

Formula Fairness Campaign To End Title I Inequities

1

A Campaign to End Discrimination Against Small and Rural
School Districts in the Formula for Distributing Federal Funds
for the Education of Disadvantaged Students

Rural School and Community Trust
And Many Co-Sponsors

2

I. Formula Basics

It's about share of the pie...

What is Title I?

3

Part of Elementary and Secondary Education Act
(also known as “No Child Left Behind”)

Title I of the act provides federal funding to local school districts to meet the educational needs of disadvantaged students.

About \$14.5 billion in school year 2009-2010.

“Disadvantaged” primarily means “living in poverty.”

Title I Formula : 4 in 1

There are actually four grant formulas within Title I.

- Basic
- Concentration
- Targeted
- Education Finance Incentive (EFIG)

Dividing the Title I Pie.

- The Title I formula calculates the percentage of the total nationwide Title I funding that each district is entitled to receive.
- Since the total is a fixed amount appropriated by Congress, any provision in the formula that gives more to some districts, takes away from all other districts.

6

II. Formula Bias

Counting rural out...

Two Key Sources of Bias in the Formula

7

How much does it cost to provide an education to a disadvantaged student?

How do you count the number of Title I-eligible students in a district?

Bias 1. How Much Does it Cost?

Determining cost by how much a state spends.

The Title I formula uses the average annual per pupil spending of all the school districts in a given state as an estimate of the cost of providing an education to Title I students in that state.

Districts in states that spend more will get more Title I money per disadvantaged students.

Average Spending Reflects Wealth and Willingness More than Cost

Using statewide average spending is supposed to account for state-to-state differences in the cost of providing an education.

But it really accounts for state-to-state differences in wealth and political willingness to fund schools.

Here is how much variation there is from state-to-state:

National Average Per Pupil Spending -- \$9,239

High State: New York -- \$15,498

Low State: Utah -- \$5,521

Formula Minimums and Maximums on Per Pupil Spending

If the statewide per pupil spending figure for any state is less than 80% of the national average per pupil spending, it is adjusted up to that level in the formula.

In school year 2008-2009, 8 states went into the formula at the minimum statewide per pupil spending figure: AZ, AL, ID, MS, NV, OK, TN, UT.

If statewide per pupil spending is more than 120% of the national average, it is adjusted down to that level in the formula.

12 states went in at the maximum statewide per pupil spending figure: AK, CT, DE, DC, MA, MD, ME, NJ, NY, RI, VT, WY.

The 12 maximum states get 50% more spending credit in the formula than do the 8 minimum states. This gives them much more Title I money for each of their disadvantaged students.

Rural Title I Students Are in Low Spending States

The 14 states that spend less than \$8,000 per pupil are mostly low-wealth rural states: AL, AZ, CA, FL, ID, MS, NM, NC, NV, OK, SD, TN, TX and UT.

Note: 59% of Title I students who attend rural districts with highest student poverty rates in the nation are in these states.

12 states that spend more than \$11,000 are mostly high wealth states, urban, suburban, and rural: AK, CT, DE, DC, MA, MD, ME, NY, NJ, RI, VT, and WY.

Note: Fewer than 1% of the Title I students who attend rural districts with the highest student poverty rates in the nation are in these states.

Remedy 1: Raise the Minimum Statewide Per Pupil Spending Rate to 90% of National Average.

Raise minimum from 80% of national average to 90%.

This would increase the spending level used in the formula for 22 states.

13 are above national average in student poverty rate.

AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, IA, ID, LA, MO, MS, NM, NC,
ND, NV, OK, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, and WA.

Remedy 2: Adjust State Per Pupil Spending Figure Used in the Formula with an “Eligibility Index”

13

Adjust the state spending figure to reflect the level of student poverty in a state using a Title I “**Eligibility Index.**”

1. Divide a state’s Title I eligibility rate (the percent of its students who qualify for Title I funding) by the national average.
2. The state’s actual per pupil spending could then be multiplied by its Eligibility Index, and the resulting figure used in the Title I formula.
3. **However, no state would receive an Eligibility Index of less than 1.0.**

This approach is consistent with objective of concentrating more funding where poverty is more concentrated.

