Mother and Father	37.0%	36.6%	37.5% <sup>###</sup>	67,2%
Only Mother	57.1	54.8	54.7 <sup>###</sup>	29.2
Only Father	1.3	1.2	0.8	1.5
Grandparent	3.2	3.8	3.9 <sup>###</sup>	0.4
Other	1.3*	3.4	2.7	1.7
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
bility (time at current resid	dence)			
0-1 year	8.2%*	5.9%	7.5%#	4.2%
1-2 years	16.4*	13.4	13.8###	6.1
2+ years	75.4	78.8	78.7 <sup>###</sup>	88.7
Total	100,0%	100,0%	100.0%	100.0%
nicity				
African American	66. <b>8%<sup>*TTT</sup></b>	76.1%	48.4% ###	35.1%
White	25.0 <sup>TTT</sup>	15.5	37.9 <sup>###</sup>	56.7
Hispanic	3.2 <sup>TTT</sup>	3.2	7.4**	4.0
Multiracial	3.8	3.8	4.3	3.0
Other	1.2	1.4	2.0	1.3
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100,0%	100.0%
igious Affiliation				
Baptist	40.4% <sup>TTT</sup>	43.0%	29.4%##	22.1%
Other Protestant	13.8	17.4	12.6	15.7
Catholic .	24.8****TTT	13,4	43.1*	49.8
	$13.2^{TTT}$		5,9	7.2
Other Religion	13.2	14.3	9.0 <sup>##</sup>	1.2

Column (1) refers to scholarship recipients who previously were in public school; (2) to public school students; (3) to scholarship students who previously were in private school; and (4) to private students who applied, but did not receive, a scholarship. All kindergartners who are scholarship students are included in column one. Values of n signify the lowest number of cases represented by a group among the selected items; consequently, one cannot infer the value of certain frequencies by taking the product of a percentage and the value of n.

100.0%

416

100.0%

533

100.0%

426

100.0%

236

Total

- signifies that differences between columns 1 and 2 are statistically significant at the .05 level. signifies that differences between columns 1 and 2 are statistically significant at the .01 level. signifies that differences between columns 1 and 2 are statistically significant at the .001 level.
- # signifies that differences between columns 3 and 4 are statistically significant at the .05 level. ## signifies that differences between columns 3 and 4 are statistically significant at the .01 level.
- signifies that differences between columns 3 and 4 are statistically significant at the .001 level.
- T signifies that differences between columns 1 and 3 are statistically significant at the .05 level.
- signifies that differences between columns 1 and 3 are statistically significant at the .01 level.
- signifies that differences between columns 1 and 3 are statistically significant at the .001 level.

#### The actual questions read as follows:

- "What is your annual family income before taxes? Please include all sources of earnings from all members of the household. Do not, however, include the value of food stamps, Medicaid or public housing."
- "What is the highest level of education that you [the mother] completed?"
- "Do you [the mother] currently have a job, either full-time or part-time?"
- "Does your child live with either biological parent?"
- "How long have you [the mother] lived at your current address?"
- "What is your [the mother's] religious affiliation?"

Data on ethnicity and family size were compiled from CSTP office records.

<sup>(1)</sup> Of those students who did not receive a scholarship and attended a public school in 1996-97, 7.4

percent had attended a private school the year before.

(2) Of those students who did not receive a scholarship and attended a private school in 1996-97, 28.4 percent had attended a public school the year before.

(3) When calculating average income, responses of "over \$50,000" were set at \$60,000.

<sup>(4)</sup> Standard errors are in parentheses.

<sup>(5)</sup> This index is scaled from 1 to 6 where 1 signifies less than high school, 2 some high school, 3 high school graduate (including GED), 4 some college, 5 college graduate and 6 more than college.

<sup>(6)</sup> This index is scaled from 1 to 4 where 1 signifies not looking for work, 2 looking for work, 3 part-time employment and 4 full-time employment.

