and Division of Policy and Planning.

^aSize is expressed in Average Daily Attendance (ADA)

^bWealth is expressed in Ability Per-Pupil Unit (APU)

TABLE 4.4
 SIZE AND WEALTH OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS
 THAT LOST FUNDS UNDER CHAPTER 2, ECIA

N = 69	Size (ADA) ^a	Wealth (APU) ^b
Mean	2,961	20,967
Median	1,874	16,412
Minimum	500	6,274
Maximum	27,218	198,665

Note: From Mississippi State Department of Education, Division of Administration and Finance and Division of Policy and Planning.

^aSize is expressed in Average Daily Attendance (ADA)

^bWealth is expressed in Ability Per-Pupil Unit (APU)

NUMBER OF DISTRICTS THAT GAINED OR
 LOST FUNDS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT

There was not a significant difference between the number of school districts that gained or lost funds with the implementation of Chapter 2, ECIA and the size of the district as measured by ADA. (See Table 4.5) Because these differences are not significant at the $p < .10$ generalizations about the differences are not to be made. However, as a case study, differences between school districts will be analyzed.

TABLE 4.5

NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS THAT GAINED
OR LOST FUNDS WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
CHAPTER 2, ECIA ACCORDING TO SIZE^a OF LEA

SIZE ^a	Observed Row Pct Col Pct	NUMBER THAT GAINED FUNDS	NUMBER THAT LOST FUNDS	Row Total
SMALL 226 TO 1,499		17 42.5 20.0	23 57.5 33.3	40 26.0
MEDIUM 1,500 TO 3,299		45 60.8 52.9	29 39.2 42.0	74 48.0
LARGE 3,300 TO 27,218		23 57.5 27.1	17 42.5 24.6	40 26.0
	Column Total	85 55.2	69 44.8	154 100.0

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Administration and Finance and Division
of Policy and Planning.

^aSize is expressed in Average Daily Attendance (ADA)

DISTRIBUTION OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN
CHAPTER 2 FUNDS AND ANTECEDENT PROGRAM FUNDS
ACCORDING TO SIZE OF DISTRICT

The size of school districts that gained funds with the implementation of Chapter 2, ECIA were analyzed. (See Table 4.6) A greater percent of large (27%) districts gained than smaller (20%). Of the 85 districts that gained, 47% of the small districts and 31% of the medium size districts gained more than 200%. Only 13% of the large districts gained more than 200%. More medium size districts (55%) than small districts (20%) or large districts (25%) gained less than 50%. On the other hand, 69% of the large districts gained less than 100% while 20% and 23% of the medium and small districts respectively gained between 50% and 99%.

TABLE 4.6

NET GAIN BETWEEN ANTECEDENT PROGRAM FUNDS
AND CHAPTER 2, EÇIA FUNDS
ACCORDING TO SIZE^a OF LEA

SIZE ^a	Observed	0%	50%	100%	MORE	Row Total
	Row Pct	TO	TO	TO	THAN	
	Col Pct	49%	99%	199%	200%	
		GAINED	GAINED	GAINED	GAINED	
SMALL 226 TO 1,499		4 23.5 20.0	4 23.5 16.7	1 5.9 6.3	8 47.1 32.0	17 20.0
MEDIUM 1,500 TO 3,299		11 24.4 55.0	9 20.0 37.5	11 24.4 68.8	14 31.1 56.0	45 52.9
LARGE 3,300 TO 27,218		5 21.7 25.0	11 47.8 45.8	4 17.4 25.0	3 13.0 12.0	23 27.1
Column Total		20 23.5	24 28.2	16 18.8	25 29.4	85 100.0

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Administration and Finance and Division
of Policy and Planning.

^aSize is expressed in Average Daily Attendance (ADA)

the implementation of Chapter 2, ECIA were analyzed, it is reported that more smaller districts than large districts lost funds. (See Table 4.7) Of the 69 districts that lost funds, 57% of the smallest districts, 45% of the medium size districts and 47% of the largest districts lost more than half of their funds. Further, 44% of the districts that lost from 75% to 99% of their funds were the smallest districts and 38% were the medium size districts while only 19% were the largest districts. In contrast, of the districts that lost less than a quarter of their funds, 38% were the largest districts, 44% were the medium size districts and 19%

TABLE 4.7

NET LOST BETWEEN ANTECEDENT PROGRAM FUNDS
AND CHAPTER 2, ECIA FUNDS
ACCORDING TO SIZE^a OF LEA

Observed Row Pct SIZE ^a Col Pct	0%	25%	50%	75%	Row Total
	TO 24% LOST	TO 49% LOST	TO 74% LOST	TO 99% LOST	
SMALL 226 TO 1,499	3 13.0 18.8	7 30.4 36.8	6 26.1 33.3	7 30.4 43.8	23 33.3
MEDIUM 1,500 TO 3,299	7 24.1 43.8	9 31.4 36.8	7 24.1 38.9	6 20.7 37.5	29 42.1
LARGE 3,300 TO 27,218	6 35.3 37.5	3 17.6 15.8	5 29.4 27.8	3 17.6 18.8	17 24.6
Column Total	16 23.2	19 27.5	18 26.1	16 23.2	69 100.0

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Administration and Finance and Division
of Policy and Planning.

^aSize is expressed in Average Daily Attendance (ADA)

CHAPTER 2 FUNDS AND ANTECEDENT PROGRAM FUNDS
ACCORDING TO WEALTH OF DISTRICT

There was not a significant difference between the number of school districts that gained or lost funds with the implementation of Chapter 2, ECIA and the wealth of the district as measured by the Ability Per-Pupil Unit. (See Table 4.8) However the differences provide important information as it relates to this single case.

TABLE 4.8

NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS THAT GAINED
 OR LOST FUNDS WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
 CHAPTER 2, ECIA ACCORDING TO WEALTH^a OF LEA

WEALTH ^a	Observed	NUMBER	NUMBER	Row Total
	Row Pct Col Pct	THAT GAINED FUNDS	THAT LOST FUNDS	
LEAST WEALTHY 4,000 TO 13,999		33 62.3 38.8	20 37.7 29.0	53 34.4
MODERATELY WEALTHY 14,000 TO 19,999		36 53.7 42.4	31 46.3 44.3	67 43.5
WEALTHIEST 20,000 TO 198,000		16 47.1 18.8	18 52.9 26.1	34 22.1
Column Total		85 55.2	69 44.8	154 100.0

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
 Division of Administration and Finance and Division
 of Policy and Planning.

^aWealth is expressed in Ability Per-Pupil Unit (APU)

Of the 85 LEAs that gained funds, more "least wealthy" districts gained (39%) than "wealthiest districts" (19%). (See Table 4.9) Further, more "least wealthy" districts (39%) gained over 200% of their antecedent program funding levels while only 31% of the "wealthiest" districts gained comparable amounts. Of the districts that gained less than 50% of their earlier funding levels, 45% were the "least wealthy" districts with only 10% "wealthiest" districts. Half of the "least wealthy" districts gained more than 100% while 66% of the "wealthiest" districts gained less than 50%. Over half of the districts that gained more than 200% were "least wealthy" districts. Almost half of the districts that gained less than 50% were "least wealthy" districts. Sixty-nine percent of the districts that gained between 100% and 200% were "moderately wealthy districts".

TABLE 4.9

NET GAIN BETWEEN ANTECEDENT PROGRAM FUNDS
AND CHAPTER 2, ECIA FUNDS
ACCORDING TO WEALTH^a OF LEA

WEALTH ^a	Observed	0%	50%	100%	MORE	Row Total
	Row Pct	TO	TO	TO	THAN	
	Col Pct	49%	99%	199%	200%	
		GAINED	GAINED	GAINED	GAINED	
		9	8	3	13	33
LEAST WEALTHY		27.3	24.2	9.1	39.4	38.8
4,000 TO 13,999		45.0	33.3	18.8	52.0	
		9	9	11	7	36
MODERATELY WEALTHY		25.0	25.0	30.6	19.4	42.4
14,000 TO 19,999		45.0	37.5	68.8	28.0	
		2	7	2	5	16
WEALTHIEST		12.5	43.8	12.5	31.3	18.8
20,000 TO 198,000		10.0	29.2	12.5	20.0	
	Column	20	24	16	25	85
	Total	23.5	28.2	18.8	29.4	100.0

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education, Division of Administration and Finance and Division of Policy and Planning.

^aWealth is expressed in Ability Per-Pupil Unit (APU)

Of the 69 LEAs that lost funds, more "least wealthy" districts lost funds than "wealthiest districts". (See Table 4.10) Forty-four percent of the "wealthiest" districts lost less than 25% of their funds while 50% of the "least wealthy" districts lost more than half of their funds. Of the districts that lost less than 25% of their antecedent funding, 50% were district in the "wealthiest" category. Further, 25% of the "least wealthy" districts lost more than three-fourths of their funds.

with the implementation of Chapter 2, ECIA than lost funds. The opposite was true for the "wealthiest" districts.

TABLE 4.10

NET LOST BETWEEN ANTECEDENT PROGRAM FUNDS
AND CHAPTER 2, ECIA FUNDS
ACCORDING TO WEALTH^a OF LEA

WEALTH ^a	Observed	0%	25%	50%	75%	Row Total
	Row Pct	TO	TO	TO	TO	
	Col Pct	24%	49%	74%	99%	
		LOST	LOST	LOST	LOST	
LEAST WEALTHY 4,000 TO 13,999		4	6	5	5	20
		20.0	30.0	25.0	25.0	29.0
		25.0	31.6	27.8	27.8	
MODERATELY WEALTHY 14,000 TO 19,999		4	11	8	8	31
		12.9	35.5	25.8	25.8	44.9
		25.0	57.9	44.4	50.0	
WEALTHIEST 20,000 TO 198,000		8	2	5	3	18
		44.4	11.1	27.8	16.7	26.1
		50.0	10.5	27.8	16.8	
Column		16	19	18	16	69
Total		23.2	27.5	26.1	23.2	100.0

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Administration and Finance and Division
of Policy and Planning.

^aWealth is expressed in Ability Per-Pupil Unit (APU)

FINDINGS

Chapter 2 represented a move from discretionary grants to formula grants. This policy change resulted in a shift in the distribution of federal funds such that districts which had previously received the largest discretionary grants were the districts that lost the greatest amount of funds. (Mandel, 1983; Jung and Bartell, 1983; Fries, 1983; Kyle, 1983; and AASA, 1983) Research question three was aimed at answering two questions concerning the LEAs in the state of Mississippi: (1) Was there a significant change in the net gain or loss of funds at the local level with the implementation of Chapter 2, ECIA, and (2) Was there a difference in the net gain or loss by size and wealth of the school district.

The level of funding for Chapter 2 program activities changed significantly ($p < .10$) from the level of funding for the consolidated antecedent programs. Eighty-five LEAs (55%) gained funds under Chapter 2 while 69 (45%) lost funds. This result is consistent with earlier findings. (AASA, 1983; CGCS, 1983; ECS, 1982; Fries, 1983; Franks and Fortune, 1981; Nathan and Doolittle, 1983; Knapp, et. al. 1986; Kyle, 1983) In a survey of approximately 1100 LEAs responding to a survey sponsored by the American Association for School Administrators, 67 percent of the LEAs received more funds, 2 percent had no change and 31 percent received

less funds. (AASA, 1983) In another study, Fries (1983) summarized the shift in the distribution of federal funds this way: "The essence of redistribution under Chapter 2 has been to distribute federal aid more uniformly among students and districts. This redistribution made many local districts winners at the expense of others".

As noted, the policy changes brought about by Chapter 2 effectively redistributed federal resources among LEAs however, this redistribution was not uniform across states or localities. Henderson (1983b) found that a key result of consolidation was that southern states tended to be "losers". Jung and Bartell (1983) found that county districts fared better than city districts and districts with low percentages on non-white students also received higher Chapter 2 allocations. Upon examining the gain or loss of funds according to the size of the school district, Apling and Padilla (1986) reported that fewer than 2 percent of districts with 600 to 2,499 students lost 75 percent or more of their funds as a result of Chapter 2. By comparison 11 percent of the largest urban districts lost at least 75 percent of antecedent funding. In a national study supported by the U.S. Department of Education (Knapp, et. al.) found that approximately three-quarters of all districts gained funds, however the proportion was especially high among smaller and medium-sized districts. These districts tended

to gain the most relative to the larger districts. Their gains were nearly double the amounts they received under the antecedent programs.

The findings of this study were somewhat different from earlier studies. Although there was not a significant difference in the net gain or loss of funds according to the size the district, however the descriptive statistics showed that more large districts in Mississippi gained than small districts. Further, more smaller and medium size districts than large districts gained in excess of 200% with Chapter 2 funds. Also, more smaller and medium size districts than large districts lost over three-fourths of their funds while more larger districts than smaller and medium size districts lost less than a quarter of their funds.

In this study there was not a significant difference between the "gainers" and "losers" and the wealth of the district. However, in the review of the literature conflicting reports were cited concerning the impact of Chapter 2 on populations with high concentrations of poor children. Knapp, (et. al., 1986) reported that there had been no obvious shift of funding away from higher concentrations of poor children except in the largest urban districts. On the other hand, Verstegen (1983) reported that the greatest share of the reductions in aid were sustained by the nation's poor and minority school children. States

that lost the most aid under Chapter 2 had the largest number of children in poverty and minority children located in schools undergoing desegregation.

In short, in Mississippi, a state where the federal funds from Chapter 2 flow fairly unrestricted to local school districts, the number of districts that gained funds (85) exceeded the number of districts that lost funds (69); however the amount of funds lost exceeded the amount of funds gained by a ten to one margin. In general, the conclusions of this case study do not agree with some earlier research (Knapp et. al, 1986) which found that more large districts lost funds and more smaller districts gained funds. Although there was not a significant difference by size (ADA) and wealth (APU) of district, more large than small districts gained funds. Further, more "least wealthy" districts gained than lost funds while more "wealthiest" districts lost rather than gained funds.

RESEARCH QUESTION 4

To what extent did the number of program activities under Chapter 2, ECIA change from the number of antecedent categorical programs?

How did the distribution of programs change by size (ADA) of LEA; wealth (APU) of LEA; and the net gain or loss of Chapter 2 funds of the LEA?

METHOD

The fourth research question was designed to examine the extent to which the number of program activities under Chapter 2, ECIA changed from the number of antecedent categorical programs. The method used to answer this question included three steps. First, the number of Chapter 2 program activities and the number of antecedent programs funded for each LEA were identified. Second, the difference between the number of antecedent programs and the number of Chapter 2 program activities was calculated. The difference between the number of antecedent programs and the number of Chapter 2 program activities was then tested using a paired t-test with a significant level of $p < .10$. Third, the results were analyzed according to characteristics of the LEAs (e. g. size, wealth, and net funds gained or lost) using crosstabulation.

DISCUSSION

In 1980-81, 147 of the 154 LEAs in Mississippi received funds from one or more of eight antecedent programs that were consolidated into Chapter 2, ECIA. The total number of programs received by the local school districts are listed in Table 4.11. The antecedent programs were distributed as follows. Seven LEAs did not receive funds from any of the antecedent programs. Over half (58%) of the LEAs received funds from only one antecedent program and 29% received funds from two programs. Only fourteen (9%) LEAs received funds from more than two programs: 9 LEAs received funds from 3 programs, 3 LEAs received funds from 4 programs and 2 LEAs received funds from 5 programs.

TABLE 4.11

NUMBER OF ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS
FUNDED BY LEAS IN MISSISSIPPI
(1980-81)

Number Of Different Programs Funded	Number Of Participating Districts	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	7	4.5	4.5
1	89	57.8	62.3
2	44	28.6	90.9
3	9	5.8	96.8
4	3	1.9	98.7
5	2	1.3	100.0
Total	154	100.0	

Note: From Mississippi State Department of Education,
Division of Policy and Planning.

In 1985-86, all 154 LEAs in the state of Mississippi received Chapter 2, ECIA funds. As shown in Table 4.12, seventy-nine percent of the school districts funded fewer than three program activities: 25% funded one program activity while 27% funded two and three program activities each. Thirty-three (21%) LEAs supported four or more program activities with Chapter 2 funds with two LEAs supporting seven program activities and one LEA supporting eight different program activities.

TABLE 4.12

NUMBER OF CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES
FUNDED BY LEAS IN MISSISSIPPI
(1985-86)

Number Of Programs Funded	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	39	25.3	25.3
2	41	26.6	51.9
3	41	26.6	78.6
4	14	9.1	87.7
5	13	8.4	96.1
6	3	1.9	98.1
7	2	1.3	99.4
8	1	.6	100.0
Total	154	100.0	

Note: From Mississippi State Department of Education, Division of Policy and Planning.

A comparison of the difference in the number activities funded under Chapter 2, ECIA and the programs funded under the antecedent programs is in Table 4.13. The results varied widely with ranging from two LEAs funding three fewer program too two other LEAs funding six more program activities twenty-seven percent of the LEAs did not change of program activities supported with Chapter 2 funds.

TABLE 4.13

DIFFERENCE IN NUMBER OF PROGRAMS
BETWEEN CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES
AND ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS FUNDED
BY LEAS IN MISSISSIPPI
(1980-81 & 1985-86)

Difference In Number Of Programs Funded	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
-3	2	1.3	1.3
-2	3	1.9	3.2
-1	12	7.8	11.0
0	41	26.6	37.7
1	37	24.0	61.7
2	33	21.4	83.1
3	9	5.8	89.0
4	14	9.1	98.1
5	1	.6	98.7
6	2	1.3	100.0
Total	154	100.0	

Note: From Mississippi State Department of Education, Division of Policy and Planning.

To test the difference between the number of Chapter 2 program activities funded in 1985-86 compared to the number of antecedent programs funded in 1980-81, a paired t-test was used. As shown in Table 4.14, there was a significant difference ($p=.001$) between the number of Chapter 2 program activities and the number of antecedent programs funded by the same LEAs. The mean number of antecedent programs funded was 1.5 with a standard deviation of .86 while the mean number of program activities funded with Chapter 2 funds was 2.6 with a standard deviation of 1.5.

TABLE 4.14
 PAIRED T-TEST BETWEEN NUMBER OF CHAPTER 2
 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES AND NUMBER OF ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS
 FUNDED BY LEAS IN MISSISSIPPI

	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	T-VALUE	DF	2-TAIL PROB.
ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS	154	1.47	.86			
CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES	154	2.63	1.46	8.87	153	.001

Note: From Mississippi State Department of Education,
 Division of Policy and Planning.

In short, there was a significant difference between the number of Chapter 2 program activities funded in 1985-86 and the number of antecedent programs funded in 1980-81. Further, the Chapter 2 funds were spread over more program activities, thus serving more locally identified needs than under the antecedent programs. This was exemplified by the fact that 48% of the LEAs funded more than two program activities with Chapter 2 funds while 91% of the same LEAs funded two or fewer antecedent programs.

Size Of School District And
The Number Of Antecedent Programs

The number of antecedent programs was crosstabulated with the school districts to determine if there was a relationship in the distribution of programs by the size of the school district as measured by the Average Daily Attendance (ADA). There was not a significant relationship however, the number of programs funded according to the size of school district provided some interesting insights into the distribution of the antecedent programs.

As shown in Table 4.15, 96 districts (62%) received funding for one or less antecedent program. Forty-four districts (28%) received funding for two programs and 14 districts ((9%) received funds for three to five programs. Further, all large districts received one or more programs while no small districts received more than three programs.

TABLE 4.15
 NUMBER OF ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS FUNDED
 ACCORDING TO SIZE^a OF LEA

		Size ^a of School District			
Observed		SMALL 226 TO 1,499	MEDIUM 1,500 TO 3,299	LARGE 3,300 TO 27,218	Row Total
Number of	0	3	4	0	7 4.5
	1	22	48	19	89 57.8
	2	12	15	17	44 28.6
	3	3	5	1	9 5.8
	4	0	1	2	3 1.9
	5	0	1	1	2 1.3
Column Total		40 26.0	74 48.0	40 26.0	154 100.0

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education, Division of Policy and Planning.

^aSize is expressed in Average Daily Attendance (ADA)

As shown in Table 4.16, seven of the 154 LEAs (4.5%) did not receive funds for any of the antecedent programs. Of these seven, four were medium size districts and three were small districts. All large districts received funds from at least one antecedent program. Eighty-six percent of all LEAs (133) received funds for one or two antecedent programs. Sixty-five percent (48) of the medium size districts, fifty-five percent (22) of the small districts, and forty-seven percent (19) of the large districts received funds for one program. Forty-three percent (17) of the large districts, thirty percent (12) of the small districts, and twenty percent (15) of the medium size districts received funds for two programs. Less than 10% (14) of the LEAs received funds for three or more antecedent programs. No small district received funds for more than three programs while one large and one small district received funds for five programs.

In general, small and medium sized LEAs funded more Chapter 2 program activities than antecedent programs while large LEAs funded a wider range of program activities with Chapter 2 funds than with antecedent funds. Further, larger districts tended to fund fewer Chapter 2 program activities than antecedent programs.

TABLE 4.16

FREQUENCY OF ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS FUNDED
ACCORDING TO SIZE OF LEA

Size Of District	NUMBER OF PROGRAMS FUNDED								
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
SMALL (N=40) 226 TO 1,499	3	22	12	3	0	0	0	0	0
MEDIUM (N=74) 1,500 TO 3,299	4	48	15	5	1	1	0	0	0
LARGE (N=40) 3,300 TO 27,218	0	19	17	1	2	1	0	0	0
TOTAL (N=154)	7	89	44	9	3	2	0	0	0
PERCENT OF TOTAL	4.5	57.8	28.6	5.8	1.9	1.3	0	0	0

Note: From Mississippi State Department of Education, Division of Policy and Planning.

Size Of School District And
The Number Of Chapter 2 Program Activities

The size of the school district was not a significant factor in the distribution of the number of Chapter 2 program activities as shown in Table 4.18. However, the frequency distribution, shown in Table 4.17, provided some interesting insights.

TABLE 4.17

FREQUENCY OF CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES
ACCORDING TO SIZE OF LEA

Size Of District	NUMBER OF PROGRAMS FUNDED								
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
SMALL (N=40) 226 TO 1,499	0	12	14	9	2	2	1	0	0
MEDIUM (N=74) 1,500 TO 3,299	0	20	17	20	8	7	1	0	1
LARGE (N=40) 3,300 TO 27,218	0	7	10	12	4	4	1	2	0
TOTAL (N=154)	0	39	41	41	14	13	3	2	1
PERCENT OF TOTAL	0	25.3	26.6	26.6	9.1	8.4	1.9	1.3	.6

Note: From Mississippi State Department of Education, Division of Policy and Planning.

All 154 LEAs received Chapter 2 funds with seventy-five percent (115) funding more than one program activity and twelve percent (19) funding five to eight program activities. Of the twenty-five percent (39) of the districts that funded one program activity, thirty-one percent (12) were small districts, fifty-one percent (20) were medium sized districts, and eighteen percent (7) were large districts. Twenty-seven percent (41) of the districts funded two program activities. Of these, thirty-four percent (14) were small districts, forty-two percent (17) were medium sized districts, and twenty-four percent (10) were

large districts. Of the twenty-seven percent (41) of the districts that funded three program activities, twenty-two percent (9) were small districts, forty-nine percent (20) were medium sized districts, and twenty-nine percent (12) were large districts. Nine percent (14) of the districts funded four program activities. Of these, fourteen percent (2) were small districts, fifty-seven percent (8) were medium sized districts, and thirty-one percent (4) were large districts. Twelve percent (19) of the districts funded five or more program activities. Of these, two small districts funded five programs activities and one funded six. No small district funded more than six program activities. Seven medium size districts funded five program activities, one funded six program activities and one funded eight program activities. Of the large districts, four funded five program activities, one funded six program activities, and two funded seven program activities.

In short, medium size districts funded a wider range of program activities than either small or large districts. Small districts funded fewer program activities than either medium sized districts or large districts, and large districts funded more program activities than either the small or medium size districts.

TABLE 4.18

TOTAL NUMBER OF CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES
ACCORDING TO SIZE^a OF LEA

Size ^a of School District				
NUMBER OF PROGRAMS	SMALL	MEDIUM	LARGE	Row Total
Observed	226 TO 1,499	1,500 TO 3,299	3,300 TO 27,218	
1	12	20	7	39 25.9
2	14	17	10	41 26.6
3	9	20	12	41 26.6
4	2	8	4	14 9.1
5	2	7	4	13 8.4
6	1	1	1	3 1.9
7	0	0	2	2 1.3
8	0	1	0	1 .6
Column Total	40 26.0	74 48.0	40 26.0	154 100.0

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Policy and Planning.

^aSize is expressed in Average Daily Attendance (ADA)

Difference In The Number Of Programs
And Size Of District

The difference between the number of program activities funded with Chapter 2 funds and the number of programs funded with antecedent funds according to the size of district was not significant, however, there were important differences as shown in Tables 4.19 and 4.20.

TABLE 4.19
 DIFFERENCE IN NUMBER OF CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES
 AND ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS FUNDED IN MISSISSIPPI
 ACCORDING TO SIZE^a OF LEA

Size ^a of School District				
NUMBER OF PROGRAMS	SMALL 226 TO 1,499	MEDIUM 1,500 TO 3,299	LARGE 3,300 TO 27,218	Row Total
-3	0	0	2	2 1.3
-2	2	1	0	3 1.9
-1	2	7	3	12 7.8
0	12	20	9	41 26.6
1	13	15	9	37 24.0
2	6	18	9	33 21.4
3	3	3	3	9 5.8
4	2	9	3	14 9.1
5	0	0	1	1 .6
6	0	1	1	2 1.3
Column Total	40 26.0	74 48.0	40 26.0	154 100.0

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education, Division of Policy and Planning.

^aSize is expressed in Average Daily Attendance (ADA)

Twenty-seven percent (41) of the school districts did not change the number of program activities in which they supported. Of these districts, 49% (20) were medium size districts, 29% (12) were small districts and 22% (9) were large districts.

Eleven percent (17) of the districts reduced the number of program activities funded with Chapter 2 funds compared to the number funded with antecedent program funds. Of these, two large districts decreased the number of program activities by three and three reduced the number funded by one program activity. One medium size district funded two fewer program activities and seven funded one less program activity. Four small districts reduced the total number of program activities funded: two reduced the number funded by two and one reduced the number funded by one. In short, fewer small districts than medium or large districts reduced the number of program activities funded with Chapter 2 funds.

Sixty-two percent (96) of the school districts funded more program activities with Chapter 2 funds than with antecedent program funds. Forty-eight percent (46) of these were medium size districts, 25% (24) were small districts and 28% (27) were large districts.

Of the thirty-seven districts that funded one additional program activity with Chapter 2 funds, 41%

(15) were medium size districts, 35% (13) were small districts and 24% (9) were large districts. Of the thirty-three districts that funded two additional program activities, 55% (18) were medium size districts, 27% (9) were large districts and 18% (6) were small districts. Of the districts that funded three or more program activities, 50% (13) were medium size districts, 19% (5) were small size districts and 31% (8) were large districts.

In sum, large districts experienced greater change in the number of program activities supported with Chapter 2 funds ranging from a decrease of three programs to an increase of six program activities. More medium size districts changed the number of programs supported than either small or large districts. Fewer small districts funded less programs than large or medium size districts and small districts funded fewer new program activities with Chapter 2 funds than either large or medium size districts.

TABLE 4.20

DIFFERENCE IN NUMBER OF ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS AND
CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES FUNDED
ACCORDING TO SIZE^a OF DISTRICT

SIZE OF DISTRICT	DIFFERENCE IN NUMBER OF PROGRAMS									
	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
SMALL (N=40) 226 TO 1,499	0	2	2	12	13	6	3	2	0	0
MEDIUM (N=74) 1,500 TO 3,299	0	1	7	20	15	18	3	9	0	1
LARGE (N=40) 3,300 TO 27,218	2	0	3	9	9	9	3	3	1	1
TOTAL (N=154)	2	3	12	41	37	33	9	14	1	2
PERCENT OF TOTAL	1.3	1.9	7.8	26.6	24.0	21.4	5.8	9.1	.6	1.3

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Policy and Planning.

^aSize is expressed in Average Daily Attendance (ADA) .

Wealth Of The School District And The Number Of Antecedent Programs

The wealth of the school district as measured by the Ability Per-Pupil Unit (APU) did not have a significant effect on the distribution of the number of antecedent programs as shown in Table 4.21. However, some interesting observations were revealed by the frequency distribution of the wealth of the school district with the number of antecedent programs funded (See Table 4.22).

TABLE 4.21

TOTAL NUMBER OF ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS
ACCORDING TO WEALTH^a OF LEA

NUMBER OF PROGRAMS Observed	Wealth ^a of School District			Row Total
	LEAST WEALTHY 4,000 TO 13,999	MODERATELY WEALTHY 14,000 TO 19,999	WEALTHIEST 20,000 TO 198,000	
0	4	1	2	7 4.5
1	34	40	15	89 57.8
2	13	18	13	44 28.6
3	2	6	1	9 5.8
4	0	1	2	3 1.9
5	0	1	1	2 1.3
Column Total	53 34.4	67 43.5	34 22.1	154 100.0

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Policy and Planning.

^aWealth is expressed in Ability Per-Pupil Unit (APU)

Of the LEAs that did not receive antecedent program funds, 57% (4) were the least wealthy districts, 29% (2) were from the wealthiest districts. 14% (1) was a moderately wealthy district. Fifty-eight percent (89) of the districts received funding from only one antecedent program. Of these, 45% (40) were from the moderately wealthy districts, 38% (34) were from the least wealthy districts, and 17% (15) were from the wealthiest districts.

Fifty-eight percent (89) received funds from one antecedent program. Of these, 45% (40) were moderately wealthy districts, 38% (34) were least wealthy districts, and 17% (15) were the wealthiest districts. Twenty-nine percent (44) of the districts funded two antecedent programs. Of these, 41% (18) were moderately wealthy and 22% each were from the least wealthy and wealthiest category. Six percent (9) of the districts received funding for three programs. Of these, 67% (6) were moderately wealthy districts, 22% (2) were least wealthy, and 11% (1) was one of the wealthiest districts. None of the least wealthy districts received funding from more than three programs. In fact, only three percent (5) districts received funds for more than three programs. These included two wealthiest districts and one moderately wealthy district that received funds for four programs and one wealthiest district and one moderately wealthy district that received funds from five programs.