Bias 2. Weighting Student Count

Not all disadvantaged children are counted equally.

14

A “weighting system” artificially inflates the Title I eligible student count in most districts by counting some Title I students more than once.

But a systematic bias in the weighting system favors a few very large districts by inflating their Title I student count *proportionally more* than it inflates the Title I student count of smaller districts.

With a disproportionately larger increase in eligible student count,

- ▣ *the larger districts’ share of the national student count increases*
- ▣ *while the share of all smaller districts decreases.*

Weighting Used only in Targeted and EFIG Formulas

Basic and Concentrated Grants– All Title I students count the same.

Targeted and EFIG Grants – Student count is “weighted” in districts with higher concentrations of Title I students.

Intended Purpose: Send more money to districts with high concentrations of poverty.

Result: Students in Big Districts “Count More”

16

For example, in 2009-10, a Title I student counted as –

- 2.69 students in Houston
but only
- 1.48 students in Jim Hogg County (TX)

Despite the fact that these districts have almost identical percentages of students who are Title I eligible.

How Does the Weighting System Work?

Two weighting systems are used.

- **Percentage Weighting** – based on percentage of students in a district who are Title I eligible.
- **Number Weighting** -- based on the number of Title I eligible students in a district.

Whichever system inflates the student count more for a district is the system used for that district in the Title I formula.

*Weighting Brackets Based on Percentage of Students
Who Are Title I Eligible*

Percentage of School Age Children Who Are Title I Eligible	Weight Given Each Student in Bracket
Up to 15.58	1.00
15.59-22.11	1.75
22.12-30.16	2.5
30.17-38.24	3.25
38.25 and up	4.00

*Weighting Brackets Based on Number
of Title I Students*

Number of Title I Eligible School Age Children	Weight Given Each Student in Bracket
1-691	1.0
692-2,262	1.5
2,263-7,851	2.0
7,852-35,514	2.5
35,515 and up	3.0

Percentage Weighting

		Houston (70,947 of about 244,500 students are eligible – 29%)		Jim Hogg (310 of about 1,110 students are eligible -- 28%)	
Percentage of Students Who Are Eligible	Weight Given Each Student in Bracket	Actual Number Eligible Students in Bracket	Weighted Number Eligible Students (Col 3 x Col 2)	Actual Number Eligible Students in Bracket	Weighted Number Eligible Students (Col 5 x Col 2)
Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6
Up to 15.58%	1.00	37,570	37,570	174	174
15.59-22.11 (the next 7%)	1.75	15,747	27,557	73	127
22.12-30.16 (the next 8%)	2.5	17,630	44,075	64	159
30.17-38.24 (the next 8%)	3.25	0	0	0	0
38.25 and up (the rest)	4.00	0	0	0	0
Total		70,947	109,202	310	460
Avg. Weight Given Each Eligible Student			1.54		1.48

Number Weighting

		Houston (70,947 of about 244,500 students are eligible – 29%)		Jim Hogg (310 of about 1,110 students are eligible -- 28%)	
Number of Eligible Students	Weight Given Each Student in Bracket	Actual Number of Eligible Students in Bracket	Weighted Number of Eligible Students (Col 3 x Col 2)	Actual Number Eligible Students in Bracket	Weighted Number Eligible Students (Col 5 x Col 2)
Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6
1-691	1.0	691	691	310	310
692-2,262	1.5	1,571	2,357	0	0
2,263-7,851	2.0	5,589	11,178	0	0
7,852-35,514	2.5	24,710	61,775	0	0
35,515 and up	3.0	38,386	115,158	0	0
Total		70,947	191,159	310	310
Avg.Weight Given Each Formula Student			2.69		1.00

Both Houston and Jim Hogg County Gain “Weight.” But Houston Gains Proportionally More Weight.