Table 2: Reasons for Applying for Scholarship Grades K-3, average scores

1996-97 School Program: Previous School: Received Scholarship?	Choice Public Yes	Public Mostly Public <sup>(1)</sup> No	Choice Private M Yes	Private Mostly Private <sup>(2)</sup> No
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
How important were the following considerations in your decision to apply for a scholarship?				
Improved Academic Quality:	2.85**	2.69	2.79###	2.56
improvou rondoniao Quanty.	$(0.38)^{(3)}$	(0,51)	(0.46)	(0.67)
Greater Safety:	2.78***	2,55	2.75###	2.51
	(0.46)	(0.62)	(0.52)	(0.69)
Location:	2.47 (0.70)	2.44 (0.70)	2.52 <sup>###</sup> (0.69)	2.33 (0.77)
Religion:	2,12***T	FT 1.80	2.40##	2.27
	(0.79)	(0.80)	(0.73)	(0.77)
Friends:	1.63 <sup>T</sup> (0.79)	1.62 (0.76)	1.70 (0.79)	1.68 (0.79)
n	597	459	255	415

Indices scored from 1 to 3, averages reported: 1 signifies not important; 2 important; and 3 very important. Also, see notes to Table 1.

Table 3: Reasons for not Participating in CSTP Grades K-3, percent responding 'important'

1996-97 School Program:	Public
Previous School: Received Scholarship?	Mostly Public No
Received Scholarship:	110
Did you receive a scholarship this year?	
Believed not Offered a Scholarship:(1)	44.1%
How important was each of the following in your decision not to participate in the scholarship program?	
Transportation:	36.5
Offered Admission to Desired Public School:	35,3
Financial Reasons:	31.2
Refused Admission to Private School:	21.1
Moved from Area:	13.1
n	460

Possible responses to survey question were dichotomous. Also, see notes to Table 1.

<sup>(1)</sup> These results combine answers to two questions. Those who believed they were not offered a scholarship were not asked the second question. Consequently, while individual respondents who believed they were offered a scholarship could claim that multiple reasons influenced their decision not to accept a scholarship, those who believed they were not offered one in the first place could only indicate the one reason.

Table 4: Parent Satisfaction with <u>Their Own School</u> Grades K-3, average score

1996-97 School Program: Previous School:	Choice Public	Public Mostly Public	Choice Private	Private Mostly Private
Received Scholarship?	Yes	No	Yes	No
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
For the following characteristic satisfied are you with the school child is attending?				
Academic Quality:	3.56*** <sub>T</sub>	3.06	3.64#	3.57
	(0,66)	(0.63)	(0.56)	(0.60)
Safety:	3.51***TT	3,02	3.66#	3.58
	(0.68)	(0.63)	(0.54)	(0.61)
Discipline:	3.49*** <b>T</b> T	2.91	3.59##	3,49
Discipinio.	(0.63)	(0.81)	(0.57)	(0.67)
Teaching Moral Values:	3.66***	3.02	3,69	3,68
Total various.	(0.58)	(0.75)	(0.50)	(0.56)
Private Attention to Child:	3.42***	2.80	3.42	3,36
	(0.70)	(0.88)	(0.67)	(0.68)
Parent Involvement:	3,44***	3.03	3.47	3.44
	(0.67)	(0.79)	(0.61)	(0.69)
Class Size:	3.37***	2.75	3.35##	3.23
CIAGO DIEV.	(0.64)	(0.71)	(0.77)	(0.78)
Facility:	3.38***T	2.85	3.47###	3.30
r acmy.	(0.72)	(0.81)	(0.63)	(0.67)
n	592	483	254	465

compares columns 1 and 2.

Indices scored from 1 to 4; averages reported. 1 signifies very dissatisfied; 2 dissatisfied; 3 satisfied; and 4 very satisfied. Also, see notes to Table 1.

<sup>#</sup> compares columns 3 and 4.

compares columns 1 and 3.

Table 5: Explanations for Scholarship Applicants' Satisfaction with <u>Their Own School</u>

Grades K-3

	Parental Satisfaction <sup>(1)</sup>	
	Model 1	Model 2
Educational Experiences:		
Involuntarily in Public School:	-6.7***	-6.6***
Type of School: <sup>(2)</sup>		
Private (No Scholarship):	15.5***	15.0***
Established Parochial School (Scholarship): New Parochial School (Scholarship): Established Secular School (Scholarship): New Secular School (Scholarship):	16.0*** 0.5 15.7** 6.5***	15.9*** 0.3 16.1** 6.6**
Demographics:		
Special Needs: Minority: Income: Kindergarten: Family Size: Mother's Education: Mother's Employment Status: Residential Mobility:	-2.6** -3.3** 0.2 2.8**	-2.7** -3.0*** 0.2 2.4** 0.4 0.7 -0.6 0.2
Constant	69.4***	66.9***
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> n	.24 1586	.23 1585

Unstandardized coefficients from OLS regressions reported. \* significant at the .05 level; \*\* significant at the .01 level; \*\* significant at the .001 level.

