***Examples of ranking schools and allocating funds can be found on pages 19 - 21 of the* USED Non-Regulatory Guidance and Appendix:**
LEA Identification and Selection of School Attendance Areas and Schools and Allocation of Title I Funds to Those Attendance Areas:
http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/program-monitoring/resources/eligible.pdf

1

Serving Schools with Title I Funds

Local education agencies (LEAs) decide on an annual basis which schools will receive Title I school allotments. The LEA should include input from all stakeholders when deciding which schools to serve (e.g., school administration, staff, parents, etc.). A school is considered a Title I school from July 1st of each fiscal year regardless of when the application for funds is approved by the State.

1. ***Selecting Schools*** **- An LEA must first rank all of its schools according to their percent of poverty. An LEA must rank each school based on the percentage (not the number) of low-income children in each school.**

   - **Determining the percent poverty** - Percent poverty for each school is typically determined by comparing the number of children attending each school (ADM) with the number of low-income children for the same school (i.e. those eligible for free or reduced lunch). Children included in the counts should be those between 5 and 17 years old.
   - **Rank ordering the schools** - Schools are then ranked in order from highest percent poverty to lowest percent poverty.
   - **Deciding which schools to serve** - All schools at 75% or above must be served (i.e., provided with an allotment). Once these schools are served, the district may serve any other schools in rank order down to those at or above 35% poverty. Once schools at 75% have been served, the LEA has the option to (1) continue on serving schools in the district-wide ranking or (2) serve schools in rank order by grade span groupings (e.g., K-5, K-8, etc.). Schools must not be skipped in the rank order within the option the LEA chooses to use. The LEA can stop in rank order at any point it chooses (e.g., serving only the first ten of a total of 16 schools in the LEA).

2. ***School Allocations*** **- Once an LEA decides which schools to serve, an allocation is determined for each school. There is no specific amount required, but each school must receive enough Title I funds to effectively operate a Title I program.**

   - **Determining the district reservations** - The LEA must first reserve funds from its total Title I allocation for (1) required "set-asides" as they apply to that district (e.g., LEA Improvement, School Improvement, Parent Involvement, etc.), and (2) any other additional set-asides an LEA may choose (e.g., Professional Development, District-wide Instructional Initiatives, etc.)
   - **Calculating the per-pupil allotment** - The remaining amount of Title I funds is divided by the total number of low-income children in all of the schools that will be served (not the district total) to determine a per-pupil allotment (PPA). NOTE: There are several options for differentiating the PPA from one school to another.
   - **Calculating the school allocation** - The PPA is then multiplied by the total number of low-income children attending each school.

3. ***Title I Plans*** **- After the LEA has determined a projected amount for each school, the LEA must collaboratively work with the school to develop a Title I plan for using the funds.**

   - **Operating a Targeted Assistance Program** - The plan for this model should be based on a needs assessment and aligned to overall school plans. In general the plan describes how students will be selected and the program to be implemented (e.g., reading, math, etc.). For most schools in NC, this can be accomplished as part of the School Improvement Planning process.
   - **Operating a Schoolwide Program** - This model allows the most flexibility in the use of Title I funds. The plan should include a description of the comprehensive needs assessment conducted for the school and nine additional required components. A district may operate a schoolwide program in the first year of being served if it assures that a year of planning has taken place. Again, for most schools in NC, the School Improvement Planning process may be able to meet this requirement.

EXAMPLE OF RANKING SCHOOLS & ALLOCATING FUNDS IN AN LEA SERVING ATTENDANCE AREAS ABOVE THE DISTRICT POVERTY RATE

Example 3

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

Per-Pupil Calculation (125% Not Required)

Amount LEA determines to allocate per-poverty child (LEA Discretion)	$1,050.66

Total Title I Allocation for LEA		$7,169,132
Reservations		
Neglected	-	$38,000
Homeless	-	$20,000
20% choice-related transportation & supplemental services	-	$1,433,826
10 % professional development for LEAs needing improvement	-	$716,913
5 % professional develoment for teachers not highly qualified	-	$358,457
1% parent involvement	-	$71,691
Administration	-	$616,545
Remaining amount to be distributed to schools		$3,913,700