22

Jim Hogg County does better under percentage weighting -- each eligible student counts 1.48 times . 310 eligible students is inflated to 460.

Houston does better under number weighting -- each eligible student counts 2.69 times . 70,947 eligible students is inflated to 191,159 students.

Those are the final student counts that go into the formula for these districts.

Even though Jim Hogg County “gained weight” it will suffer a decrease in Title I funding because Houston (and others) gained proportionally far more weight. Gaining a bigger Title I grant due to number weighting is not about “gaining weight.” It’s about gaining **weight share.**

How Much Did Your Kids Count in 2008-09?

Some Examples...

23

How Much Each

<u>If You Are In</u>	<u>Poverty Rate</u>	<u>Title I Student Counts</u>
Fairfax Co., VA	5.7%	1.97
Dillon 02, SC	39.2%	1.97
Wake County, NC	9.8%	2.13
Bladen Co., NC	29.3%	1.54
Baltimore Co., MD	8.8%	2.02
Barton-Lexa, AR	30.1%	1.59
Queens, NY	16.9%	2.60
Lincoln Co., WV	27.7%	1.48
Clark Co., NV	14.8%	2.54
Tunica, MS	35.5%	1.82

III. Impact of Number Weighting

It matters if you're big, not if you're poor...

The Impact of Number Weighting

Including number weighting rather than weighting on the basis only of eligible student percentage means:

In 2008-09, about \$408 million was shifted among districts, both interstate and intrastate.

- About \$196 mil. in Targeted grants was shifted among districts throughout the nation, both interstate and intrastate.
- About \$ 218 mil. in EFIG funds was shifted among districts but only among districts in the same state.

(Numbers do not add because some who gain under Targeted program lose under EFIG and vice versa. The \$408 million total is net of all winners and losers in both programs).

Overall, about 550 district gained money.

About 10,760 district lost money.

Who gets hurt?

- 4.3 million Title I students are in districts that lost funding due to number weighting. 48.7% of all Title I students.
- Three-fifths of them (2.67 million) were in districts with above average Title I eligibility rates (high poverty).

Helped and Hurt Most

Districts that gain the most:

- Large districts with moderate to low poverty rates – suburbs
- High absolute number of Title I students – inner cities.

Districts that lose the most:

- Small districts with high poverty rates.
- Small-to-moderate sized urban districts with high poverty rates
- Nearly all districts in states with very large high poverty urban districts
- Nearly all small and moderate sized districts in every state.

About 8,000 small districts lose 15% or more.

High-Poverty Rural Districts Lose

The 900 rural and small town districts with highest student poverty rates collectively lost \$54.5 million due to number weighting in 2008-09, compared to what they would received if all districts were weighted only on percentage of eligible students.

At 37%, the Title I eligibility rate in these rural districts is higher than that of nearly all large urban districts.

Still, the Denver School District received 35% more money *per Title I student* than these rural districts received on average. Newark, 52% more. New York 58% more. Chicago, 63% more. Philadelphia, 64% more. All have lower eligibility rates than the Rural 900 districts.

Impact of Number Weighting on Districts Separated into Poverty Groupings

All Districts	Total Title I Students	Title I Eligibility Rate	Total Grant Per Title I Student	Gain (Loss) Due to Number Weighting	Gain (Loss) Per Title I Student
Very High Poverty	2,216,853	34.9%	\$1,763	-\$33,984,200	-\$15.33
High Poverty	2,224,983	25.6%	\$1,553	\$24,105,000	\$10.83
Low Poverty	2,231,829	18.1%	\$1,438	\$49,436,100	\$22.15
Very Low Poverty	2,212,120	10.2%	\$1,330	\$10,550,000	\$4.77

Very High Poverty Districts Separated Into Size Groupings

Very High Poverty Districts	Total Title I Students	Title I Eligibility Rate	Total Grant Per Title I Student	Gain (Loss) Due to Number Weighting	Gain (Loss) Per Title I Student
Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6
Very Large	553,779	33.5%	2,234	\$78,404,200	\$141.58
Large	559,135	34.2%	1,734	\$15,375,800	\$27.50
Small	549,732	36.3%	1,588	-\$64,390,200	-\$117.13
Very Small	554,207	35.6%	1,495	-\$63,374,000	-\$114.35