<sup>(1)</sup> Index of satisfaction, summarizing eight dimensions listed in Table 3. See page 15 for description.

<sup>(2)</sup> The baseline group includes those individuals who were offered a scholarship, but refused it, and claimed that being refused admission to a desired public school was not an important reason for choosing to attend a public school.

Table 6: Explanations for Scholarship Recipients'
Satisfaction with <u>Their Own School</u>
Grades K-3

	Parental Satisfaction		
	Model 1	Model 2	
Educational Experiences:			
Prior Public School:	-0.3	-0.5	
Religious Compatibility:	-0.4	-0.2	
Type of School. (1)			
Established Parochial School:	15.0***	15.0***	
Established Secular School:	14.9***	15,4***	
New Secular School;	5.6**	5.9***	
Demographics:		•	
Special Needs:	-3.0*	-3.0*	
Minority:	-4.2***	-3.5 <sup>**</sup>	
Income:	-0.1	-1.8	
Kindergarten:	2.3	2.3	
Family Size:		0.7	
Mother's Education:		0.5	
Mother's Employment Status:		-0.4	
Residential Mobility:		0.1	
Constant	76.3***	73.3***	
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.17	.17	
n	770	755	

Unstandardized coefficients from OLS regressions reported. \* significant at the .05 level; \*\* significant at the .01 level; \*\* significant at the .001 level.

<sup>(1)</sup> The baseline group consists of two parochial schools with a high number of new scholarship students.

Table 7: Explanations for Non-Recipients'
Satisfaction with <u>Their Own School</u>
Grades K-3

	Parental Satisfaction	
	Model 1	Model 2
Educational Experiences:		
Prior Public School: Involuntarily in Public School:	1.9 -3.8**	1.4 -3.6**
Type of School; <sup>(1)</sup>		
Private School:	19.1***	18,3***
Demographics;		
Special Needs:	-1,5	-1.4
Minority:	-0.8	-0.3
Income:	0.5	0.6*
Kindergarten:	3.4*	3,1
Family Size:	••	0.1
Mother's Education:		0,3
Mother's Employment Status:		-0.8
Residential Mobility:		0.0
Constant	57.3***	56.0***
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.20	.20
n	813	736

Standardized coefficients from OLS regressions reported. \* significant at the .05 level; \*\* significant at the .01 level; \*\* significant at the .001 level.

<sup>(1)</sup> The baseline group includes those individuals who were offered a scholarship, but refused it, and claimed that being refused admission to a desired public school was not an important reason for choosing to attend a public school.

**Table 8: School Mobility Rates of Scholarship Students Grades K-3** 

1996-97 School Program: Previous School: Received Scholarship?	Choice Public Yes	Choice Private Yes	Choice Total Yes
Child attend same school entire year?			
Yes:	91.0%***	99.2%	93.7%
No (broken out by stated reason):			
Admitted to Preferred Private School:	3.3*	0.0	2.3
Quality of Schools:	1.3	0.4	1.1
Admitted to Preferred Public School:	1.0	0.0	0.7
Moved:	0.8	0.0	0.6
Transportation Difficulties:	0.8	0.4	0.7
Administration:	0.3	0.0	0.2
Disability/Behavior Problems:	0.3	0.0	0.2
School Closure/Change	0.3	0.0	0.2
Financial:	0.2	0.0	0.1
Expulsion:	0.2	0.0	0.1
Other:	0.3	0.0	0.2
n	600	256	856

 $<sup>^*</sup>$  compares columns 1 and 2.

Also, see notes to Table 1.