In short, all but seven local school districts received funds from at least one antecedent program. More moderately wealthy districts funded antecedent programs than either least wealthy or wealthiest districts. Further, LEAs from moderately wealthy districts and the wealthiest districts received funds from four and five antecedent programs while least wealthy districts received funds from no more than three programs.

TABLE 4.22
FREQUENCY OF ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS
ACCORDING TO WEALTH^a OF LEA

WEALTH OF DISTRICT	NUMBER OF PROGRAMS FUNDED					
	0	1	2	3	4	5
LEAST WEALTHY (N=53)						
4,000 TO 13,999	4	34	13	2	0	0
MODERATELY WEALTHY (N=67)						
14,000 TO 19,999	1	40	18	6	1	1
WEALTHIEST (N=34)						
20,000 TO 198,664	2	15	13	1	2	1
TOTAL (N=154)	7	89	44	9	3	2
PERCENT OF TOTAL	4.5	57.8	28.6	5.8	1.9	1.3

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Policy and Planning.

^aWealth is expressed in Ability Per-Pupil Unit (APU)

Wealth Of The School District And
The Number Of Chapter 2 Program Activities

The wealth of the school district as measured by the Ability Per-Pupil Unit (APU) did not have a significant effect on the distribution of the number of Chapter 2 program activities (See Table 4.24) however, there were some interesting observation to be made from the frequency distribution of the wealth of the school district and the number of Chapter 2 program activities funded as shown in Table 4.23.

Of the fifty-three least wealthy LEAs that receive Chapter 2 funds, twenty-six percent (14) funded one program activity, thirty percent (16) funded two program activities, twenty-one percent (11) funded three program activities, nine percent (5) funded four and five program activities, and two percent (1) funded six and seven program activities. Of the sixty-seven moderately wealthy LEAs, twenty-five percent (17) funded one program activity, twenty-three percent (16) funded two program activities, twenty-eight percent (19) funded three program activities, ten percent (7) funded four program activities, seven percent (5) funded five program activities, three percent (2) funded six program activities, and two percent (1) funded eight program activities. Of the thirty-four wealthiest LEAs, twenty-four percent (8) funded one program activity, twenty-six percent

(9) funded two program activities, thirty-two percent (11) funded three program activities, six percent (2) funded four program activities, nine percent (3) funded five program activities, and three percent (1) funded seven program activities.

TABLE 4.24
TOTAL NUMBER OF CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES
ACCORDING TO WEALTH^a OF LEA

NUMBER OF PROGRAMS	Wealth ^a of School District			Row Total
	LEAST WEALTHY 4,000 TO 13,999	MODERATELY WEALTHY 14,000 TO 19,999	WEALTHIEST 20,000 TO 198,000	
Observed				
1	14	17	8	39 25.3
2	16	16	9	41 26.6
3	11	19	11	41 26.6
4	5	7	2	14 9.1
5	5	5	3	13 8.4
6	1	2	0	3 1.9
7	1	0	1	2 1.3
8	0	1	0	1 .6
Column Total	53 32.4	67 43.5	34 22.1	154 100.0

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Policy and Planning.

^aWealth is expressed in Ability Per-Pupil Unit (APU)

In short, more least wealthy school districts funded one and two program activities than moderately wealthy or wealthiest districts. Of the districts that funded three program activities, the wealthiest districts funded the most. Further, the moderately wealthy districts funded the greatest range of program activities.

TABLE 4.23
FREQUENCY OF CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES
ACCORDING TO WEALTH^a OF LEA

WEALTH OF DISTRICT	NUMBER OF PROGRAMS FUNDED							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
LEAST WEALTHY (N=53)								
4,000 TO 13,999	14	16	11	5	5	1	1	0
MODERATELY WEALTHY (N=67)								
14,000 TO 19,999	17	16	19	7	5	2	0	1
WEALTHIEST (N=34)								
20,000 TO 198,664	8	9	11	2	3	0	1	0
TOTAL (N=154)	39	41	41	14	13	3	2	1
PERCENT OF TOTAL	25.3	26.6	26.6	9.1	8.4	1.9	1.3	.6

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Policy and Planning.

^aWealth is expressed in Ability Per-Pupil Unit (APU)

Difference In The Number Of Programs
And The Wealth Of School District

The wealth of a school district did not have a significant effect on the difference in the number of programs supported by LEAs with Chapter 2 funds compared to programs supported with antecedent program funds (See Table 4.25). However, the distribution provided some insights into the changes brought about by the new funding method of Chapter 2, ECIA (See Table 4.26).

Of the 17 LEAs that funded fewer program activities with Chapter 2 than with the antecedent programs, the moderately wealthy and the wealthiest districts funded fewer programs than the least wealthy districts. Of these 17 only five (29%) were in the least wealthy category (e.g. one with two fewer and four with one fewer program activities). Fifty-three percent (9) were from the moderately wealthy category with one funding three fewer, two funding two fewer, and six funding one fewer program activities. Of the wealthiest school districts that funded fewer program activities: one funded three fewer and two funded one fewer program activities.

Twenty-seven percent (41) of the LEAs did not change the number of program activities they funded. More of these LEAs (44%) were in the moderately wealthy category than in the other two categories. Thirty-three percent (13) were of

the wealthiest districts while 24% (10) were of the least wealthy districts.

Of the ninety-six LEAs that increased the number of program activities with Chapter 2 funds, fewer of the wealthiest districts (19%) increased their number of funded program activities than moderately wealthy districts (42%) or least wealthy districts (39%). Further, fewer of the wealthiest districts (4) increased the number of funded program activities more than three (e.g., one increased by three, two increased by four and one increased by five). The moderately wealthy districts increased the number of program activities the greatest. Five LEAs increased the number of program activities by three, six LEAs increased their number of program activities by four and one LEA increased its number by six program activities.

In short, of the LEAs that funded fewer program activities with Chapter 2 funds than with antecedent program funds, the moderately wealthy and the wealthiest districts funded fewer programs than the least wealthy districts. More of the moderately wealthy LEAs did not change the number of program activities funded and fewer wealthiest districts increased the number of program activities with Chapter 2 funds than moderately wealthy districts or least wealthy districts.

TABLE 4.25
DIFFERENCE IN NUMBER OF CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES
AND ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS FUNDED IN MISSISSIPPI
ACCORDING TO WEALTH^a OF LEA

NUMBER OF PROGRAMS Observed	Wealth ^a of School District			Row Total
	LEAST WEALTHY 4,000 TO 13,999	MODERATELY WEALTHY 14,000 TO 19,999	WEALTHIEST 20,000 TO 198,000	
-3	0	1	1	2 1.3
-2	1	2	0	3 1.9
-1	4	6	2	12 7.8
0	4	1	2	7 4.5
1	34	40	15	89 57.8
2	13	18	13	44 28.6
3	2	6	1	9 5.8
4	0	1	2	3 1.9
5	0	1	1	2 1.3
Column Total	53 34.4	67 43.5	34 22.1	154 100.0

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Policy and Planning.

^aWealth is expressed in Ability Per-Pupil Unit (APU)

TABLE 4.26
DIFFERENCE IN NUMBER OF ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS AND
CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES FUNDED
ACCORDING TO WEALTH OF LEA

WEALTH OF DISTRICT	DIFFERENCE IN NUMBER OF PROGRAMS									
	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
LEAST WEALTHY (N=53) 4,000 TO 13,999	0	1	4	10	18	10	3	6	0	1
MODERATELY WEALTHY (N=67) ¹ 14,000 TO 19,999		2	6	18	12	16	5	6	0	1
WEALTHIEST (N=34) 20,000 TO 198,664	1	0	2	13	7	7	1	2	1	0
TOTAL (N=154)	2	3	12	41	37	33	9	14	1	2
PERCENT OF TOTAL	1.3	1.9	7.8	26.6	24.0	21.4	5.8	9.1	.6	1.3

¹Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Policy and Planning.

^aWealth is expressed in Ability Per-Pupil Unit (APU)

Difference In The Number Of Programs Funded
And The "Gainers" and "Losers" With Chapter 2 Funding

There was not a significant difference in the number of programs funded with the implementation of Chapter 2, ECIA and the number of programs funded with antecedent program funds as shown in Table 4.27. However, that descriptive statistics are of interest.

Of the 17 LEAs that decreased the number of program activities funded with Chapter 2 funds, two gained funds and 15 lost funds. Of the the fifteen that lost funds, ten (67%) decreased the number of program activities by one, three

decreased the number by two, and two decreased their number by three.

More LEAs that lost funds (54%) than gained funds (46%) with Chapter 2 continued to fund the same number of program activities as was funded under the antecedent programs. However, more LEAs that gained funds (75%) increased the number of program activities than LEAs that lost funds (46%).

TABLE 4.27

THE NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS THAT GAINED OR LOST FUNDS
WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CHAPTER 2, ECIA

NUMBER OF PROGRAMS Observed	GAIN	LOSS	Row Total
-3	0	2	2 1.3
-2	0	3	3 1.9
-1	2	10	12 7.8
0	19	22	41 26.6
1	26	11	37 24.0
2	21	12	33 21.4
3	6	3	9 5.8
4	9	5	14 9.1
5	1	0	1 .6
6	1	1	2 1.3
Column Total	85 55.2	69 44.8	154 100.0

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Policy and Planning.

FINDINGS

There was a significant difference between the number of Chapter 2 program activities funded in 1985-86 and the number of antecedent programs funded in 1980-81. In addition, the Chapter 2 funds were spread over more program activities, thereby serving more locally identified needs than under the antecedent programs.

The affects of the size of the school district on the distribution of funds was that small and medium size districts funded more Chapter 2 program activities than antecedent programs while large districts funded a wider range of program activities with Chapter 2 funds than with antecedent funds. Larger districts tended to fund fewer Chapter 2 programs activities than antecedent programs and small districts funded fewer program activities than either medium size districts or large districts.

Large districts experienced greater change in the number of program activities supported with Chapter 2 funds ranging from a decrease of three programs to an increase of six program activities. Fewer small districts funded less programs than large or medium size districts and small districts funded fewer new program activities with Chapter 2 funds than either large or medium size districts.

When the distribution of antecedent programs was grouped according to the wealth of the school district, more

"moderately wealthy" districts funded antecedent programs than either "least wealthy" or "wealthiest" districts. "Moderately wealthy" districts and "wealthiest" districts received funds from four and five antecedent programs while "least wealthy" districts received funds from no more than three programs.

When the distribution of Chapter 2 program activities was grouped according to the wealth of the school district, more "least wealthy" school districts funded one and two program activities than "moderately wealthy" or "wealthiest districts". Of the districts that funded three program activities, the "wealthiest" districts funded the most. Also, the "moderately wealthy" districts funded the greatest range of program activities.

When the number of program activities funded with Chapter 2 funds was compared to the number of antecedent programs according to the wealth of the school district, "moderately wealthy" and "wealthiest" districts funded fewer programs than "least wealthy" districts. More of the "moderately wealthy" districts did not change the number of program activities funded and fewer "wealthiest" districts increased the number of program activities with Chapter 2 funds than "moderately wealthy" districts or "least wealthy" districts.

When the change in the number of programs funded was grouped according to whether they gained or lost funds, eighty-eight percent of the LEAs that decreased the number of program activities with the Chapter 2 funds suffered a net loss of funds as compared to the funds received under the antecedent programs. More districts that lost funds than gained funds with Chapter 2 continued to fund the same number of program activities as was funded under the antecedent programs. Also, a greater number of districts that gained Chapter 2 funds increased the number of program activities supported compared to the districts that lost funds with the implementation of Chapter 2.

RESEARCH QUESTION 5

What differences were there between the types of program activities funded under Chapter 2, ECIA and the types of programs funded under the consolidated antecedent programs?

METHOD

Question five addresses the change at the local district level in the funding priorities between the antecedent programs and Chapter 2 program activities. This was determined by comparing the LEAs' selection of Chapter 2 program activities as presented in the LEA Chapter 2 application to the number of LEA funded antecedent programs. A paired t-test with an alpha of .10 was used to determine if there was a significant difference between the types of programs funded.

DISCUSSION

To answer this question four assumptions were made: (1) LEA program expenditure was the same as LEA funding; (2) the identified antecedent program expenditure was the total amount spent by an LEA on the program; (3) the Chapter 2 expenditure was the total amount the LEA spent on a particular program activity; and, (4) the "labels" placed on the Chapter 2 program activities were comparable to the antecedent program titles.

In identifying the changes in the funding patterns of local school districts it is important to understand the manner in which Chapter 2 was operated at the local level. Two antecedent programs did not have comparable Chapter 2 programs activities: Teacher Corps and Innovative Practices (Title IV-C). The Teacher Corps was designed to provide collaborative staff development between higher education institutions and local school districts. In Mississippi this involved 5 LEAs and higher education institutions. Under Chapter 2, ECIA higher education institutions did not receive funding to continue providing staff development with local school districts. Further, staff development was not among the topics supported by Chapter 2. Consequently comparisons between the antecedent program and Chapter 2, ECIA was not possible.

Similarly, seven local school districts received funding for Innovative Practices (Title VI-C) but was unable to indicate the continuation of such funding because the title was not listed as an acceptable program activity under Chapter 2, ECIA. Thus, there was no way to make a comparison between the antecedent programs and Chapter 2, ECIA program activities.

One of the principal factors of Chapter 2, ECIA was local control. As a result of local discretion, local school districts were allowed to define their own program

activities and give these activities any name they choose. An unanticipated consequence of such local control was that some LEAs chose to redefine antecedent programs while maintaining the same title. For example: an LEA could take the antecedent program "Gifted and Talented" and change the selection criteria and still label it "Gifted and Talented" under Chapter 2, ECIA. This local flexibility brought about the lack of standardize terminology; however, for this study the program "labels" listed in Table 4.28 are used to make the comparison between the two funding strategies.

TABLE 4.28

PROGRAM "LABELS" USED FOR
ANALYSIS PURPOSES

Antecedent Programs	Chapter 2 Program Activities
Title IV-B	Subchapter B - Library Media/Materials
Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Children	Subchapter B - Programs To Support Minority Guidance/Counseling/Testing
Gifted & Talented	Subchapter C - Gifted & Talented
Career Education	Subchapter C - Career Education
Basic Skills	Subchapter A - Reading Mathematics Written and Oral Communications
Criminal Justice	Subchapter C - Law Related Education

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Policy and Planning.

As examined in the previous research question there were significantly more Chapter 2 program activities funded with Chapter 2 funds than there were programs funded with antecedent funds. (See Table 4.14) However, when the analysis is taken a step further and comparisons are made between the amount LEAs spent on particular antecedent programs and the amount they spent on "comparable" Chapter 2 program activities the results vary. For example, when comparing the expenditure of an LEA's antecedent program "Title IV-B" to the expenditure for the Chapter 2 program activity "Subchapter - B, Library Media/Materials" there were significantly more funds spent on the antecedent Title IV-B programs than spent on Chapter 2 "Title IV-B Type" program activities. (See Table 4.29) There was also significantly more funds expended on the antecedent ESAA (Emergency School Aid Act) programs than on the combined expenditures of Chapter 2 program activities entitled "Programs To Support Minority Children" and "Guidance/Counseling/ Testing". (See Table 4.30)

TABLE 4.29

PAIRED T-TEST BETWEEN ANTECEDENT TITLE IV-B PROGRAM EXPENDITURE
AND CHAPTER 2 "TITLE IV-B TYPE" PROGRAM ACTIVITY EXPENDITURE

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	S.E.	2-Tail Prob.
ESEA Title IV-B	144	24001.03	21332.88	1777.74	.000
Subchapter B - Library Media/ Materials	144	7239.06	8371.90	697.66	

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Policy and Planning.

TABLE 4.30

PAIRED T-TEST BETWEEN ANTECEDENT ESAA PROGRAM EXPENDITURE
AND CHAPTER 2 "ESAA TYPE" PROGRAM ACTIVITY EXPENDITURE

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	S.E.	2-Tail Prob.
Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA)	32	9168.46	33562.56	4654.29	.097
Subchapter B - Programs To Support Minority Children & Guidance/Counseling/ Testing; Safe Schools, Vandalism	32	1208.48	2406.21	333.68	

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Policy and Planning.

When comparisons are made between the other antecedent program expenditures and their "comparable" Chapter 2 program activity expenditures there are no significant differences. However, in each case the mean expenditure for antecedent programs exceeds the expenditure for the "comparable" Chapter 2 program activity. For example, the mean expenditure for the Gifted and Talented antecedent program was \$2,676.28 while the mean expenditure for the Gifted and Talented Chapter 2 program activity was \$1,872.66 (Table 4.31), the mean expenditure for the Criminal Justice antecedent program was \$1,409.53 while the mean expenditure for the Law Related Education Chapter 2 program activity was \$36.84 (Table 4.32), the mean expenditure for the Basic Skills antecedent program was \$4,535.59 while the mean expenditure for Subchapter A of the Chapter 2 program activities was \$370.81 (Table 4.33), and the mean expenditure for the Career Education antecedent program was \$626.23 while no school district reported supporting Career Education with Chapter 2 funds.

TABLE 4.31

PAIRED T-TEST BETWEEN ANTECEDENT GIFTED & TALENTED
PROGRAM EXPENDITURE AND CHAPTER 2 "GIFTED &
TALENTED TYPE" PROGRAM ACTIVITY EXPENDITURE

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	S.E.	2-Tail
					Prob.
Gifted & Talented	13	2676.28	7626.03	1797.47	.685
Subchapter C -					
Gifted & Talented	13	1872.66	2064.86	486.69	

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Policy and Planning.

TABLE 4.32

PAIRED T-TEST BETWEEN ANTECEDENT CRIMINAL JUSTICE
PROGRAM EXPENDITURE AND CHAPTER 2 "CRIMINAL JUSTICE
TYPE" PROGRAM ACTIVITY EXPENDITURE

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	S.E.	2-Tail
					Prob.
Criminal Justice	19	1409.53	6143.98	1409.53	.344
Subchapter C -					
Law Related Education	19	36.84	160.59	36.84	

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Policy and Planning.

TABLE 4.33

PAIRED T-TEST BETWEEN ANTECEDENT BASIC SKILLS
PROGRAM EXPENDITURE AND CHAPTER 2 "BASIC SKILLS TYPE"
PROGRAM ACTIVITY EXPENDITURE

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	S.E.	2-Tail Prob.
Basic Skills	128	4535.59	47801.42	4225.12	.327
Subchapter A -					
Reading, Mathematics & Written and Oral Communications	128	370.81	1713.93	151.49	

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Policy and Planning.

TABLE 4.34

PAIRED T-TEST BETWEEN ANTECEDENT CAREER EDUCATION
PROGRAM EXPENDITURE AND CHAPTER 2 "CAREER EDUCATION TYPE"
PROGRAM ACTIVITY EXPENDITURE

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	S.E.	2-Tail Prob.
Career Education	36	626.23	1527.87	121.17	
Subchapter C -					
Career Education	0	0	0	0	

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Policy and Planning.

FINDINGS

From the analysis of the data collected for this study it is concluded that there was an important shift in the type of program activities funded under Chapter 2 when compared to the types of programs funded under the antecedent programs. This change in the pattern of programs is reflected in the funding levels for program activities funded with Chapter 2, ECIA as compared to the funding level for comparable antecedent programs. While the difference between the total amount of expenditure on Chapter 2 program activities and the total amount of expenditure on antecedent programs was not significant (Table 4.14), LEAs were expending significantly less on some "comparable" programs (e.g. "Title IV-B Type" program activities and "ESAA Type" program activities) and substantially less on others. (See Tables 4.28 - 4.34) The direction and magnitude of the shift in both the number and size of funded program activities leads one to conclude that under Chapter 2, ECIA there are fewer large programs activities and more smaller program activities.

Earlier research found that Chapter 2, ECIA often became a "super Title IV-B" program (AASA, 1981); however, in this study LEAs in Mississippi were spending significantly less on Title IV-B type activities than on the

Title IV-B antecedent programs. The mean expenditure for the Chapter 2 Title IV-B type program activity was \$7,239.06 while the mean expenditure for the antecedent Title IV-B program was \$24,001.03.

Earlier research also concluded that by blocking the antecedent program Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) local school districts would spend less funds on desegregation activities. The results of the study concur with these earlier findings. The mean expenditure for the antecedent ESAA programs was \$9,168.46 while the mean expenditure for the three Chapter 2, ECIA program activities was \$1,288.21.

RESEARCH QUESTION 6

To what extent did local school districts exercise their power to establish and implement Chapter 2 program activities?

METHOD

The variable of interest in this question is the discretion of local school authorities in establishing and implementing Chapter 2 program activities at the LEA level. "Local discretion" was measured in three ways: (1) An analysis of Chapter 2 Coordinators' responses to a survey questionnaire in which they were asked to register their perceived changes anchored against antecedent program restrictions; (2) Descriptions of funded Chapter 2 program activities taken from a sample of Chapter 2 activities

reported to the Mississippi State Department of Education; and, (3) Actual changes in the number of program activities selected for funding with 1985-86 Chapter 2 funds as compared to comparable programs funded with the antecedent programs in 1980-81.

DISCUSSION

The first level of analysis for this question included the examination of data collected from the questionnaire sent to all 154 local school districts. On the questionnaire the LEA Chapter 2 Coordinators were asked to indicate whether their district experienced less flexibility, about the same flexibility, or more flexibility in their authority to establish and implement programs with Chapter 2 funds compared with antecedent program funding. Four of the eight antecedent programs funded in 1980-81 were listed. They were: (1) School Library Resources (Title IV-B, ESEA); (2) Support and Innovation (Title IV-C, ESEA); (3) Emergency School Aid (Title VI, ESAA); (4) Career Education (Career Education Incentive Act). Also, space was provided for the respondents to list other federal programs consolidated into Chapter 2, ECIA and local program funds.

In general, LEA Chapter 2 Coordinators reported that they had more discretion to establish and implement programs with Chapter 2 funds than with the categorical antecedent

programs. When measured on a three-point Likert scale, the mean response ranged from 2.48 to 2.72 suggesting that, on the whole, the respondents felt they had more discretion over Chapter 2 funds as compared to other funds.

More specifically, ninety-two percent of the Chapter 2 Coordinators reported that they had about the same (37%) or more (55%) flexibility to establish and implement programs with Chapter 2 funds compared with ESEA Title IV-B funds. This response was of particular interest in light of the fact that ESEA, Title IV-B was one of the least restrictive antecedent program received by all but one of the LEAs in Mississippi.

Chapter 2 Coordinators reported that Chapter 2 funds were more flexible than the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) program funds (61%) and other federal programs (72%). Forty-five percent of the Chapter 2 Coordinators reported that Chapter 2 funds were about as flexible as other local funds. (See Table 4.29)

TABLE 4.35

LEA CHAPTER 2 COORDINATORS'
PERCEPTIONS OF LES DISCRETION
OVER CHAPTER 2 FUNDS AS COMPARED
TO ANTECEDENT FUNDS

Program Title	N	(1)		(2)		(3)		Mean Response (N=3)
		Less		About The Same		More		
		N	%	N	%	N	%	
ESEA Title IV-B (Library Resources)	83	6	7.2	31	37.4	46	55.4	2.48
ESEA Title IV-C	59	5	8.5	14	23.7	40	67.8	2.59
ESAA Title VI	33	6	18.2	7	21.2	20	60.6	2.68
Career Education	32	1	3.1	8	25.0	23	71.9	2.68
Other Federal Prog.	18	0	-0-	5	27.8	13	72.2	2.72
<u>Local Funds</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>25.4</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>45.1</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>29.6</u>	<u>2.04</u>

Note. Survey Of LEA Chapter 2 Coordinators

The second means of assessing the discretion exercised by LEAs in using Chapter 2 funds was an examination of the LEA's description of program activities as reported on the Chapter 2 application filed with the State Department of Education. From a review of a fifteen percent random sample of Chapter 2 applications, it was apparent that LEAs were exercising local discretion in the choice of program activities funded. For example, program activities that were funded included: (1) the purchase of computers and classroom supplies and materials, such as art supplies and science materials; (2) guidance and testing materials; (3) venetian blinds; (4) staff development and in-service training; (5) school personnel such as a certified shop teacher; a school nurse; kindergarten teachers and aides, and substitute teachers; and, (6) a complete Drug Education Program. (For additional information regarding the specific program activities supported by Chapter 2 funds. (See Appendix).

A third means of assessing LEA discretion in the use of Chapter 2 funds was a comparison of the actual changes in the number of program activities selected for funding with 1985-86 Chapter 2 funds to programs funded with the antecedent programs in 1980-81. (See Table 4.36) For this comparison local school districts that received antecedent Title IV-B and Title IV-C programs were selected and the number of different Chapter 2 program activities funded were analyzed.

When making this comparison, LEAs funded a variety of Chapter 2 program activities that were different from the comparable Title IV-B programs. For example, these LEAs supported such program activities as: "Instructional Equipment", "Local Improvement Program", "Guidance/Counseling/ Testing", "Improvement Of Planning and Management", "Teacher Training /In-Service", "Arts Education", "Health Education", "Consumer Education", "Gifted and Talented", "Safe Schools" , and activities supporting the "Establishment Of Educational Proficient Standards".

A similar pattern was observed when the variety of Chapter 2 program activities were analyzed according to local school districts that received ESEA Title IV-C funds. Local school districts supported such Chapter 2 program activities as "Reading", "Mathematics", "Written and Oral Communication", "Local Improvement Program", "Guidance/Counseling/Testing", "Teacher Training In-Service", "Improvement Of Planning and Management", "Arts Education", "Gifted and Talented", "Establishment Of Educational Proficiency Standards", and "Safe Schools".

TABLE 4.36
 THE NUMBER OF ACTIVITIES FUNDED
 IF THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS RECEIVED
 TITLE IV-B OR TITLE IV-C ANTECEDENT FUNDS

Chapter 2 Program Activities	Number of Activities	Number of Activities
	Funded If LEA Received Title IV-B Funds N=147	Funded If LEA Received Title IV-C Funds N=7
SUBCHAPTER A		
Reading	10	2
Mathematics	8	0
Written and Oral Communication	2	0
SUBCHAPTER B		
Library/Media Materials	112	7
Instructional Equipment	107	7
Local Improvement Programs	57	6
Guidance/Counseling/Testing	8	7
Improvement Of Planning & Management	4	6
Teacher Training/ In-Service	2	7
SUBCHAPTER C		
Arts Education	3	3
Consumer Education	1	0
Health Education	1	0
Establishment Of Educational Proficient Standards	1	3
Gifted And Talented	13	3
Safe Schools, Vandalism	1	3

Note. Survey Of Chapter 2 Coordinators and
 Mississippi State Department Of Education

FINDINGS

Local school districts have demonstrated their discretion to establish and implement Chapter 2 program activities in three ways. First, from an analysis of Chapter 2 Coordinators' responses to a questionnaire, Chapter 2 program activities were reported to be more flexible than the antecedent programs. Second, from descriptions of Chapter 2 program activities, LEAs were exercising more local discretion in determining Chapter 2 program activities than they were under antecedent programs. Third, when comparing actual changes in the number of program activities selected for funding with Chapter 2 funds to programs funded with the antecedent programs, LEAs were exercising local discretion in their choices of Chapter 2 program activities.

RESEARCH QUESTION 7

To what extent was there a change in the sharing of authority between public and private school officials over the design and implementation of Chapter 2 program activities compared to the involvement in antecedent programs?

METHOD

To assess the extent to which LEAs shared their authority over the design and implementation of Chapter 2 program activities with private school officials, information was gathered from several sources. These

included: Chapter 2, ECIA legislation; the Mississippi State Department of Education policy; the questionnaire sent to the local school districts; and, LEA Chapter 2 applications. A descriptive analysis of the information was completed and conclusions concerning the sharing of authority were made.

DISCUSSION

The repackaging of federal aid to education into a block grant changed federal funding of several educational programs by providing additional benefits to private schools (AASA, 1984; Jordan and Irwin, 1981; and , Kyle, 1983) Of the 42 categorical programs consolidated into Chapter 2, ECIA, only one program mandated private school participation and only four other programs made provisions for private school participation. Thus Chapter 2 extended access to federally funded programs that previously excluded private school student participation.

This change was consistent with the intent of the Chapter 2, ECIA legislation. As stated in the law, the intent of Congress in Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act was to provide, in the Federally supported activities, equitable participation of private school students. In addition to the stated intention of improving education for private school students, the law spelled out numerous provisions that "will

assure equitable participation of such children in the purposes and benefits of the chapter... " [Sec. 586(a)(1)]. In particular, the law states that if the needs of the children enrolled in private schools are different from the needs of children enrolled in public schools, the LEA shall provide Chapter 2 services for the private school children that address their needs on an equitable basis. [Sec. 586] Further, if an SEA or LEA is prohibited by law from providing Chapter 2 services for private school children on an equitable basis or has substantially failed, or is unwilling, to provide services for private school children on an equitable basis, the Secretary can implement a by-pass thereby serving private school children directly from the federal government. [Sec. 586(d), (e), and (g)]. These changes in the law suggest that there should be substantive changes in the sharing of authority between public and private school officials over the design and implementation of program activities serving private school students.

A review of the Mississippi State Department of Education's policy toward private school participation in federal and state funded programs revealed no change with the implementation of Chapter 2, ECIA. The state department's policy is that private schools are a matter of local concern and therefore they are not a state concern. The state department does not even maintain a list of

private schools operating within the state. Thus the Mississippi State Department of Education abdicates all responsibilities for private school involvement to the local school district.

In an effort to ascertain changes in local school districts concerning their policy toward private schools it was assumed that a more open policy would encourage more private school participation. In fact, the new changes in the federal law had encouraged a significant increase in the participation rate of private school pupils nationwide (AASA, 1984). Thus Chapter 2 coordinators were asked, in the statewide survey, if the number of private schools participating in Chapter 2 had changed compared to the number participating in the antecedent programs. The response was that 87% said that there was no change. Of the additional 13%, three percent said that there was an increase while ten percent said there was a decrease in participation.