Very Low Poverty Districts Separated into Size Groupings

Very Low Poverty Districts	Total Title I Students	Title I Eligibility Rate	Total Grant Per Title I Student	Gain (Loss) Due to Number Weighting	Gain (Loss) Per Title I Student
Col.1	Col. 2	Col.3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6
Very Large	553,779	11.3%	1,539	\$82,520,500	\$149.65
Large	559,135	10.6%	1,289	\$23,318,500	\$42.10
Small	549,732	9.7%	1,224	-\$42,795,500	-\$77.26
Very Small	554,207	9.3%	1,268	-\$52,493,500	-\$94.95

Top 25 Rural Districts That Lose Funding Due to Number Weighting

<u>State</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Percent Title I children</u>	<u>Loss Due to Number Weighting SY 08-09</u>
NC	ROBESON COUNTY SCHOOLS	40%	-\$1,958,000
NM	GADSDEN INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS	44%	-\$747,700
SC	WILLIAMSBURG COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	37%	-\$625,900
CA	COACHELLA VALLEY UNIFIED	31%	-\$619,600
FL	GADSDEN COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	26%	-\$580,100
TX	CLINT INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT	41%	-\$496,200
AZ	NOGALES UNIFIED DISTRICT	34%	-\$471,900
TX	EDCOUCH-ELSA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DIS	61%	-\$448,200
KY	FLOYD COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	35%	-\$430,100
TX	SAN FELIPE-DEL RIO CONSOLIDATED IND	35%	-\$418,000
GA	COFFEE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	27%	-\$392,100
GA	CRISP COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	40%	-\$391,000
TN	COCKE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	30%	-\$385,700

<u>State</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Percent Title I children</u>	<u>Loss Due to Number Weighting SY 08-09</u>
FL	LEVY COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	29%	-\$381,500
TN	CAMPBELL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	31%	-\$371,000
NM	CENTRAL CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS	29%	-\$371,000
GA	EMANUEL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	36%	-\$354,400
TX	SOUTHWEST INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT	30%	-\$353,000
NC	DUPLIN COUNTY SCHOOLS	25%	-\$352,500
SC	SUMTER SCHOOL DISTRICT 02	25%	-\$334,500
FL	SUWANNEE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	24%	-\$327,600
NC	VANCE COUNTY SCHOOLS	30%	-\$322,500
GA	BURKE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	33%	-\$318,100
AZ	INDIAN OASIS-BABOQUIVARI UNIFIED DI	50%	-\$311,500
KY	KNOX COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	44%	-\$308,300

Top 25 Urban Districts the Gain Funding Due to Number Weighting

State	District	Percent Title I Children	Gain Due to Number Weighting 08-09	State	District	Percent Title I Children	Gain Due to Number Weighting 08-09
NY	Kings County	30%	\$28,106,700	OH	COLUMBUS CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	30%	\$4,779,600
CA	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED	29%	\$22,071,700	NM	ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC SCHOOLS	17%	\$4,490,300
IL	CITY OF CHICAGO SCHOOL DISTRICT 299	27%	\$18,566,200	AZ	MESA UNIFIED DISTRICT	15%	\$4,194,000
PA	PHILADELPHIA CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	34%	\$14,204,900	TN	NASHVILLE-DAVIDSON COUNTY SCHOOL	21%	\$4,163,200
NY	Queens County	16%	\$14,138,100	FL	DUVAL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	15%	\$4,078,700
TX	DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT	27%	\$13,188,500	CA	SAN DIEGO CITY UNIFIED	19%	\$3,695,800
MI	DETROIT CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	39%	\$12,427,500	TX	AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT	21%	\$3,486,500
NY	Bronx County	39%	\$12,242,200	AZ	TUCSON UNIFIED DISTRICT	20%	\$3,427,900
NY	New York County	33%	\$8,516,500	GA	ATLANTA CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	32%	\$3,314,900
TN	MEMPHIS CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	28%	\$7,629,500	MN	MINNEAPOLIS	23%	\$3,096,400
MA	BOSTON	28%	\$6,359,700	MN	ST. PAUL	23%	\$2,931,100
CO	DENVER COUNTY 1	23%	\$5,207,200	TX	HOUSTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT	31%	\$2,906,400
WI	MILWAUKEE	34%	\$4,889,300				

