APPENDIX B

ANALYSIS OF NON-RESPONSE ON THE SFA SURVEY AND STATE ADMINISTRATIVE DATA COLLECTION EFFORTS

To determine whether there were differences in the characteristics of the sample school districts and States that did and did not provide data for the study, we conducted an analysis of survey and administrative data non-response. First, we examined differences in the characteristics of school districts in our sample that did and did not complete the SFA Survey. Then, we examined differences in the characteristics of sample districts for which we did and did not receive State FS/TANF administrative data. For this analysis, we focused on those sample districts that use direct certification.

A. SFA SURVEY NON-RESPONSE ANALYSIS

As described in Appendix A, the response rate on the SFA survey was 81 percent, with 1,223 of 1,512 eligible districts responding. Table B.1 shows selected characteristics of the districts that responded and that did not respond to the survey. Responding and non-responding districts were similar in terms of their racial/ethnic distributions and the poverty rates in their counties. In addition, a similar proportion of each group were located in urban areas.

Responding districts tended to be a bit larger than nonresponding districts, with a mean enrollment of about 14,000 compared with just under 9,000 for nonresponding districts. The only other significant difference with respect to the characteristics we measured was that responding districts were more likely to be located in rural areas (36 percent versus 30 percent) and less likely to be in suburban areas (49 percent versus 56 percent). Since sample strata were defined in part according to districts' enrollment and the sample weights adjusted for differences in response rates by stratum, the sample weights should adjust for the fact that responding districts were slightly larger than nonresponding districts.

TABLE B.1

CHARACTERISTICS OF DISTRICTS IN SFA SAMPLE, BY SURVEY RESPONSE STATUS

	Districts	
	Responded to Survey	Did Not Respond to Survey
Enrollment (mean)	14,024.3***	8,633.5
	(1,322.0)	(1,003.6)
Racial/Ethnic Distribution (means)		
Percentage White	73.7	73.7
	(1.08)	(2.37)
Percentage Black	12.9	11.5
	(0.79)	(1.62)
Percentage Hispanic	8.5	8.9
	(0.66)	(1.45)
Percentage Asian American	1.5	1.8
	(0.14)	(0.28)
County Poverty Rate (mean)	12.3	11.8
	(0.16)	(0.31)
Urbanicity (percentages)		
Urban	15.0	14.2
	(1.02)	(1.94)
Suburban	48.7**	56.2
	(1.80)	(2.76)
Rural	36.2**	29.6
	(1.37)	(2.54)
Sample Size	**1,223**	**289**

*Significantly different from zero at the .10 level, two-tailed test
**Significantly different from zero at the .05 level, two-tailed test
***Significantly different from zero at the .01 level, two-tailed test

B. NON-RESPONSE AMONG STATES IN PROVIDING ADMINISTRATIVE DATA

Not all State agencies were able to provide data for this study for the reasons discussed in Appendix A. Table B.2 lists the States that did and did not submit data. Sample districts located in States that did not provide data had to be excluded from our analysis of ineligibility among directly certified students. In addition, a small number of sample districts in Maine and New York were not included because we did not have the correct zip code information for these districts.

In Table B.3, we explore differences in the characteristics of districts that were included in and excluded from our analysis. The table includes only those districts that use direct certification and that responded to the SFA survey. No differences presented in the table were statistically significant. Districts included in the analysis are very similar to those not included in the analysis in terms of their enrollment levels, mean certification rate, the year they started using direct certification, and the proportion of students certified for free meals through direct certification.

TABLE B.2

STATES INCLUDED IN AND EXCLUDED FROM THE ANALYSIS OF
DIRECT CERTIFICATION INELIGIBILITY

States Included in Analysis	States Excluded from Analysis
Alabama	Alaska
Arizona	Georgia
Arkansas	Massachusetts
California	Michigan
Colorado	Mississippi
Connecticut	Montana
Delaware	New Hampshire
Florida	New Mexico
Hawaii	Oklahoma
Idaho	Rhode Island
Illinois	South Dakota
Indiana	Virginia
Iowa	Washington
Kansas	West Virginia
Kentucky	
Louisiana	
Maine	
Maryland	
Minnesota	
Missouri	
Nebraska	
Nevada	
New Jersey	
New York	
North Carolina	
North Dakota	
Ohio	
Oregon	
Pennsylvania	
South Carolina	
Tennessee	
Texas	
Utah	
Vermont	
Washington, D.C.	
Wisconsin	
Wyoming	

TABLE B.3

CHARACTERISTICS OF DIRECT CERTIFICATION DISTRICTS INCLUDED AND NOT INCLUDED IN THE ANALYSIS OF DIRECT CERTIFICATION INELIGIBILITY[a]

	Direct Certification Districts	
	Included	Not Included
Enrollment (percentages)		
Less than 500	29	32
500 to 1,000	20	11
1,001 to 2,500	25	21
2,501 to 5,000	11	21
5,001 to 10,000	7	9
10,001 to 25,000	5	4
25,001 to 50,000	1	1
More than 50,000	1	<1
Median Enrollment	1039	1263
Mean Enrollment	3886	3370
(Standard Error)	(193.45)	(329.97)
Free and Reduced-Price Meal Certification Rate (percentages)		
0 to 10 percent	5	11
11 to 20 percent	10	8
21 to 30 percent	20	16
31 to 40 percent	22	17
41 to 50 percent	17	10
51 to 75 percent	22	34
76 to 100 percent	4	4
Mean Certification Rate	39.0	40.6
(Standard Error)	(0.94)	(2.08)
District Started Using Direct Certification		
Within Past 2 Years	6	9
3 to 5 years ago	30	30
More than 5 years ago	65	61
Percentage of Students Certified for Free Meals Who Were Directly Certified		
0 to 10 percent	13	19
11 to 20 percent	27	26
21 to 30 percent	27	26
31 to 40 percent	22	16
41 to 50 percent	5	5
51 to 75 percent	5	8
76 to 100 percent	1	0
Mean Percentage Directly Certified	25.3	23.7
(Standard Error)	(0.88)	(2.14)
Sample Size	**608**	**184**

[a]Districts not included in the analysis of direct certification ineligibility are either located in States which did not submit data on FS/TANF eligibility, or contain zip code areas for which we do not have data. For a list of States that are included in the analysis, see Table B.2.