A third means of determining the extent to which LEAs shared the design and implementation of Chapter 2 program activities with private schools was the examination of the Chapter 2 program applications filed with the State Department of Education. The applications were reviewed for two changes: (1) program design and (2) program expenditure.

A review of a fifteen percent random sample of Chapter 2 LEA applications revealed that there was no change in the program design for the LEAs that served private school students. All program designs reflected basic "Title IV-B" programs which was the only antecedent program in which private school students in Mississippi participated. A second observation was the absence of any structural or procedural manner in which private school involvement was solicited. In fact, in several cases the "old Title IV-B" forms were used in requesting private school information.

A fourth indicator of the lack of change in the sharing of authority over the Chapter 2 program was the purchases made for private school students. A review of the sample of Chapter 2 program applications revealed that the purchases made for private school use was very similar to the antecedent Title IV-B program. This included: books, film projectors, computers, and other library-type materials.

FINDINGS

The extent to which LEAs shared their authority with private school officials over the design and implementation of Chapter 2 program activities was difficult to determine. However, from the variety of sources available it was concluded that little if any change has occurred between the way Chapter 2 programs were designed and implemented

compared to the one antecedent program in which private school students participated, (e.g. ESEA Title IV-B).

RESEARCH QUESTION 8

With the restructuring of the traditional evaluation requirements placed on federal project activities by Chapter 2 legislation, to what extent have local education agencies continued to evaluate Chapter 2 program activities?

METHOD

In order to identify the extent to which LEAs accepted responsibility for the evaluation of their Chapter 2 program activities, information was collected from the survey of Chapter 2 Coordinators. In the survey they were asked to identify the methods used to evaluate Chapter 2 program activities by their district. Information was also obtained from a fifteen percent random sample of Chapter 2 applications in which the LEAs described their plan for evaluating Chapter 2 program activities.

DISCUSSION

Chapter 2, ECIA did not require LEAs nor SEAs to provide formal evaluations of individual program activities as was required of antecedent programs. Because the law left evaluation in the hands of local schools it was important to identify how LEAs were evaluating Chapter 2 program activities. To answer this question LEA Chapter 2

Coordinators were asked to identify, from a list of common evaluation measures, the degree each measure was used to evaluate their Chapter 2 program activities. Their responses are presented in Table 4.37.

As reported in Table 4.37, student and teacher feedback is the most often used measure (65.5%). Forty-two percent of the LEA Coordinators reported using student data sometimes with thirty-seven percent reporting using student data often. Forty-two percent reported using self-evaluation often and forty-nine percent reported using formal evaluation.

TABLE 4.37

RESPONSES TO SEA SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
CONCERNING EVALUATING CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Evaluation Measure	N	% Used		% Some- times	% Used Often	% Don't Know
		Not Used	Very Little			
Self-evaluation	81	17.3	4.9	30.9	42.0	4.9
Measures of student performances	80	13.8	10.0	31.3	37.5	7.5
Data on student usage	81	9.9	12.3	42.0	28.4	7.4
Feedback from students	87	4.6	0.0	24.1	65.5	5.7
Feedback from teachers	87	6.9	2.3	19.5	65.5	5.7
Feedback from Librarian	83	14.5	8.4	44.6	25.3	7.2
Classroom observation	79	17.7	19.0	30.4	26.6	6.3
A formal evaluation of the program	83	10.8	4.8	31.3	49.4	3.6
Chapter 2 Coordinator's professional opinion	18	77.8	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6

Note. Survey Of Chapter 2 Coordinators

In addition to survey questionnaire data a review of the sample of Chapter 2 State Applications was made. On the application the LEA coordinators indicated the manner in which they evaluated each program activity. Of the fifteen percent sample reviewed only three LEAs reported what would be defined as a formal evaluation. The others ranged from counting the number of students participating in the program activity to opinions of teachers and students.

FINDINGS

If it is accepted that all LEAs which had antecedent programs had formal evaluations then, based on the LEAs response to the evaluation question and the review of Chapter 2 applications, it is evident that there were fewer formal evaluations of Chapter 2, ECIA program activities than there were formal evaluation of antecedent programs. Further, it is evident that the type of evaluations being used is more often informal assessment rather than reliable and valid formal program evaluations.

RESEARCH QUESTION 9

To what extent has the Mississippi State Department of Education allowed the LEAs to exercise complete discretion over Chapter 2, ECIA?

METHOD

The final question dealt with the extent to which the Mississippi State Department of Education allowed the LEAs to exercise complete discretion over Chapter 2, ECIA as required by the law. Information was obtained from three sources: (1) The Chapter 2, ECIA law (P.L. 97-35); (2) the Mississippi State Department of Education policy statements; and, (3) The LEA Chapter 2 applications. A descriptive analysis of the available information was completed and appropriate conclusions were drawn.

DISCUSSION

Chapter 2 legislation was quite explicit regarding local school discretion over Chapter 2 funds. It stated that funds were to be used "in accordance with the needs and priorities of ... local educational agencies as determined by those agencies" [Sec. 561(a)]. To reinforce this message, the law added the following stipulation regarding the funds that flow directly to districts: "Each local educational agency shall have complete discretion, subject only to the provisions of this chapter, in determining how the funds the

agency receives under this section shall be divided among the purposes of this chapter..." [Sec. 566(c)].

The procedures established by the Mississippi State Department of Education for administering Chapter 2 funds to local school districts was within the guideline of the law and approved by the Secretary of Education. Included in the procedures was an application package to be completed by the officials of the local school district and filed with the State Department of Education. Among other things, the application listed 29 different "categories" under which the LEA could submit program activities to be operated within their school district. These categories are listed in the Appendix.

On the surface these procedures seemed to meet the legal requirement of total local discretion "... in determining how the funds ... shall be divided among the purposes of this chapter..." [Sec. 566(c)]. However, a closer examination reveals certain restrictions which severely restrict local control over the design and implementation of programs to meet locally identified needs. For example, in the MSDE policy statements accompanying the Chapter 2 application is a list of "prohibited expenditures". This list included: text books, expendable items, certain types of equipment, and restrictions on personnel.

Another restriction placed on local school district discretion was the list of acceptable "categories". Although this list was taken directly from the Chapter 2 legislation there was no provision for local school districts to design programs to meet local needs that would have been within the "purposes of the chapter" but did not conform to the list of "categories" provided by the State Department of Education. Thus local school administrators were forced to stay within the limits placed on the LEAs by the Mississippi State Department of Education.

The restrictions placed on the local school districts by the application procedure forced school administrators into making one of four choices. First, local school district officials could continue to fund antecedent programs by just changing the title of the existing program to fit new "categories". Second, local school district officials could accept new categories and define local needs within these boundaries. For example, a local school district could determine that they have a need for Guidance, Counseling and Testing and choose to expend Chapter 2 funds for a program activity within this category. Third, local school district officials could identify local needs, create a program to meet needs, and force the new program into the new categories. For example, the school officials may identify a need for a drug education program but since there

is not a category for drug education they may label it "Guidance, Counseling, and Testing". Finally, local school officials may choose not to use Chapter 2 funds to support locally identified needs but rather to use only local and/or state funds.

FINDINGS

Although the Mississippi State Department of Education is meeting the requirements of the letter of the law the procedures used stifle local discretion over the use of Chapter 2 funds. In particular, the state declares that local school districts have full discretion over the expenditure of Chapter 2 funds when, in fact, the procedure for requesting funds places greater restrictions on LEAs than the antecedent programs. The State Department of Education is telling the local school officials that they can fund program activities to meet local school needs as long as their needs fall within the twenty-nine titles provided for in the Chapter 2 application. If their needs are different from the titles listed then Chapter 2 funds are not to be used to support a program aimed at addressing the identified needs.

On the other hand, the reporting procedures established by the State Department of Education are not sufficiently defined nor monitored to assure that all program activities implemented with Chapter 2 funds fall within the "official"

twenty-nine categories. Since there are not standard definitions for program activities established by the State Department of Education local school officials are allowed to define the program activities as they choose. Therefore clever school administrators design program activities to meet local needs and create program descriptions that fall within the "official" list.

SUMMARY

Provided in this chapter was an analysis of the data collected from the various sources: Mississippi State Department of Education's Chapter 2 survey questionnaire, SEA records, and LEA data. This section was followed by a description of the antecedent programs in Mississippi. The next section provided a description of Chapter 2 program activities in the state of Mississippi and concluded that over eighty-nine percent of the funds were spent in three categories: Library and Media Materials; Instructional Equipment, and Local Improvement Programs. The last section analyzed appropriate data to answer the six policy-relevant research questions.

In the next chapter, general conclusion from this study will be presented along with a discussion of policy implications for each of the six Chapter 2 objectives. The chapter will conclude with recommendations for future research on the topic.

Chapter 5

POLICY IMPLICATIONS FROM THE STUDY OF CHAPTER 2, ECIA IN MISSISSIPPI

In reviewing results of this and other studies relating to Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act it seems reasonable to conclude that none of the Reagan administration's objectives were achieved without an unintended or undesired consequence. This chapter discusses the background of Chapter 2, ECIA and presents policy implications for each of the six objectives.

BACKGROUND

In 1981, with the election of President Reagan and a Republican controlled Senate, federal policy toward education changed significantly. This policy change was consistent with President Reagan's overall goal to reduce the role of government in the economy, reduce federal spending, and transfer significant powers and responsibilities to state and local levels of government and to the private sector. As a part of this "New Federalism" the Administration proposed "The Program for Economic Recovery" which was designed to provide: a stable and restrictive monetary policy; a reduction in personal and business taxes; a cut in domestic spending and an increase in defense spending; and, substantial regulatory relief.

The Administration's economic program was based on a fundamentally conservative social philosophy for the responsibilities of the federal government in promoting the general welfare of the country's citizens. The Administration argued that economic recovery and long-term growth were important prerequisites to achieving other goals. By yoking its social and educational agenda to the economic policy, the administration secured a degree of public and legislative support for its program that otherwise might not have been forthcoming. However, social and structural reform was a secondary goal of the Program for Economic Recovery. As a consequence, programs aimed at developing human resources (e.g. education, training, and social services) were disproportionately cut rather than maintained or reformed (Palmer and Sawhill, 1981).

In response to President Reagan's proposal, Congress passed "The Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981" which included portions of the Administration's economic program. This act was intended to: (1) provide tax relief from inflation-induced bracket creep; (2) promote economic growth; and, (3) reduce the size of government. The immediate result was a 25% across-the-board tax reduction in personal income tax with an estimated revenue loss of over \$1 trillion for the first six years. (Palmer & Sawhill, 1981)

In an effort to offset the reduced federal revenue brought about by the tax cut the Administration recommended drastic reductions in the growth of federal spending in non-defense activities and a restructuring of the system for distributing federal aid. This was reflected in the President's proposed budget presented to Congress, in March of 1981, in which he proposed a reduction in non-defense program outlays of 15 to 20 percent in real terms with major targets being means-tested entitlement programs and annually funded grants to states and local levels of government. (Palmer & Sawhill, 1981) The President's budget package had two major implications for education: (1) a reduction in the budget authority for elementary, secondary, and vocational education by 33% less than the amount needed to maintain programs at the FY 1981 levels and (2) the consolidation of a large number of categorical grants into fewer, broad-based block grants.

Congress responded to the Administration's proposal with the largest consolidation of education programs in history: the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (P.L. 97-35). This act included nine block grants combining sixty-six different categorical grants. Seven were new block grants in the areas of health and social services with one combining a number of community development grants and another combining a number of educational grants.

The educational block grant was Title V, Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, Chapter 2, Subtitle D of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35. Although this act consolidated forty-two categorical programs/titles into one block grant, the purposes for which the funds from the various funding sources were intended remained the same. By "blocking" the funding programs into a single fund, the legislators hoped to retain the basic purposes of the earlier legislation, while freeing the local school agency to choose among the several purposes in accordance with its own needs and priorities.

The Reagan Administration's philosophy of cutting federal spending, reducing the federal role, and transferring control from the federal level to the local levels of government was applied toward the Administration's broader educational policy. From the Administration's perspective, the Constitution established education as a state and local responsibility. Using this interpretation, the administration's goal was:

- (1) The reduction, consolidation, and/or elimination of federal education programs,
- (2) A substantial reduction in the funding of federal programs and,
- (3) The abolition of the Department of Education. (Clark & Amiot, 1983)

In short, Reagan's radical tax cut created pressure to substantially reduce federal spending. The reduction was part of the overall Republican objective to reduce the role of the federal government by transferring control to lower levels of government. In order to make the drastic cuts more politically viable, the Administration proposed "blocking" forty-two categorical programs/titles into one education block grant under Chapter 2 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981. This act, in effect, eliminated categorical aid which was the principal instrument of Federal control of funding priorities while retaining the laudable purposes to which categorical aid was designed. In addition, blocking the 42 funding programs into a single fund extended the Administration's objectives which included: (1) Radically reducing the amount of paperwork imposed on states and local school districts; (2) Extending aid to more LEAs; (3) Providing private schools with a greater share in the authority over public funds; and, (4) Allowing the LEAs, rather than the federal government, to determine how to allocate available funds in accordance with local needs and priorities. The education agenda was thus transferred from the federal level of government to the local school districts. This was consistent with the theme of the New Federalism: to provide local school districts the authority to design and implement program activities to meet locally determined needs.

From the Reagan Administration's standpoint, Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 exemplified the New Federalism's educational policy for the federal government. Specifically, the legislation was designed to achieve six immediate intents: (1) To reduce the amount of paperwork. (2) To equalize the distribution of the Federal funds; (3) To increase local discretion in the disposition of the Federal funds; (4) To provide in the Federally supported activities equitable participation of private school students; (5) To increase local responsibility for program evaluations; (6) To limit the role of the State education agencies.

**INTENDED AND UNINTENDED RESULTS
OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CHAPTER 2, ECIA IN MISSISSIPPI**

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which the six expressed intentions of Chapter 2, ECIA were realized in the school districts in Mississippi. These were:

- (1) Has Chapter 2, ECIA effectively reduced the paperwork burden placed on local education agencies?
- (2) Has Chapter 2, ECIA equalized the distribution of funds to LEAs?
- (3) Have LEAs exercised local discretion in the design and implementation of Chapter 2 program activities?
- (4) Have public schools shared the control over Chapter 2 program activities with private school authorities?
- (5) Have local school authorities accepted responsibility for the accountability of Chapter 2 program activities?

- (6) Has the State Department of Education permitted LEAs to exercise local control over Chapter 2, ECIA?

The focus of the study was to observe changes brought about by the implementation of Chapter 2, ECIA at the local jurisdiction of government when federal funds were under local control. Each of the six objectives of Chapter 2, ECIA are discussed in light of the nine research questions of this study.

Before observations began it was necessary to assess the extent to which adequate information was available. A thorough investigation of twenty-one types of data from eight different data sources revealed that all but one source provided secondary information. While these secondary sources provided standard information aggregated at a collective state level, direct information about the specific impact on local school districts would need to come from a mail questionnaire.

In short, a review of the available information led to three conclusions.

- (1) Secondary sources of information collected by the State Department of Education would not provide a complete and accurate picture of local level effects.
- (2) Additional information from local school districts would be necessary, preferably from a mail survey.
- (3) The data that was available came from a variety of sources and consequently had an assortment of units of measure. This necessitated the construction of a special data management system.

PAPERWORK REDUCTION

One of the primary goals of Chapter 2, ECIA was to reduce radically the amount of paperwork and administrative burden imposed on states and local school districts by the 42 categorical funding programs without lessening program quality. Results from this and other studies (Hastings and Bartell, 1983; Kyle, 1983; OIG, 1983; Knapp et. al., 1983; Corbett et. al., 1983) support the fact that the amount of paperwork required to carry out the administration of the new program was reduced but not without certain unintended consequences.

The Act effectively accomplished the goal of reducing the paperwork burden by eliminating the need for a separate application for each of the 42 antecedent programs, reducing the fiscal reporting to state and federal agencies, eliminating evaluation reports for the first two years, and reducing the local progress reports to one annual rather than four quarterly reports. In addition, only one administrative system was required to manage the budgeting, accounting, auditing, inventory, and evaluation of Chapter 2, ECIA rather than a separate system for each categorical program as before.

However, accompanying the reduction of paperwork burden was three unintended consequences. First, there was a general loss of state and local level administrative staff. These people not only provided support for the program but

also performed a number of other staff support functions ranging from routine monitoring to instructional leadership. This loss was not restricted to local school districts but was felt at the state level as well. The departments within the Mississippi State Department of Education that were responsible for the management of antecedent programs lost twenty-five percent of their personnel. This loss was ultimately reflected in diminished technical assistance provided by the state to local schools.

Second, when analyzed from the local school districts perspective there existed considerable variability in the reduction of paperwork. For example, some LEAs' paperwork increased because they never had applied for federal programs in the past while other LEAs' paperwork was reduced because they applied for several antecedent programs. Further, comparing paperwork reduction based on programs funded omits a substantial amount of paperwork that is not considered, such as the many applications that were submitted but not funded.

Third, the unintended consequence of reducing the paperwork burden reduced the quality of programs implemented with Chapter 2 funds. The rules and regulations from the federal government required state education agencies to provide local education agencies with a list of "categories" to choose program activities that best fit their needs. In Mississippi, the State Department of Education (MSDE)

developed an application packet for each LEA to apply for Chapter 2 funds. As a part of this packet LEAs were asked to select from among 29 different categories the activities in which they planned to expend Chapter 2 funds. (See Appendix II and III).

The Chapter 2 application used by the MSDE did not provide for explicit program definitions. This reduction in paperwork, in effect, closed the front door while leaving open the back door. For example, the lack of program definitions and guidelines allowed local education agencies to be very elusive in their descriptions of Chapter 2 program activities. This provided LEAs with the opportunity to use Chapter 2 funds as general aide. A point in case: one LEA labeled its Chapter 2 program as a "Local Improvement Program" and defined the need as follows:

The school needs 55 venetian blinds for classrooms to help regulate the amount of light and darkness desired for study and teaching. Blinds will give privacy when needed.

Another LEA requested \$37,714 to meet the following need:

Our survey of need reveal a major deficiency in maps and globes in each of our schools. The ones we now have are outdated and are not conducive to teaching children about today's and tomorrow's world. Included in this project is a sufficient amount of maps and globes to meet our accreditation standards.

The program evaluation included:

A comparison of achievement test results on next year's tests will be compared with this year's results, in the social studies area and the Instructional Supervisor and principals will determine what effect the purchase of these materials has had on pupil performance by completing a check list.

As illustrated by these two examples, the reduction in paperwork burden (e.g. the application process) resulted in a loss of definable programs and a reduction in program quality. In addition, by not requiring LEAs to submit detailed program evaluations, the impact of Chapter 2, ECIA program activities are left with out supporting evidence of program effectiveness.

EQUALIZATION OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL FUNDS

Prior to the enactment of Chapter 2, ECIA 42 educational programs were made available to state and local jurisdictions in the form of competitive and categorical grants. Competitive grants were offered to school districts that submitted the best proposals. This meant that large school districts with capable grantsmen often "won" the competition while smaller districts without access to grantsmen were unable to compete successfully for these grants. Categorical aid was provided to address special needs of specific populations deemed to be in the national interest, e.g. Ethnic Heritage Studies, Metric Education). This method of providing funds for educational purposes permitted the federal government to specify, in some

detail, the national purposes or goals for which the categorical funds would be expended, the educational agencies that would be supported in pursuing the national goals, the precise programs and activities to be involved, and the basis on which the aid recipient agency's performance would be evaluated. Further, it allowed the government to compensate for inequities in the fiscal capacity of regions, states, and local jurisdictions. The heavily conditional nature of this mode of funding stimulated and supported programs designed to meet national goals that might not be undertaken without a federal initiative. Assurance that such needs were being served was enforced by detailed accountability procedures and closely monitored by federal officers or their agents in the SEAs.

When Congress passed Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation Improvement Act, the intent to equalize the distribution of federal funds was achieved by changing the manner in which the funds were distributed. The new federal funds were distributed "to the local educational agencies . . . according to the relative enrollments in public and nonpublic schools within the school districts adjusted, in accordance with criteria approved by the Secretary, to provide higher per pupil allocations to local educational agencies which have the greatest numbers or percentages of children whose education imposes a higher than average cost per child". [Sec. 565 (a)]

This study looked at the effects of Chapter 2, ECIA on the equalization of the distribution of funds in three ways: the change in the level of funding to LEAs, the change in the number of programs supported, and the change in the types of programs supported.

First, the difference between the level of funding with Chapter 2, ECIA and the level of funding from the total antecedent programs was calculated. The amount of funds lost was significantly greater ($p < .05$) than the amount of funds gained. The total amount of funds lost exceeded the amount gained by more than a 10 to 1 ratio.

Although there were significant differences in the total amount of Chapter 2 funds there were more districts that gained funds than lost funds. The differences between the "gainers" and the "losers" was not found to be significant by either size, as measured by Average Daily Attendance, or by wealth of district as measured by Ability Per-Pupil Unit. However, from a case study perspective, more large than small districts in Mississippi gained funds while more small than large districts lost funds. Also, more "least wealthy" districts gained than lost funds while more "wealthiest" districts lost rather than gained funds. This finding was contrary to an earlier study (Knapp, et. al., 1986) in which small districts gained and large districts were the losers.

Second, the distribution of Chapter 2 funds was analyzed by the change in the number of program activities supported with Chapter 2 funds as compared to the number of programs supported with antecedent funds. The number of program activities supported with Chapter 2 funds was found to be significantly greater than the number of programs funded with antecedent funds ($p < .001$). Chapter 2 funds were spread over more program activities, thus serving more locally identified needs than under the antecedent programs.

There was not significant difference in the number of program activities supported with Chapter 2 funds and the size (ADA) or wealth of district (APU). However, small and medium sized LEAs funded more Chapter 2 program activities and large LEAs funded fewer Chapter 2 program activities. On the other hand, "least wealthy" district funded fewer program activities than "wealthiest" districts.

Third, the distribution of Chapter 2 funds was analyzed to ascertain changes at the local district level in the types of programs funded. This comparison was difficult to make because the titles for Chapter 2 program activities often did not reflect program content and some antecedent programs such as "Teacher Corp" and "Innovative Practices" were not listed on the approved MSDE list of Chapter 2 program activities. Even with these limitation LEAs were expending significantly less on some "comparable" programs and substantially less on others. For example, contrary to

earlier research (Knapp, 1986; AASA, 1983) which labeled Chapter 2 as a "Super Title IV-B" program, the LEAs in Mississippi expended significantly less on "Title IV-B Type" program activities. On the other hand, congruent with earlier research (Darling-Hammond, 1983), the number of "Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Type" program activities was reduced significantly.

In short, the net affect of the implementation of Chapter 2 in Mississippi was: (1) An overall significant loss of funds with some districts suffering from substantial loss while other districts enjoyed a considerable gain in funds. (2) LEAs were supporting more program activities with Chapter 2 funds than they were with antecedent program funds thus serving more locally identified needs. (3) LEAs in Mississippi were supporting fewer "Title IV-B Type" program activities and reduced significantly their support for "Emergency School Aid Type" program activities.

This study concluded that the redistribution of Chapter 2 funds coupled with unleashed local discretion resulted in three predictable but otherwise unintended results. First, smaller school districts received sizable amounts of funds with little or no prior experience with federal programs and little guidance from the state education agency. These districts seldom designed "definable" programs. This resulted in expending funds for activities in which there were no measurable program effects leaving the question of

both quality and impact of the program activity in question. Second, the median level of program funding decreased significantly and the number of programs funded changed from a few larger programs to many smaller programs. With the exception of one program activity which was funded at \$301,024, the largest program activity funded was \$47,554. The median expenditure ranged from \$733 to \$9,340. This shift in equalizing the distribution of funds resulted in such dispersion of funds so that program effect was minimal if not transparent. Finally, the increase in local discretion and the shift away from support for former desegregation programs suggest that local school districts are withdrawing from earlier federal mandates. For example, only three LEAs supported Chapter 2 program activities for "Programs To Support Minority Children" (Mean = \$3,456) as compared to 17 LEAs that had ESAA programs (Mean = \$192.082).

INCREASE IN LOCAL DISCRETION

Under the prior categorical method of funding educational programs, an explicit purpose and an imposed federal priority was included within each program. Chapter 2, ECIA legislation altered this plan by providing local school districts with increased discretion over the establishment of program objectives and funding priorities. This was accomplished by providing each district with a list

of twenty-nine program topics defined as legitimate program titles. Each district was to choose from these categories the programs they wished to fund. Local school authorities were given flexibility to design programs to address local priorities and authority to establish funding priorities within these program titles. In short, LEAs were allowed, within broad guidelines, to decide how and where the funds from Chapter 2 would be expended.

In this case study of LEAs in the state of Mississippi, the intention of Chapter 2 legislation to provide local discretion for school authorities to establish and implement program activities to meet local need was confirmed. First, an analysis of Chapter 2 Coordinators' responses to a survey questionnaire concluded that local school administrators perceived the Chapter 2 program as being more flexible than the antecedent programs.

Second, a review of Chapter 2 program activities reported to the State Department of Education revealed that local school administrators were using Chapter 2 funds to meet many types of needs that would not have been permissible under the antecedent programs. For example, one districts purchased venetian blinds for their school. It is doubtful that this expenditure could have been justified under any of the antecedent programs.

Finally, actual changes in the number of program activities supported with Chapter 2 funds were compared to

comparable antecedent programs. This comparison revealed that LEAs were funding a variety of Chapter 2 program activities different from the antecedent programs that they had previously funded. For example, LEAs that received only Title IV-C funds supported such activities as Teacher Training, Gifted and Talented, Guidance/ Counseling/Testing, Arts Education, and Reading.

This change in the authority to establish program priorities resulted in increasing local discretion at the expense of transferring the education agenda from the federal level to the local school districts. These changes often resulted in local school districts completely withdrawing from prior program commitments thus allowing for the abandonment of the original national priorities. (For example, of the 17 LEAs that had received funding for the antecedent program "Emergency School Aid Act", only one continued to support a Chapter 2, ECIA program activity labeled "Programs To Support Minority Children".) It was the underlying intention of Chapter 2 legislation to allow local education agencies to establish their own priorities, however it was not clear that the intention of the legislation was for local school districts to abandon federal priorities. In fact, in testimony given at Congressional hearings it was reported that local school districts would, if given the authority, support such national imperatives as school desegregation. As this study

clearly illustrates, local education agencies, if given the opportunity, will seldom support national imperatives such as "Metric Education" and "School Desegregation" rather, they will use federal funds for general education purposes.

**PROVISION FOR EQUITABLE PARTICIPATION OF
PRIVATE SCHOOL STUDENTS**

Chapter 2, ECIA broadened the scope of federal programs available to private school students, increased private school authority over these funds, and increased the actual dollar value of services provided to private school students. This was accomplished through four special provisions made by Chapter 2, ECIA. First, local school districts were to provide private school children with benefits and services equitable to those provided to public school children. This required LEAs to consult with appropriate private school officials regarding the development and implementation of the Chapter 2 program before making any decision that affected the opportunities of private school children to participate in the program. Second, if the needs of children enrolled in private schools were different from the needs of those enrolled in public schools, the LEAs were to provide Chapter 2 services for the private school children that addressed their needs on an equitable basis. Third, the LEAs could not require assurances from private schools regarding compliance with Chapter 2 requirements, such as Title IV of the Civil Rights

Act of 1964 and Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as a condition to receiving services. Fourth, if an LEA did not provide equitable benefits and services to private school children, then the SEA or the federal government were to make arrangements, such as through a by-pass contract with a nonprofit agency or organization, under which private school children were provided with services and materials equitable with those provided to public school children.

The increased access to and authority over federally funded programs provided to private school students by Chapter 2, ECIA has led to six unintended results as reported in the review of the literature. First, there has been a significant increase in the participation rate of private school pupils (AASA, 1984). While this is the trend on a national level, this study of the LEAs in Mississippi produced conflicting results. On the survey sent to the local Chapter 2 Coordinators only three percent reported an increase in private school participation. Ten percent reported a decrease and 87% reported no change. Although the participation rate of private school students may not be on the increase in Mississippi, the issue of constitutionality of providing public funding for private schools is still a matter of concern.

Second, the actual dollar value of services provided to private school students has increased on the average, thus

providing funds for private use that could otherwise be used for improving public education. (It is estimated that nearly three times as much federal aid was provided to private school students under Chapter 2 than was available under the several categorical programs. (AASA, 1984)) While the amount of funds diverted from public schools may be on the increase nationally, this study did not find evidence of an increase in Mississippi.

Third, the greater authority given to private school officials over the use of federal funds often altered the public and private school relationship (Knapp & Cooperstein, 1984; OIG, 1983; Darling-Hammond & Marks, 1983; Turnbull & Marks, 1986). However, in Mississippi, this did not seem to be the case. Public and private school administrators, in personal interviews, stated that there was not a noticeable change in their relationship.

Fourth, public school officials are required to share authority over purposes and priorities established for private school students but public school officials can not require private school officials to provide compliance assurances as a condition for receiving federal funds. This leaves the door open for potential misuse of public funds. While this study did not address this issue it is a continuing concern. Especially in light of the State Department of Education's current policy: private schools are a matter of local concern and therefore not a state

concern. The state department does not even maintain a list of private schools operating within its jurisdiction.

Fifth, the increase in private school participation placed additional demands upon local school administrators for a wide-range of technical assistance. This added strain to the already overburdened public school administration (Darling-Hammond & Marks, 1983). This seemed to be a concern in Mississippi as well. In interviews and on the survey of Chapter 2 Coordinators in Mississippi, it was reported that local officials were having difficulty in determining what type of services were permissible and how much services were to be provided.

Sixth, private schools participating in Chapter 2, ECIA are not subject to the more rigorous monitoring and auditing procedures required of the previous categorical program funds thus raising the issue of assuring accountability for the expenditure of public funds. In Mississippi, the State Department of Education makes no provisions for auditing private schools that participate in Chapter 2, ECIA. The responsibility is left with the local education agency.

