

**Report of the
At-Risk Students
Subcommittee
of the
House Education
Committee**

January 2, 2007

Report of the At-Risk Students Subcommittee of the House Education Committee

Table of Contents

Section I. Subcommittee Members

Section II. Report of Subcommittee

Section III. Attachment A – Federal Income Poverty Guidelines

Section IV. Attachment B – US Census Report

Section V. Attachment C – List of At-Risk Districts Ranked by Percentage

Section VI. Attachment D – At-Risk Student Funding Goal

AT-RISK STUDENTS SUBCOMMITTEE

Subcommittee Members:

David W. Myers, Chair

Bryant W. Clark

Joey Fillingane

John Morton Mayo

Pat Montgomery

Leonard Morris

Nolan Ray Rogers

Sara R. Thomas

**REPORT OF THE “AT-RISK STUDENTS SUBCOMMITTEE”
JANUARY 2, 2007
Chairman, Representative David Myers**

INTRODUCTION

The “At-Risk Student Subcommittee” was formed to study two main issues: (1) the need to add additional funding for at-risk students and what level of funding is appropriate to properly serve these students, and (2) to review the definition of an at-risk student as defined in the calculation of the Mississippi Adequate Education Program (MAEP) to determine if the definition adequately identifies at-risk students.

The subcommittee held three separate meetings: August 28, 2006, September 21, 2006 and October 23, 2006. The MS Department of Education provided technical assistance to the subcommittee and at the October 23, 2006 meeting the subcommittee held a public hearing on this issue.

A summary of the two areas of focus is provided below followed by the subcommittee’s recommendation to the 2007 regular legislative session.

IDENTIFYING AT-RISK STUDENTS

At-risk students are currently identified as those students that qualify for free lunch as defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Child Nutrition Programs Income Eligibility Guidelines. The current school year’s income level eligibility for free lunch is derived by multiplying the 2006 Federal Income Poverty Guidelines by 1.30 for the range of household size and income. **Attachment A** provides the details.

Poverty in the home is the one constant and dominant factor that influences the ability and success of a child to learn and be successful in school. The subcommittee finds that use of the federal definition of free lunch is an excellent method of identifying students in poverty and, therefore, in need of additional quality supplemental educational services to enhance the opportunity for success. No change in the definition is recommended.

FUNDING FOR AT RISK STUDENTS

Funds for at-risk students are allocated to school districts through the MAEP. Section 37-151-7 (1) (d) provides the following: “***Adjustment to the base student cost for at-risk pupils.*** *The amount to be included for at-risk pupil programs for each school district shall be computed as follows: Multiply the base student cost for the appropriate fiscal year as determined under paragraph (b) by five percent (5%), and multiply that product by the number of pupils participating in the federal free school lunch program in such*

school district, which yields the total adjustment for at-risk pupil programs for such school district.”

The subcommittee finds no issue with the MAEP calculation and allocation process for at-risk funding but the subcommittee does find that the level of funding for at-risk students is woefully inadequate. The subcommittee finds two main issues of concern regarding funding for at-risk students: (1) Full funding of MAEP, and (2) Increase in the percentage of the base student cost allocated for at-risk students.

Full Funding of MAEP

The subcommittee recognizes that school districts’ ability to provide additional educational services to at-risk students is compromised when MAEP is underfunded. Districts with high poverty and a high percentage of at-risk students have fewer local resources to provide much needed additional educational services to students such as after-school programs, tutoring services, parent centers, smaller class sizes, recruitment of qualified teachers, etc. When MAEP is underfunded the current 5% allocation of the base student cost for at-risk students is minimized. Often the poorest districts with the most needs find very limited resources available to provide additional educational services. It is the strongest recommendation of the subcommittee that MAEP be fully funded.

Increased Funding for At-Risk Students

The subcommittee recognizes that Mississippi has one of the highest poverty rates in the country. The U. S. Census report from 2003 shows that Mississippi has the third highest poverty rate for children under 18 years of age, followed only by Louisiana and the District of Columbia. (**Attachment B**) One hundred and eleven of Mississippi’s 152 school districts have 50% or more of their students that qualify for the free lunch program; 44 districts have 90% or more that qualify. (**Attachment C**) Knowing that poverty is by far the dominant factor that impacts a student’s education and future, it is imperative that Mississippi do more to ensure at-risk students receive additional and appropriate educational services by providing districts with the added resources.

Mississippi currently provides an allocation equal to 5% of the base student cost for each student that is defined as at-risk. The subcommittee makes the following recommendations to the 2007 legislature for increased funding for at-risk students:

1. Increase at-risk funding from 5% to 43%. The goal of 43% is based on research conducted by the Department of Education as part of the 2005 study of the MAEP. **Attachment D** shows the total costs for increasing the funding level to 43% and what it would cost each year for a five-year phase-in.
2. The Department of Education shall develop an accountability standard that provides guidelines and criteria for each school district in the state on the effective and

efficient use of at-risk funds. The subcommittee recognizes the importance of ensuring these additional funds are used wisely and effectively.