Table 9: Matriculation Plans of Scholarship Students Grades K-3

1996-97 School Program:	Choice	Choice	Choice
Previous School:	Public	Private	Total
Received Scholarship?	Yes	Yes	Yes
Plan on attending same school next yea	ar?		
Yes:	80,5%**	87,7%	82,8%
No (broken out by stated reason):			
Quality of School:	5.7*	2.1	4.5
Change of Student's Grade Le	evel: 3.5*	0.4	2.5
Move from Area:	2.0	1.3	1.8
Prefer Different Private Schoo	ol: 1.6	2.1	1.8
Transportation Difficulties:	1.4*	0.0	1.0
Cost:	1.0	2.1	1.4
Disappointed with Program:	0.8	0.9	0.8
School or Program Closing Do	own: 0.8	0,8	0,8
Lack Special Ed. Resources:	0.4	0.0	0.3
Prefer Different Public School	0.4	0.0	0.3
Refused Readmission/Expulsion	on: 0.4	0.4	0.4
Other:	1.8	2.1	1.9
Total:	100.0% 507	100.0% 244	100.0% 751

compares columns 1 and 2.

Also, see notes to Table 1.

Table 10: Explanations for Retention of Scholarship Recipients Grades K-3

		Retention Rate(1)	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Educational Experiences:			
Satisfaction:	2,88***	2.24***	
Prior Public School:	-0.17	-0.13	-0.14
Religious Compatibility:	-0.02	0.06	-0.02
Type of School: (2)			
Established Parochial School (Scholarship)	0.46	0.36*	0,84***
Established Secular School (Scholarship)	-1.01***	-0.74***	-0.46*
New Secular School (Scholarship)	-0.05	0.02	0.15
Demographics:			
Special Needs:	0.11	0.09	-0.02
Minority:	-0.22	-0.16	-0.29*
Income:	-0.00	. 0.02	-0.00
Kindergarten:	-0.07	-0.10	-0.06
Family Size:	-0.06	-0.07	-0.06
Residential Mobility:	-0.11	-0.09	-0.06
Mother's Education:		-0.09	-0.07
Mother's Employment Status:		0.04	0.08
Single Parent Household:		-0.07	-0.09
Constant	-1.05**	-0.62	0.99*
Degrees of Freedom	753	737	763
Chi-Square Goodness of Fit	785	899	776
n	766	753	778

Regression coefficients from a Probit Model are reported. \* significant at the .05 level; \*\* significant at the .01 level; \*\*\* significant at the .001 level.

with a high number of new scholarship students.

<sup>(1)</sup> Mobility is a dummy variable, scored 1 if the respondent changed school during the school year or planned to change school at the end of the school year.
(2) The baseline group consists of two parochial schools, both of which were established in the early 1990s,

Table 11: Test Score Changes Grades 1-3, Hope schools

	Fall, 1996	Spring, 1997	Change
Reading	28.4	34.1	5.6*
Ü	(155)	(155)	
Language	41.2	36.6	-4.5
•	(154)	(154)	
Mathematics Total	29.2	40.8	11.6*
	(155)	(155)	
Mathematical Concepts	28.6	41.4	12.8*
•	(155)	(155)	

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically Significant at .05 level. Numbers may not add, due to rounding. Number of cases in parentheses.

Table 12: Test Score Changes in Language Grades 1-3, Hope schools

	Fall 1996	Spring 1997	Change	Number of Students
Kindergarten				
Math			N/A	
Math Concepts	36.6	54.7	18.1**	(108)
Reading	30,4	35,8	5.4**	(108)
Language			N/A	
Total			N/A	
Grade 1				
Math	25.0	31.6	6.6**	(66)
Math Concepts	21.6	37.0	15.4**	(67)
Reading	25.5	32.2	6.6	(67)
Language	48,8	29.8	-19.0	(66)
Total	26.6	29.8	3.2	(66)
Grade 2				
Math	36,3	54.4	18.0**	(59)
Math Concepts	37.7	50.5	12.8	(59)
Reading	28.8	33,3	4.5	(59)
Language	40.3	43.2	2.9	(59)
Total	30.6	42.6	12.0	(59)
Grade 3				
Math	24.6	34.6	10.0**	(29)
Math Concepts	26,3	33.0	6.7	(29)
Reading	34,4	39.9	5,5	(29)
Language	25.4	38.9	13.5	(29)
Total	25.8	36.5	10.7**	(29)

Statistically significant at .05 level; significant at the .1 level. Numbers may not add, due to rounding.