ALLOCATION TO ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

Attendance Area	Total Enrollment	Children from Low-Income Families: Public	Children from Low-Income Families: Private	Children from Low-Income Families: Total	Percent Poor	Eligible Schools Receiving Funds 1 = Yes 0 = No	Attendance Area Allocation (No. of Poor X $1,050.66)	Allocation Generated By Public School Poor Children	Allocation Generated By Private School Poor Children (2)
LEA Total	14,059	6,767	100	6,867	LEA AVG. 48.84%	7	$3,913,700	$3,834,900	$78,799
Violet Hill	870	850	20	870	100.00%	1	$914,074	$893,061	$21,013
Oakdale	276	202	8	210	76.09%	1	$220,639	$212,233	$8,405
Elemwood	951	591	24	615	64.67%	1	$646,156	$620,940	$25,216
Valley View	696	444	0	444	63.79%	1	$466,493	$466,493	$0
Hobson	601	367	10	377	62.73%	1	$396,099	$385,592	$10,507
Berlieth	933	550	5	555	59.49%	1	$583,116	$577,863	$5,253
Davis	1,134	646	8	654	57.67%	1	$687,123	$678,718	$8,405
Indian Rock	1,695	815	0	815	48.08%	0	$0		
Roosevelt	203	95	0	95	46.80%	0	$0		
Takoma	1,080	487	6	493	45.65%	0	$0		
Camp Springs	1,026	449	14	463	45.13%	0	$0		
White Hill	857	293	3	296	34.54%	0	$0		
Bannaker	874	299	2	301	34.44%	0	$0		
Eastern	490	142	0	142	28.98%	0	$0		
Taft	2,073	509	0	509	24.55%	0	$0		
Wilson	300	28	0	28	9.33%	0	$0		

(1) The LEA must reserve the amount of funds generated by private school children and in consultation with appropriate private school officials may (1) combine those amounts to create a pool of funds from which the LEA provides equitable services to eligible private school children in greatest need of those services; or (2) provide equitable services to eligible children in each private school with the funds generated by children from low-income families who attend that private school.

2

EXAMPLE OF RANKING SCHOOLS & ALLOCATING FUNDS IN AN LEA USING THE 35% ELIGIBILITY PROVISION

Example 2

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

Per-Pupil Calculation (125% Not Required)

Amount LEA determines to allocate per-poverty child (LEA Discretion) $700.00

Total Title I Allocation for LEA		$7,169,132
Reservations		
Neglected	-	$38,000
Homeless	-	$20,000
20% choice-related transportation & supplemental services	-	$1,433,826
10 % professional development for LEAs needing improvement	-	$716,913
5 % professional develoment for teachers not highly qualified	-	$358,457
1% parent involvement	-	$71,691
Administration	-	$616,545
Remaining amount to be distributed to schools		$3,913,700

ALLOCATION TO ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

Attendance Area	Total Enrollment	Children from Low-Income Families: Public	Private	Total	Percent Poor	Eligible Schools 1 = Yes 0 = No	Attendance Area Allocation (No. of Poor X $700)	Allocation Generated By Public School Poor Children	Allocation Generated By Private School Poor Children (1)
LEA Total	14,059	6,767	100	6,867	LEA AVG. 48.84%	11	$3,913,700	$3,847,200	$66,500
Violet Hill	870	850	20	870	100.00%	1	$609,000	$595,000	$14,000
Oakdale	276	202	8	210	76.09%	1	$147,000	$141,400	$5,600
Elemwood	951	591	24	615	64.67%	1	$430,500	$413,700	$16,800
Valley View	696	444	0	444	63.79%	1	$310,800	$310,800	$0
Hobson	601	367	10	377	62.73%	1	$263,900	$256,900	$7,000
Berlieth	933	550	5	555	59.49%	1	$388,500	$385,000	$3,500
Davis	1,134	646	8	654	57.67%	1	$457,800	$452,200	$5,600
Indian Rock	1,695	815	0	815	48.08%	1	$570,500	$570,500	$0
Roosevelt	203	95	0	95	46.80%	1	$66,500	$66,500	$0
Takoma	1,080	487	6	493	45.65%	1	$345,100	$340,900	$4,200
Camp Springs	1,026	449	14	463	45.13%	1	$324,100	$314,300	$9,800
White Hill	857	293	3	296	34.54%	0			
Bannaker	874	299	2	301	34.44%	0			
Eastern	490	142	0	142	28.98%	0			
Taft	2,073	509	0	509	24.55%	0			
Wilson	300	28	0	28	9.33%	0			