CONCLUSIONS

The Mississippi Adequate Education program is designed to provide adequacy and equity in school funding. The MAEP was studied last year and a revised formula was adopted by the legislature during the 2006 legislative session. One of the recommendations of the study report stresses the need for enhanced funding for at-risk students. The study commission recognized and revised the formula to provide additional funding for districts that have growing student populations and the subcommittee recognizes that as a real and legitimate need. It is now time for the state to fully recognize the substantial need for additional funding for the poorest students in the state to enhance their opportunities to learn and succeed in school and to become productive citizens of the state.

A summary of the subcommittee recommendations is as follows:

1. Fully fund the Mississippi Adequate Education Program
2. Increase the at-risk funding level from 5% to 43%
3. Direct the Department of Education to develop an accountability standard that establishes guidelines and standards for the effective and efficient use of at-risk funds

The subcommittee will draft legislation for consideration during the 2007 legislative session. The table of contents provides a list of Attachments that were used by the subcommittee in its discussions and decision-making process.

ATTACHMENT A

HOUSEHOLD SIZE		INCOME ELIGIBILITY GUIDELINES														
		Effective from July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007				REDUCED PRICE MEALS - 185 %				FREE MEALS - 130 %						
FEDERAL POVERTY GUIDELINES		ANNUAL	MONTHLY	TWICE PER MONTH	EVERY TWO WEEKS	WEEKLY	ANNUAL	MONTHLY	TWICE PER MONTH	EVERY TWO WEEKS	WEEKLY	ANNUAL	MONTHLY	TWICE PER MONTH	EVERY TWO WEEKS	WEEKLY
48 CONTIGUOUS STATES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, GUAM, AND TERRITORIES																
1	9,800	18,130	1,511	756	698	349	12,740	1,062	531	490	245					
2	13,200	24,420	2,035	1,018	940	470	17,160	1,430	715	660	330					
3	16,600	30,710	2,560	1,280	1,182	591	21,580	1,799	900	830	415					
4	20,000	37,000	3,084	1,542	1,424	712	26,000	2,167	1,084	1,000	500					
5	23,400	43,290	3,608	1,804	1,665	833	30,420	2,535	1,268	1,170	585					
6	26,800	49,580	4,132	2,066	1,907	954	34,840	2,904	1,452	1,340	670					
7	30,200	55,870	4,656	2,328	2,149	1,075	39,260	3,272	1,636	1,510	755					
8	33,600	62,160	5,180	2,590	2,391	1,196	43,680	3,640	1,820	1,680	840					
For each add'l family member, add		3,400	525	263	242	121	4,420	369	185	170	85					
ALASKA																
1	12,250	22,663	1,889	945	872	436	15,925	1,328	664	613	307					
2	16,500	30,525	2,544	1,272	1,175	588	21,450	1,788	894	825	413					
3	20,750	38,388	3,199	1,600	1,477	739	26,975	2,248	1,124	1,038	519					
4	25,000	46,250	3,855	1,928	1,779	890	32,500	2,709	1,355	1,250	625					
5	29,250	54,113	4,510	2,255	2,082	1,041	38,025	3,169	1,585	1,463	732					
6	33,500	61,975	5,165	2,583	2,384	1,192	43,550	3,630	1,815	1,675	838					
7	37,750	69,838	5,820	2,910	2,687	1,344	49,075	4,090	2,045	1,888	944					
8	42,000	77,700	6,475	3,238	2,989	1,495	54,600	4,550	2,275	2,100	1,050					
For each add'l family member, add		4,250	656	328	303	152	5,525	461	231	213	107					
HAWAII																
1	11,270	20,850	1,738	869	802	401	14,651	1,221	611	564	282					
2	15,180	28,083	2,341	1,171	1,081	541	19,734	1,645	823	759	380					
3	19,090	35,317	2,944	1,472	1,359	680	24,817	2,069	1,035	955	478					
4	23,000	42,550	3,546	1,773	1,637	819	29,900	2,492	1,246	1,150	575					
5	26,910	49,784	4,149	2,075	1,915	958	34,983	2,916	1,458	1,346	673					
6	30,820	57,017	4,752	2,376	2,193	1,097	40,066	3,339	1,670	1,541	771					
7	34,730	64,251	5,355	2,678	2,472	1,236	45,149	3,763	1,882	1,737	869					
8	38,640	71,484	5,957	2,979	2,750	1,375	50,232	4,186	2,093	1,932	966					
For each add'l family member, add		3,910	603	302	279	140	5,083	424	212	196	98					

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 1758(b)(1).

Dated: March 9, 2006.

Roberto Salazar,
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 06-2476 Filed 3-14-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-30-C

preferably via express mail. Because packages sent to the Agency through the United States Postal Service can be damaged or delayed due to security procedures at USDA Washington DC headquarters, express mail services or couriers are strongly recommended. Paper submissions must be sent to: Mr. Errol Bragg, Associate Deputy Administrator, Marketing Services Branch, Transportation and Marketing Programs, AMS, USDA, Room 2646—South, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC, 20250-0269. (202) 720-8317.

If an e-mail address is provided, FMPP will send an e-mail message confirming receipt of the application package.