INCREASE IN LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

Chapter 2, ECIA was intended to increase local responsibility for program evaluations. Under Chapter 2, ECIA, LEAs were no longer required to perform the structured program evaluations earlier mandated by the federal

government. They only had to "provide such information to the state education agency as reasonably may be required for fiscal audit and program evaluation [566 (a)(3)]."

This raises an important policy issue: how evaluation systems balance accountability and flexibility. Chapter 2 legislation sets the stage for this dilemma by increasing local discretion over program design and implementation and restricting mandated structured evaluation procedures. This led to one unintended result: the inability to define or measure program effects thus making accountability difficult to achieve. In Mississippi, for example, local school administrators were given a list of 29 topics from which to select as funding categories. There were no accompanying guidelines defining program categories or providing criteria for evaluation. As a consequence, one school district designed a drug prevention program under the "Local Improvement" category while another school district purchased venetian blinds under the same category. The question of evaluation was addressed both in the survey of Chapter 2 Coordinators and review of Chapter 2 application. The Chapter 2 Coordinators reported student and teacher feedback as the most often used measure for evaluating program effectiveness. The shortfall for evaluations was further illuminated in the review of application. Of a fifteen percent random sample of applications, only three LEAs reported using standard evaluation procedures. A

typical evaluation for a Chapter 2 program activity would be as follows. "Local Improvement Program" is the Chapter 2 program activity. The program is defined as providing a "16mm Project for viewing films related to our curricular offering to students and viewing film during staff development training sessions when consultants are not available". The evaluation consist of: "We have over 900 film in our film library. The interest level of students will be observed by teachers. By observation and improvement in standardized achievement test scores and the ACT". (See Appendix)

By removing the uniform federal requirements for program design and structured evaluation procedures there was neither a method for attributing funding levels to specific program activities nor a means of measuring program effects.

In short, under Chapter 2, ECIA State Education Agencies established how much or how little evaluation districts were required to perform. In Mississippi, only program "labels" were provided leaving program definitions and evaluation criteria to the local education agency. This, in effect, left the evaluation of Chapter 2 program activities to reflect local traditions, beliefs in the value of evaluations, and local expertise. The result was predictable: with the shift in the responsibility for program evaluations changing from federally mandated program

evaluations to volunteer local evaluations both the quality and the reliability of the evaluations would suffer leaving the question of accountability unanswered.

THE LIMITED ROLE OF THE STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

The role of the state education agency as it pertained to the categorical antecedent programs that were consolidated into Chapter 2, ECIA was to provide technical assistance to local education agencies, monitor program compliance, and assure fiscal responsibility. With the enactment of Chapter 2, the role of state education agencies was severely curtailed. Under Chapter 2, local education agencies had full discretion over local program design and implementation. Essentially, the role of the SEAs was reduced to that of trustee of federal funds. A SEA might influence the formula to be used in the state to distribute Chapter 2 funds but it had no authority to amend local decisions concerning program design, implementation, or evaluation. Further, SEAs were no longer authorized to either conduct site visits in order to monitor program activity and assure compliance with the law or to evaluate local programs. Rather, SEAs were instructed to rely upon reports provided by the LEAs.

Redefining the role of the SEA produced five major consequences. First, the legislation was very clear concerning the autonomy local education agencies had over Chapter 2 funds. For example, section 566(c) states "Each

local educational agency shall have complete discretion ... in determining how the funds the agency receives under this section shall be divided among the purposes of the chapter. . ." The restrictive nature of the legislation allowed State Education Agencies to influence local decision making as little as they would like. As far as the State Department of Education was concerned, they would interfere as little as possible. The state of Mississippi provided the least influence allowed under the law, even in the distribution of the state set-aside.

Second, there was a transfer of programmatic decisions from the federal level directly to the local school districts without SEA intervention or monitoring thus leaving the issue of accountability in limbo. For example, the SEA failed to provide adequate guideline for LEAs to follow when dealing with private schools. This failure had two consequences: it failed to assuring private schools their appropriate share of Chapter 2 funds and it failed to see that LEAs were dealing with private schools as the law provided (e.g. Civil Rights compliance).

Third, in Mississippi the new method of distributing Chapter 2 funds resulted in significant increases of funds to smaller LEAs - some LEAs had never received federal assistance before. For example, under the antecedent programs there were 252 programs in less than 100 districts. With the implementation of Chapter 2 there were 416 program

activities in 154 districts. Expertise in how to manage federal grants was often not readily available at the local level for smaller districts. They often had such problems as not expending all of their allocated funds by the end of the fiscal year. Chapter 2 had no provisions for carrying over unencumbered funds. Small districts were penalized for not knowing how to operate federal programs. They were in need more technical assistance from the SEA not less.

Fourth, the State Department of Education failed to provide any guidelines for LEAs to use in designing evaluations for Chapter 2 program activities thus the program activities were left with inadequate evaluation plans. This lessening of SEA technical assistance to LEAs and the lack of local expertise in designing measurable outcomes for the Chapter 2 program activities made it all but impossible to determine the impact of Chapter 2 on education. Further, the quality of the program activities was left unchecked,

Finally, the lack of State Department Of Education's direction in defining Chapter 2 program activities led to school administrators making one of four predictable choices. First, some local school district officials continued to fund antecedent programs by just changing the title of the existing program to fit new "categories". For example, some LEAs simply changed their former Title IV-B program to the Chapter 2 program activity "Library/Media

Materials". Second, some local school district officials accepted new categories and defined local needs within these boundaries. For example, some local school districts determined that they needed Guidance, Counseling and Testing and choose to expend Chapter 2 funds for a program activity within this category. Third, some local school district officials identified local needs, created a program to meet these needs, and forced the new program into the new categories. For example, a school officials identified a need for a drug education program but since there was not a category for drug education he labeled it a "Local Improvement Program". Fourth, some local school officials chose not to use Chapter 2 funds to support locally identified needs but rather to use only local funds. For example, one LEA refused to accept Chapter 2 funds.

SUMMARY

From an opponents' view, Chapter 2, ECIA threatened to dilute national priorities for education, lessen LEA accountability for results, expose the nation to a constitutional dispute over involvement of private schools, and ultimately lessen the quality of projects and programs funded by the federal government. Yet, nothing in the Reagan proposal suggested that his administration wished to dilute national priorities, rather he wished to reduce the role of

the federal government in setting those priorities. Nothing in the Reagan proposal suggested that his administration expected or wished for any lessening of program quality or of LEA accountability for results, rather he wished to reduce drastically the amount of time LEAs were involved in applying for different funding programs and filing numerous reports. Nothing in the Reagan proposal suggested that his administration desired to create a Constitutional problem for private schools, he only wished to increase the authority of private schools in the design of programs to meet their unique needs.

Accordingly, the policy relevant issues raised by Chapter 2, ECIA might reasonably be summed as follows:

- * Reduce the amount of paperwork without reducing the quality of programs,
- * Equalize the distribution of federal funds without reducing the benefits to specific target populations,
- * Increase local discretion without diminishing prior program commitments to the original national priorities,
- * Increase the role of private education without raising the constitutional issue,
- * Reduce reporting and evaluation requirements without a commensurate loss of accountability, and
- * Reduce the constraints on SEAs in the planning of federally funded projects and programs without a loss of perceived quality in those programs.

While the goals of the Reagan administration were admirable they were not without unintended consequences. In Mississippi, the implementation of Chapter 2, ECIA met each of the six objectives but each goal had its limitations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Association of School Administrators (AASA). Education Consolidation and Improvement: Chapter 2 Survey Update. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators, 1982.
- American Association of School Administrators (AASA). Private School Participation in Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators, 1984.
- American Association of School Administrators (AASA). The Impact of Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act on Local Education Agencies, Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators, March 1983.
- Apling, R., and C. Padilla, Funds Allocation and Spending Patterns under the Education Block Grant, Menlo Park, CA: SRI International, 1986.
- Bell, T. H. Goals and Performance Priorities of the U. S. Department of Education for Fiscal Year 1983. Memo. October 19, 1982.
- Belson, William A. "Respondent Understanding of Survey Questions," Polls vol. 3, pp. 1-3, 1968.
- (Bibliography) "Rethinking the Federal Role in Education." Harvard Education Review, vol. 52, pp. 371-589, November, 1982.
- Blakely, C., and M. Stearns, The Improvement of Parents and Citizens in Local Decision making under the Education Block Grant, Menlo Park, CA: SRI International, 1986.
- Burns, D. W. "Issuegram: Implementing the Education Block Grant". Denver, CO: ECS Education Governance Center, March, 1983.
- Burns, D. W. "State Implementation of Chapter 2: The Distribution of Dollars." Denver, CO: Education Governance Center, Education Commission of the States, 1982.
- Casserly, M. Testimony on the Department of Education's implementation of the Chapter 2 block grant. Federal education assistance: Are block grants meeting the need? Hearing before the Intergovernmental Relations and Human Resources Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, September 20, 1983.
- Clark, D. and M. A. Amiot. The disassembly of the Federal Education Role. Education and Urban Society, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 367-388, 1983.

- Clark, D. L., T. A. Astuto, and P. M. Rooney. "The changing structure of federal education policy in the 1980s." Phi Delta Kappan, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 188-193, 1983.
- Cooperstein, R. Participation of Private School Students in Services Supported by the Education Block Grant, Menlo Park, CA: SRI International, 1986
- Conlon, T. J. Congressional responses to the new federalism: The politics of special revenue sharing and its implications for public policy making. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1982.
- Council of Great City Schools (CGCS). Analysis of the Effects of FY82 and FY83 Reagan Budget Proposals on Urban Schools. Washington, DC: The Council of Great City Schools, February, 1982.
- Council of Great City Schools (CGCS). Trends in Federal Funding to Urban Schools: A Progress Report on The Reagan Years, Washington, D.C.: The Council of Great City Schools, February 1983.
- Corbett, H. D., G. B. Rossman, and J. A. Dawson. The Meaning of Funding Cuts: Coping with Chapter 2 of ECIA, Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools, Inc., November 1983.
- Corbett, H. D. ECIA: The First Year of Consolidation. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1983.
- Cubberley, E. P. "Public Education in the United States", pp. 85-86, 1934.
- Darling-Hammond, L. and E. L. Marks The New Federalism in Education: State Responses to the 1981 Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, February 1983.
- Doyle, D. P. "Your Meager Slice of New Federalism Could Contain Delicious Options for Schools." Educational Digest, vol. 48, pp. 5-7, October, 1982.
- Doyle, D. P. "Deregulation, The New Federalism and Scarcity: The End of Additive Reform." Phi Delta Kappan vol. 64, pp. 54-56, September, 1982.
- Education Commission of the States (ESCS). State Implementation of Chapter 2: The Distribution of Dollars. Denver, CO: Education Governance Center, Education Commission of the States, 1982.
- Education Daily, "Most Block Grant Money Distributed on Per-Pupil Basis, Says NCCE," February 18, 1983.

- Ellis, J. "Since 1965: The impact of federal funds on public education." Education and Urban Society, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 351-366, 1983.
- Elmore, R. "Backward Mapping: Implementation Research and Policy Decisions." Political Science Quarterly, vol. 94, no. 3, pp. 601-616, 1980.
- Elmore, R. and M. W. McLaughlin. A Review of USOE Policies and Practices: ESEA Title IV. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, November, 1977.
- Eyler, J. "Case Study of the Implementation of ECIA, Chapter 2 in Tennessee." Vanderbilt University. (Unpublished), 1983
- Franks, M. E., and J. C. Fortune. "Impact of Chapter 2, Educational Consolidation And Improvement Act, On 33 Local Education Agencies in the Commonwealth of Virginia," A paper presented at the 1984 AERA Annual Meeting, April 25, 1984).
- Fries, A., The Education Block Grant, Preliminary Draft, Washington D.C.: The Urban Institute, June 1983.
- Hastings, A. "Snipping the Strings: Local and State Administrators discuss Chapter 2". Phi Delta Kappan, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 194-198, 1983.
- Hastings, A. H., and T. Bartell. The Effects of the chapter 2, ECIA, Consolidation on the Administrative and Paperwork Requirements for Local School Districts. McLean, VA: Advanced Technology, Inc., June 1983.
- Hawer, J. B. National Research and Evaluation Agenda: Chapter 2, Education Consolidation and Improvement Act. Research Triangle Park, NC: Southeast Regional Council for Educational Improvement, 1984.
- Henderson, A. "Business as Usual," NETWORK, May 1983.
- Henderson, A. No Strings Attached: An Interim Report on the New Education Block Grant, Columbia, Maryland: The National Committee for Citizens in Education, 1983.
- Henderson, A. Testimony presented to the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations and Human Resources Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. Federal Education Assistance: Are Block Grants Meeting the Need? House of Representatives, Ninety-eighth Congress, First Session, September 20, 1983.
- Henderson, A. An Occasional Report on Chapter 2 Formulas: Most States Will Have to Change Chapter 2 Funds, Columbia, MD: The National Committee for Citizens in Education, March 1984.

- Henderson, A. Anything goes: A Summary Report on Chapter 2. Columbia, MD: The National Committee for Citizens in Education, 1985.
- Hickey, D. "Block Grant Funding: Its Effect on Educational Research: Revisited", Paper presented at the New England Educational Research Organization, April 27-29, 1983.
- Hood, P. Research and School Improvement in the Far West: The Effects of Federal and State Cutbacks, Consolidation, and Deregulation on Education in California, Nevada and Utah. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory, 1982.
- Institute for Educational Leadership. The Impact of Federal Education Cutbacks on the States: Early Alert, Washington, D.C.: The Institute for Educational Leadership, 1982.
- Irwin, P.M., S. Boren, A. Evans, K. F. Jordan, W. C. Riddle, and M. Wolfe Impact of Budget Changes on Major Education Programs, Both Enacted and Proposed, During the 97th Congress. Washington, D.C.: The Congressional Research Service, Education and Public Welfare Division, 1982.
- Jordan, K. F. and P. M. Irwin. (1982, February 25). Grant Consolidation for Education Programs. (Issue Brief No. IB 79021) Washington, D.C.: Congressional REsearch Service, Education and Public Welfare Division.
- Jung, R. and T. Bartell, "Analysis Memorandum Concerning the Fiscal Impacts of the Chapter 2, ECIA Block Grant on the Largest Districts and Cities." Prepared for U. S. Department of Education Planning and Evaluation Service, 1983.
- Jung, R. K. and T. Bartell. Fiscal Effects of the Chapter 2, ECIA Block Grant on the Largest Districts and Cities, McLean, VA: Advanced Technology, Inc., May 1983.
- Jung, R. K. and R. M. Stonehill. "Big Districts and the Block Grant: A Cross-Time Assessment of the Fiscal Impacts." A Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.: April, 1984.
- Jung, R. and M. Tashjian. "Big Districts and the Block Grant: First-year Fiscal Impacts". Phi Delta Kappan, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 199-203.
- Katzman, M. T. "The Implementation of ECIA Chapter 2, Texas." University of Texas, Dallas. (Unpublished), 1983.
- Kearney, C.P. "Block Grants in Education: An Updated State and Local Perspective," ERS Newsletter, Vol. 7, No.2, p.5, Spring 1983.

- Kimbrough, C. P. A Description of Funding and Service Patterns Under Programs Consolidated by ECIA Chapter II. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1982.
- Knapp, M., Legislative Goals for the Education Block Grant: Have They Been Achieved at the Local Level? Washington, DC: SRI International, 1983.
- Knapp, M., M. Stearns, B. Turnbull, J. David, and S. Peterson. Cumulative Effects of Federal Education Policies on Schools and Districts. Menlo Park, CA: Sri International, 1982.
- Knapp, M. and C. Blakely, The Education Block Grant at the Local Level: The Implementation of Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act in Districts and Schools. Menlo Park, CA: January, 1986.
- Knapp, M. S. and R. A. Cooperstein. "Early Research on the Federal Block Grant: Themes and Unanswered Questions." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 121-137, Summer, 1986.
- Knapp, M. S. and R. A. Cooperstein. "Charting a Course for Future Investigation of Educational Block Grants: A Reader's Guide to Current and Ongoing Research on Chapter 2", Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.: April 23-27, 1984.
- Kyle, R. M. J and E. J. Allen, Jr., Public Funding of Private Education, Contexts and Review: Technical Appendix. Washington, DC: E. H. White and Company, 1983.
- Kyle, R. M. J. Kaleidoscopes, Emerging Patterns of Response and Action in ECIA Case Studies of Chapter 2 in Selected States. Washington, D.C.: E.H. White and Company, July 1983.
- Kyle, R. M. J. Kaleidoscopes II: The Implementation and Impact of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act in Nine Selected States, Washington, DC: E. H. White and Company, 1985.
- Levin, H. M. "Categorical Grants in Education: Rethinking the Federal Role." Policy Perspectives. Stanford University, CA: Institute for Research on Finance and Governance, Spring, 1981.
- Levin, H. M. and M. C. Tsang. Federal Grants and National Educational Policy. Stanford University, CA: Institute for Research and Educational Finance and Governance, Report No.82-A18, 1982.
- Long, J. and P. De Vito. "The Impact of Chapter 2, ECIA on One State: A Case Analysis". Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.: April 23-27, 1984.

- Mandal, D. "Doing more with less? The response of the states to the new federalism on intergovernmental relations in education." A Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Montreal, Canada, 1983.
- Mandel, D. "ECIA Chapter 2 Education's First Taste of the New Federalism." Education and Urban Society vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 29-43, November, 1983.
- McDonnell, L., and M. W. McLaughlin, Program Consolidation and the States' Role in ESEA Title IV. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1980.
- McKee, S. Results of the Fifty-State Survey of the ESEA IV-B Program. Washington, DC: National Association of State Educational Media Professionals and the National Audio-Visual Associations, 1976.
- McLaughlin, M. W. "States and the New Federalism," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 52, No.4, pp. 564-583, November 1982.
- National Committee For Citizens In Education (NCCE). "Chapter 2 A Bonanza For Private Schools". Columbia, MD: National Committee For Citizens In Education, 1984.
- National School Boards Association (NSBA). The Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981: A Manual for Local Policy Makers and Administrators. Washington, DC: National School Boards Association, 1981.
- Nathan, R. P., and F. C. Doolittle. The Consequences of Cuts: The Effects of the Reagan Domestic Program on State and Local Governments. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Urban and Regional Research Center, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University, 1983.
- Nehrt, R. C. Private Schools in American Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, January, 1981.
- O'Hara, P. "End of federal role seen: Education block grants meet stiff opposition." Congressional Weekly, pp.1005-1008, June 6, 1981.
- Osborn, S. Block Grants: An Approach To Restructuring The Federal Aid System. Congressional Research Service, Washington, DC: Library of Congress, February 25, 1981.
- Palmer and Sawhill, 1982.
- Perilla, A. and L. S. Orum. Community Access to Information on Education: A Case Study of the Education Block Grant. Washington, DC: National Council of La Raza, 1984.

- Quattlebaum, C. A. "Federal Educational Policies, Programs, and Proposals: A Survey and Handbook", Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1968.
- Reagan, R. "American's New Beginning: A Program for Economic Recovery." Washington, DC: U. S. President, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1981.
- Rezmovic, V. and J. W. Keesling. Paperwork and Administrative Burden for School Districts Under Title I. McLean, VA: Advanced Technology, 1982.
- Rossman, G. B., H. D. Corbett, and J. A. Dawson. Intentions and Impacts: A Comparison of Sources of Influence on Local School Systems. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1984.
- Simms, M. The Impact of Changes in Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 1985.
- Silverstein, R. and S. McMullan. The Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981: Its Meaning for State and Local Policymakers and Administrators. Washington, DC: National Association of State Boards of Education, 1981.
- Stedman, J. B. The Consolidation of the Emergency School Act--A Brief Analysis of its Impact. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, Education and Public Welfare Division, 1982.
- Stedman, J. B. "The impact of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 on activities that have been funded under the Emergency School Aid Act." Hearings before the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary--House of Representatives. Washington, DC: 1982.
- Turnbull, B. J. "Promises and Prospects of Education Program Consolidation at the Federal Level." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 21-23, 1981.
- Turnbull, B.J. "Local Decision Making," in M.S. Knapp, M.S. Stearns, B.J. Turnbull, J.L. David, and S.M. Peterson. Cumulative Effects of Federal Education Policies on Schools and Districts, Menlo Park, CA: SRI International, January 1983.
- Turnbull, B. and E. Marks. The Education Block Grant and Intergovernmental Relations: Effects at the Local Level. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International, 1986.
- U. S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Block Grants: A Comparative Analysis. Report A-60. Washington, DC: 1977.

- U. S. General Accounting Office (GAO). Lessons Learned From Past Block Grants: Implementations For Congressional Oversight. Washington, DC: The General Accounting Office, 1984.
 - U. S. General Accounting Office (GAO). Education Block Grant Alters State Role and Provides Greater Local Discretion. Washington, DC: The General Accounting Office, November, 1984.
 - U. S. Department of Education. "Annual Evaluation Report: ECIA Chapter 2 Block Grant." Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation (OPBE), 1983.
 - U. S. Department of Education. Program Consolidation and the State Role in ESEA Title IV. Washington, DC: Office of Program Evaluation, August, 1980.
 - U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Office of Evaluation and Dissemination. Annual Evaluation Report on Programs Administered by the U. S. Office of Education. Washington, DC: 1979.
 - U. S. Office of Inspector General (OIG). Report on Audit of the Implementation and Administration of Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act at the Kansas State Department of Education, Topeka, Kansas. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Inspector General, June 1983.
- Verstegen, D. A. The Great Society Meets a New Federalism: Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin, August, 1983.
- Yeakey, C. C. Block Grants and Public Schooling Implications for Educational Policy and Decision-Making." Educational Horizons vol. 61, pp. 18-24, Fall 1982.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY OF CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

School District Name : _____

Survey Respondent's Name : _____
 Title: _____ Phone: () _____

(NOTE: ALL information will be kept confidential.)

PART A: CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Indicate whether your district has less flexibility, about the same flexibility, or more flexibility to establish and implement programs under Chapter 2 compared with each of the following funding sources. (PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH PROGRAM)

Compared with:	Flexibility under Chapter 2			Did not Have Program	Not Sure
	Less	About the Same	More		
A. School Library Resources (Title IV-B, ESEA)	1	2	3	4	9
B. Support & Innovation (Title IV-C, ESEA)	1	2	3	4	9
C. Emergency School Aid (Title VI, ESEA)(ESAA)	1	2	3	4	9
D. Career Education (Career Education Incentive Act)	1	2	3	4	9
E. Other programs consolidated into Chapter 2	1	2	3	4	9
_____	1	2	3	4	9
F. Regular district education funds	1	2	3	4	9

Please indicate whether district programs supported by each of the following antecedent funding sources have remained: (1) the same; (2) increased; (3) decreased; (4) been redefined; or, (5) been eliminated because of Chapter 2.

Antecedent Program	Stayed the					Didn't have Program in 1981-82	Don't Know
	Same	Increased	Decreased	Redefined	Eliminated		
A. School Library Resources (Title IV-B, ESEA)	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
B. Support & Innovation (Title IV-C, ESEA)	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
C. Emergency School Aid (Title VI, ESEA)(ESAA)	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
D. Career Education (Career Education Incentive Act)	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
E. Other programs consolidated into Chapter 2	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6	9

Who has had a very important role in selecting the purposes for which Chapter 2 funds have been used?

(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

- | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 01 State Department of Education | 07 School board members | |
| 02 District superintendent | 08 Principals | 12 Students |
| 03 Associate superintendent | 09 Teachers | 13 Parents |
| 04 Assistant superintendent | 10 Librarian or | 14 Local civic groups |
| 05 Chapter 2 coordinator | Media Specialists | 15 Local businesses |
| 06 Other district administrators | 11 Teachers Union | 16 Other community members |
| | 17 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) _____ | |
| | 99 Not Sure | |

What factors have influenced how your district has used Chapter 2 funds?

(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 01 Desire to continue programs funded by antecedent programs | 06 Preferences of key district personnel |
| 02 Unanticipated critical needs | 07 Pressure from the local community |
| 03 Existing district priorities | 08 Recommendations in national reform reports |
| 04 New district priorities created due to Chapter 2 funding | 09 Recommendations in state reform reports |
| 05 Other ongoing programs that needed additional support | 10 State mandates or priorities |
| | 11 Interpretation of Chapter 2 regulations |
| | 12 The amount of money received |
| | 13 Meet accreditation standards |
| 99 Not Sure | 14 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) _____ |

Did you assess the needs of the students before deciding on what program activities would be supported with Chapter 2 funds? Yes No

If so, how often ?

Briefly describe the process:

How often did the State Department of Education provide technical assistance for your Chapter 2 program activities in 1984-85?

- | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------|
| 01 No Technical Assistance | 03 Twice |
| 02 Once | 04 Three or more times |

What types of assistance did they provide?

- | | |
|--|---|
| 01 Proposal development | 05 Recommended consultants |
| 02 Proposal review & critique | 06 Instructions on Federal Guidelines |
| 03 Budget development | 07 Assistance with completing application |
| 04 Consulting service for program design | 08 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) _____ |

Which of the following statements best describe your district's relationship to the State Department Of Education concerning Chapter 2?

(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

"Mississippi State Department of Education . . ."

- | | |
|---|--|
| 01 Is more oriented to helping than checking up. | 07 Has been concerned with the educational services delivered. |
| 02 Is more oriented to checking up than helping. | 08 Has acted on our suggestions. |
| 03 Has taken a "hands off" approach. | 09 Has not responded to our suggestions. |
| 04 Has taken a directive approach. | 10 Administers Chapter 2 the same as other federal programs. |
| 05 Has helped resolve the mechanics of the Chapter 2 program. | 11 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) _____ |
| 06 Has not helped resolve the mechanics of the Chapter 2 program. | 99 Not sure |

How often did the U. S. Department of Education inquire about your Chapter 2 program activities in 1984-85?

- 01 No inquiry
02 Once
03 Twice
04 Three or more times

What was the essence of their inquiry?

In the current school year, what types of students are being served by Chapter 2 program activities? (PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

- 01 Gifted and Talented
02 Dropouts/Potential dropouts
03 Economically/educationally disadvantaged students
04 Handicapped
05 Limited English Speaking
06 Migrants
07 Refugees/Immigrants
08 Students participating in desegregation
09 "Average" students
10 Other (Please Specify) _____

Listed below are measures used to evaluate Chapter 2 program activities. (PLEASE CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH MEASURE.)

	Not Used	Used Very Little	Used Sometimes	Used Often	Don't Know
Self-evaluation required by SDE	0	1	2	3	9
Measures of student performances	0	1	2	3	9
Data on student usage	0	1	2	3	9
Feedback from students	0	1	2	3	9
Feedback from teachers	0	1	2	3	9
Feedback from Media Spec./Librarian	0	1	2	3	9
Classroom observations	0	1	2	3	9
A formal evaluation of the program	0	1	2	3	9
Chapter 2 Coordinator's professional opinion	0	1	2	3	9
Other _____	0	1	2	3	9

How essential to the academic program has Chapter 2 funding been? (PLEASE CIRCLE ONLY ONE RESPONSE)

- 01 Very critical 03 Critical 02 Somewhat critical 04 Not at all critical

PART B: LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT PROVISIONS FOR PRIVATE SCHOOL PARTICIPATION IN CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

What accounts for the fact that private schools in your district's boundaries are not participating in Chapter 2 services?

(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

00 Does not apply

"Some private schools . . ."

- 01 Are opposed philosophically
02 Don't want the strings of the Federal Government
03 Don't want the administrative burden
04 Don't want offered services
05 Feel the funds are too small to make it worthwhile
06 Were informed about Chapter 2 too late
07 Our district has not been able to reach all private schools
08 Our district has not encouraged private school participation
09 The state has not encouraged private school participation
10 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) _____

IF THERE ARE NO PRIVATE SCHOOLS PARTICIPATING IN CHAPTER 2
DO NOT ANSWER PAGE FOUR

What must a private school do to receive Chapter 2 services?

How are Chapter 2 funds allocated to serve private school students?

- 01 Per pupil basis, calculated only on participating private school enrollment
 02 Formula basis, calculated on need or high cost factors
 03 Per pupil basis, calculated on total district private school enrollment
 04 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) _____

Are fewer, the same, or more private schools in your district participating in Chapter 2 activities in the current school year than participated in federally funded programs in the 1980-81 school year?

- 01 Fewer 02 The same 03 More 04 Don't know

Who decides what services/materials are to be provided private school students? (PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

- 01 Public School Superintendent 05 Private School Headmaster
 02 Chapter 2 Coordinator 06 Private School Librarian
 03 Public School Librarian 07 Other Private School Personnel _____
 04 Other Public School Personnel _____

What Services/Materials are provided to private school students with Chapter 2 resources? (PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

- 01 Instructional programs for students 06 Computers: hardware/software 10 Personnel _____
 02 Library/Media center support 07 Audiovisual equipment _____
 03 Textbooks 08 Curriculum development _____
 04 Administrative services 09 Other instructional materials or equipment
 05 Student support services for particular curricular areas _____
 (e.g., counseling, testing) _____

What limitations did your district place on the use of Chapter 2 resources by private schools? (PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

- 00 Does not apply; did not limit private schools in their use of Chapter 2 resources

"Chapter 2 resources could . . ."

- 01 not pay for personnel 05 only be used for secular purposes
 02 not be used for textbooks 06 only be used for same things as former federal programs
 03 not be used for equipment 07 only be used for the same things as public schools
 04 not be used for materials 08 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY) _____

IF YOU HAVE ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO MAKE ABOUT CHAPTER 2
 PLEASE FEEL FREE TO MAKE THEM.

APPENDIX B

THE MISSISSIPPI EDUCATION SYSTEM

Five aspects of the schools in the state of Mississippi during the 1984-85 school year are described: (1) LEA School Enrollment; (2) LEA School Revenue; (3) LEA Wealth Factor; (4) LEA Ad Valorem Tax Base; and, (5) LEA Expenditure.