(1) The LEA must reserve the amount of funds generated by private school children and in consultation with appropriate private school officials may (1) combine those amounts to create a pool of funds from which the LEA provides equitable services to eligible private school children in greatest need of those services; or (2) provide equitable services to eligible children in each private school with the funds generated by children from low-income families who attend that private school.

3

EXAMPLE OF RANKING SCHOOLS & ALLOCATING FUNDS IN AN LEA

USING THE 35% ELIGIBILITY PROVISION AND ALLOWING FOR "BANDS" OF POVERTY WITHIN THE LEA

Example 4

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

Per-Pupil Calculation (125% Not Required)

Amount LEA determines to allocate per-poverty child:	
Schools with greater than 65% poverty	$749
Schools with greater than 50% poverty, less than 65% poverty	$701
Schools with less than 50% poverty (LEA Discretion)	$670

Total Title I Allocation for LEA		$7,169,132
Reservations		
Neglected	-	$38,000
Homeless	-	$20,000
20% choice-related transportation & supplemental services	-	$1,433,826
10 % professional development for LEAs needing improvement	-	$716,913
5 % professional develoment for teachers not highly qualified	-	$358,457
1% parent involvement	-	$71,691
Administration	-	$616,960
Remaining amount to be distributed to schools		$3,913,285

ALLOCATION TO ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

Attendance Area	Total Enrollment	Children from Low-Income Families: Public	Children from Low-Income Families: Private	Children from Low-Income Families: Total	Percent Poor	Eligible Schools 1 = Yes 0 = No	Attendance Area Allocation (No. Poor X $749, $701, or $670, Depending on Poverty Band)	Allocation Generated By Public School Poor Children	Allocation Generated By Private School Poor Children (1)
LEA Total	14,059	6,767	100	6,867	LEA AVG. 48.84%	11	$3,913,285	$3,845,966	$67,319
Violet Hill	870	850	20	870	100.00%	1	$651,630	$636,650	$14,980
Oakdale	276	202	8	210	76.09%	1	$157,290	$151,298	$5,992
Elemwood	951	591	24	615	64.67%	1	$431,115	$414,291	$16,824
Valley View	696	444	0	444	63.79%	1	$311,244	$311,244	$0
Hobson	601	367	10	377	62.73%	1	$264,277	$257,267	$7,010
Berlieth	933	550	5	555	59.49%	1	$389,055	$385,550	$3,505
Davis	1,134	646	8	654	57.67%	1	$458,454	$452,846	$5,608
Indian Rock	1,695	815	0	815	48.08%	1	$546,050	$546,050	$0
Roosevelt	203	95	0	95	46.80%	1	$63,650	$63,650	$0
Takoma	1,080	487	6	493	45.65%	1	$330,310	$326,290	$4,020
Camp Springs	1,026	449	14	463	45.13%	1	$310,210	$300,830	$9,380
White Hill	857	293	3	296	34.54%	0			
Bannaker	874	299	2	301	34.44%	0			
Eastern	490	142	0	142	28.98%	0			
Taft	2,073	509	0	509	24.55%	0			
Wilson	300	28	0	28	9.33%	0			

(1) The LEA must reserve the amount of funds generated by private school children and in consultation with appropriate private school officials may (1) combine those amounts to create a pool of funds from which the LEA provides equitable services to eligible private school children in greatest need of those services; or (2) provide equitable services to eligible children in each private school with the funds generated by children from low-income families who attend that private school.

4