Electronic Submissions via Grants.gov—Federal grant applicants may apply electronically for grants through the Federal grants Web site: <http://www.grants.gov>. Applicants who submit their FMPP proposals via the Federal grants Web site are not required to submit any paper documents to FMPP. For information on how to apply electronically, click on <http://www.grants.gov/GetStarted>.

Dated: March 10, 2006.

Lloyd Day,
Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. E6-3709 Filed 3-14-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Food and Nutrition Service

Child Nutrition Programs—Income Eligibility Guidelines

AGENCY: Food and Nutrition Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This Notice announces the Department's annual adjustments to the Income Eligibility Guidelines to be used in determining eligibility for free and reduced price meals and free milk for the period from July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007. These guidelines are used by schools, institutions, and facilities participating in the National School Lunch Program (and Commodity School Program), School Breakfast Program, Special Milk Program for Children, Child and Adult Care Food Program and Summer Food Service Program. The annual adjustments are required by section 9 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act. The guidelines are intended to direct benefits to those children most in need

and are revised annually to account for changes in the Consumer Price Index.

DATES: *Effective Date:* July 1, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Robert M. Eadie, Chief, Policy and Program Development Branch, Child Nutrition Division, FNS, USDA, Alexandria, Virginia 22302, or by phone at (703) 305-2590.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This action is not a rule as defined by the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601-612) and thus is exempt from the provisions of that Act.

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3507), no new recordkeeping or reporting requirements have been included that are subject to approval from the Office of Management and Budget.

This action is exempted from review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Order 12866.

These programs are listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under No. 10.553, No. 10.555, No. 10.556, No. 10.558 and No. 10.559 and are subject to the provisions of Executive Order 12372, which requires intergovernmental consultation with State and local officials. (See 7 CFR part 3015, subpart V, and the final rule related notice published at 48 FR 29114, June 24, 1983.)

Background

Pursuant to sections 9(b)(1) and 17(c)(4) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758(b)(1) and 42 U.S.C. 1766(c)(4)), and sections 3(a)(6) and 4(e)(1)(A) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1772(a)(6) and 1773(e)(1)(A)), the Department annually issues the Income Eligibility Guidelines for free and reduced price meals for the National School Lunch Program (7 CFR part 210), the Commodity School Program (7 CFR part 210), School Breakfast Program (7 CFR part 220), Summer Food Service Program (7 CFR part 225) and Child and Adult Care Food Program (7 CFR part 226) and the guidelines for free milk in the Special Milk Program for Children (7 CFR part 215). These eligibility guidelines are based on the Federal income poverty guidelines and are stated by household size. The guidelines are used to determine eligibility for free and reduced price meals and free milk in accordance with applicable program rules.

Definition of Income

In accordance with the Department's policy as provided in the Food and Nutrition Service publication *Eligibility Guidance for School Meals Manual*,

“income,” as the term is used in this Notice, means income before any deductions such as income taxes, Social Security taxes, insurance premiums, charitable contributions and bonds. It includes the following: (1) Monetary compensation for services, including wages, salary, commissions or fees; (2) net income from nonfarm self-employment; (3) net income from farm self-employment; (4) Social Security; (5) dividends or interest on savings or bonds or income from estates or trusts; (6) net rental income; (7) public assistance or welfare payments; (8) unemployment compensation; (9) government civilian employee or military retirement, or pensions or veterans payments; (10) private pensions or annuities; (11) alimony or child support payments; (12) regular contributions from persons not living in the household; (13) net royalties; and (14) other cash income. Other cash income would include cash amounts received or withdrawn from any source including savings, investments, trust accounts and other resources that would be available to pay the price of a child's meal.

“Income,” as the term is used in this Notice, does not include any income or benefits received under any Federal programs that are excluded from consideration as income by any legislative prohibition. Furthermore, the value of meals or milk to children shall not be considered as income to their households for other benefit programs in accordance with the prohibitions in section 12(e) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and section 11(b) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1760(e) and 1780(b)).

The Income Eligibility Guidelines

The following are the Income Eligibility Guidelines to be effective from July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007. The Department's guidelines for free meals and milk and reduced price meals were obtained by multiplying the year 2006 Federal income poverty guidelines by 1.30 and 1.85, respectively, and by rounding the result upward to the next whole dollar.

The income eligibility chart for School Year 2006-2007 continues the changes that were implemented for School Year 2004-2005. Prior to School Year 2004-2005, the Department displayed the monthly and weekly amounts for the Federal poverty guidelines in addition to the annual figures as issued by the Department of Health and Human Services. This Notice, however, only displays the annual figures because the monthly and weekly Federal poverty guidelines were

not used to determine the Income Eligibility Guidelines. As detailed below, all calculations are based on the annual figures.

In addition, the chart which details the free and reduced price eligibility criteria includes columns for income received twice monthly as well as income received every two weeks. To differentiate, a person paid every two weeks is paid 26 times per year, whereas a person paid twice monthly is paid 24 times per year. Furthermore, the

inclusion of information about income received twice per month as well as income received every two weeks conforms to the format used by the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC) (42 U.S.C. 1786; 7 CFR part 246).

