

Department of Education
EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language	A-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	A-2
Appropriation, Adjustments and Transfers	A-4
Summary of Changes	A-5
Authorizing Legislation.....	A-6
Appropriations History.....	A-7
Significant Items in FY 2018 Appropriations Reports.....	A-9
Summary of Request	A-10
Activities:	
Grants to local educational agencies	A-12
Comprehensive literacy development grants	A-23
Innovative approaches to literacy.....	A-28
State agency programs:	
Migrant	A-31
Neglected and delinquent.....	A-37
Special programs for migrant students	A-43
State Tables*	

State tables reflecting final 2017 allocations and 2018 and 2019 estimates are posted on the Department's webpage at: <https://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/statetables/index.html>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

For carrying out title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (referred to in this Act as "ESEA"), \$15,926,790,000, of which \$4,244,892,000 shall become available on July 1, 2019, and shall remain available through September 30, 2020, and of which \$11,681,898,000 shall become available on October 1, 2019, and shall remain available through September 30, 2020, for academic year 2019–2020:¹ *Provided*, That \$15,459,802,000 shall be for Part A of title I and shall be made available without regard to section 1002(a) of the ESEA:² *Provided further*, That \$6,459,401,000 shall be for basic grants under section 1124 of the ESEA:³ *Provided further*, That up to \$5,000,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary of Education (referred to in this title as "Secretary") on October 1, 2019, to obtain annually updated local educational agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census:⁴ *Provided further*, That \$1,362,301,000 shall be for concentration grants under section 1124A of the ESEA:⁵ *Provided further*, That \$3,819,050,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA:⁶ *Provided further*, That \$3,819,050,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A of the ESEA:⁷ *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding section 1003A(a)(1)(A) of the ESEA, a State educational agency may reserve not more than 5 percent of the amount such State educational agency receives under Part A of Title I to carry out section 1003A of the ESEA.⁸

NOTES

A full-year 2018 appropriation for this account was not enacted at the time the budget was prepared; therefore, the budget assumes this account is operating under the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018 (Division D of P.L. 115-96, as amended). The amounts included for 2018 reflect the annualized level provided by the continuing resolution.

No appropriations language is included for programs authorized under the expired Higher Education and Act of 1965, as amended; when new authorizing legislation of the Higher Education Act is enacted, appropriations language for these programs will be proposed.

Each language provision that is followed by a footnote reference is explained in the Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes document which follows the appropriations language.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>¹ ... <u>of which \$4,244,892,000 shall become available on July 1, 2019, and shall remain available through September 30, 2020, and of which \$11,681,898,000 shall become available on October 1, 2019, and shall remain available through September 30, 2020, for academic year 2019–2020:</u></p>	<p>This language provides for funds to be appropriated on a forward-funded basis for the Title I Basic Grants, Concentration Grants, Targeted Grants, Education Finance Incentive Grants, and State Agency Migrant and Neglected and Delinquent. The language also provides that a portion of the funds is available in an advance appropriation that becomes available for obligation on October 1 of the following fiscal year.</p>
<p>² ...<u>Provided, That \$15,459,802,000 shall be for Part A of title I and shall be made available without regard to section 1002(a) of the ESEA:</u></p>	<p>This language provides funds for Title I grants without regard to the authorization of appropriations for those grants.</p>
<p>³ ...<u>Provided, That \$6,459,401,000 shall be for basic grants under section 1124 of the ESEA:</u></p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Basic Grants.</p>
<p>⁴ ...<u>Provided further, That up to \$5,000,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary of Education (referred to in this title as “Secretary”) on October 1, 2019, to obtain annually updated local educational agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census:</u></p>	<p>This language makes available, on a current-funded basis, \$5 million from Basic Grant funds to support continued work by the Census Bureau to update LEA-level poverty data.</p>
<p>⁵ ...<u>Provided further, That \$1,362,301,000 shall be for concentration grants under section 1124A of the ESEA:</u></p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Concentration Grants.</p>
<p>⁶ ...<u>Provided further, That \$3,819,050,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA:</u></p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Targeted Grants.</p>
<p>⁷ ...<u>Provided further, That \$3,819,050,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A of the ESEA:</u></p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Education Finance Incentive Grants.</p>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>⁸ <u>...Provided further, That, notwithstanding section 1003A(a)(1)(A) of the ESEA, a State educational agency may reserve not more than 5 percent of the amount such State educational agency receives under Part A of Title I to carry out section 1003A of the ESEA.</u></p>	<p>This language would raise, from 3 percent to 5 percent, the maximum percentage of Title I funds that SEAs may reserve to provide direct student services under section 1003A.</p>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriation, Adjustments and Transfers

(dollars in thousands)

Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers	2017	2018 Annualized CR	2019
Discretionary:			
Appropriation	\$16,070,168	0	\$15,926,790
Annualized CR (P.L. 115-96)	<u>0</u>	<u>\$16,107,781</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, discretionary appropriation	16,070,168	16,107,781	15,926,790
Advance:			
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	-10,767,555	-10,841,177	-11,681,898
Advance from prior year	<u>10,841,177</u>	<u>10,767,555</u>	<u>10,841,177</u>
Total, budget authority	16,143,790	16,034,159	15,086,069

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Changes
(dollars in thousands)