LEA School Enrollment

For the purpose of the study, school size refers to the average daily attendance (ADA) of the school districts. The Mississippi school districts are divided into three categories according to average daily attendance: Small (ADA range of 226 - 1,499); Medium (ADA range of 1,500 - 3,299); and, Large (ADA range of 3,300-27,218).

During the 1984-85 school year there were 154 LEAs in Mississippi ranging in size from 226 to 27,218 with an average size of 2,817. Ninety percent of all LEAs were between 1,000 and 9,000 with 74% between 1,500 and 3,299. The two largest school districts were 10,842 and 27,218 in size. The frequency of the school districts by size (ADA) is shown in Table 3.2.

The state of Mississippi was comprised of 1,059 schools serving 466,059 pupils in 154 school districts. As shown in Table 3.3, the 154 school districts were divided into 68 county school districts, 28 consolidated school districts, 53 municipal separate school districts, and five special municipal school districts. Table 3.4 provides the distribution of elementary and secondary schools by average daily attendance. There were 616 (58%) elementary schools and 443 (41.8%) secondary schools, of which 75 were vocational-technical schools.

TABLE 3.2

MISSISSIPPI SCHOOL DISTRICTS
BY AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE
(1984-85)

Range In ADA	N	Percent
Small		
226 - 1,499	40	26.0
Medium		
1,500 - 3,299	74	48.0
Large		
3,300 - 27,218	40	26.0
Total:	154	100.0
Mean		Std. Dev.
2,817.42		2,677.75

Note. From Superintendent's Annual Report
(1984-85), Mississippi State Department
Of Education

Over 70% (433) of the elementary schools had fewer than 500 students in average daily attendance (ADA) with three percent (19) having under 100. There were only ten (1.6%) elementary schools enrolling more than 1000 students.

Fifty-two percent (188) of the secondary schools had between 100 and 500 students. Thirty-eight percent (141) had between 500 and 1000 students, while 1% (12) had less than 100 students and 7% (27) had over 1000. In short, during the 1984-85 school year, the student population in Mississippi was almost evenly divided between elementary and secondary students and they attended relatively small schools (See Tables 3.4 and 3.5).

TABLE 3.3
 AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE BY
 TYPE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT IN MISSISSIPPI
 (1984-85)

Average Daily Attendance	County Districts	Consolidated Districts	Municipal Separate Districts	Special Municipal Districts	Total
Above 25,000			1		1
11,000 - 11,999					
10,000 - 10,999	1				1
9,000 - 9,999	1				1
8,000 - 8,999	1				1
7,000 - 7,999	1		2		3
6,000 - 6,999			1		1
5,000 - 5,999	3		5	1	9
4,000 - 4,999	4	1	2		7
3,000 - 3,999	9	1	15		25
2,000 - 2,999	22	4	5		31
1,000 - 1,999	23	15	19	3	60
500 - 999	2	6	3	1	12
0 - 499	1	1			2
Total	68	28	53	5	154

Note. From Superintendent's Annual Report (1984-85),
 Mississippi State Department Of Education

TABLE 3.4
 AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE FOR
 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN MISSISSIPPI
 (1984-85)

Average Daily Attendance	Elementary			Secondary			Total ADA		
	N	% of Total	Cum %	N	% of Total	Cum %	N	% of Total	Cum %
1 - 24	5	.8	.3	1	.2	.2	6	.6	.5
25 - 49	4	.7	1.5	2	.5	.7	6	.6	1.2
50 - 99	10	1.6	3.1	9	2.0	2.7	19	1.7	2.9
100 - 299	209	33.9	37.0	92	20.8	23.5	301	28.4	31.3
300 - 499	205	33.3	70.3	96	21.7	45.2	301	28.4	59.7
500 - 999	173	28.1	98.4	141	31.8	77.0	314	29.6	89.3
1000 - 1499	10	1.6	100.0	25	5.6	82.6	35	3.3	92.6
1500 - 1999				2	.5	83.1	2	.2	92.8
Vocational-Technical				75	16.9	100.0	75	7.1	100.0
==Total	616			443			1059		
	(58.2%)			(41.8%)			(100.0%)		

Note. From Superintendent's Annual Report (1984-85),
 Mississippi State Department Of Education

TABLE 3.5
 TOTAL SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND
 AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE
 BY TYPE OF SCHOOL
 IN MISSISSIPPI
 (1984-85)

	Total Fall 1984 Enrollment	Average Daily Attendance
Kindergarten & Pre-Kindergarten	7,010	N/A
Total Elementary	244,486	229,032
Total Secondary	221,573	206,555
Total Enrollment	466,059	435,587

Note. From Superintendent's Annual Report (1984-85),
 Mississippi State Department Of Education

LEA School Revenue

The total general funds available for the state of Mississippi in 1984-1985 were \$1,372,349,677. Of this amount 40.76%, or \$559,383,356, was appropriated for public elementary and secondary education. The total revenue from all sources (i.e. local, state, and federal contribution) for the 1984-85 school year was \$882,815,813. The local revenue included Ad Valorem Tax funds and tax funds for bonded indebtedness. The state revenue included textbook allocation but did not include school food service or student activity revenues.

The sources of revenue for LEAs were distributed quite unevenly, as indicated in Table 3.6. The median local contribution was 20.1%, with some LEAs contributing as little as 7.6% and others contributing as much as 71.7%. The figures are similar for the state's contribution. The state contributed as little as 20% and as much as 81.7% with a median contribution of 67.1%. As would be expected, the federal contribution was the smallest. The median contribution was 11.6% with a range of 4.4% to 26.2%.

TABLE 3.6
 PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOL REVENUE FOR LEAS
 DERIVED FROM LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL SOURCES
 FOR THE 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

	Percent Of Local Revenue	Percent Of State Revenue	Percent Of Federal Revenue	Total Revenue (\$)
Local Contribution				
Minimum	7.6	74.9	17.5	3,056,298
Median	20.1	72.8	7.1	1,947,695
Maximum	71.7	20.0	8.3	7,251,658
State Contribution				
Minimum	71.7	20.0	8.3	7,251,658
Median	23.5	67.1	9.4	3,622,989
Maximum	8.1	81.7	10.2	1,803,170
Federal Contribution				
Minimum	26.5	69.1	4.4	6,197,902
Median	20.5	68.9	11.6	4,689,791
Maximum	14.5	59.3	26.2	1,995,027

Note. N=154

From Superintendent's Annual Report. (1984-85).
 Mississippi State Department Of Education

LEA Wealth Factor

The wealth of the school districts was calculated by dividing the assessed value of a district by the number of students whose residence was within the district. This is referred to as the Ability Per-pupil Unit (APU). The 154 LEAs were divided into three categories: Least Wealthy (APU range of 4,000 to 13,999); Moderately Wealthy (APU range of 14,000 to 19,999); and, Wealthiest (APU range of 20,000 to 198,664). With the exception of the LEA with the highest APU, 198,664, the districts were normally distributed with 90% between 10,000 APU and 50,000 APU. The frequency of the school districts by wealth (APU) is shown in Table 3.7.

TABLE 3.6

PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOL REVENUE FOR LEAS
DERIVED FROM LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL SOURCES
FOR THE 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

	Percent Of Local Revenue	Percent Of State Revenue	Percent Of Federal Revenue	Total Revenue (\$)
Local				
Contribution				
Minimum	7.6	74.9	17.5	3,056,298
Median	20.1	72.8	7.1	1,947,695
Maximum	71.7	20.0	8.3	7,251,658
State				
Contribution				
Minimum	71.7	20.0	8.3	7,251,658
Median	23.5	67.1	9.4	3,622,989
Maximum	8.1	81.7	10.2	1,803,170
Federal				
Contribution				
Minimum	26.5	69.1	4.4	6,197,902
Median	20.5	68.9	11.6	4,689,791
Maximum	14.5	59.3	26.2	1,995,027

Note. N=154

From Superintendent's Annual Report. (1984-85).
Mississippi State Department Of Education

LEA Wealth Factor

The wealth of the school districts was calculated by dividing the assessed value of a district by the number of students whose residence was within the district. This is referred to as the Ability Per-pupil Unit (APU). The 154 LEAs were divided into three categories: Least Wealthy (APU range of 4,000 to 13,999); Moderately Wealthy (APU range of 14,000 to 19,999); and, Wealthiest (APU range of 20,000 to 198,664). With the exception of the LEA with the highest APU, 198,664, the districts were normally distributed with 90% between 10,000 APU and 50,000 APU. The frequency of the school districts by wealth (APU) is shown in Table 3.7.

The mean wealth (APU) of the school districts was 18,595.69. The district with the smallest wealth factor was 4,009.60 APU with an average daily attendance of 1,226. The district with the largest wealth factor was 198,664.86 with an average daily attendance of 1,795 (See Table 3.7).

TABLE 3.7

Mississippi School Districts By Wealth
As Measured By Average Per-Pupil Unit
(1984-85)

Range In APU	N	Percent
Least Wealthy 4,000 - 13,999	46	29.9
Moderately Wealthy 14,000 - 19,999	74	48.0
Wealthiest 20,000 - 198,664	34	22.1
Total:	154	100.0
Mean		Std. Dev.
18,595.69		16,454.33

Note. From Superintendent's Annual Report (1984-85), Mississippi State Department Of Education

LEA Ad Valorem Tax Base

The ad valorem tax figure was the actual amount of taxes collected as reported in the Mississippi Department of Education's Superintendent's Annual Report for 1984-85. The mean Ad Valorem tax factor per school district was \$327.37 with a minimum of \$68.65 and a maximum of \$2,695.31 (See Table 3.8).

TABLE 3.8
AD VALOREM TAX FOR
MISSISSIPPI SCHOOL DISTRICTS
(1984-85)

	Ad Valorem Tax
Median	327.37
Minimum	68.65
Maximum	2695.31

Note. N=154
From Superintendent's Annual Report. (1984-85)
Mississippi State Department Of Education

LEA Expenditure

School expenditure was divided into three categories: (1) Average Expenditure Per Pupil In Average Daily Attendance (2) Average Current Expenditure Per Pupil For Instructional Cost In Average Daily Attendance; and, (3) Average Expenditure Per Pupil In Average Daily Attendance Less Transportation. The instructional cost per-pupil ranged from \$966.38 to \$2,066.37, while the total per-pupil expenditure ranged between \$1,457.55 and \$4,085.75 (See Table 3.9).

TABLE 3.9
PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE
FOR LEAS IN MISSISSIPPI
(1984-85)

	AVERAGE EXPENDITURE PER PUPIL IN ADA	AVERAGE EXPENDITURE PER PUPIL FOR INSTRUCTIONAL COST IN ADA	AVERAGE EXPENDITURE PER PUPIL IN ADA LESS TRANSPORTATION
Mean	\$1,965.75	\$1,261.09	\$1,842.94
Minimum	1,457.55	966.38	1,341.92
Maximum	4,085.75	2,066.37	3,799.88

Note. N=154

From Superintendent's Annual Report. (1984-85).
Mississippi State Department Of Education

**ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS
IN MISSISSIPPI**

As described earlier in this study, forty-two federal categorical programs were consolidated into Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981. The local school districts in Mississippi participated in only eight of these antecedent programs with a total expenditure of \$14,824,259 in the 1980-81 school year (See Table 3.10). Over ninety percent of the annual expenditure was used to support three programs: ESEA Title IV-B, Library Support (25.6%); Emergency School Aid Act (22%); and, ESEA Title II, Criminal Justice (43.8%). Other programs that were funded included: Teacher Corps (2.9%); Gifted and Talented (0.8%); Career Education (0.7%); Basic Skills (4%); and, ESEA, Title IV, Part C, Innovative Practices (0.2%).

All but seven LEAs received funds from ESEA Title IV-B, Library Support (P.L. 95-561). The purpose of this program was to assist local schools in the acquisition of books, materials, library resources and instructional equipment. The total expenditure of all the LEAs in the state was \$3,796,508. The smallest expenditure was \$1,724 and the largest was \$111,444 with a median expenditure of \$19,020.

The Mississippi State Department of Education received a population-based allocation from a specific appropriation as determined by the Career Education Incentive Act (P.L. 95-207) to provide funds to LEAs to demonstrate effective educational techniques of career education at the elementary and secondary school levels. In 1980-81 the state received \$99,271 and distributed these funds to thirty-nine LEAs. The median funding level was \$1,885 and the mean level was \$2,545 with a range of \$100 to \$7,600.

Twenty-six LEAs received support for ESEA Title IX-A, the Gifted and Talented Program. This program provided funds to plan, develop, operate and improve programs to meet the needs of gifted and talented children. Gifted and talented children were defined as those with high general academic averages, those with high achievement in particular areas, and those who demonstrated leadership potential or the potential to accelerate in a particular academic area. The Gifted and Talented programs in Mississippi ranged from \$925 to \$32,641 with a median funding level of \$3,175 and a mean level of \$7,242.

The antecedent program receiving the third largest amount of funds in 1980-81 was ESAA Title VI - Emergency School Aid Act. The purpose of this program was to meet the special needs arising from the elimination of minority group segregation and discrimination and to facilitate the voluntary elimination, reduction, or prevention of minority group isolation in elementary and secondary schools with substantial proportions of minority students. Only seventeen LEAs received ESAA funds in 1980-81 with a total expenditure of \$3,265,404. The median LEA expenditure was \$133,633 with a minimum of \$3,519 and a maximum of \$797,394. The mean expenditure was \$192,082.

Seven LEAs received funding for ESEA, Title IV, Part C, Innovative Practices. The seven programs ranged in funding levels from \$2,250 to \$6,761 with a median funding level of \$3000 and a mean level of \$3,542.

Seven local school districts received \$588,431 from ESEA Title II, Basic Skills Improvement for programs to improve student achievement in reading, mathematics, and oral and written communication skills. These seven programs ranged from \$100 to \$540,843 with a median of \$7,700 and a mean of \$84,061.

**ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS
IN MISSISSIPPI**

As described earlier in this study, forty-two federal categorical programs were consolidated into Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981. The local school districts in Mississippi participated in only eight of these antecedent programs with a total expenditure of \$14,824,259 in the 1980-81 school year (See Table 3.10). Over ninety percent of the annual expenditure was used to support three programs: ESEA Title IV-B, Library Support (25.6%); Emergency School Aid Act (22%); and, ESEA Title II, Criminal Justice (43.8%). Other programs that were funded included: Teacher Corps (2.9%); Gifted and Talented (0.8%); Career Education (0.7%); Basic Skills (4%); and, ESEA, Title IV, Part C, Innovative Practices (0.2%).

All but seven LEAs received funds from ESEA Title IV-B, Library Support (P.L. 95-561). The purpose of this program was to assist local schools in the acquisition of books, materials, library resources and instructional equipment. The total expenditure of all the LEAs in the state was \$3,796,508. The smallest expenditure was \$1,724 and the largest was \$111,444 with a median expenditure of \$19,020.

The Mississippi State Department of Education received a population-based allocation from a specific appropriation as determined by the Career Education Incentive Act (P.L. 95-207) to provide funds to LEAs to demonstrate effective educational techniques of career education at the elementary and secondary school levels. In 1980-81 the state received \$99,271 and distributed these funds to thirty-nine LEAs. The median funding level was \$1,885 and the mean level was \$2,545 with a range of \$100 to \$7,600.

Teacher Corps was funded in five school districts with a minimum of \$18,837, a maximum of \$141,975, a mean expenditure of \$85,861, and a median expenditure of \$86,188. Teacher Corps was a program in which the LEA and a higher education institution worked cooperatively to improve teaching. When the antecedent programs were consolidated into Chapter 2 this was one of the programs not included on the "approved" list supported by the Mississippi State Department of Education; consequently, support was not continued under Chapter 2.

Four LEAs received funds for ESEA, Title III Special Project, Criminal Justice. The three Criminal Justice programs were funded at \$16,266, \$18,441, \$26,781 and, \$6,435,507.

In sum, LEAs in Mississippi received funds in 1980-81 from eight federal programs with a state total of \$14,824,259. The participation rate varied from 147 of the 154 LEAs receiving funds from ESEA, Title IV-B (Library Support), which accounted for 26% of the state funding, to 4 LEAs receiving funds from ESEA, Title III (Criminal Justice), which accounted for over 40% of the total state funding. With respect to the size of program awards (i.e. amount of funds received), the largest awards went to LEAs receiving ESAA Title VI (Desegregation Assistance) grants with an average grant of \$192,082. The smallest awards went to LEAs supporting ESEA, Title IV-C (Innovative Practices) with an average award of \$3,542. Further, over 90% of the total antecedent funds went to support three programs: ESEA, Title III (43.8%); ESEA, Title IV-B (25.6%); and, ESAA, Title VI (22%), leaving 8.6% for the remaining four programs.

TABLE 3.10
EIGHT ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS AND RESPECTIVE
EXPENDITURE LEVELS IN MISSISSIPPI
(1980-81)

Antecedent Program By Title of ECIA Subchapters (Purpose)	N	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Total amount	Percentage
						expended by districts in 1980-81	of total antecedent program funding in 1980-81
SUBCHAPTER A							
ESEA, Title II (Basic Skills Improvement)	7	\$84,061	\$7,700	\$100	\$540,843	\$588,431	4.0
SUBCHAPTER B							
ESEA, Title IV-B (Library Support)	147	25,827	19,020	1,724	111,444	3,796,508	25.6
ESAA* (Desegregation Assistance)	17	192,082	133,633	3,519	797,394	3,265,404	22.0
ESEA, Title IV-C (Innovative Practices)	7	3,542	3,000	2,250	6,761	24,796	0.2
Teacher Corps** (Collaborative Staff Development)	5	85,861	86,188	18,837	141,975	429,306	2.9
SUBCHAPTER C							
Career Education (Introduction to the world of work)	39	2,545	1,885	100	7,600	99,271	0.7
ESEA, Title IX-A (Gifted & Talented)	26	7,242	3,175	925	32,641	123,548	0.8
ESEA, Title III (Criminal Justice)	4	1,624,248	22,611	16,266	6,435,507	6,496,995	43.8
Total Of All Programs						\$14,824,259	100.0

Note: * Subsequently ESEA, Title VI

An approximately equivalent amount was received by institutions of higher education to support their portion of Teacher Corps activities. From Superintendent's Annual Report (1980-81) and data provided by Mississippi State Department Of Education, Division of Administration and Finance.

Distribution Of Antecedent Programs

The antecedent programs were distributed widely across 147 of the 154 LEAs in Mississippi. The number of programs a district received ranged from 0 to 6 (See Table 3.11). Seven LEAs did not receive any antecedent programs. Listed below is the distribution of LEAs that received antecedent programs in 1980-81: 79 LEAs or 51.3% received funds from only one antecedent program; 45 LEAs or 29.2% received funds from two antecedent programs; 13 LEAs or 8.4% received funds from three antecedent programs; 7 LEAs or 4.5% received funds from four antecedent programs; 2 LEAs or 1.3% received funds from five antecedent programs; and 1 LEA or .6% received funds from six antecedent programs.

TABLE 3.11

NUMBER OF ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS
FUNDED IN MISSISSIPPI SCHOOL DISTRICTS
(1980-81)

Number Of Different Programs	Number Of Participating Districts	Percent Of Participating Districts
0	7	4.5
1	79	51.3
2	45	29.2
3	9	8.4
4	3	4.5
5	2	1.3
6	1	.6
TOTAL	154	100.0
Mean	Std. Dev.	
1.64	1.026	

Note. From Superintendent's Annual Report (1980-81), and Mississippi State Department Of Education, Division of Administration and Finance.

Categories Of Antecedent Programs

For the purpose of this study the antecedent programs were divided into three categories based on the amount of total antecedent program funds received by each LEA in 1980-81. The categories were: Small (0 through \$13,999); Medium (\$14,000 through \$29,999); and, Large (\$30,000 through \$7,022,379). The category for the small programs included 51 LEAs, 7 of which did not receive any antecedent funds in 1980-81. The maximum amount received was \$13,766 with a median of \$7,658 and a sum of \$372,191. The category for the medium size programs included 49 LEAs ranging from \$14,028 to \$29,932 with a median of \$20,717 and a sum of \$1,035,969. The category for the large size programs included 54 LEAs with a minimum of \$30,269 and a maximum of \$7,022,379. Only one LEA exceeded \$944,631. The median for this category was \$63,312 and the sum for the category was \$13,416,099.

TABLE 3.12

ANTECEDENT PROGRAM FUNDS BY CATEGORY
OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN MISSISSIPPI
(1980-81)

Category For				Frequency	Percent	Cum
Antecedent Program Funds						Percent
<u>SMALL</u>						
0	THROUGH	\$13,999	51	33.1	25.4	
MEDIAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	SUM			
\$7,658	\$0	\$13,766	\$372,191			
<u>MEDIUM</u>						
\$14,000	THROUGH	\$29,999	49	31.8	64.9	
MEDIAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	SUM			
\$20,717	\$14,028	\$29,932	\$1,035,969			
<u>LARGE</u>						
\$30,000	THROUGH	\$7,022,379	54	35.1	100.0	
MEDIAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	SUM			
\$63,312	\$30,269	\$7,022,379	\$13,416,099			
TOTAL				154	100.0	

Note. From Superintendent's Annual Report (1980-81),
and Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Administration and Finance.

Antecedent Programs By Size Of District

The total antecedent program funds received by the LEAs were crosstabulated by the size of the districts (ADA Small, Medium, and Large). There was not a significant difference in the distribution of funds by size of district; however, as shown in Table 3.13, there were some interesting differences. Smaller districts received a total amount of antecedent program funds in all three categories (e.g. small, medium, and large), while no large district received total antecedent program funds in the small category. More school districts in the medium size category received a total amount of funds in all three funding categories than either the small or the large size districts. In fact, almost half (48%) of the funds went to medium size districts with almost half (49%) of these districts being in the medium size category. The largest districts received funds in the medium and large funding categories with sixty-five percent receiving funds in the medium amount category. In short, smaller districts received funds in all three categories with more LEAs receiving funds in the medium category; the greatest number of LEAs were medium size districts receiving funds in the medium category; and, the largest districts received funds in the medium and large categories with most (65%) receiving funds in the medium category.

TABLE 3.13
 TOTAL ANTECEDENT PROGRAM FUNDS
 ACCORDING TO SIZE^a OF LEA

Total Antecedent Program Funds					
SIZE ^a	Count Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	SMALL	MEDIUM	LARGE ^b	Row Total
		0 - \$13,999	\$14,000 29,999	\$30,000- 7,022,379	
SMALL 226 TO 1,499	17 42.5 43.6 11.0	18 45.0 22.5 11.7	5 12.5 14.3 3.2	40 26.0	
MEDIUM 1,500 TO 3,299	22 29.7 56.4 14.3	36 48.6 45.0 23.4	16 21.6 45.7 10.4	74 48.1	
LARGE 3,300 TO 27,218		26 65.0 32.5 16.9	14 35.0 40.0 9.1	40 26.0	
Column Total	39 25.3	80 51.9	35 22.7	154 100.0	

Df=4 a=.05

Chi-Squire=6.39 (NS)
 Critical Value=21.71

Note. From Superintendent's Annual Report (1980-81),
 and Mississippi State Department Of Education,
 Division of Administration and Finance.

^aSize is expressed in Average Daily Attendance (ADA)

^bThe next to the largest amount was \$944,631

Antecedent Programs By Wealth Of District

A comparison of the distribution of the total antecedent program funds to the wealth (APU: Least Wealthy, Moderately Wealthy, and Wealthiest) of the districts is presented in Table 3.14. When looking at the distribution of the total antecedent program funds across the least wealthy districts, more districts (19) received funds in the smallest category than in either the medium (14) or large (13) categories. The distribution of funds among the moderately wealthy LEAs was more evenly distributed, with 26 LEAs in the smallest category and 24 in the medium and large categories respectively. The distribution of the total antecedent program funds across the wealthiest school districts was skewed towards those districts receiving the largest amount of funds. Seventeen LEAs were in the largest category, 11 in the moderate size category, and 6 in the smallest category.

In short, the distribution of the total antecedent program funds received by LEAs in Mississippi was not significantly influenced by the wealth of the school district. Fewer districts in the least wealthy category (13), however, received large total antecedent program funds than districts in either the moderately wealthy (24) or wealthiest (17) categories. Fewer districts in the wealthiest category (6) received small total antecedent funds than districts in either the least wealthy (19) or moderately wealthy (26) categories.

TABLE 3.14
 TOTAL ANTECEDENT PROGRAM FUNDS
 ACCORDING TO WEALTH^a OF DISTRICT

Total Antecedent Program Funds					
WEALTH ^a	Count	SMALL	MEDIUM	LARGE ^b	Row Total
	Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	0 - \$13,999	\$14,000 29,999	\$30,000- 7,022,379	
LEAST WEALTHY 0 TO 13,999	19 41.3 37.3 12.3	14 30.4 28.6 9.1	13 28.3 24.1 8.4	46 29.9	
MODERATELY WEALTHY 14,000 TO 19,999	26 35.1 51.0 16.9	24 32.4 49.0 15.6	24 32.4 44.4 15.6	74 48.1	
WEALTHIEST 20,000 TO 198,000	6 17.6 11.8 3.9	11 32.4 22.4 7.1	17 50.0 31.5 11.0	34 22.0	
Column	51	49	54	154	

Df=4 a=.05

Chi-Squire=6.39 (NS)
Critical Value=17.78

Total	33.1	31.8	35.1	100.0
-------	------	------	------	-------

Note. From Superintendent's Annual Report (1980-81),
 and Mississippi State Department of Education,
 Division of Administration and Finance.

^aWealth is expressed in Ability Per-Pupil Unit (APU)

^bThe next to the largest amount was \$944,631

Antecedent Program Funds
Without ESEA, Title IV-B

As indicated earlier, ESEA, Title IV-B (e.g. Library Support) was the most widely distributed antecedent program, with 147 of the 154 LEAs receiving funds in 1980-81. Further, Title IV-B was the only antecedent program that was distributed on an entitlement basis. All other antecedent programs were competitive categorical programs. Therefore, a look at the distribution of the total antecedent programs without ESEA, Title IV-B was in order.

An analysis of the distribution of antecedent programs without ESEA, Title IV-B indicated that 44% (68) of the LEAs in Mississippi received funds for antecedent programs other than ESEA, Title IV-B in 1980-81, totaling \$11,027,751. The total funds received by each LEA ranged from \$100 to \$6,981,250 with only one district receiving funds totaling over one million dollars. The next largest amount was \$833,187. Eighty percent of the districts received less than \$10,000 with a median of \$4,863. The distribution of the total antecedent program funds by size and wealth of LEA is presented in Tables 3.15 and 3.16 respectively.

There was no significant difference in the distribution of the total antecedent program funds without ESEA, Title IV-B by either size or wealth. However, several observations can be made: There were fewer small districts (16) that received a total amount of antecedent program funds than either the medium (27) or large (25) districts. Likewise, there were fewer "least wealthy"

districts (11) that received a total amount of antecedent program funds than either the moderately wealthy (37) or wealthiest (20) districts. According to the wealth of district, there were more districts in the moderately wealthy category (16) than in either the least wealthy (4) or wealthiest (6) categories that received antecedent program funds in the small category. Also, moderately wealthy districts received more funds in the small category (16) than in either the medium (11) or large (10) categories.

TABLE 3.15

TOTAL ANTECEDENT PROGRAM FUNDS
WITHOUT ESEA, TITLE IV-B^a
ACCORDING TO SIZE^b OF DISTRICT

Total Antecedent Program Funds Without ESEA, Title VI-B Funds					
SIZE ^b	Count Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	SMALL	MEDIUM	LARGE ^c	Row Total
		0 - \$13,999	\$14,000 29,999	\$30,000- 7,022,379	
		6	7	3	16
SMALL		37.5	43.8	18.8	23.5
226 TO 1,499		23.1	29.2	16.7	
		8.8	10.3	4.4	
		10	9	8	27
MEDIUM		37.0	33.3	29.6	39.7
1,500 TO 3,299		38.5	37.5	44.4	
		14.7	13.2	11.8	
		10	8	7	25
LARGE		40.0	32.0	28.0	36.8
3,300 TO 27,218		38.5	33.3	38.9	
		14.7	11.8	10.3	
	Column	26	24	18	68
	Total	38.2	35.3	26.5	100.0

Note. From Superintendent's Annual Report (1980-81), and Mississippi State Department of Education, Division of Administration and Finance.

^aTitle IV-B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1978

^bSize is expressed in Average Daily Attendance (ADA)

^cThe next to the largest amount was \$944,631

TABLE 3.16
 TOTAL ANTECEDENT PROGRAM FUNDS
 WITHOUT ESEA, TITLE IV-B^a
 ACCORDING TO WEALTH^b OF DISTRICT

Total Antecedent Program Funds Without ESEA, Title VI-B Funds					
WEALTH ^b	Count	SMALL	MEDIUM	LARGE ^c	Row Total
	Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	0 - \$13,999	\$14,000 29,999	\$30,000- 7,022,379	
LEAST WEALTHY 0 TO 13,999	4 36.4 15.4 5.9	4 36.4 15.4 5.9	3 27.3 16.7 4.4	11 16.2	
MODERATELY WEALTHY 14,000 TO 19,999	16 43.2 61.5 23.5	11 29.7 45.8 16.2	10 27.0 55.6 14.7	37 54.4	
WEALTHIEST 20,000 TO 198,000	6 30.0 23.1 8.8	9 45.0 37.5 13.2	5 25.0 27.8 7.4	20 29.4	
Column Total	26 38.2	24 35.3	18 26.5	68 100.0	

Note. From Superintendent's Annual Report (1980-81),
 and Mississippi State Department Of Education,
 Division of Administration and Finance.

^aTitle IV-B of the Elementary and Secondary Education
 Act of 1978

^bWealth is expressed in Ability Per-Pupil Unit (APU)

^cThe next to the largest amount was \$944,631

In summary, there was not a significant difference in the distribution of the total antecedent program funds by size or wealth of school district. Although the distributions of certain individual antecedent programs, such as ESAA, Title VI, were significantly different by size and wealth, the distribution of the total antecedent programs was not significantly different by size or wealth of district. Further, when Title IV-B, the most widely distributed program, was controlled, there was still no significant difference by size or wealth of district. Thus, one may conclude that the size or wealth of a local school district did not significantly affect the distribution of the total antecedent program funds.

**CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES
IN MISSISSIPPI**

As stated in the Chapter 2, ECIA legislation (P.L. 97-35, Sec. 526), the State Education Agency (SEA) was responsible for the administration and allocation of Chapter 2 funds to the Local Education Agencies (LEAs). In Mississippi, the State Department of Education (MSDE) developed an application packet for LEAs to apply for Chapter 2 funds. As a part of the application packet, LEAs were asked to select, from among twenty-nine different categories, the activities in which they planned to expend Chapter 2 funds and the level of support for each activity. According to the State Department of Education's "Administrative Handbook" (MSDE, 1985):

The LEA has complete discretion in the expenditure of funds under any of the 30 former programs. However, the SEA 'strongly recommends' that old guidelines be followed. This recommendation is made to protect the LEAs in the event additional requirements should be forth coming.

The MSDE divided Chapter 2 expenditures into three broad categories: (Table 3.15)

- (1) Subchapter A - Basic Skills Development
- (2) Subchapter B - Educational Improvement & Support Services
- (3) Subchapter C - Special Projects

The total LEA Chapter 2 expenditure in 1985-86 was \$4,133,544. These funds were distributed quite unevenly across the three broad categories. One and a half percent (\$61,898) was spent in the general category of Basic Skills Development, 96% (\$3,983,886) in Educational Improvement and Support Services, and 2% (\$87,760) in Special Projects (See Table 3.17).

Included under Basic Skills Development (Subchapter A) were three program activities: (1) Reading; (2) Mathematics; and, (3) Written and Oral Communication. A total of twenty-six project activities were funded within these three areas: fifteen Reading program activities; nine Mathematics program activities; and, two Written and Oral Communication program activities. These activities were all relatively small, ranging from \$113 for a math activity to \$13,230 for a reading activity, with the median math activity being \$733 and the median reading activity \$2,023. The two Communication program activities were funded at \$980 and \$1000.

The Educational Improvement and Support Services (Subchapter B) included seven program activities:

- (1) Library/Media Materials;
- (2) Instructional Equipment;
- (3) Local Improvement Programs;
- (4) Programs To Support Minority Children;
- (5) Guidance/Counseling/Testing;
- (6) Improvement Of Planning & Management; and,
- (7) Teacher Training/In-Service.

Ninety-six percent of the total Chapter 2 funds were expended within Subchapter B with 89% expended in three categories: Library and Media Materials (25%), Instructional Equipment (28%), and Local Improvement Programs (36%). Further, 73% (112) of the LEAs supported at least one activity in the Library and Media Materials category; 70% (107) purchased instructional equipment; and, 42% (64) had a Local Improvements Program.

The program activities supported in the Library and Media Materials category were quite varied. They ranged from as small as \$500 to as large as \$48,054 with a median expenditure of \$7,345. The same was true with the Instructional Equipment purchases, which ranged from \$27 to \$41,134 with a median expenditure of \$9,340.

The Local Improvement program activities had both the widest range of expenditure and the largest single program activity. The total program activity expenditure ranged from \$104 to \$301,024, with over 30% ranging from \$21,000 to \$78,000 and one program activity funded at \$301,024.

The remaining four program activities within Subchapter B received relatively little support. Only three LEAs provided funds for the Programs to Support Minority Children, ranging from \$426 to \$5,515; twenty-seven LEAs supported Guidance/Counseling/Testing, ranging from \$90 to \$10,000; twenty-one LEAs provided support for Improvement Of Planning and Management, ranging from \$103 to \$23,472; and, twenty-nine LEAs provided for Teacher Training/ In-Service, ranging from \$68 to \$16,000.

Special Projects (Subchapter C) contained twenty program activities, the most activities of the Chapter 2 categories, yet fewer LEAs chose activities from this category. Only ten were chosen by LEAs. The Gifted and Talented program activity was supported by thirteen LEAs, the largest number of districts. The activities ranged in funding levels from \$209 to \$6500 with a median of \$2400. Four LEAs supported Arts Education program activities, ranging from \$608 to \$17,000 with a median

expenditure of \$1,159. Other program activities under Subchapter C included: Health Education (\$9,776); Parent In-School Partnership(\$3000); Consumer Education (\$300); Law-Related Education (\$700); Establishment of Educational Proficiency Standards (\$300 & \$1,973); Safe Schools (\$500 & \$1,705); and, one "Other" (\$9,565). Four LEAs were allowed to charge indirect cost to Chapter 2, ranging from \$368 to \$4,028.

TABLE 3.17
 CHAPTER 2 EXPENDITURE
 BY PROGRAM ACTIVITY FOR ALL
 DISTRICTS IN MISSISSIPPI
 (1985-86)

Category	Number of LEAs	Expenditure In Dollars				Per Cent Of	
		Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Total
SUBCHAPTER A (BASIC SKILLS)							
Reading	12	4091	2023	280	12950	49096	1.19
Mathematics	9	1202	733	113	3500	10822	.26
Written and Oral Communication	2	990	-	980	1000	1980	.05
SUB-TOTAL SUBCHAPTER A						61898	1.50
SUBCHAPTER B (EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT)							
Library/Media Materials	112	9307	7345	500	47554	1042425	25.22
Instructional Equipment	107	10840	9340	27	41134	1159954	28.06
Local Improvement Programs Programs To Support	64	23050	14133	104	301024	1475174	35.69
Minority Children	3	3456	4000	426	5515	10367	.25
Guidance/Counseling/Testing Improvement Of Planning & Management	27	2355	1200	90	10000	63595	1.52
Teacher Training/In-Service	29	6907	4301	103	23472	145037	3.51
SUB-TOTAL SUBCHAPTER B						3983886	96.38
SUBCHAPTER C (SPECIAL PROJECTS)							
Metric Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Arts Education	4	4982	1159	608	17000	19926	.48
Parent In-School Partnership	1	3000	-	-	-	3000	.07
Pre-school Parent Partnership	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Consumer Education	1	300	-	-	-	300	.01
Youth Employment	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Environmental Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Health Education	1	9776	-	-	-	9776	.24
Law-Related Education	1	700	-	-	-	700	.02
Population Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Biomedical Education For Disadvantaged Community Schools	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Establishment Of Educational Proficient Standards	2	1137	-	300	1973	2273	.05
Gifted And Talented	13	2593	2400	209	6500	33708	.82
Safe Schools, Vandalism	2	1103	-	500	1705	2205	.05
Ethnic Heritage Studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
1964 CRA, Title IV Training & Advisory	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Career Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Other	1	9556	-	-	9556	9556	.23
Indirect Cost	4	1579	960	368	4028	6316	.15
SUB-TOTAL SUBCHAPTER C						87760	2.12
TOTAL FOR ALL PROGRAM ACTIVITIES						4133544	100.0

Note. From Data Provided By The Mississippi State Department Of Education,
 Division of Policy, Planning and Evaluation.

Distribution Of Chapter 2 Program Activities

Chapter 2 program activities were distributed widely across all 154 LEAs in Mississippi with an average of 1.6 program activities per LEA in 1985-86. (See Table 3.18) The number of program activities supported by the local school districts ranged from one to eight, with 39 LEAs (25.3%) funding one program activity and one LEA (.6%) funding eight program activities. Each of 41 LEAs (26.6%) supported two and three program activities. The remaining 33 LEAs (21.3%) funded program activities as follows: 14 (9.1%) funded four program activities; 13 (8.4%) LEAs funded five program activities; three (1.9%) LEAs funded six program activities; two (1.3%) LEAs funded seven program activities; and one LEA (.6%) funded eight program activities.

TABLE 3.18
NUMBER OF CHAPTER 2, ECIA PROGRAM ACTIVITIES
FUNDED IN MISSISSIPPI SCHOOL DISTRICTS
(1985-86)

Number Of Different Programs	Number Of Participating Districts	Percent Of District Participating
1	39	25.3
2	41	26.6
3	41	26.6
4	14	9.1
5	13	8.4
6	3	1.9
7	2	1.3
8	1	.6
TOTAL	154	100.0
Mean		Std. Dev.
1.64		1.026

Note. From Mississippi State Department
Of Education, Division of Policy,
Planning and Evaluation.

Chapter 2 Allocation By Category

For the purpose of this study the Chapter 2 program activity funds were divided into three categories based on the amount of total Chapter 2 program funds received by each LEA in 1984-85. The categories are: Small (\$2,820 - \$16,999); Medium (\$17,000 - \$27,999); and, Large (\$28,000 - \$301,632). The category for the small programs included 48 LEAs (31.2%) with a minimum amount of \$2,820, a maximum amount of \$16,928, a median of \$12,250 and a sum of \$547,624. The category for the medium size program activities included 47 LEAs, accounting for 30.5% of the total LEAs. The total Chapter 2 program activities at the local school district level ranged in size from \$17,000 to \$27,989. The median was \$21,412 and the sum was \$1,035,969. The category for the large size programs included 59 LEAs (38.3%) with a minimum of \$28,064 and a maximum of \$301,632. Only one LEA exceeded \$98,744. The median for this category was \$36,240 and the sum was \$2,788,341.

TABLE 3.19
 CHAPTER 2 ALLOCATION
 FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN MISSISSIPPI
 (1985-86)

CHAPTER 2 ALLOCATION				Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
<u>SMALL</u>						
	\$2,820	THROUGH	\$16,999	48	31.2	31.2
MEDIAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	SUM			
\$12,250	\$2,820	\$16,928	\$547,624			
<u>MEDIUM</u>						
	\$17,000	THROUGH	\$27,999	47	30.5	61.7
MEDIAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	SUM			
\$21,412	\$17,000	\$27,989	\$1,043,299			
<u>LARGE</u>						
	\$28,000	THROUGH	\$301,632	59	38.3	100.0
MEDIAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	SUM			
\$36,240	\$28,064	\$301,928	\$2,788,341			
<u>TOTAL</u>				154	100.0	100.0

Note. From Data Provided By The Mississippi State Department Of
 Education, Division of Policy, Planning and Evaluation.
 N=154

Chapter 2 Program Activities By Size Of District

The distribution of Chapter 2 program activity funds across the 154 LEAs in Mississippi by size of school district is presented in Table 3.20. School districts are divided into three categories according to ADA: Small (226 - 1,499); Medium (1,500 - 3,299); and Large (3,300 - 27,218).

Although there was not a significant difference in the distribution of Chapter 2 funds according to size of school district there were some important distinctions. Of the 40 small LEAs, those under 1,500 ADA, 85% (34) received a total of less than \$17,000 and 15% (6) received between \$17,000 and \$28,000. No small school district received funds totaling more than \$28,000. Of the seventy-four medium size school districts, those with ADA ranging between 1,500 and 3,300, 41 (55%) received funds between \$17,000 and \$28,000; fourteen (19%) received less than \$17,000 and nineteen (26%) received funds totaling more than \$28,000. All of the large school districts, those with ADA ranging between 3,300 and 27,000, received funds in excess of \$28,000.

In sum, Chapter 2 program activity funds were distributed in proportion to the size of the school district. This is shown by the distribution of the three categories of Chapter 2 funds across the three sizes of school districts. Seventy-one percent of the Chapter 2 funds in the small category went to small districts, 87% of the funds in the medium size category went to medium size school districts, and 68% of the funds in the large category went to large school districts.

TABLE 3.20
 TOTAL CHAPTER 2, ECIA^a PROGRAM FUNDS
 ACCORDING TO SIZE^b OF DISTRICT

Total Chapter 2, ECIA Funds					
SIZE ^b	Count	SMALL	MEDIUM	LARGE ^c	Row Total
	Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	\$2,820- \$16,999	\$17,000 27,999	\$28,000- 301,362	
SMALL 226 TO 1,499	34 85.0 70.8 22.1	6 15.0 12.6 3.9			40 26.0
MEDIUM 1,500 TO 3,299	14 18.9 29.2 9.1	41 55.4 87.2 26.6	19 25.7 32.2 12.3		74 48.1
LARGE 3,300 TO 27,218			40 100.0 67.8 26.0		40 26.0
Column Total	48 31.2	47 30.5	59 38.3	154 100.0	

Note. From Superintendent's Annual Report (1980-81),
 and Mississippi State Department Of Education,
 Division of Administration and Finance.

^aTitle IV-B of the Elementary and Secondary Education
 Act of 1978

^bSize is expressed in Average Daily Attendance (ADA)

^cThe next to the largest amount was \$98,744

Chapter 2 Program Activities By Wealth Of District

The distribution of Chapter 2 program activity funds across the 154 LEAs in Mississippi by wealth of school district is presented in Table 3.21. Districts are divided into three categories according to APU: Least Wealthy (4,010 - 13,999); Moderately Wealthy (14,000 - 19,999); and Wealthiest (20,000 - 198,000).

There was not a significant difference in the distribution of total Chapter 2 program activity funds received by the districts according to wealth of district. However, some interesting observations are noteworthy. The funds were quite evenly distributed across the 46 least wealthy districts with roughly a third of the districts receiving funds in each of the three Chapter 2 allocation categories. Of the 74 LEAs in the moderately wealthy category, 29 (39%) received funds in the small category, 19 (26%) received funds in the medium category, and 26 (35%) received funds in the large category. Of the 34 wealthiest school districts 19 (56%) received funds in the large category, 11 (32%) received funds in the medium category and 4 (12%) received funds in the small category.

In analyzing the distribution of the Chapter 2 allocations by wealth of district it can be seen that 60% of the 48 LEAs receiving the smallest allocations of Chapter 2 funds (e.g. less than \$17,000) were concentrated in the moderately wealthy category, while 31% were in the least wealth category. Only 8% of the wealthiest districts received under \$17,000. A similar

pattern was observed in the distribution of Chapter 2 allocations ranging between \$17,000 and \$28,000. Forty percent of the districts were in the moderately wealthy category, 36% were in the least wealthy category, and 23% were in the wealthiest category. Of the LEAs receiving the largest Chapter 2 allocations (e.g. over \$28,000) the largest concentration of districts was in the moderately wealthy category with 26 of the 59 (44%) LEAs in this category. The remaining 56% were distributed with 24% (14) in the least wealthy category and 32% (19) in the wealthiest category.

In sum, the wealth of a district was not a significant factor in the allocation of Chapter 2 funds. However, the category with the greatest concentration of districts was the moderately wealthy category with districts receiving the smallest amount of Chapter 2 funds. The category with the least concentration of districts was the wealthiest category with districts receiving the smallest amount of Chapter 2 funds.

TABLE 3.21
 TOTAL CHAPTER 2, ECIA^a PROGRAM FUNDS
 ACCORDING TO WEALTH^b OF DISTRICT

Total Chapter 2, ECIA Funds					
WEALTH ^b	Count	SMALL	MEDIUM	LARGE ^c	Row Total
	Row Pct	\$2,820-	\$17,000	\$28,000-	
	Col Pct	\$16,999	27,999	301,630	
	Tot Pct				
LEAST WEALTHY	15	17	14		46
4,010 TO 13,999	32.6	37.0	30.4		29.9
	31.3	36.2	23.7		
	9.7	11.0	9.1		
MODERATELY WEALTHY	29	19	26		74
14,000 TO 19,999	39.2	25.7	35.1		48.1
	60.4	40.4	44.1		
	18.8	12.3	16.9		
WEALTHIEST	4	11	19		34
20,000 TO 198,000	10.6	32.4	55.9		22.0
	11.8	23.4	32.2		
	2.6	7.1	12.3		
Column	48	47	59		154
Total	31.2	30.5	38.3		100.0

Note. From Superintendent's Annual Report (1980-81),
 and Mississippi State Department Of Education,
 Division of Administration and Finance.

^aChapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and
 Improvement Act of 1982

^bWealth is expressed in Ability Per-Pupil Unit (APU)

^cThe next to the largest amount was \$98,744

APPENDIX C

DETERMINATION OF ALLOCATION TO LEAs

The ECIA Chapter 2 Advisory Council in their meeting on March 23, 1982, recommended a formula for the distribution of funds to the LEAs and the percentage of "set-aside" money to school districts. Ninety-five percent of the 80% going to LEAs will be distributed on a per pupil basis. Five percent (5%) of the funds going to LEAs were set aside for high cost school districts. The council also suggested factors to be used in determining the formula for high cost students. Suggestions given were: (1) gifted, (2) low income families (free lunch), (3) special education, (4) sparsity, and (5) vocational education. Upon further review, it was determined that data was not available to be used to include "gifted" as a factor in the formula. Using the percentage of free lunch students, the percentage of special education students, the percentage of vocational education students, and the percentage of sparsity, the high cost districts were determined.

Determination of Amount Per Pupil

Public school enrollments for the end of the first month as submitted to the School Finance and Statistics Office in the Division of Administration and Finance along with the private school enrollments for each school district were combined to determine the total enrollment of a district. All district enrollments were added to get a state total for public and private school students. Ninety-five percent (95%) of the allocation going to LEAs is divided on a per pupil basis. Dividing the 95% amount by the total state enrollment will give the per pupil amount. The amount per pupil allocation for each district is determined by multiplying the district enrollment by the per pupil amount.

Determination of High Cost Districts

The number of special education students, vocational education students, and the number of students receiving free lunches are divided by the total enrollment of each district to determine a percentage for each factor. The districts are then ranked according to the highest percentages to the lowest percentages for each of these factors. The sparsity of each school district is determined by dividing the ADA transported students by the square miles in each district to determine the density factor. All school districts are ranked using the sparsity factor from lowest to highest. The ranking of the districts are weighted based on a scale of 1 to 10. Each district receives a weighted number of 1 to 10 for each of the four factors in the formula. These factors are added together to get a total weighted factor. The total weighted factor for each district is divided by four to determine a percentage for each district. All districts are ranked from highest percentage to lowest percentage. Districts having a total percentage of 7.0 and above received a high cost per pupil amount based on the 5% set aside divided by the enrollments of the districts which fell above the 7.0 cut off. The high cost amount per district is determined by multiplying the high cost per pupil amount times the total district enrollment.

ECIA CHAPTER 2

FORMULA FOR DETERMINING HIGH COST FACTOR

1983-84

- (a) 5 per centum of money designated to go to local educational agencies will be reserved for local educational agencies to meet Section 565. The factors of low-income students, the percentage of special education students, the percentage of vocational educational students, and sparsity will be used.
- (b) 95 per centum of money designated to go to local educational agencies will be reserved and distributed on a per pupil basis.
- (c) The first month's enrollment in the local educational agency plus the number of students enrolled in private schools will be the basis for fund distribution of (a) and (b) above.

APPENDIX D

Educational Consolidation and Improvement Act...Chapter 2
Administrative Handbook

1985-86

Mississippi State Department of Education
Richard A. Boyd, Superintendent
A. C. Bilbo, Office of Planning and Policy

FOREWORD

This administrative manual outlines the major provisions of Chapter 2 of the Educational Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (P.L. 97 - 35). Chapter 2 is a consolidation of 30 former federally funded programs. The local district has 100% discretion as to whether they wish to participate in one or any combination of the 30 programs. The U.S. Department of Education requires that your accounting system must accommodate the ability to trace expenditure to program areas. The "burden of proof" therefore lies with local districts. The major thrust of the block grant legislation is to ensure that the local school unit is relieved of regulatory rules that prevent local discretion. However, there remains a need for guidance with respect to various questions and concerns, because the State Department of Education is responsible for the administration of funds made available under Chapter 2. This manual addresses many of those questions and concerns.

GENERAL INFORMATION

State Advisory Council

The state has established a 16 member advisory council appointed by the Governor. This is required by P.L. 97-35. The membership of this council is broadly representative of both the educational and general public. Their duties are:

- to advise the State Educational Agency on the allocation among authorized functions of funds reserved for state use.
- to advise on the formula for the allocation of funds to local educational agencies.
- to advise on the planning, development, support, implementation and evaluation of state programs assisted under Chapter 2.

Formula for Allocation of Funds to Local Educational Agencies

The distribution of Chapter 2 funds is made to LEAs within the state according to the enrollments in public and private schools within each school district. Each district receives a per pupil allotment for all students enrolled. Higher per pupil allocations must be made to LEAs that have the greatest number of children whose education imposes a higher than average cost per child. The formula for determining high cost children in the state was developed using the following criteria:

- (1) percent of vocational students
- (2) percent of special education students
- (3) percent of low income
- (4) sparsity

The SEA application has a three year funding cycle. The LEA allocation for each year is based on the state's yearly allotment and is determined by the LEAs first month's enrollment (of the preceding year) and the high cost factor.

Local Discretion

The LEA has complete discretion in the expenditure of funds under any of the 30 former programs. However, the SEA "strongly recommends" that old guidelines be followed. This recommendation is made to protect the LEAs in the event additional requirements should be forth coming.

Technical Assistance

To assist LEAs in carrying out their increased responsibilities the SEA will provide technical assistance by:

- providing administrative manuals and application forms for preparation of a project.
- conducting workshops and/or inservice training as needed for public and private schools.
- being available for assistance in identifying needs, determining goals, establishing priorities, and developing short and long range objectives.
- assisting in inventorying and monitoring procedures.
- assisting in the planning strategies and dissemination procedures.
- providing assistance in fiscal management procedures.

Monitoring Process

The SEA staff will provide monitoring services by:

- reviewing Chapter 2 projects to determine if LEAs are in compliance with applicable statutes, regulations, and grant procedures.
- reviewing project needs, activities, and evaluations.
- conducting periodic on-site programmatic and fiscal reviews.

GENERAL FISCAL AND PROGRAMMATIC INFORMATION

Each local education agency will submit to the State Department of Education such reports as required by Federal and/or State regulations and policies.

Maintenance of Effort

The state will receive its full entitlement of funds under Chapter 2 for any fiscal year that either the combined fiscal effort per student of the aggregate expenditures within the state with respect to the provision of free public education for the preceding fiscal year was not less than 90 per centum of such combined fiscal effort or aggregate expenditures for the second preceding fiscal year.

Supplement, Not Supplant

An SEA or LEA that receives Chapter 2 funds may use and allocate those funds only to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of federal funds made available under Chapter 2, be made available from nonfederal sources. It is not permissible to use Chapter 2 funds to supplant funds from nonfederal sources.

Budget Item Summary

Monies expended under subchapters A, B, and C as approved on the LEA application Budget Summary Sheet, must be accountable and traceable by line items in the district accounting procedures.

Inventory Procedures

Local school districts should maintain inventory records on equipment and books purchased with Chapter 2 funds for at least five years. An item-by-item inventory should be maintained by each school. The school district should maintain an inventory on equipment and summary data on books. Appropriate inventory records should be available during on-site monitoring/auditing visits.

Suggested inventory procedures are as follows:

- Acquired items should be inventoried yearly.
- Inventory records should be physically checked yearly against books and equipment.
- Loss, damage, or theft should be fully documented.
- All books and equipment purchased under this program should be marked "ECIA Chapter 2, 19__".

PRIVATE SCHOOLS

Annually, all private schools in the district must be notified in writing that the LEA is making application for ECIA Chapter 2 funds for FY 1986. The private schools must be notified of the intent of ECIA Chapter 2 and the services that are available. The private schools must be informed that they must be in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to be eligible for participation. The LEA is responsible for determining the eligibility of private schools and that eligible private school children are participating on an equitable basis. Documentation that all private schools have been notified should be on file in the superintendent's office. Any responses to the letters of notification should be on file also.

One page of the application will identify all private schools, eligible and ineligible, and their responses as to whether or not they will participate. Another page of the application, the Record of Consultation with Eligible Private School Personnel, must be completed for those private schools in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The following information provides additional clarification:

- LEAs must contact in writing, all private schools.
- LEAs must provide equitable services to children enrolled in eligible private schools even when needs of private schools differ from LEAs.
- LEAs must consult with appropriate officials of eligible private schools regarding the planning, development and implementation of the Chapter 2 program. Documentation of this consultation shall become a part of the LEAs Chapter 2 Application.
- The control of funds provided under Chapter 2 and title to materials and equipment shall remain with the LEA and the LEA shall administer such funds and property in accordance with the purposes of Chapter 2.
- Participating private schools must provide the LEAs with appropriate programmatic information and any additional information as may be required by the SEA.
- Chapter 2 benefits are provided to children enrolled in participating private schools with the LEA, regardless of where those children reside.
- In the event an LEA or the SEA fails or is unwilling to provide for the participation on an equitable basis of children enrolled in eligible private schools, the Secretary may waive such requirements and shall arrange for the provision of services.

Technical Assistance for Private Schools

The SEA will provide information and technical assistance to private school officials upon request.

FISCAL INFORMATION

Separate Accounting Procedures for Chapter 2 Funds

Each LEA receiving funds under ECIA Chapter 2 will be required to establish separate accounting for Chapter 2 funds, but not a separate bank account.

Receipt of Funds

The State Department of Education will advance 50% of the grant award upon approval of the LEA application. Advancement of an additional 25% will be made upon certification that the first 50% has been expended. The final 25% will be allocated upon certification that the first 75% has been expended.

Public Contracts and Purchases

All materials and equipment purchased with Chapter 2 funds must be in compliance with State law. No funds should be obligated or expended prior to the date the project is approved by the State Department of Education. All funds must be obligated by September 30, 1986 and expended by December 31, 1986.

Marking and Labeling of Items Purchased

Items acquired with ECIA Chapter 2 funds should be clearly identified as property of the LEA and as having been purchased with ECIA Chapter 2 funds. All items purchased should be marked "ECIA Chapter 2, 19__."

Budget/Certification of Expenditures Reports

Budget/Certification of Expenditures Reports are due in the SEA upon certification that the first 50% of the allocation has been expended. The second Report will be due upon certification that the first 75% of the allocation has been expended. A final Report will be due upon certification that all funds have been expended but no later than December 31, 1986.

Budget Amendments

Chapter 2 project applications are approved and operate on the concept of prior approval before expenditures are obligated. If an amendment is required, the LEA must request and get line item approval prior to obligating funds. All amendments must be submitted on the Chapter 2, Budget Amendment form.

Maintenance of Records

Each LEA must agree to keep records and information as may be required for fiscal audit and program evaluation. The following records and information should be maintained for five years.

- a copy of the application and amendments
- a notice of approved project application and amendments
- letters to private schools and responses
- records that document consultation with eligible private school officials about project development and implementation

- documentation that parents, teachers and administrators participated in planning of the application
- records of money received
- invoices
- purchase orders for salaries, benefits, travel, and consultative services
- copies of on-site monitoring reports, self-evaluation forms, programmatic evaluation forms, and annual reports
- audit reports
- budget/certification of expenditures reports

Audits

The Educational Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 requires that the state conduct fiscal and programmatic audits of Chapter 2 funds every two years. The first audit period covered years 1982-83 and 1983-84.

LEA APPLICATION PROCEDURES

The application consists of: an information and assurance page, two private school pages, a project planning page, project narrative pages, and a budget summary page.

- The information and assurance page contains the per pupil, high cost and total tentative allocation for the LEA, plus assurances.
- The private school identification page lists all private schools located within the district boundaries and a record of participation.
- The private school consultation page is a record of approved activities to be provided eligible private schools.
- The project planning committee page provides documentation of persons participating in project planning and committee involvement during the year.
- The budget summary page identifies the 30 programs and the amount of money that is to be budgeted by line item.
- The project narrative page is an abstract of identified needs, types of materials, equipment and services and the evaluation of each by line items.
- The line item LOCAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS is reserved for mini-projects.

DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETING FORMS

Budget Report (Form 2)

The Budget Report is a summary of cumulative transactions completed during the period covered by the report. Budget Reports, Form 2, are due in the SEA as described on page 5.

Report the amount by line items for the latest approved budget in column 1, the cumulative line item expenditures through the reporting date in column 2, and the line item balance in column 3.

Budget Amendment (Form 3)

Chapter 2 project applications are approved and operate on the concept of prior approval before any expenditures are obligated. An amendment may be submitted for approval at any time. Complete Budget Amendment, Form 3, when requesting a line item budget amendment. Always list the latest approved budget in column 1, list the increases, decreases or no change by line item in column 2, and list the revised budget request in column 3.

Pupil Population Data (Form 4)

Complete the data form based on the current 1984 - 85 enrollment figures. This form is due by September 30, 1985.

MISSISSIPPI STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 BUDGET/CERTIFICATION OF EXPENDITURES REPORT
 ECIA CHAPTER 2

School District Name _____ Dates _____ To _____

	1 <i>Approved Budget</i>	2 <i>Cumulative Expenditures</i>	3 <i>Balance</i>
SUBCHAPTER A (BASIC SKILLS DEVELOPMENT)			
Reading.....	_____	_____	_____
Mathematics.....	_____	_____	_____
Written & Oral Communication.....	_____	_____	_____
SUBCHAPTER B (EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT & SUPPORT SERVICES)			
Library/Media Materials.....	_____	_____	_____
Instructional Equipment.....	_____	_____	_____
Local Improvement Programs (Mini Projects).....	_____	_____	_____
Programs to Support Minority Children.....	_____	_____	_____
Guidance/Counseling/Testing.....	_____	_____	_____
Improvement of Planning & Management Practices.....	_____	_____	_____
Teacher Training/In-Service.....	_____	_____	_____
SUBCHAPTER C (SPECIAL PROJECTS)			
Arts Education.....	_____	_____	_____
Biomedical Education for Disadvantaged.....	_____	_____	_____
Career Education.....	_____	_____	_____
Citizenship Education.....	_____	_____	_____
Community Schools.....	_____	_____	_____
Consumer Education.....	_____	_____	_____
Environmental Education.....	_____	_____	_____
Establishment of Educational Proficiency Standards....	_____	_____	_____
Ethnic Heritage Studies.....	_____	_____	_____
Follow Through.....	_____	_____	_____
Gifted and Talented.....	_____	_____	_____
Health Education.....	_____	_____	_____
Law-Related Education.....	_____	_____	_____
Metric Education.....	_____	_____	_____
Parent In-Partnership.....	_____	_____	_____
Population Education.....	_____	_____	_____
Preschool Parent Partnership.....	_____	_____	_____
Safe Schools, Vandalism.....	_____	_____	_____
Title IV Training and Advisory Services, 1964 CRA....	_____	_____	_____
Youth Correction Education.....	_____	_____	_____
Youth Employment.....	_____	_____	_____
Total.....	_____	_____	_____

SUBMIT 2 COPIES

Return to: A. C. Bilbo
 Office of Planning and Policy
 State Department of Education
 P. O. Box 771
 Jackson, MS 39205

I certify that 50% _____ 75% _____ 100% _____
 of the allocation has been expended.