Income calculations are made based on the following formulas: Monthly income is calculated by dividing the annual income by 12; twice monthly income is computed by dividing annual

income by 24; income received every two weeks is calculated by dividing annual income by 26; and weekly income is computed by dividing annual income by 52. All numbers are rounded upward to the next whole dollar. The numbers reflected in this notice for a family of four in the 48 contiguous states, the District of Columbia, Guam and the territories represent an increase of 3.36% over last year's level for a family of the same size.

BILLING CODE 3410-30-P

ATTACHMENT B

Percent of Children Under 18 Years Below Poverty Level in the Past 12 Months (For Whom Poverty Status is Determined)

Children under 18 years for whom poverty status is determined

Rank	State	Percent	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
	United States	17.7	17.4	18.0
1	District of Columbia	35.6	31.7	39.5
2	Louisiana	29.8	27.8	31.9
3	Mississippi	28.6	26.9	30.4
4	New Mexico	25.6	22.5	28.8
5	West Virginia	25.5	23.1	27.9
6	Arkansas	23.9	21.8	26.0
6	Kentucky	23.9	21.7	26.2
8	Alabama	23.5	21.9	25.1
9	Texas	22.8	21.9	23.8
10	Oklahoma	22.3	19.9	24.7
11	Arizona	21.2	19.2	23.2
12	Tennessee	19.9	18.3	21.4
13	New York	19.4	18.4	20.4
14	California	19.0	18.4	19.7
14	Florida	19.0	18.0	20.0
16	North Carolina	18.8	17.7	19.9
17	Georgia	18.7	17.0	20.4
17	South Carolina	18.7	17.2	20.3
19	Montana	18.0	15.3	20.8
20	Ohio	17.9	16.9	18.8
21	Idaho	17.6	15.0	20.2
22	Oregon	17.5	15.2	19.9
23	Rhode Island	16.7	14.4	18.9
24	Illinois	15.8	14.6	16.9
25	Michigan	15.7	14.6	16.7
25	Missouri	15.7	14.4	17.1
25	Pennsylvania	15.7	14.6	16.8
28	Hawaii	15.3	13.4	17.1
29	Nevada	15.2	12.8	17.5
30	Wisconsin	14.4	12.4	16.5
31	Kansas	14.2	11.8	16.6
32	Washington	13.9	12.0	15.8
33	Alaska	13.8	11.6	16.1
33	North Dakota	13.8	11.9	15.6
35	South Dakota	13.7	11.8	15.7
36	Indiana	13.5	12.3	14.8
37	Maine	13.3	11.5	15.1
38	Colorado	13.2	11.0	15.3
39	Nebraska	12.6	10.9	14.4
40	Delaware	12.5	10.0	14.9
41	Massachusetts	12.3	11.1	13.4
41	Wyoming	12.3	10.4	14.2
43	Iowa	12.1	10.6	13.6
44	Utah	11.8	10.2	13.4
45	New Jersey	11.7	10.5	13.0
45	Vermont	11.7	9.6	13.8
47	Virginia	11.6	10.0	13.2
48	Connecticut	11.0	9.4	12.6
49	Maryland	10.4	8.8	11.9
50	Minnesota	9.4	8.4	10.4
51	New Hampshire	8.3	6.6	10.0

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2003 American Community Survey

The table above shows the margin of error, represented by the lower and upper bounds of the 90-percent confidence interval. The confidence interval gives a range of values likely to include the population true value. The smaller the confidence interval the more precise the estimate of the characteristic of interest.

An 'N' entry in the estimate, lower bound, and upper bound columns indicates that data for this geographic area cannot be displayed because the number of sample cases is too small.

ATTACHMENT C

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
FY 07 AT-RISK CALCULATION**

