Title I Budgeting Issues

Khoolud Mohammed Alamoudi

Abstract:

The United States' funds for public school caused a dilemma in education services that provided in poor-community schools. The obvious differentiation between schools in wealthy- districts and poor-districts is an evidence of title I budget misusing. Even after the states efforts to ensure an equal educational opportunity for all children, and the No Child Left Behind act NCLB the problem still remain.

In this paper I will discuss the title I budgeting methodology and gaps in order to reach the stakeholders and make them aware of the educational crisis. All the children must receive equitable, quality, and excellence education no matter where they are living. To solve the problem I encourage that school-leaders share this research and share it with stakeholders so that they can understand what they are enduring.

_____

Public education has been offered for all children regard their background in the United States. Poor community's schools have been provided with Title I federal funding to maintain equitable public education. School districts are qualified to receive Title I funds depend on federal poverty census information, and the amount of funds that a school receives is determined by the number of poor-community-children which defined by using income surveys to identify poor-students. The states and districts may use data from different sources for different reasons of Title I responsibility. By Using data from different sources districts are able to focus on closing achievement gaps without narrowing the number of students who qualify for supplemental services.

Federal funds are determined by four legal formulas that are based primarily on estimating census poverty and the education cost in each state. _The first formula is Basic Grants that_

provide funds to LEA's if the number of children counted in the formula is at least 10 and exceeds 2 % of school-age population.

The second formula is Concentration Grants that flow to LEAs when the number of formula children exceeds 6,500 or 15 % of the total school-age population.

The third one are Targeted Grants formula which flow to LEAs where the number of children counted in the formula (without application of the formula weights) is at least 10 and at least 5 % of the LEA's school-age population.

The last formula is Education Finance Incentive Grants (EFIG) which distributes funds to states based on factors that measure a state's effort to provide financial support for education compared to its relative wealth as measured by its per capita income, and the degree to which education expenditures among LEAs through the state are equalized. By using a weighted count formula that is similar to Targeted Grants funds are allocated to LEAs if the number of children from low-income families is at least 5 % of the LEA's school-age population.

Nevertheless, researchers have found that in 23 states, high-poverty districts spend fewer dollars per student than low-poverty districts. The major issue can be found in the lack of poor-communities schools' support. In more than half of the states, disadvantaged students receive few supports of dollars compared to other students living in a wealthy community. Hence, the primary reason of ESEA Act wasn't served the main problem, and provided the required support for poor-students. The gap between poor and wealthy communities' schools remain the same.

In 2001 the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), has been passed by the Congress to fill in the gap between poor and wealthy communities' students' achievement; Law that includes a requirement that districts ensure that Title I schools receive "services comparing" from state and local funds, so that federal funds can reach their goal of supplementing equitable state and local funding.

In sum, Title one focus to engage, educates, and empowers every student every day. Under NCLB, schools that receive title I budget are required to:

1- Offer students a chance to transfer to another school, and additional services.

2- Notify parents of teachers' qualification degree, and increase

parent involvement.

3- Develop strategies to improve teacher quality.

4- Hire only paraprofessional teachers who received a higher education degree, obtained an associates degree or met a rigorous standard of quality, and demonstrate knowledge of certain core subjects.

However, federal money is not enough to cover title I budget requirement. For that, schools' leaders who serve poor-community-schools suffer from the lack of support to reach high performing teachers and students. School's facilities are poorly equipped, and students additional programs didn't offer equally compering with wealth-community-schools.

Researchers, educators, and legislators have argued that federal money doesn't spend appropriately and doesn't reach its main goal of funding disadvantaged students in public schools. They suggest that using district wide salary schedule can be a tool to solve the problem and explicit the funds' misusing which fill state and local funding gaps instead of providing additional services for poor students. Schools' funds must be completely covered every school's community-

demands without considering its race or economic condition. Equal education will lead to equal opportunities for all children in the future, which is affect the economic condition of the states.

References

E. (n.d.). Saying 'No' to Title I Why Three Districts Did It. Retrieved March 04, 2016, from http://www.educationworld.com/a_issues/issues/issues402.shtml

More Than 40% of Low-Income Schools Don't Get a Fair Share of State and Local Funds, *Department of Education Research Finds*. (2011, November 3). Retrieved March 04, 2016, from http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/more-40-low-income-schools-dont-get-fair-share-state-and-local-funds-department-education-research-finds

T. (2015, May 18). A Fresh Look at School Funding. Retrieved March 04, 2016, from https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/report/2015/05/18/113397/a-fresh-look-at-school-funding/

IJSER