 Signature of Superintendent Date

MISSISSIPPI STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF PLANNING AND POLICY
BUDGET AMENDMENT
ECIA CHAPTER 2

School District Name _____ Dates _____ To _____

	1	2	3
	Approved	Amendment	Revised
	Budget	(+)(-)(0)	Budget
SUBCHAPTER A (BASIC SKILLS DEVELOPMENT)			
Reading.....	_____	_____	_____
Mathematics.....	_____	_____	_____
Written & Oral Communication.....	_____	_____	_____
 SUBCHAPTER B (EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT & SUPPORT SERVICES)			
Library/Media Materials.....	_____	_____	_____
Instructional Equipment.....	_____	_____	_____
Local Improvement Programs (Mini Projects).....	_____	_____	_____
Programs to Support Minority Children.....	_____	_____	_____
Guidance/Counseling/Testing.....	_____	_____	_____
Improvement of Planning & Management Practices.....	_____	_____	_____
Teacher Training/In-Service.....	_____	_____	_____
 SUBCHAPTER C (SPECIAL PROJECTS)			
Arts Education.....	_____	_____	_____
Biomedical Education for Disadvantaged.....	_____	_____	_____
Career Education.....	_____	_____	_____
Citizenship Education.....	_____	_____	_____
Community Schools.....	_____	_____	_____
Consumer Education.....	_____	_____	_____
Environmental Education.....	_____	_____	_____
Establishment of Educational Proficiency Standards....	_____	_____	_____
Ethnic Heritage Studies.....	_____	_____	_____
Follow Through.....	_____	_____	_____
Gifted and Talented.....	_____	_____	_____
Health Education.....	_____	_____	_____
Law-Related Education.....	_____	_____	_____
Metric Education.....	_____	_____	_____
Parent In-Partnership.....	_____	_____	_____
Population Education.....	_____	_____	_____
Preschool Parent Partnership.....	_____	_____	_____
Safe Schools, Vandalism.....	_____	_____	_____
Title IV Training and Advisory Services, 1964 CRA....	_____	_____	_____
Youth Correction Education.....	_____	_____	_____
Youth Employment.....	_____	_____	_____
Total.....	_____	_____	_____

SUBMIT 2 COPIES

Return to: A. C. Bilbo
Office of Planning and Policy
State Department of Education
P. O. Box 771
Jackson, MS 39205

Signature of Superintendent

Date

Form 4
Chapter 2
5/85

OFFICE OF PLANNING AND POLICY
ECIA Chapter 2

PUPIL POPULATION DATA
1985 - 86

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Public School Enrollment

	Kindergarten	Grades 1 - 6	Grades 7 - 12	Totals
Enrollment				

Public School Children Participating in Chapter 2

	Kindergarten	Grades 1 - 6	Grades 7 - 12	Totals
Chapter 2				

PRIVATE SCHOOLS

1. Does the applicant have eligible private schools in the district? Yes No
If the answer is yes, complete number 2 and 3.

2. Eligible Private School Enrollment

	Kindergarten	Grades 1 - 6	Grades 7 - 12	Totals
Enrollment				

3. Eligible Private School Children Participating in Chapter 2

	Kindergarten	Grades 1 - 6	Grades 7 - 12	Totals
Chapter 2				

Return to:
A.C. BILBO
OFFICE OF PLANNING AND POLICY
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
POST OFFICE BOX 771
JACKSON, MS 39205

School District _____
Superintendent _____
[signature]
Date _____

APPENDIX E

EDUCATION CONSOLIDATION AND IMPROVEMENT ACT, CHAPTER 2
ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS FY 1981

Legislative Authority

Elementary and Secondary
Education Act of 1965:

<u>TITLE II</u>	*	<u>BASIC SKILLS IMPROVEMENT</u>
Title II-A	(1)	National Programs
Title II-B	(2)	State Basic Skills Program
Title II-C	(3)	Special Program for Improving Basic Skills
<u>TITLE III</u>		<u>SPECIAL PROJECTS</u>
Title III-A	* (4)	National Diffusion Program
Title III-A	* (5)	Educational Television Programming
Title III-A	* (6)	Cities in Schools
Title III-A	* (7)	PUSH for Excellence
Title III-B	* (8)	Metric Education
Title III-C	* (9)	Arts in Education
Title III-D	(10)	Preschool Partnership Program
Title III-E	* (11)	Consumer Education
Title III-F	(12)	Youth Employment
Title III-G	* (13)	Law Related Education
Title III-H	(14)	Environmental Education
Title III-I	(15)	Health Education
Title III-J	(16)	Correction Education
Title III-K	(17)	Dissemination of Information
Title III-L	* (18)	Biomedical Education
Title III-M	(19)	Population Education
Title III-N	* (20)	International Education-
<u>TITLE IV</u>		<u>EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT, RESOURCES, AND SUPPORT</u>
Title IV-B	* (21)	Instructional Materials and School Library Resources
Title IV-C	* (22)	Improvement in Local Educational Practice
Title IV-D	(23)	Guidance, Counseling, and Testing
<u>TITLE V</u>		<u>STATE LEADERSHIP</u>
Title V-A	(24)	Administration of Educational Programs and Duties of SEA
Title V-B	* (25)	Strengthening State Educational Agency Management
Title V-C	(26)	National and State Advisory Councils

 Legislative Authority

TITLE VIEMERGENCY SCHOOL AID

- * (27) Basic Grants to LEAs
- * (28) Special Programs and Projects
- * (29) Grants to Non-Profit Organizations
- * (30) Magnet Schools, Neutral Sites and Pairing Grants
- * (31) Educational Television and Radio
- * (32) Evaluation

TITLE VIII

- * (33) COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

TITLE IXADDITIONAL PROGRAMS

- * (34) Gifted and Talented
- (35) Educational Proficiency Standards
- (36) Special Grants for Safe Schools
- * (37) Ethnic Heritage Program

Alcohol and Drug Abuse
Education Incentive
Act

- * (38) Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education

Career Education
Incentive Act

- * (39) Career Education

National Science
Foundation Act of 1950:
Section 3(a)(1)

- * (40) Pre-college Science Teacher Training

Higher Education Act
of 1965:

Title V-A

- * (41) Teacher Corps

Title V-B,

Section 532(a)(1)

- * (42) Teacher Centers

Economic Opportunity Act
of 1964:

Title V-3

- * (43) Follow-Through

Civil Rights Act of
1964:

Title IV, Section 405

Desegregation Training and Advisory
Services

*Programs receiving appropriations during FY 1981 which were subsequently merged into the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, Chapter 2.

APPENDIX F

ECIA, Chapter 2 Application
Project Narrative

Needs - Types Of Materials - Evaluation

Subchapter A - Reading

\$629.65

Needs -

The elementary grades are in need of specially developed teaching material that will help and reinforce certain reading and language arts skills and concepts. The selected supplies will help students improve their reading skills as well as improve comprehension and listening skills.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities
Filmstrip and cassette sets.

Presenting the Parts of Speech
Sentence Building
Developing the Vocabulary
Report Writing

Programs which are developed to increase listening skills:
Treasury of Nursery Rhymes

Evaluation -

Teacher-made evaluations
Teacher-made checklist
Development of Teacher Objectives

Subchapter A - Basic Skills Development (Math) \$113.60

Needs -

Students in the mathematics program at the elementary school are in need of supplementary material reinforcing the metric concept.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities
Metric-Step-On (Learning Activity Program)

Evaluation -

A teacher-made evaluation will be utilized to identify the student's understanding of the metric concept.

Subchapter A - Basic Skills Development (Math) \$112.94

Needs -

The counting frame is needed to help teach students to add and subtract.

The chalkboard compass will be used in geometry to help teach the concepts of radius and diameter.

The reversible rectangular polar graph chart is needed to help teach the students how to graph linear equations.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

3 Jumbo Counting Frames

1 Chalkboard Compass

1 Reversible Rectangular Polar Graph Chart

Evaluation -

The math teachers will use these items and determine if their usage helps them to teach their objectives. This will be determined through testing and achievement test scores.

Subchapter A - Basic Skills Development (Math) \$400.00

Needs -

As Agricultural High School proposes to use a portion of the monies for the improvement of skills in mathematics, especially in algebra and geometry.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Workbooks, tapes and cassettes, filmstrips and other materials will be purchased. These will be used in the classroom by students enrolled in the various mathematics classes.

Evaluation -

A proper evaluation will be successfully purchasing the items and using them in classes. Additionally test will be administered to measure levels gained by students enrolled in the mathematics classes.

Subchapter A - Basic Skills Development (Reading) \$2,010.32

Needs -

Supplementary readers to provide enrichment activities and improve reading skills of young children.
To increase the level of Achievement Tests and to develop better reading habits of children through enjoyable reading experiences. The reading charts are needed to teach phonics, vowels, spelling, word building, blends and digraphs. The reading teachers need these to teach objectives in the AIM Plan. The chart stands are needed to hang the charts on for better moveability.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

182 supplementary readers of various grade levels (1-5), by Ginn and Company
Reading Charts

Evaluation -

Teachers will observe and evaluate reading skills, reading habits, and aesthetic appreciation of reading. Reading Achievement Tests will be given to determine grade level and evaluate student progress.
These materials can be evaluated by improvement in reading achievement test scores, teacher-made test, and student performance.

Subchapter B - Local Improvement \$9,890

Need -

To help students gain skills in computer literacy

Types of Material -

Equipment: 8 Apple IIE Computers
Materials: Disks & Diskettes

Evaluation -

These computers will be used to make our students aware of the computer age in which we now live. Also, they will be used to enrich our academic programs. The computers will also aid in student record-keeping allowing more time for classroom activity.

Subchapter B - Local Improvement \$6,919

Need -

To expand the variety of books and materials, such as filmstrips, tapes and disc recordings in the school libraries of the three attendance centers.

Types of: Materials-Equipment-Books-Activities

Books and Instructional Materials

Evaluation -

These materials will make the specific subject matter more meaningful to the students and enhance the learning environment.

Subchapter B - Library/Media Materials \$2,200

Need -

Playground supplies, A/V materials, laminating material, and instructional supplies

Types of: Materials-Equipment-Books-Activities

Skill paks, skill sheets, tapes, records, cassettes, Balls, Learning modules, laminating materials

Evaluation -

A/V supplies and instructional supplies and materials placed in respective schools.

Subchapter B - Instructional Equipment \$6,776

Need -

A/V equipment, computers and computer equipment, Televisions, and video players

Types of: Materials-Equipment-Books-Activities

Filmstrip projectors, opaque projectors, televisions, overhead projectors

Evaluation -

A/V equipment and other equipment placed in respective schools

Subchapter B - Local Improvement \$5,000

Need -

Coordinator of AIM to improve curriculum

Types of: Materials-Equipment-Books-Activities

Provide a part-time person to work with teachers to implement AIM plan. Provide in-service for teachers and work with principals and teachers to determine if there is a discrepancy in their AIM plans. If there is, provide assistance in correcting the problems. Help develop a test item bank and provide assistance to teachers in utilizing computers to manage the AIM plan. This person will hold an administrative certificate.

Evaluation -

Survey teachers to see if they have obtained sufficient assistance to put their AIM plan into effect.

Subchapter B - \$2.00
Improvement of Planning & Management Practices

Need -

Assistance in planning, coordinating, developing- and evaluating educational programs such as teacher in-service, needs assessments, teacher evaluation, and computer programing.

Types of: Materials-Equipment-Books-Activities

Participating in Regional Educational Service Agency that covers several districts working together for their mutual benefits

Evaluation -

Teacher and administrative questionnaire

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Programs \$10,036

Need -

There is a need to expand our computer lab which was started with 1983-84 Chapter 2 funds.

There is a need for reproduction equipment for both schools.

Types of: Materials-Equipment-Books-Activities

\$6,000 will be spent on computers, accessories and peripherals. 4 computers will be added at the Center which will make it possible for 30 students to receive instruction at any one time.

\$4,036 will be used to purchase a copy machine for each center. Chambers will receive a small machine as it has only 200 students. The will receive a heavy duty type machine as it will have heavy volume loads.

Evaluation -

All equipment will be assigned to trained teachers and clearly marked as Chapter 2. Use records will be used to determine if this equipment is being used to the schools advantage.

Subchapter B - Library/Media \$2,900

Need -

There is a need to continue to upgrade the library at Chambers and The. There is a need to add to a small inventory of computer software.

Types of: Materials-Equipment-Books-Activities

\$500 will be used at the Chambers library which serves 200 students in grades 1-8. This amount should purchase 100 books selected by staff, students, and parents.

\$1,900 will be used at the The library which serves 1175 students in grades 1-12. This amount should purchase 275 books and media materials selected by students, staff, and parents.

\$500 will be spent on computer software for children in grades 1-12. 500 students should be involved in the use of computers.

Evaluation -

A circulation record will be kept on all books and material that will be clearly marked as Chapter 2.

These materials will be accounted for by assigned persons who are responsible for computer instruction.

Subchapter - B Instructional Equipment \$44,998

Needs -

To use computers in education from kindergarten through grade twelve.

To improve teachers' and students' computer literacy.

To afford teachers opportunity to use drill and practice with students.

Types of: Materials-Equipment-Books-Activities

Micro-computers

Evaluation -

Compare test scores to determine whether computers are being used to aid in improving scores. Check to see how many teachers are using computers to determine if the number is increasing over last year.

Subchapter - B Library Media Services \$39,836

Needs -

Have software to use with micro-computers to teach computer literacy and drill and practice.

Purchase instructional materials and supplies that will enhance the opportunity to teach AIM objectives to assure 80% mastery.

Types of: Materials-Equipment-Books-Activities

Computer Software

Materials and Supplies

Evaluation -

Fill out forms on software evaluating the effectiveness of the software for instruction in the areas and grades it is being utilized.

Compare test scores in 1984-85 with scores in 1983-84.

Each child will be tested on each objective to determine 80% mastery.

Subchapter - B Library Media Services \$11,257

Needs -

Library and reference books are needed to provide supplemental reading and research materials.

Media materials are needed to supplement those materials available for public school music classes, elementary classes, and the media center.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Library books and encyclopedias will be used on an individual and classroom basis by students for supplemental reading and research.

Records will be used by teachers and students in elementary classes and in public school music classes.

Evaluation

Teacher evaluation

Library usage records

Inventory

Subchapter B - Instructional Equipment \$5,431

Needs -

Audio-visual equipment is needed to supplement the teacher demonstrations and lectures in order to help develop interest and understanding.

ITV equipment is needed to enable the teachers to incorporate ITV programs into the instructional program.

Additional scientific equipment is needed to supplement that material and equipment available for instruction in the natural sciences.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Record players, cassette players, and film projectors will be used by teachers in presentation of prepared material to enhance understanding and increase motivation.

Additional video recorder/players are needed to make ITV materials available to the individual classrooms at the time the classroom schedules require.

Microscopes, balances, and the micro-projector will be used by teachers and students in science instruction and laboratory work.

Evaluation

Teacher evaluation

Amount of usage of equipment

Inventory

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Program \$12,640

Needs -

To test additional elementary students that district cannot test.

To provide in-service for selected teachers to begin preparation for House Bill #4.

Additional library books

Shelving to help establish a library

Computer Equipment & Programs

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities
Test booklets, manuals, answer sheets, norm booklets

Selected teachers attend a three day in-service to help them understand their teaching duties and responsibilities.

Library books

Wood shelving material & labor

Computer equipment & software

Evaluation -

For grouping and diagnostic purpose

Teacher feed back through evaluation of in-service workshop

Additional books for library use

Shelving for library books at Clark Street School

Teachers & students using computers for instruction

Subchapter B - Instructional Equipment \$12,049

Needs -

To install, equip, and maintain computer equipment to be used in teaching computer literacy and computer programing to students and teachers.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Purchase of a printer and supplies to augment existing equipment and to assist in teaching.

Evaluation -

Teacher made tests and AIM program will be used to evaluate success.

Subchapter B - Library/Media Materials \$9,230

Needs -

To upgrade and improve the literary and media centers in four schools in the district.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

To purchase books, periodicals, and other reading materials that relate to the instructional management of the school district.

Evaluation -

District will maintain Southern Association and State AA Accreditation.

Subchapter B - Library/Media Materials \$2,000

Needs -

Purchase of library and classroom resources which help motivate our students for improvement in their learning.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Enlarge existing programs of learning to aid students to:

1. develop skills in varied subject areas through the use of the computer,
2. continue to develop skills in the use of computers,
3. use of video tape player to enhance student learning.

Evaluation -

Expected results:

Improvement in classroom performance of students as measured by teacher-made tests and an improvement in achievement as indicated by improvement of student scores on California Achievement Test.

Subchapter B - Reading \$4,500

Needs -

Supplemental and enrichment materials that enhance comprehension

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Materials consisting mainly of reading materials will be purchased. Most of this will be published by Ginn to compliment the Ginn 720 Reading Series.

Evaluation -

The evaluation will be made by the building principals and the staff members.

Subchapter B - Library/Media Materials \$2,000

Needs -

There is a continuing need for additional books and resource materials.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

This expenditure will be used for books and resource materials.

Evaluation -

The evaluation will be made by the building principals and the librarians.

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Programs \$7,000

Needs -

Library assistant who will work at two elementary schools.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

The library assistant will work under the supervision of the librarian who works one-half time at one elementary school and one-half time at another elementary school. The library assistant, who is trained by the librarian, alternates with the librarian and this enables both libraries to be open with adult supervision full time. The library assistant helps the children with books and audio visual materials and such other duties as assigned by the principals and the librarian.

The library assistant is not a certified person. The full salary of the librarian is paid from the Chapter 2 funds.

Evaluation -

The evaluation of the program will be made by the principals and the faculty members of the two schools.

Subchapter B - Teacher Training/In-Service \$2,500

Needs -

Staff development and in-service training are necessary to meet requirements of state law and the results will be an improved delivery of instruction.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Part of this expenditure will be for materials to be used with teacher in-service and the remainder will be used in related activities. Final plans in this area are incomplete.

Evaluation -

The evaluation will be made by building principals and faculty members.

Subchapter B - Instructional Equipment \$20,846

Needs -

The needs assessment conducted by this project revealed major needs in several areas of our curriculum. The equipment and materials indicated for use by this system will be useful to supplement, reinforce and enrich our curriculum and help us to raise the competency level of all students attending these schools.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Computers
Copy Machines
Ditto Machines
Carts
Projectors
Lab Stools
Record players
Language Lab
Instructional Equipment

Evaluation -

The effectiveness of the materials and equipment used in the classroom will be determined by:

1. Teacher made test
2. Standard test
3. Teacher observation

Subchapter B - Library/Media Materials \$11,610

Needs -

The needs assessment conducted by the schools involved in this project revealed major needs in several areas of our curriculum. The equipment and materials indicated for use by this system will be useful to supplement, reinforce and enrich our curriculum and help us to raise the competence level of all students attending these schools.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Computer Software
Basic Reading Program
Films
Speech and Communication Films
Maps
Globes
Charts
Biology Material
Listening Stations

Evaluations -

The effectiveness of the materials and equipment used in the classroom will be determined by:

1. Teacher made test
2. Standardized test
3. Teacher observation.

Subchapter 8 - Local Improvement Programs \$31,940

Needs -

The school system plans to continue the Drug Education program during the 1984-85 school year. This program is a result of a community and school staff study made in 1982 and updated this current school year. The need to continue is made evident by the increasing awareness of drug problems on the Coast and in the nation.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

No materials, equipment, etc. are being purchased from the Chapter 2 budget for the drug specialist.

The drug specialist will contact each student in the school system as an individual or in a group before the end of the 1984-85 school year.

Evaluation -

At the end of the school year the principal, staff, and students of each school will be given an opportunity to have an input into the program value and ways it can better serve our students.

Subchapter 8 - Local Improvement Programs \$19,863

Needs -

The school system plans to continue an additional elementary guidance counselor under the Chapter 2 program. The elementary guidance program has been defined by our principals and teachers as one of our greatest needs due to the fact that numbers of serious problems in this area are being identified. The guidance counselor is able to give in-depth attention to students who need more services than the classroom teacher is able to give.

Types of: Material - Equipment - Books - Activities

The Chapter 2 guidance counselor will work with students who have been referred and if necessary they will refer the student to agencies or professionals who are equipped to handle and help solve the problem.

Evaluation -

An input will be given by the staff and principals at the end of the school year as to the effectiveness of the program. We also will ask them for suggestions to make the program more effective.

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Programs \$7,189

Needs-

Each parochial school was contacted as to how they wish to spend their Chapter 2 allocation. Reading (especially oral and comprehension) was identified as the number one need of the parochial schools. This was followed by math and language.

Types of: Material - Equipment - Books - Activities

Each school has or will submit a specific list as to materials and equipment that will supplement their existing programs with the purpose of correcting the needs of students. On elementary school will be adding to their Chapter 2 computer program. Another elementary school will be purchasing reading, math, and language materials to upgrade available assistance in these areas.

All materials and equipment will be incorporated in the regular school curriculum.

Evaluation -

The evaluation of the parochial purchases will be incorporated in the overall testing program at the end of the school year.

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Program \$18,153.49

Needs -

Students need interaction from teachers and a social worker in an academic and social environment.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

A certified social worker (100% Chapter 2 with a Salary of \$18,153.49) will provide the students in Grades 7 and 8 with an effective method of dealing with the problems related to problem solving, logical reasoning, and communication within their social environment through the use of guidance and counseling techniques.

1. The social worker will stress value concepts and self-image concepts.
2. The social worker will provide in-service training on testing and achievement scores and their meaning to teachers, students, and parents.
3. Pre and post testing, formal and informal testing focusing on academic, emotional, and social growth will be explained to the parents and students.
4. To provide individual therapy and follow-up by counselor who will periodically work with each student on measuring his progress and in alleviating any existing problems.

Evaluation -

Data to be collected and maintained include:

1. Records of all counseling sessions with students in the project will be maintained.
2. Records of all home visits will be kept.
3. Records of in-service sessions along with content of the sessions and evaluation will be kept.
4. An information file on the referrals and follow-up activities will be kept.
5. The results of all pre and post tests as were as a record of follow-up activities will be kept in the central office.

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Program

\$19,486.32

Needs-

Students need interaction from teachers and a guidance counselor in an academic and social environment.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

A certified guidance counselor (100% Chapter 2 with a Salary of \$19,486.32) will provide the students in Grades 7 and 8 with an effective method of dealing with the problems related to problem solving, logical reasoning, and communication within their social environment through the use of guidance and counseling techniques.

1. The guidance counselor will stress value concepts and self-image concepts.
2. The guidance counselor will provide assistance to students, teachers, and parents with emotional, social, and cultural problems.
3. Pre and post testing, formal and informal testing focusing on academic, emotional, and social growth will be explained to the parents and students.
4. To provide individual therapy and follow-up by counselor who will periodically work with each student on measuring his progress and in alleviating any existing problems.

Evaluation -

Data to be collected and maintained include:

1. Records of all counseling sessions with students in the project will be maintained.
2. Records of all home visits will be kept.
3. Records of in-service sessions along with content of the sessions and evaluation will be kept.
4. An information file on the referrals and follow-up activities will be kept.
5. The results of all pre and post tests as were as a record of follow-up activities will be kept in the central office.

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Program \$15,846.06

Needs -

A method of communicating and disseminating educational information between the homes and the schools by the use of community workers.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Two non-certified community workers (100% Chapter 2 with combined salaries of \$15,846.06) will provide the students at the 7th and 8th grade school affected by the court ordered plan with a method of communicating and dissemination educational information between the homes and the schools.

The duties of the community workers will be:

1. The community workers will work on absenteeism, potential dropouts, and community problems associated with desegregation.
2. The community workers will encourage parents to become more involved in school functions and activities.
3. The community workers will keep parents informed concerning their student's favorable or unfavorable actions at school.

Evaluation -

(NONE)

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Program \$14,578.41

Needs -

An expanded scholastic curriculum in the area of shop.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

A certified shop teacher (100% Chapter 2 with a salary of \$14,578.41) to provide the students in the 7th and 8th grades with an expanded scholastic curriculum in the area of shop.

The employment of one certified shop teacher will allow the students at the 7th and 8th grade school to all have the opportunity to expand their curriculum and career experiences.

The teacher will introduce the students to carpentry, small engine repair, and leather crafts.

Evaluation -

The increased number of students participating in the program. The expanded scholastic curriculum for the students has been initiated and is continuing. The success of this program can be measured by the skills acquired at the conclusion of the course, but the long term impact can only be measured by the students' increase or decrease in vocational participation at the high school level.

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Program \$226.26

Needs -

Substitute teachers salaries for the home economics aide and certified shop teacher so that we can establish continuity of the program.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities
Payroll sheets as submitted by principals.

Evaluation -
\$226.26

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Program \$1216

Needs -

To improve and expand in-service programs for the faculty and staff of a parochial school.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities
Micro Computer
Apple IIe Professional System

Evaluation -
\$1216.00

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Program \$629.67

Needs -

To expand the scholastic curriculum offering through the purchase of additional library books and related materials.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities
Assorted library books from Mississippi Library & Media Supply Co.

Evaluation -
\$629.67

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Program \$1239.83

Needs -

To expand the curriculum offerings through the use of more AV equipment.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities
Panasonic Record Player - Tri-made stereo system \$184.96
Panasonic Tape Recorder AC-DC Slim Line 25.87
16mm Movie Projector 600.00
VCR Sharp 381 429.00

Evaluation -
NONE

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Programs \$212.00

Needs -

To expand the scholastic curriculum in the area of social studies.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

U.S. Map 61" X 57"	\$63.00
World Map	63.00
Mountings	12.00
Physical Globe	37.00
Political Globe	37.00

Evaluation -

NONE

Subchapter B - Library/Media Materials \$1600.00

Needs -

The library is the hub of educational activities on campus. The committee proposes to use a portion of funds to supplement holdings in the library. There is a need for additional materials to be made available to all students.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Basically, the library will be supplemented with publication appropriate for high school use. Hard and soft cover books and other media materials will be obtained with monies in this category.

Evaluation -

One objective of the program is to make materials available to all students. Evaluation will include members of students using materials as verified by library and teacher records.

Subchapter B - Instructional Equipment \$500.00

Needs -

Many class presentations involve the need of audio equipment. The committee plans to supplement the school's equipment by purchasing three much needed record players to be used by all faculty members on an as needed basis.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

The committee will purchase through the school three commercial type record players to be used by all faculty members.

Evaluation -

The successful purchase, use and upkeep of the three record players will be used as evaluation guides for this category.

Subchapter B - Guidance/Counseling/Testing \$832.00

Needs -

There is need for more professional materials to be used by counselors in the performance of their duties.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Booklets, pamphlets, tests and audio visual tapes will be purchased for use both by the counselors and teachers.

Evaluations -

A successful evaluation will be purchasing and using these materials by the personnel involved.

Subchapter B - Teacher Training/In-Service \$600.00

Needs -

Teacher improvement must be an ongoing process. The committee felt that the improvement of the faculty is a much needed item.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

These activities will include workshops conducted by professionals in their area of specialization.

Evaluation -

Evaluation will be done by participants as well as administrators and committee members.

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Programs \$37,714.74

Needs -

Our Survey of Needs reveal a major deficiency in maps and globes in each of our schools. The ones we now have are outdated and are not conducive to teaching children about today's and tomorrow's world. Included in this project is a sufficient amount of maps and globes to meet our accreditation standards.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Maps, globes, atlases, geographical term sets, and other social studies materials appropriate for every grade level.

Evaluation -

A comparison of achievement test results on next year's tests will be compared with this year's results, in the social studies area and the Instructional Supervisor and principals will determine what effect the purchase of these materials has had on pupil performance by completing a checklist.

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Programs

Needs -

One four-drawer file cabinet in order that school records are kept safe and in a classic filed order.
One Firemaster four-drawer filing Cabinet, with lock.
Two two-drawer file cabinets with locks.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

One four-drawer cabinet, with lock
One Firemaster four-drawer filing cabinet with lock
Two two-drawer file cabinets, with locks

Evaluation -

Confidential records of staff and students will be kept in the file cabinet. This will help us to improve our methods of record keeping immediately.

School records will be kept in a classified order for easy access of location. Vital records will be kept safe.

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Programs

Needs -

Non-consumable science kits to supplement out textbook oriented science program.

Children will be able to see and observe concrete evidence of scientific happenings rather than just reading about them. "Hand-on" demonstrations will also serve as a motivation factor. Children will become better prepared to understand and cope with our technological scientific world.

Students learn better when they can actually see and do things themselves.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Non-consumable scientific kits; one dissecting kit

Evaluation -

Teachers will observe and evaluate children by performance on demonstrations. Teacher made test will also be used to determine mastery of scientific skills. Also, achievement tests will be used to determine grade level.

Science teacher will monitor use and effectiveness of dissection kit.

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Programs

Needs -

To supply reference materials for:

Research Papers

Biographies of famous literary writers, scientists, historians, and mathematicians.

To supply materials for recreational reading on all levels.

Reference materials for various teaching assignments.

Science safety equipment is needed in the science laboratory for use during experiments for safety reasons.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Library Books

Reference Books

Dictionaries

Laboratory Aprons

Safety Goggles

Evaluation -

The teachers will observe and evaluate reading and reference activities. Achievement tests will monitor reference skills.

Science teachers will monitor their use and effectiveness.

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Programs

Needs -

To improve the range of experience of children through providing microcomputers for the business classroom. To provide the student with a basic knowledge of microcomputers so that he/she can enter a working environment associated with computers.
To improve the range of experience in biological science.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Six microcomputers with seven disk drives, one printer, and three covers for computers.
Six microscopes with 10-20 200 M objectives with 4X, 10X, 40X lenses.