DIST. NO	DISTRICT NAME	Average Daily Attendance	# of At-Risk Students	Percent At-Risk to ADA	Percent At-Risk Rank (H - L)	FY 07 MAEP ALLOCATIONS	Portion of MAEP Allocation for At-Risk
1402	COAHOMA AHS	275.48	323	117.25%	1	\$ 1,433,861	\$ 72,013
0613	NORTH BOLIVAR	770.76	894	115.99%	2	\$ 4,399,665	\$ 199,317
6720	DREW SEP	625.20	708	113.24%	3	\$ 2,894,354	\$ 157,849
2502	HINDS AHS	200.20	226	112.89%	4	\$ 1,068,222	\$ 50,387
4220	GREENWOOD SEP	2,872.49	3,237	112.69%	5	\$ 13,581,977	\$ 721,689
0612	BENOIT	282.44	314	111.17%	6	\$ 1,285,344	\$ 70,006
6312	SOUTH DELTA SCHOOL DIS.	1,232.74	1,368	110.97%	7	\$ 5,328,626	\$ 304,996
7611	HOLLANDALE CONS	870.68	962	110.49%	8	\$ 4,660,411	\$ 214,478
3300	JEFF DAVIS COUNTY	1,995.23	2,199	110.21%	9	\$ 10,105,284	\$ 490,267
5200	NOXUBEE COUNTY	1,983.02	2,176	109.73%	10	\$ 9,429,817	\$ 485,139
3200	JEFFERSON COUNTY	1,407.47	1,534	108.99%	11	\$ 7,118,184	\$ 342,005
4720	HOLLY SPRINGS SEP	1,651.56	1,800	108.99%	12	\$ 7,759,841	\$ 401,310
0611	WEST BOLIVAR	1,015.51	1,105	108.81%	13	\$ 5,146,283	\$ 246,360
4200	LEFLORE COUNTY	2,835.53	3,064	108.06%	14	\$ 13,370,272	\$ 683,119
2620	DURANT SEP	587.34	634	107.94%	15	\$ 2,769,456	\$ 141,350
6000	QUITMAN COUNTY	1,471.48	1,588	107.92%	16	\$ 7,031,811	\$ 354,045
7900	WILKINSON COUNTY	1,410.16	1,519	107.72%	17	\$ 6,710,004	\$ 338,661
5712	SOUTH PIKE CONS	1,916.32	2,062	107.60%	18	\$ 8,577,517	\$ 459,723
6812	W. TALLAHATCHIE CONS.	1,018.47	1,092	107.22%	19	\$ 4,878,027	\$ 243,461
0616	MOUND BAYOU	658.33	695	105.57%	20	\$ 3,553,440	\$ 154,950
1400	COAHOMA COUNTY	1,744.48	1,836	105.25%	21	\$ 7,618,184	\$ 409,336
0300	AMITE COUNTY	1,299.29	1,362	104.83%	22	\$ 5,502,938	\$ 303,658
0615	SHAW	648.91	678	104.48%	23	\$ 3,197,559	\$ 151,160
2600	HOLMES COUNTY	3,234.65	3,367	104.09%	24	\$ 14,650,725	\$ 750,673
1300	CLAY COUNTY	179.26	185	103.20%	25	\$ 910,757	\$ 41,246
0921	OKOLONA SEP	793.68	816	102.81%	26	\$ 3,985,681	\$ 181,927
7200	TUNICA COUNTY	2,071.14	2,104	101.59%	27	\$ 8,012,452	\$ 469,087
2700	HUMPHREYS COUNTY	1,760.24	1,778	101.01%	28	\$ 7,863,395	\$ 396,405
4520	CANTON SEP	3,014.34	3,043	100.95%	29	\$ 13,216,632	\$ 678,437
1100	CLAIBORNE COUNTY	1,885.72	1,870	99.17%	30	\$ 7,415,475	\$ 416,917
5300	OKTIBBEHA COUNTY	799.10	786	98.36%	31	\$ 4,371,968	\$ 175,239
7612	LELAND CONS	1,077.26	1,052	97.66%	32	\$ 5,173,082	\$ 234,543
8220	YAZOO CITY SEP	2,581.62	2,516	97.46%	33	\$ 12,192,360	\$ 560,942

NOTE: The number of At-Risk Students is an actual enrolled count; therefore in some cases this number will exceed the ADA count which is a count of the average daily attendance of a school district over a nine month period.

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
FY 07 AT-RISK CALCULATION**

DIST. NO	DISTRICT NAME	Average Daily Attendance	# of At-Risk Students	Percent At-Risk to ADA	Percent At-Risk Rank (H - L)	FY 07 MAEP ALLOCATIONS	Portion of MAEP Allocation for At-Risk
7620	GREENVILLE SEP	6,660.94	6,345	95.26%	34	\$ 29,958,064	\$ 1,414,618
4820	ABERDEEN SEP	1,528.13	1,442	94.36%	35	\$ 6,554,939	\$ 321,494
1520	HAZLEHURST SEP	1,618.03	1,526	94.31%	36	\$ 6,934,767	\$ 340,222
1420	CLARKSDALE SEP	3,421.23	3,217	94.03%	37	\$ 15,629,519	\$ 717,230
0500	BENTON COUNTY	1,272.05	1,193	93.79%	38	\$ 6,045,684	\$ 265,979
2320	BAY ST. LOUIS SEP	1,410.99	1,321	93.62%	39	\$ 8,695,761	\$ 294,517
6721	INDIANOLA SEP	2,494.23	2,327	93.30%	40	\$ 11,072,405	\$ 518,805
0130	NATCHEZ-ADAMS	4,183.55	3,889	92.96%	41	\$ 17,132,377	\$ 867,053
5720	MCCOMB SEP	2,818.95	2,612	92.66%	42	\$ 12,775,343	\$ 582,345
4900	MONTGOMERY COUNTY	457.31	416	90.97%	43	\$ 2,157,570	\$ 92,747
6700	SUNFLOWER COUNTY	1,767.61	1,596	90.29%	44	\$ 7,929,629	\$ 355,828
3111	EAST JASPER CONS	1,140.71	1,025	89.86%	45	\$ 5,012,506	\$ 228,524
7613	WESTERN LINE CONS	1,928.47	1,725	89.45%	46	\$ 7,517,967	\$ 384,589
3420	LAUREL SEP	2,814.35	2,488	88.40%	47	\$ 11,125,550	\$ 554,700
3500	KEMPER COUNTY	1,262.61	1,116	88.39%	48	\$ 5,498,375	\$ 248,812
8111	COFFEEVILLE CONS	655.30	576	87.90%	49	\$ 3,159,677	\$ 128,419
5411	NORTH PANOLA CONS	1,719.95	1,506	87.56%	50	\$ 8,128,788	\$ 335,763
1820	HATTIESBURG SEP	4,273.28	3,716	86.96%	51	\$ 17,852,540	\$ 828,482
3020	MOSS POINT SEP	3,197.10	2,736	85.58%	52	\$ 16,729,692	\$ 609,991
3711	LUMBERTON LINE	766.13	642	83.80%	53	\$ 3,872,176	\$ 143,134
6811	E. TALLAHATCHIE CONS.	1,490.30	1,228	82.40%	54	\$ 7,432,271	\$ 273,783
0800	CARROLL COUNTY	963.02	793	82.35%	55	\$ 4,119,241	\$ 176,799
4700	MARSHALL COUNTY	3,196.15	2,587	80.94%	56	\$ 14,687,313	\$ 576,772
1320	WEST POINT SEP	3,302.68	2,667	80.75%	57	\$ 14,447,014	\$ 594,608
0400	ATTALA COUNTY	1,218.18	979	80.37%	58	\$ 5,470,100	\$ 218,268
2421	GULFPORT SEP	4,571.03	3,650	79.85%	59	\$ 22,858,290	\$ 813,768
3820	MERIDIAN SEP	6,155.66	4,797	77.93%	60	\$ 25,496,346	\$ 1,069,491
4600	MARION COUNTY	2,364.98	1,820	76.96%	61	\$ 11,969,232	\$ 405,769
1500	COPIAH COUNTY	2,841.49	2,177	76.61%	62	\$ 12,275,229	\$ 485,362
3112	WEST JASPER CONS	1,611.53	1,226	76.08%	63	\$ 7,719,997	\$ 273,337
2423	PASS CHRISTIAN SEP	1,362.46	1,035	75.97%	64	\$ 7,577,041	\$ 230,753
1600	COVINGTON COUNTY	3,243.34	2,449	75.51%	65	\$ 13,695,323	\$ 546,005
6220	FOREST SEP	1,514.63	1,135	74.94%	66	\$ 6,356,524	\$ 253,048
8200	YAZOO	1,739.45	1,299	74.68%	67	\$ 7,097,367	\$ 289,612