Table 13: National Percentile Rankings of Low-Income Students at the Hope schools and Low-Income Voucher Applicants in Milwaukee in Grade K-3

	Hope schools	Hope schools	Milwaukee Low-Income Scholarship Applicants		
	Fall	Spring	Spring		
Math	29.2	40.8	34.9		
Math Concepts	31.9	49.9	31.0		
Reading	29.2	34.8	33.5		

<sup>\*</sup>Language and total scores were not available for students in Milwaukee.

### Appendix A:

Table A1: Breakdown of Survey Response Rates

1996-97 School Program: Previous School:	Choice Public	Choice Private	Not a Recipient Public & Private	Total Public & Private	
Frequencies:					
Interviewed	726	288	1,006	2,020	
Could not Contact <sup>(1)</sup>	240	69	933	1,242	
Refused to be Interviewed	i 37	8	130	175	
Total Contacts Attempted	1: 1,003	365	2,069	3,437	
As a percentage of contacts a	ittempted:		·		
Interviewed	72.4%	78.9%	48.6%	58.8%	
Could not Contact	23.9	18.9	45.1	36.1	
Refused to be Interviewed	d 3.7	2.2	6.3	5.1	
Total:	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

The majority of these cases are non-working numbers (53.9% in column 4). Other reasons for not being able to contact a household include: the respondent being unavailable or unknown at attempted number (27.2%); and multiple failed attempts (10.9%); change of numbers to business, electronic or mobile use (5.8%); the respondent not speaking English or being mentally or physically impaired (1.4%).

Table A2: Examining the Possibility of Response Bias Grades K-3

Select Group:	All Applicants		Choice	Choice(Public)(1)		Choice(Private)(3)		No Voucher	
Data Source:	Survey	Universe	Survey	Universe	Survey	Universe	Survey	Universe	
	(1A)	(1B)	(2A)	(2B)	(3A)	(3B)	(4A)	(4B)	
Average Income	\$16,279***	\$14,754	\$12,533 <sup>(3)</sup>	\$12,045	\$11,923**	<b>\$</b> 10,698	\$20,748***	\$16,251	
	(14,586)	(14,184)	(12,194)	(11,361)	(9,959)	(7,907)	(16,261)	(15,424)	
Average Family Size	3.77***	4.03	3.77**	3.89	3.83***	3.97	3.92***	4.09	
	(1.47)	(1.46)	(1.43)	(1.43)	(1.51)	(1.54)	(1.40)	(1.46)	
Ethnicity									
African American	59.5%	62.8%	68,6%	68.8%	49.3%	48.7%	55.9%***	62.4%	
White	31.7	27.4	23.8	22.0	38.2	37.3	35.8***	28.1	
Hispanic	3.9	5,0	3.0	3.5	6.9	7.3	3.5 <sup>*</sup>	5.2	
Multiracial	3.5	3.2	3.5	3.8	3.8	4.4	3.3	2.9	
Other	1.3	1.6	· 1.I	1.9	1.7	2.0	1.3	1.4	
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
n	1896	6050	719	1,493	288	496	887	4,548	

See notes to Table 1.

compares differences between the survey and universe.

<sup>(1)</sup> Choice(Public) refers to those individuals who received a scholarship and previously attended a public school – this includes kindergartners.
(2) Choice(Private) refers to all individuals who received a scholarship and previously attended a private school – this too includes kindergartners.
(3) See footnote 8 in the text.

106TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION

# S. 1266

To allow a State to combine certain funds to improve the academic achievement of all its students.

### IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 22, 1999

Mr. GORTON (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. GREGG, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. HELMS, and Mr. VOINOVICH) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

## A BILL

To allow a State to combine certain funds to improve the academic achievement of all its students.

- 1 Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-
- 2 tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
- 3 SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
- 4 This Act may be cited as the "Academic Achievement
- 5 for All Act (Straight Λ's Act)".
- 6 SEC. 2. PURPOSE.
- 7 The purpose of this Act is to create options for States
- 8 and communities—