Top 25 Urban Districts That Lose Funding Due to Number Weighting

State	District	Percent Title I children	Loss Due to Number Weighting 08-09
NY	ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	36%	-\$2,610,300
NY	SYRACUSE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	31%	-\$2,297,800
NY	BUFFALO CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	32%	-\$2,107,800
TX	LAREDO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT	49%	-\$2,064,800
MI	FLINT CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	37%	-\$1,986,500
MA	SPRINGFIELD	35%	-\$1,795,600
NY	UTICA CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	37%	-\$1,521,100
AZ	PHOENIX ELEMENTARY DISTRICT	46%	-\$1,398,700
PA	READING SCHOOL DISTRICT	40%	-\$1,325,200
MI	DEARBORN CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	36%	-\$1,308,900
TX	EDINBURG CISD	48%	-\$1,265,700
GA	BIBB COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	33%	-\$1,238,600
TX	PHARR-SAN JUAN-ALAMO INDEPENDENT SC	48%	-\$1,211,700

State	District	Percent Title I children	Loss Due to Number Weighting 08-09
AZ	SUNNYSIDE UNIFIED DISTRICT	35%	-\$1,172,200
CA	PORTERVILLE UNIFIED	34%	-\$981,700
OH	YOUNGSTOWN CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	32%	-\$880,400
TX	BROWNSVILLE INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DIST	54%	-\$857,500
MI	SAGINAW CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	39%	-\$831,300
GA	DOUGHERTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	28%	-\$794,900
TX	MISSION CONSOLIDATED INDEPENDENT SC	51%	-\$784,200
PA	ERIE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	29%	-\$730,700
AZ	CREIGHTON ELEMENTARY DISTRICT	33%	-\$698,300
CA	BAKERSFIELD CITY ELEMENTARY	38%	-\$694,700
TX	NORTH FOREST INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DIS	44%	-\$692,400
GA	VALDOSTA CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	29%	-\$669,300

Top 25 Suburban Districts That Gain Funding Due to Number Weighting

State	District	Percent Title I Children	Gain Due to Number Weighting, 08-09
NV	CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	15%	\$8,990,000
FL	BROWARD COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	14%	\$7,321,800
KY	JEFFERSON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	16%	\$5,429,200
GA	GWINNETT COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	9%	\$4,774,300
GA	DE KALB COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	19%	\$4,593,700
MD	PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	10%	\$3,658,500
FL	HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	17%	\$3,207,800
GA	COBB COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	9%	\$3,179,800
MD	BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	8%	\$2,812,400
VA	FAIRFAX COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	6%	\$2,763,100
GA	FULTON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	15%	\$2,310,700
GA	CLAYTON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	19%	\$2,243,700
TX	GARLAND INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT	16%	\$2,125,400

State	District	Percent Title I Children	Gain Due to Number Weighting, 08-09
FL	DADE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	22%	\$2,086,800
UT	GRANITE SCHOOL DISTRICT	11%	\$1,907,400
CO	JEFFERSON COUNTY R-1	8%	\$1,834,600
FL	PASCO COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	15%	\$1,651,400
HI	HONOLULU COUNTY	11%	\$1,551,500
CA	GARDEN GROVE UNIFIED	16%	\$1,470,700
SC	GREENVILLE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	16%	\$1,435,500
VA	HENRICO COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	9%	\$1,296,100
MD	MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	6%	\$1,169,800
FL	LEE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	14%	\$1,108,200
CA	ELK GROVE UNIFIED	15%	\$1,100,600
FL	POLK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	19%	\$1,075,100