NOTE: The number of At-Risk Students is an actual enrolled count; therefore in some cases this number will exceed the ADA count which is a count of the average daily attendance of a school district over a nine month period.

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
FY 07 AT-RISK CALCULATION**

DIST. NO	DISTRICT NAME	Average Daily Attendance	# of At-Risk Students	Percent At-Risk to ADA	Percent At-Risk Rank (H - L)	FY 07 MAEP ALLOCATIONS	Portion of MAEP Allocation for At-Risk
5130	NEWTON SEP	1,015.09	758	74.67%	68	\$ 4,575,208	\$ 168,996
6400	SIMPSON COUNTY	3,998.63	2,968	74.23%	69	\$ 17,741,660	\$ 661,716
4420	COLUMBUS SEP	4,573.97	3,378	73.85%	70	\$ 19,438,715	\$ 753,125
8020	LOUISVILLE SEP	2,682.31	1,978	73.74%	71	\$ 11,990,077	\$ 440,995
5020	PHILADELPHIA SEP	1,050.16	767	73.04%	72	\$ 4,548,902	\$ 171,003
2420	BILOXI SEP	4,283.63	3,106	72.51%	73	\$ 23,062,855	\$ 692,483
7700	WAYNE COUNTY	3,660.72	2,630	71.84%	74	\$ 16,680,980	\$ 586,359
0614	CLEVELAND	3,368.89	2,413	71.63%	75	\$ 14,172,410	\$ 537,978
2100	GREENE COUNTY	1,838.33	1,313	71.42%	76	\$ 8,693,626	\$ 292,733
4620	COLUMBIA SEP	1,734.56	1,182	68.14%	77	\$ 7,765,824	\$ 263,527
5600	PERRY COUNTY	1,333.73	906	67.93%	78	\$ 5,679,999	\$ 201,993
3022	PASCAGOULA SEP	6,396.03	4,276	66.85%	79	\$ 27,485,182	\$ 953,334
5412	SOUTH PANOLA CONS	4,400.73	2,935	66.69%	80	\$ 19,434,913	\$ 654,358
1212	QUITMAN CONS	2,202.78	1,469	66.69%	81	\$ 9,506,512	\$ 327,514
0700	CALHOUN COUNTY	2,347.20	1,551	66.08%	82	\$ 11,011,848	\$ 345,795
1900	FRANKLIN COUNTY	1,449.98	956	65.93%	83	\$ 6,965,147	\$ 213,140
1000	CHOCTAW COUNTY	1,608.98	1,055	65.57%	84	\$ 7,500,890	\$ 235,212
6200	SCOTT COUNTY	3,757.00	2,415	64.28%	85	\$ 17,826,453	\$ 538,424
4000	LEAKE COUNTY	3,141.37	2,005	63.83%	86	\$ 13,623,242	\$ 447,015
2520	JACKSON SEP	29,499.21	18,546	62.87%	87	\$ 119,071,518	\$ 4,134,831
7500	WARREN-VICKSBURG	8,521.24	5,280	61.96%	88	\$ 32,388,010	\$ 1,177,176
8113	WATER VALLEY CONS	1,237.05	746	60.30%	89	\$ 5,976,106	\$ 166,321
5520	PICAYUNE SEP	3,410.63	2,050	60.11%	90	\$ 15,277,933	\$ 457,048
0920	HOUSTON SEP	1,870.83	1,123	60.03%	91	\$ 8,881,293	\$ 250,373
5920	BALDWYN SEP	915.61	548	59.85%	92	\$ 4,250,551	\$ 122,177
6900	TATE COUNTY	2,714.24	1,614	59.46%	93	\$ 12,679,155	\$ 359,841
1800	FORREST COUNTY	2,340.59	1,388	59.30%	94	\$ 10,431,467	\$ 309,455
0900	CHICKASAW COUNTY	482.67	286	59.25%	95	\$ 2,467,398	\$ 63,764
5530	POPLARVILLE SEP	1,972.62	1,153	58.45%	96	\$ 8,913,078	\$ 257,061
4320	BROOKHAVEN SEP	2,900.93	1,678	57.84%	97	\$ 12,232,419	\$ 374,110
5320	STARKVILLE SEP	3,830.10	2,206	57.60%	98	\$ 16,153,631	\$ 491,828
2220	GRENADA SEP	4,335.96	2,458	56.69%	99	\$ 18,356,690	\$ 548,011
3900	LAWRENCE COUNTY	2,216.31	1,255	56.63%	100	\$ 9,447,050	\$ 279,802
2300	HANCOCK COUNTY	3,689.24	2,084	56.49%	101	\$ 15,638,718	\$ 464,628