Evaluation -

The teacher will observe and evaluate student progress. Achievement tests will be given to evaluate student progress. Evaluation will also be based on changes in achievement test scores.

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Programs

Needs -

Audiovisual equipment is needed in the classroom by the teachers in order to help teach their objectives. The record player is needed by the literature teachers to play the prologue form The Canterbury Tales in order that the student can learn the pronunciation from the Middle English period. The cassette/filmstrip projector is needed to teach fourth grade students how to use the library and to motivate them to read by showing short stories. The video recorder is needed to record ETV programs and to the pre-recorded tapes for in-service training. The TV cart is needed to transport the TV and recorder to the classrooms. The wall/ceiling screen is needed to show 16mm films that the school district has.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Record Player
Cassette/Filmstrip Projector
1/2" VHS Video Recorder
25" TV Monitor
Mobile Cart for TV and Video Recorder
Wall/Ceiling Screen

Evaluation -

This equipment can be evaluated by improvement in achievement test scores, and teacher-made tests. Testing and practical application of skills will determine if the student has learned to use the library.

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Programs

Needs -

Copying machine for duplicating instructional materials for students and teachers. Students with scheduling problems may obtain copies of reference materials which are too valuable to be checked out of the library. Multiple copies of materials may be made when several students need access to it.

One 16mm Projector for viewing films related to our curricular offering to students and viewing film during staff development training sessions when consultants are not available.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Two Copying Machines

16mm Projector

Evaluation -

The copying machine will improve time on tasks for teachers and students and will allow more time for teaching and learning.

We have over 900 films in our film library. The interest level of students will be observed by teachers. By observation, and improvement in standardized achievement test scores and the ACT.

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Programs

Needs -

Fifty-five venetian blinds for classrooms to help regulate the amount of light and darkness desired for study and teaching. Blinds will give privacy when needed.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Fifty-five Venetian Blinds

Evaluation -

Venetian blinds will help keep students and teachers on tasks by blocking out the outside activities. It will make classroom activities more interesting by improving the visual aspects of the classroom.

Subchapter B - Library/Media Materials

\$7,500.00

Needs -

Library books and media materials are needed in the curriculum area in all the schools within the district. More up-to-date materials will improve achievement test scores.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Teachers and librarians will select new library books and materials to be used in the schools instructional programs. These books and materials will provide experiences for students to learn concepts and skills that will increase knowledge in the academic areas.

Evaluation -

Achievement test scores will be improved in academic areas.

Subchapter B - Instructional Equipment \$15,000.00

Needs -

The county school system is developing a test item bank in cooperation with the PREPS consortium. For each school in the district to be able to retrieve and store test items as needed, five IBM Personal Computers are requested.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Five dual density dual drive 64K support units with monochromatic displays and printer adapters and dot liner printers.

Evaluation -

The test item bank for the school system will have access to test items developed.

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Program \$272.00

Needs -

Some health services are needed that presently are not provided by the district. Many students come to school with head lice, impetigo, scabies, pink eye and other contagious infections. Since we have no school nurse, services are needed from the health occupations periodically to diagnose and help control these infections in the schools.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

A nurse will be employed on an hourly or daily basis as required to check for communicable infections so that proper measures may be taken by school officials.

Evaluation -

Absenteeism will be reduced due to diagnosing and treating infectious diseases.

Subchapter B - Teacher Training/In-Service \$3,000.00

Needs -

Teachers indicate that they need more training in test development and evaluation as work progresses on the AIM Program. Some of these funds are also needed for staff development through utilizing consultants and in-service materials and supplies.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

In-service sessions will be held within the district to develop proficiency in test development. Sessions will also be held to begin implementation of staff development programs required by state law.

Evaluation -

The AIM Program will progress and teachers will become more competent through identifying weaknesses and taking measures to alleviate them.

Subchapter B - Instructional Equipment

\$12,112.75

Needs -

Our elementary school and our high school are in need of equipment that will reinforce the instructional activity being carried out in the classroom.

This equipment is needed to make reinforcement possible for all students, and will be used as a teaching tool in meeting the objectives set in AIM. Students are in need to an alternative instructional method from the regular classroom lecture type of teaching. This type of reinforcement method will be used to supplement the regular teaching style.

A duplication machine is needed to duplicate student worksheets and activities.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Video Equipment (player/recorded & monitors)

Record players

Film-strip Projectors

Blank Tapes for video equipment

Tripod Screen

Enclosed mobile Cabinet (for use with video equipment)

Opaque Projector

Electric Duplicator

Evaluation -

A periodic check will be made to assess the proper use for this instructional equipment.

Student's reaction to the use of this equipment will be recorded. scores on particular teaching activities and evaluations will be recorded in an effort to determine if students are responding to certain activities.

Teachers will be given evaluation sheets to briefly evaluate the effectiveness of this equipment as a reinforcement teaching tool.

Subchapter B - Library Media Materials

\$1,352.00

Needs -

Television Receiver

Record Player

Tape Recorders

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Television Receiver

Record Player

Tape Recorders

Evaluation -

NONE

Subchapter B - Instructional Equipment \$2,776.00

Needs -
Computers and Programs

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities
Computers and programs

Evaluation -
NONE

Subchapter B - Instructional Equipment \$2,776.00

Needs -
Computers and Programs

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities
Computers and programs

Evaluation -
NONE

Subchapter B - Library Media/Materials \$544.00

Needs -
Language
Communication Skills
Reading Skills
Math Skills

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities
Videotape machine, videotapes, and color television for use in
school library to tape instructional programs and to play special
instructional tapes.

Evaluation -
NONE

Subchapter - B Library Media/Materials \$1568.80

Needs -
To provide supplementary services for students weak in various
areas and subjects.
To provide enrichment for gifted students.
To increase hands-on materials and library books for social
studies classes in middle grades.
To increase number of professional books and periodicals
available for teacher use.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities
One TRS Model 4, Single Disk Drive and
One Radio Shack System III Network Controller

Evaluation -
NONE

Subchapter B - Library Media/Materials \$1480.00

Needs -

Improvement in reading and math CAT scores
Computer literacy

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities
A computer, image writer printer and software

Evaluation -
NONE

Subchapter B - Instructional Equipment \$2,408.00

Needs -

There is a need for students to be introduced to microcomputer literacy. With the microcomputer as a supplementary instructional educational tool, it will be extremely beneficial to students at the school in all areas of their curriculum.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities
Microcomputer for supplementary instructional equipment

Evaluation -
NONE

Subchapter B - Instructional Equipment \$1384.00

Needs -

Computers
Software for computers
Maps and Globes
Study Skills Kits
Playground Equipment

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities
Computers and Software for computers

Evaluation -
NONE

Subchapter B - Library Media/Materials \$3,920.00

Needs -

More reading materials for our library
More reference materials
Additional tapes, machines, and teaching supplies
Additional materials on art, poetry, etc.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Evaluation -
NONE

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Programs \$5,360

Needs -

Local improvement for computer software and materials and reading enrichment in grades K-8.

Use the computer as a teaching machine to enrich classroom drill and practice.

Reading enrichment materials for above level skills, reinforcement and exposure.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Computer

Reading materials

Evaluation -

NONE

Subchapter B \$2,384.00

Need -

Reading

Social Studies Instruction

Computer

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Television (1)

Computer (1)

Evaluation -

NONE

Subchapter B - Library Media/Materials \$1,840.00

Needs -

Develop an understanding of computers and how they work

Beginning programming for the older students

Hands-on experience with computers

Individualization in the area of Math and Reading

Up to date visual materials in the area of Social Studies

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

SRA Reading Kits, one U.S. Map, Computer literacy programs, other programs dealing with Math and reading on various grade levels.

Evaluation -

NONE

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Programs \$ 57,320.00

Needs -

Two elementary schools are ineligible for Chapter 1 funding. Since kindergarten classes are otherwise funded by Chapter 1, five year olds in these school zones do not have kindergarten programs available.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Two kindergarten classes will be established with a teacher and aide in each. Classes will each serve 25 children who are eligible for first grade in 1985-86 and who will be screened as children in greatest need on a first-come-first-served basis. Instructional materials and field trip experiences will be provided.

Evaluation -

Progress of students will be measured by a pre- post-testing with the Metropolitan Readiness Tests.

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Programs \$193,688.00

Needs -

Curriculum changes, advent of the computer, new emphasis on science and mathematics, renewed commitment to effective schools and effective teaching all bring a continuous need for instructional staff training.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

1. Basic certification in math or science
2. Computer education training
3. Staff in-service
4. Curriculum revision
5. Development of alternative learning programs for mastery of district essential objectives in elementary and secondary schools
6. Correlates of the effective school
7. Summative evaluation
8. Eight steps of the teaching act

Evaluation -

Each training session will be evaluated by each participant as to how well the session was conducted and how well the session met the participant's needs.

Subchapter B - Library/Media Materials \$11,789.00

Needs -

Due to increasing enrollments and widening ranges of student abilities and disabilities, certain library/media materials are needed in non-public schools.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Library/media materials to be purchased are:

Library books
 Reading Kits
 Computer software
 Computer texts and manuals
 U.S. Map
 Mississippi History Map
 Globes

Evaluation -

Evaluation will vary from situation to situation, but will be in terms of:

Frequency of use
 Teacher-made tests
 Improved achievement test scores
 Improved student participation
 Improved circulation in library

Subchapter B - Instructional Equipment \$12,927.00

Needs -

Non-public schools with limited resources are often not able to budget for certain instructional equipment needed to better deliver instructional services to students. Student needs, curriculum offerings and curriculum additions have been considered in establishing need for equipment.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

The following types of equipment will be purchased:

Computers
 Printer for computer
 Video-cassette recorder/player
 color television
 Record player
 Cassette recorder/player

Evaluation -

Each equipment item will be evaluated in terms of usage, enhancement of instructional program and improvement of achievement test scores.

Subchapter B - Local Improvement Programs \$300.00

Needs -

Reading is a priority need among students in one non-public school. Instructional need in this area is for high interest, low vocabulary reading materials for secondary age students.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities

Purchase of classroom sets of reading materials for emphasis of quality teaching.

Evaluation -

Observation of increased interest in reading.

Improved reading participation

Improved reading test scores.

Subchapter C - Ethnic Heritage Studies \$700.00

Needs -

It was the committee's feeling that there is a need for the students to learn more about their ethnic background.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities
Audio/Visual tapes, booklets, records, pamphlets, books and related materials will be purchased with funds from this line item. Materials will be housed in classrooms and the library and will be available to all students and faculty.

Evaluation -

A successful evaluation will be purchasing and using these materials by the students and faculty.

Subchapter C - Establishment of Proficiency Standards \$3,000.00

Needs -

The state requires that an Accountability for Instructional Management Program be in effect for all schools. Instructional objectives and activities will be written and evaluation items for these objectives will be established.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities
Some teachers will be chosen to work outside school hours and beyond regular time expectations to help complete the AIM Program. These teachers will receive a per hour stipend and some of the funds will be utilized to pay substitutes to provide released time for teachers working on AIM.

Evaluation -

More progress will be made toward completion of the district's AIM Program.

Subchapter C - Arts Education \$600.00

Needs -

To facilitate the development and growth of symbolic functioning
To attain a greater sense of mastery over the environment.
To contribute to growth in cognitive, perceptual, social, and motor development.

Types of: Materials - Equipment - Books - Activities
Materials for an already existing ART Therapy program

Evaluation -

NONE

APPENDIX G

LIST OF LEAS SORTED BY CHAPTER 2 GAIN OR LOSS

SIZE (ADA)	WEALTH (APU)	ANTECEDENT PROGRAM FUNDS	CHAPTER 2 ALLOCATION	CHAPTER 2 GAIN OR LOSS	PERCENT GAIN/LOSS
4311.00	20008.63	7018379.0	36776.00	-6981603	-189.84
855.00	15296.44	816142.00	7912.00	-808230	-102.15
27218.00	31149.51	944631.00	301632.00	-642999	-2.13
10842.00	15775.15	545648.00	98744.00	-446904	-4.53
2785.00	38185.39	232347.00	28080.00	-204267	-7.27
2464.00	14882.65	192637.00	28772.00	-163865	-5.70
1726.00	25501.79	171472.00	21320.00	-150152	-7.04
5645.00	16771.08	199526.00	51752.00	-147774	-2.86
3957.00	17044.70	173427.00	38824.00	-134603	-3.47
2357.00	18798.87	157434.00	26328.00	-131106	-4.98
8889.00	12335.17	205235.00	77992.00	-127243	-1.63
7472.00	47011.15	198039.00	71256.00	-126783	-1.78
1235.00	9856.14	115426.00	13432.00	-101994	-7.59
1570.00	14127.76	114662.00	13520.00	-101142	-7.48
3253.00	18591.85	124547.00	32056.00	-92491.0	-2.89
3135.00	12520.26	101592.00	28104.00	-73488.0	-2.61
1469.00	14095.18	87098.00	18227.00	-68871.0	-3.78
1305.00	14668.39	74006.00	10792.00	-63214.0	-5.86
2466.00	15162.87	83739.00	21192.00	-62547.0	-2.95
1776.00	33440.90	75022.00	26800.00	-48222.0	-1.80
2671.00	15772.57	82737.00	34544.00	-48193.0	-1.40
3439.00	21797.73	78428.00	31176.00	-47252.0	-1.52
1522.00	15290.59	57566.00	12256.00	-45310.0	-3.70
1861.00	7196.02	58802.00	15424.00	-43378.0	-2.81
500.00	16411.61	46533.00	7282.00	-39251.0	-5.39
1432.00	19320.96	51757.00	12752.00	-39005.0	-3.06
2588.00	17946.37	59429.00	23640.00	-35789.0	-1.51
765.00	11642.59	39405.00	6456.00	-32949.0	-5.10
3770.00	7582.39	63834.00	32600.00	-31234.0	-.96
1323.00	25974.57	47296.00	18759.00	-28537.0	-1.52
971.00	9470.41	36122.00	8200.00	-27922.0	-3.41
3110.00	18675.42	60466.00	32896.00	-27570.0	-.84
3147.00	15983.65	56888.00	32064.00	-24824.0	-.77
1636.00	13056.13	51466.00	27628.00	-23838.0	-.86
1022.00	15570.89	32611.00	9072.00	-23539.0	-2.59
5161.00	29759.17	69258.00	48408.00	-20850.0	-.43
5955.00	31129.20	84328.00	65776.00	-18552.0	-.28
1155.00	6274.29	25092.00	10784.00	-14308.0	-1.33
2514.00	14955.99	39461.00	26016.00	-13445.0	-.52
3928.00	8068.78	56149.00	43096.00	-13053.0	-.30
2019.00	10442.81	39743.00	26940.00	-12803.0	-.48
1160.00	14909.98	22471.00	10504.00	-11967.0	-1.14
1602.00	19770.43	26333.00	14400.00	-11933.0	-.83
4093.00	16409.87	48404.00	36840.00	-11564.0	-.31
3533.00	19250.37	41656.00	30768.00	-10888.0	-.35
2048.00	16163.80	31563.00	21112.00	-10451.0	-.50
1780.00	17418.60	24605.00	15328.00	-9277.00	-.61

SIZE (ADA)	WEALTH (APU)	ANTECEDENT PROGRAM FUNDS	CHAPTER 2 ALLOCATION	CHAPTER 2 GAIN OR LOSS	PERCENT GAIN/LOSS
1099.00	19903.18	18435.00	9368.00	-9067.00	-.97
1600.00	14486.72	25781.00	17208.00	-8573.00	-.50
758.00	8181.10	14046.00	6056.00	-7990.00	-1.32
3440.00	20795.82	38360.00	30560.00	-7800.00	-.26
1227.00	12769.50	20240.00	12883.00	-7357.00	-.57
2597.00	20533.27	28857.00	23072.00	-5785.00	-.25
1546.00	17881.56	23886.00	18496.00	-5390.00	-.29
747.00	13357.12	11801.00	6472.00	-5329.00	-.82
1090.00	27962.83	22969.00	17661.00	-5308.00	-.30
1249.00	17823.69	18163.00	12856.00	-5307.00	-.41
1227.00	50831.98	18042.00	12736.00	-5306.00	-.42
2207.00	12827.12	22870.00	18205.00	-4665.00	-.26
1017.00	16283.72	12500.00	8528.00	-3972.00	-.47
1795.00	198664.86	21664.00	17992.00	-3672.00	-.20
686.00	19834.42	9010.00	6120.00	-2890.00	-.47
1482.00	19392.01	15432.00	12640.00	-2792.00	-.22
3373.00	19813.14	33200.00	32416.00	-784.00	-.02
1288.00	9599.38	17867.00	17339.00	-528.00	-.03
3005.00	21671.05	27657.00	27280.00	-377.00	-.01
1936.00	14200.75	17120.00	16808.00	-312.00	-.02
1874.00	25942.74	32159.00	31915.00	-244.00	-.01
9663.00	22525.74	96717.00	96712.00	-5.00	-.00
928.00	16698.40	9970.00	10767.00	797.00	.07
226.00	23493.96	1724.00	2820.00	1096.00	.39
1750.00	18547.16	14782.00	15976.00	1194.00	.07
3445.00	15447.48	29454.00	31040.00	1586.00	.05
1631.00	12494.27	12121.00	14337.00	2216.00	.15
692.00	14330.03	3776.00	6208.00	2432.00	.39
912.00	16989.97	6655.00	9272.00	2617.00	.28
1841.00	12837.88	20123.00	22755.00	2632.00	.12
1278.00	16116.47	10000.00	12936.00	2936.00	.23
2223.00	13831.48	14880.00	18416.00	3536.00	.19
1416.00	22593.75	22587.00	26618.00	4031.00	.15
1680.00	17819.49	10000.00	14040.00	4040.00	.29
1826.00	16224.57	14641.00	18896.00	4255.00	.23
2743.00	14585.07	21614.00	25968.00	4354.00	.17
1340.00	5939.32	10000.00	15008.00	5008.00	.33
954.00	15940.29	7198.00	12244.00	5046.00	.41
661.00	7266.77	0.00	5368.00	5368.00	1.00
2727.00	15994.90	20717.00	26144.00	5427.00	.21
1939.00	17539.19	11026.00	16688.00	5662.00	.34
2253.00	13769.17	13332.00	19833.00	6501.00	.33
1969.00	17625.57	10000.00	16712.00	6712.00	.40
1480.00	15775.56	6289.00	13160.00	6871.00	.52
1231.00	11168.14	3030.00	10008.00	6978.00	.70
3530.00	13476.05	30480.00	37472.00	6992.00	.19
529.00	24997.43	0.00	7071.00	7071.00	1.00

SIZE (ADA)	WEALTH (APU)	ANTECEDENT PROGRAM FUNDS	CHAPTER 2 ALLOCATION	CHAPTER 2 GAIN OR LOSS	PERCENT GAIN/LOSS
1226.00	4009.60	3141.00	10256.00	7115.00	.69
1364.00	10026.55	3400.00	10968.00	7568.00	.69
2768.00	7989.92	17671.00	25736.00	8065.00	.31
1642.00	13291.40	13203.00	21412.00	8209.00	.38
3068.00	13440.13	23210.00	32456.00	9246.00	.28
1734.00	17320.37	7040.00	16568.00	9528.00	.58
1174.00	14573.85	0.00	9776.00	9776.00	1.00
3622.00	15788.26	23649.00	33632.00	9983.00	.30
1045.00	14811.48	2826.00	12932.00	10106.00	.78
1711.00	13785.52	10766.00	21046.00	10280.00	.49
1614.00	13343.34	9335.00	19803.00	10468.00	.53
7746.00	13858.66	80115.00	90744.00	10629.00	.12
3247.00	13294.32	17428.00	28064.00	10636.00	.38
2650.00	17004.88	11537.00	22752.00	11215.00	.49
3086.00	11256.56	18902.00	30856.00	11954.00	.39
1642.00	20042.60	2703.00	15000.00	12297.00	.82
3617.00	11251.66	19708.00	32560.00	12852.00	.39
2201.00	19942.55	6237.00	19120.00	12883.00	.67
1689.00	14960.45	9348.00	22323.00	12975.00	.58
4016.00	13533.10	20188.00	33576.00	13388.00	.40
2155.00	30657.40	5252.00	18640.00	13388.00	.72
1825.00	15460.46	10000.00	23433.00	13433.00	.57
2812.00	15634.72	10000.00	23472.00	13472.00	.57
2353.00	13507.33	6195.00	19680.00	13485.00	.69
1871.00	40276.98	16067.00	29871.00	13804.00	.46
4272.00	17899.03	22851.00	36792.00	13941.00	.38
3649.00	15325.52	18782.00	32800.00	14018.00	.43
2435.00	22507.98	6669.00	21280.00	14611.00	.69
2202.00	16517.98	17300.00	32079.00	14779.00	.46
3681.00	19127.37	21432.00	36240.00	14808.00	.41
2091.00	13217.30	10000.00	24942.00	14942.00	.60
3538.00	17254.94	21461.00	36552.00	15091.00	.41
2565.00	7124.54	6513.00	21616.00	15103.00	.70
1919.00	16482.53	10066.00	25986.00	15920.00	.61
1518.00	11327.72	0.00	16928.00	16928.00	1.00
1820.00	14643.86	0.00	17000.00	17000.00	1.00
2958.00	11005.46	7658.00	25312.00	17654.00	.70
5485.00	26056.49	38417.00	56150.00	17733.00	.32
2195.00	15740.08	15516.00	33711.00	18195.00	.54
3114.00	18797.53	7910.00	26136.00	18226.00	.70
5621.00	23842.86	31087.00	49336.00	18249.00	.37
4235.00	21706.86	20696.00	39864.00	19168.00	.48
4881.00	32189.55	22647.00	41896.00	19249.00	.46
2410.00	18110.64	10164.00	30126.00	19962.00	.66
2797.00	16782.18	9879.00	30016.00	20137.00	.67
2464.00	16991.53	12281.00	32890.00	20609.00	.63
1689.00	48844.68	0.00	20616.00	20616.00	1.00

SIZE (ADA)	WEALTH (APU)	ANTECEDENT PROGRAM FUNDS	CHAPTER 2 ALLOCATION	CHAPTER 2 GAIN OR LOSS	PERCENT GAIN/LOSS
2598.00	13121.36	0.00	21160.00	21160.00	1.00
1365.00	10557.01	6656.00	27989.00	21333.00	.76
3946.00	6867.31	10121.00	32736.00	22615.00	.69
2867.00	17272.16	17183.00	39838.00	22655.00	.57
2651.00	6326.99	7118.00	30781.00	23663.00	.77
5371.00	33225.80	19373.00	45344.00	25971.00	.57
5639.00	15099.52	21454.00	50296.00	28842.00	.57
5931.00	23244.44	29932.00	58992.00	29060.00	.49
4666.00	14614.49	10278.00	40051.00	29773.00	.74
6772.00	24875.54	34381.00	66232.00	31851.00	.48
5676.00	24374.39	29000.00	61544.00	32544.00	.53
7542.00	9399.69	30269.00	63368.00	33099.00	.52
3897.00	15945.55	11109.00	56677.00	45568.00	.80

APPENDIX H

TABLE A.1

NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS
THAT GAINED OR LOST FUNDS
WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
CHAPTER 2, ECIA
ACCORDING TO SIZE OF LEA

SIZE ^a	Observed	LEAS	LEAS	Row Total
	Exp. Frq.	THAT	THAT	
	Row Pct	GAINED	LOSS	
	Col Pct	FUNDS	FUNDS	
	Tot Pct			
SMALL 226 TO 1,499		17	23	40 26.0
		22	18	
		42.5	57.5	
		20.0	33.3	
		11.0	14.9	
MEDIUM 1,500 TO 3,299		45	29	74 48.0
		41	33	
		60.8	39.2	
		52.9	42.0	
		29.2	18.8	
LARGE 3,300 TO 27,218		23	17	40 26.0
		22	18	
		57.5	42.5	
		27.1	24.6	
		14.9	11.0	
Column	85	69	154	
Total	55.2	44.8	100.0	

D.F. Chi-Square
2 3.636

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Administration and Finance and Division
of Policy and Planning.

^aSize is expressed in Average Daily Attendance (ADA)

TABLE A.2
NET GAIN OR LOSS BETWEEN ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS
AND CHAPTER 2, ECIA
ACCORDING TO WEALTH^a OF LEA

Net Gain or Loss of Program Funds				
WEALTH ^a	Observed			Row Total
	Exp. Frq.			
	Row Pct	GAIN	LOSS	
	Col Pct			
	Tot Pct			
		33	20	
		29	24	53
LEAST WEALTHY		62.3	37.7	34.4
4,000 TO 13,999		38.8	29.0	
		21.4	13.0	
		36	31	
		37	13	67
MODERATELY WEALTHY		53.7	46.3	43.5
14,000 TO 19,999		42.4	44.3	
		23.4	20.1	
		16	18	
		19	15	34
WEALTHIEST		47.1	52.9	22.1
20,000 TO 198,000		18.8	26.1	
		10.4	11.7	
Column		85	69	154
Total		55.2	44.8	100.0
D.F.		Chi-Square		
2		2.04		

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Administration and Finance and Division
of Policy and Planning.

^aWealth is expressed in Ability Per-Pupil Unit (APU)

TABLE A.3
 NUMBER OF ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS FUNDED
 ACCORDING TO SIZE^a OF LEA

		Size ^a of School District			
Observed	Exp. Frq.	SMALL 226 TO 1,499	MEDIUM 1,500 TO 3,299	LARGE 3,300 TO 27,218	Row Total
Number Of Programs	0 - 1	25 24.9	52 46.1	19 24.9	96
	2 - 5	15 15.1	22 27.9	21 15.1	58
Column Total		40	74	40	154

D.F. Chi-Square
 2 5.71

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education, Division of Policy and Planning.

^aSize is expressed in Average Daily Attendance (ADA)

TABLE A.4
TOTAL NUMBER OF CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES
ACCORDING TO SIZE^a OF LEA

Size ^a of School District				
NUMBER OF PROGRAMS	SMALL	MEDIUM	LARGE	Row
Observed	226 TO 1,499	1,500 TO 3,299	3,300 TO 27,218	Total
Exp. Frq.				
1 - 3	35 31.4	57 58.2	29 31.4	121
4 - 8	5 8.6	17 15.8	11 8.6	33
Column Total	40	74	40	154
	D.F.	Chi-Square		
	2	2.88		

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Policy and Planning.

^aSize is expressed in Average Daily Attendance (ADA)

TABLE A.5
 DIFFERENCE IN NUMBER OF CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES
 AND ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS FUNDED IN MISSISSIPPI
 ACCORDING TO SIZE^a OF LEA

Size ^a of School District				
NUMBER OF PROGRAMS	SMALL 226 TO 1,499	MEDIUM 1,500 TO 3,299	LARGE 3,300 TO 27,218	Row Total
Observed Exp. Frq.				
-1 to -3	4 4.4	8 8.2	5 4.4	17
0 to 2	31 28.8	53 53.3	27 28.8	111
3 to 6	5 6.7	13 12.4	8 6.7	26
Column Total	40	74	40	154
	D.F. 4	Chi-Square 1.93		

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education, Division of Policy and Planning.

^aSize is expressed in Average Daily Attendance (ADA)

TABLE A.6
TOTAL NUMBER OF ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS
ACCORDING TO WEALTH^a OF LEA

Wealth ^a of School District				
NUMBER OF PROGRAMS	LEAST WEALTHY	MODERATELY WEALTHY	WEALTHIEST	
Observed Exp. Frq.	4,000 TO 13,999	14,000 TO 19,999	20,000 TO 198,000	Row Total
0 - 1	38 33.0	41 21.2	17 13	96
2	13 15.1	18 19.1	13 9.7	44
3 - 5	2 4.8	8 6.1	4 3.1	14
Column Total	53	67	34	154
	D.F.	Chi-Square		
	4	23.92		

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Policy and Planning.

^aWealth is expressed in Ability Per-Pupil Unit (APU)

TABLE A.7
TOTAL NUMBER OF CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES
ACCORDING TO WEALTH^a OF LEA

Wealth ^a of School District				
NUMBER OF PROGRAMS	LEAST WEALTHY	MODERATELY WEALTHY	WEALTHIEST	
Observed Exp. Frq.	4,000 TO 13,999	14,000 TO 19,999	20,000 TO 198,000	Row Total
1 - 2	30 27.5	33 34.8	17 17.7	80
3 - 4	16 18.9	26 23.9	13 12.1	55
5 - 8	7 6.5	8 8.3	4 4.2	19
Column Total	53	67	34	154

D.F. Chi-Square
4 1.11

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Policy and Planning.

^aWealth is expressed in Ability Per-Pupil Unit (APU)

TABLE A.8
DIFFERENCE IN NUMBER OF CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES
AND ANTECEDENT PROGRAMS FUNDED IN MISSISSIPPI
ACCORDING TO WEALTH^a OF LEA

Wealth ^a of School District				
NUMBER OF PROGRAMS	LEAST WEALTHY	MODERATELY WEALTHY	WEALTHIEST	
Observed	4,000 TO 13,999	14,000 TO 19,999	20,000 TO 198,000	Row
Exp. Frq.				Total
-3 to -1	5 10.7	9 13.5	3 6.8	17
0 to 6	48 42.3	58 53.5	31 27.1	137
Column Total	53	67	34	154
	D.F.	Chi-Square		
	2	18.68		

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Policy and Planning.

^aWealth is expressed in Ability Per-Pupil Unit (APU)

TABLE A.9

THE NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS THAT GAINED OR LOST FUNDS
WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CHAPTER 2, ECIA

NUMBER OF PROGRAMS Observed Exp. Frq.	GAIN	LOSS	Row Total
-3 to -1	2 9.4	15 7.6	17
0 to 6	83 75.6	54 61.4	137
Column Total	85	69	154

D.F. Chi-Square
1 14.63

Note. From Mississippi State Department Of Education,
Division of Policy and Planning.

**The vita has been removed from
the scanned document**