Remedies: Number Weighting

- Eliminate number weighting. Weight student count on percentage only.
- Eliminate number weighting option, but hold harmless those districts that benefitted from it.
- Eliminate number weighting option, but hold harmless high poverty districts that benefitted from it.
- Limit future eligibility for number weighting to districts with a high poverty rate.
- Reduce the weights used in the number weighting scale, especially in higher brackets.
- Increase number weighting bracket size so fewer students are counted in higher brackets.
- Increase the weights in the percentage weighting brackets.
- Some combination of the above.

37

IV. Formula Fairness Campaign

Making it right...

Formula Fairness Campaign Goal

Eliminate unfair and discriminatory treatment of small and rural districts in the formula for distributing funds to local school districts under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Focus on reauthorization of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (aka No Child Left Behind) in 2010 or 2011.

Formula Fairness Campaign Strategy II

39

- Building the Base –Get FFC Sign-on from:
 - ▣ Rural organizations in key states
 - ▣ Rural and small school advocates everywhere
 - ▣ Adversely affected rural districts, especially high-poverty districts
 - ▣ Most adversely affected urban districts
 - ▣ National education interest and advocacy groups committed to equity.

Formula Fairness Campaign Strategy I

40

- Building the Case -- Tools for Advocates
 - ▣ Case studies
 - ▣ Simple graphs and tables
 - ▣ A non-technical PowerPoint presentation
 - ▣ News Media Packet
 - ▣ An analysis of results of Congressional Research Service study

Formula Fairness Campaign Strategy III

41

- Building Awareness
 - Webinars, target marketed to superintendents, school board members, and journalists in adversely affected districts, explaining the issue, its impact, and remedies.
 - Capitol Hill briefings for congressional staff and interest groups.
 - Opinion-Editorials in leading state newspapers in the most adversely affected states and cities.
 - Presentations to major interest group meetings, conferences, and events.
 - Placement of investigative report stories in key daily newspapers and education magazines.

Formula Fairness Campaign Strategy IV

42

- Building Remedies: Identify potential remedies and evaluate each for more equitable targeting to high poverty rural districts, political practicality, cost.

Formula Fairness Campaign Strategy V

43

- ❑ Engaging the Base – What you can do to help
 - ❑ Visit www.formulafairness.com. Learn the issues
 - ❑ Sign up for information updates and Action Alerts.
 - ❑ Respond to calls for action in Action Alerts
 - ❑ Sign FFC petition asking Congress and the Administration to end discrimination
 - ❑ Forward the petition to others to sign.
 - ❑ Contact the most-affected districts in your state – steer them to campaign website: www.formulafairness.com
 - ❑ Download background information and share it with friends.
 - ❑ Find out how your school district and other districts in your state fare under Number Weighting. Visit the website and follow the link to a district-by-district searchable data base that shows how every district in the nation is affected. Compare high poverty small rural districts with low-poverty large urban or suburban districts.
 - ❑ Use that information in a letter to your Senators and Representative.

Add Your Organization's Name as Co-Sponsor of the Formula Fairness Campaign

Formula Fairness Campaign	
Arkansas Rural Education Association	Organizations Concerned About Rural Education
Center for Rural Affairs	Pennsylvania Association of Rural and Small Schools
Colorado Rural Schools Caucus	Rural Community Alliance (AR)
Michigan Small and Rural Schools Association	Rural School and Community Trust
Missouri Association for Rural Education	Save Alabama's Small Schools
Montana Small Schools Alliance	Small School Districts Association (CA)
National Alliance of Black School Educators	South Carolina Rural Education Grassroots Group
National Rural Education Advocacy Coalition	Texas Rural Education Association
North Carolina Rural Education Working Group	

Join Now!

45

Formula Fairness Campaign
Rural School and Community Trust

www.formulafairness.com

Contact Marty Strange

marty.strange@comcast.net

(802) 728-4383