NOTE: The number of At-Risk Students is an actual enrolled count; therefore in some cases this number will exceed the ADA count which is a count of the average daily attendance of a school district over a nine month period.

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
FY 07 AT-RISK CALCULATION**

DIST. NO	DISTRICT NAME	Average Daily Attendance	# of At-Risk Students	Percent At-Risk to ADA	Percent At-Risk Rank (H - L)	FY 07 MAEP ALLOCATIONS	Portion of MAEP Allocation for At-Risk
4920	WINONA SEP	1,317.46	737	55.94%	102	\$ 6,280,414	\$ 164,314
2400	HARRISON COUNTY	11,322.24	6,328	55.89%	103	\$ 49,343,163	\$ 1,410,828
5620	RIGHTON SEP	697.16	381	54.65%	104	\$ 3,550,583	\$ 84,944
4111	NETTLETON LINE CONS	1,320.00	720	54.55%	105	\$ 6,299,052	\$ 160,524
0420	KOSCIUSKO SEP	1,990.44	1,045	52.50%	106	\$ 8,939,323	\$ 232,983
6500	SMITH COUNTY	2,946.47	1,535	52.10%	107	\$ 13,282,632	\$ 342,228
7800	WEBSTER COUNTY	1,730.00	891	51.50%	108	\$ 8,166,134	\$ 198,648
0220	CORINTH SEP	1,780.45	912	51.22%	109	\$ 7,708,227	\$ 203,330
7011	N. TIPPAAH CONS.	1,304.14	664	50.91%	110	\$ 6,543,729	\$ 148,039
3400	JONES COUNTY	7,537.15	3,777	50.11%	111	\$ 34,049,748	\$ 842,082
7400	WALTHALL COUNTY	2,609.57	1,293	49.55%	112	\$ 11,671,262	\$ 288,274
4821	AMORY SEP	1,726.98	851	49.28%	113	\$ 7,793,983	\$ 189,730
7012	S. TIPPAAH CONS.	2,633.67	1,294	49.13%	114	\$ 12,246,625	\$ 288,497
5131	UNION SEP	838.03	407	48.57%	115	\$ 4,101,838	\$ 90,741
5000	NESHOBA COUNTY	2,838.70	1,367	48.16%	116	\$ 12,688,388	\$ 304,773
5900	PRENTISS COUNTY	2,205.80	1,052	47.69%	117	\$ 11,051,934	\$ 234,543
2900	ITAWAMBA COUNTY	3,553.82	1,672	47.05%	118	\$ 15,917,634	\$ 372,772
1211	ENTERPRISE CONS	839.78	393	46.80%	119	\$ 3,597,540	\$ 87,619
4100	LEE COUNTY	6,172.89	2,882	46.69%	120	\$ 27,001,056	\$ 642,542
4300	LINCOLN COUNTY	2,819.85	1,299	46.07%	121	\$ 12,819,903	\$ 289,612
6600	STONE COUNTY	2,562.44	1,165	45.46%	122	\$ 11,064,403	\$ 259,737
4120	TUPELO SEP	6,750.85	3,056	45.27%	123	\$ 27,021,989	\$ 681,335
7300	UNION COUNTY	2,559.75	1,153	45.04%	124	\$ 11,750,556	\$ 257,061
2500	HINDS COUNTY	5,992.36	2,672	44.59%	125	\$ 23,582,001	\$ 595,722
1802	FORREST AHS	565.40	251	44.39%	126	\$ 2,551,643	\$ 55,960
2000	GEORGE COUNTY	3,858.72	1,711	44.34%	127	\$ 18,067,738	\$ 381,467
3600	LAFAYETTE COUNTY	2,218.29	983	44.31%	128	\$ 10,296,353	\$ 219,160
4400	LOWNDES COUNTY	5,173.65	2,250	43.49%	129	\$ 21,284,276	\$ 501,638
7100	TISHOMINGO/ IUKA	3,125.20	1,352	43.26%	130	\$ 13,678,728	\$ 301,428
3620	OXFORD SEP	3,067.58	1,299	42.35%	131	\$ 11,851,084	\$ 289,612
5100	NEWTON COUNTY	1,767.38	743	42.04%	132	\$ 8,295,206	\$ 165,652
7320	NEW ALBANY	2,031.22	850	41.85%	133	\$ 8,944,466	\$ 189,508
6920	SENATOBIA SEP	1,754.80	729	41.54%	134	\$ 7,754,032	\$ 162,531
5711	NORTH PIKE CONS	1,875.39	771	41.11%	135	\$ 8,269,882	\$ 171,894

NOTE: The number of At-Risk Students is an actual enrolled count; therefore in some cases this number will exceed the ADA count which is a count of the average daily attendance of a school district over a nine month period.

**MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
FY 07 AT-RISK CALCULATION**

DIST. NO	DISTRICT NAME	Average Daily Attendance	# of At-Risk Students	Percent At-Risk to ADA	Percent At-Risk Rank (H - L)	FY 07 MAEP ALLOCATIONS	Portion of MAEP Allocation for At-Risk
3800	LAUDERDALE COUNTY	6,208.98	2,540	40.91%	136	\$ 27,732,021	\$ 566,293
6120	PEARL SEP	3,587.79	1,465	40.83%	137	\$ 14,269,953	\$ 326,622
5800	PONTOTOC COUNTY	3,064.66	1,215	39.65%	138	\$ 13,769,186	\$ 270,884
5500	PEARL RIVER COUNTY	2,762.76	1,078	39.02%	139	\$ 11,711,223	\$ 240,340
5820	PONTOTOC SEP	2,205.54	858	38.90%	140	\$ 9,874,257	\$ 191,291
3000	JACKSON COUNTY	7,797.72	2,978	38.19%	141	\$ 30,818,728	\$ 663,945
4800	MONROE COUNTY	2,341.34	887	37.88%	142	\$ 10,551,736	\$ 197,757
0200	ALCORN COUNTY	3,593.63	1,357	37.76%	143	\$ 17,061,641	\$ 302,543
1821	PETAL SEP	3,622.65	1,361	37.57%	144	\$ 16,892,461	\$ 303,435
2422	LONG BEACH SEP	2,688.58	1,008	37.49%	145	\$ 13,509,642	\$ 224,734
5921	BOONEVILLE SEP	1,365.52	460	33.69%	146	\$ 6,069,628	\$ 102,557
3700	LAMAR COUNTY	7,089.18	2,135	30.12%	147	\$ 30,513,282	\$ 475,998
2521	CLINTON SEP	4,682.83	1,314	28.06%	148	\$ 18,722,401	\$ 292,956
6100	RANKIN COUNTY	16,067.30	4,452	27.71%	149	\$ 60,849,378	\$ 992,573
4500	MADISON COUNTY	10,215.08	2,761	27.03%	150	\$ 37,867,205	\$ 615,565
1700	DESOTO COUNTY	25,702.41	6,372	24.79%	151	\$ 99,963,260	\$ 1,420,637
3021	OCEAN SPRINGS SEP	4,711.30	1,054	22.37%	152	\$ 21,672,956	\$ 234,989
	TOTAL	461,112.14	280,405			\$ 2,009,382,167	\$ 62,516,295

NOTE: The number of At-Risk Students is an actual enrolled count; therefore in some cases this number will exceed the ADA count which is a count of the average daily attendance of a school district over a nine month period.

ATTACHMENT D

At-Risk Student Funding Goal of 43%

Breakdown of At-Risk Funding Components:

Curent MAEP At-Risk Funding Level (5%)	Curent "Other" At-Risk Funds (12.2%)	Total Additional State Funds Needed (25.8%)	At-Risk Fuding Goal (43%)
\$ 65,461,389	\$ 160,000,000	\$ 337,506,556	\$ 562,967,945

Phase-In of Additional 25.8% State Funding Needed to Reach 43% Goal:

FY 2008: Request Additional 5%	FY 2009: Request Additional 5% (Cummulative 10% Addt'l)	FY 2010: Request Additional 5% (Cummulative 15% Addt'l)	FY 2011: Request Additional 5% (Cummulative 20% Addt'l)	FY 2012: Request Additional 5.8% (Cummulative 25.8% Addt'l)
\$ 65,461,389	\$ 132,232,006	\$ 200,338,035	\$ 269,806,185	\$ 351,137,520 *

* Fluctuation in number of At-Risk Students due to Katrina and the average annual increase in base student cost will impact the yearly At-Risk calculation. A 2% annual increase in the Base Student Cost is assumed in these calculations.