2018 Annualized CR	\$16,107,781
2019.....	<u>15,926,790</u>
Net change	-180,991

Increases:	<u>2018</u>	<u>Change</u>
	<u>Annualized CR</u>	<u>from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
Increase funding to reflect the President's Budget request to fund Title I Grants to LEAs, Migrant, Neglected and Delinquent, and Special Programs for Migrant Students at FY 2017 enacted levels. This amount would restore cuts resulting from the 0.6791 percent across-the-board reduction included in the FY 2018 Annualized CR.	\$15,926,790	<u>+\$34,536</u>
Subtotal, increases		+34,536
 Decreases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
Eliminate funding for Comprehensive literacy development grants because the program has limited impact and duplicates activities that may be supported by other Federal, State, or local funds.	188,710	-188,710
Eliminate funding for Innovative approaches to literacy because the program has limited impact and duplicates activities that may be supported by other Federal, State, or local funds.	26,817	<u>-26,817</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-215,527
Net change		-180,991

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Authorizing Legislation
(dollars in thousands)

A-6

Activity	2018 Authorized	2018 Annualized CR	2019 Authorized	2019 Request
Grants to local educational agencies (<i>ESEA-1-A</i>):				
LEA grants formulas:	\$15,457,459		\$15,897,371	
Basic grants (<i>Section 1124</i>)	⁽¹⁾	\$6,428,036	⁽¹⁾	\$6,459,401
Concentration grants (<i>Section 1124A</i>)	⁽¹⁾	1,362,301	⁽¹⁾	1,362,301
Targeted grants (<i>Section 1125</i>)	⁽¹⁾	3,819,050	⁽¹⁾	3,819,050
Education finance incentive grants (<i>Section 1125A</i>)	⁽¹⁾	3,819,050	⁽¹⁾	3,819,050
Comprehensive literacy development grants (<i>ESEA-II-B-2, Section 2222</i>)	⁽²⁾	188,710	⁽²⁾	0
Innovative approaches to literacy (<i>ESEA-II-B-2, Section 2226</i>)	⁽²⁾	26,817	⁽²⁾	0
State agency programs:				
Migrant (<i>ESEA I-C</i>)	374,751	372,206	374,751	374,751
Neglected and delinquent (<i>ESEA I-D</i>)	47,614	47,291	47,614	47,614
			To be	
Special Programs for Migrant Students (<i>HEA IV-A-5</i>)	<u>0³</u>	<u>44,320</u>	<u>determined³</u>	<u>44,623</u>
Total definite authorization	15,879,824		16,319,736	
Total appropriation		16,107,781		15,926,790
Portion of request subject to reauthorization				44,623

¹ Of the total funds appropriated for Grants to LEAs, an amount equal to the fiscal year 2001 appropriation of \$7,397,690 thousand is to be distributed through the Basic Grants formula. An amount equal to the fiscal year 2001 appropriation of \$1,365,031 thousand is to be distributed through the Concentration Grants formula. Amounts appropriated in excess of the fiscal year 2001 appropriation are to be divided equally and distributed through the Targeted Grants and Educational Finance Incentive Grants formulas. In recent years, Congress specified the amounts to be distributed through each formula in the annual appropriations acts.

² A total of \$468,881 thousand is authorized for Part B of Title II. Of the total amount appropriated for Title II, Part B, 34.1 percent is authorized for Subpart 2 programs.

³ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2015. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for fiscal year 2019.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2010 (2010 Advance for 2011)	\$16,431,632 (10,841,176)	\$15,938,215 (10,841,176)	\$15,891,132 ¹ (10,841,176)	\$15,914,666 (10,841,176)
2011 (2011 Advance for 2012) Rescission (P.L. 112-74)	15,912,193 (11,681,897)	15,914,666 ² (10,841,176)	16,726,579 ¹ (10,841,176)	15,914,666 ³ (10,841,176) -(20,490)
2012 (2012 Advance for 2013)	16,253,026 (11,681,897)	15,949,319 ⁴ (13,279,177)	15,741,703 ⁴ (10,841,177)	15,741,703 (10,841,177)
2013 (2013 Advance for 2014)	15,558,649 (11,681,898)	15,208,151 ⁵ (10,841,177)	15,840,103 ⁵ (10,841,177)	14,921,636 (10,841,177)
2014 (2014 Advance for 2015)	15,683,649 (11,681,898)	N/A ⁶	15,875,231 ¹ (10,841,177)	15,552,693 (10,841,177)
2015 (2015 Advance for 2016)	15,377,965 (11,681,898)	N/A ⁶	15,566,226 ⁷ (10,841,177)	15,536,107 (10,841,177)
2016 (2016 Advance for 2017)	16,592,546 (10,841,177)	14,869,641 ⁸ (10,841,177)	15,455,802 ⁸ (10,841,177)	16,016,790 (10,841,177)
2017 (2017 Advance for 2018)	16,043,790 (10,841,177)	15,986,790 ⁹ (11,041,177)	16,066,790 ⁹ (10,841,177)	16,143,790 ⁹ (10,767,555)
2018 (2018 Advance for 2019)	16,347,558 (10,841,177)	15,953,790 ¹⁰ (10,841,177)	16,169,198 ¹⁰ (10,841,177)	16,107,781 ¹⁰ (10,841,177)

¹ The level for the Senate allowance reflects Committee action only.

² The level for the House allowance reflects the House-passed full-year continuing resolution.

³ The level for appropriation reflects the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 112-10).

⁴ The level for the House allowance reflects an introduced bill and the level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Committee action only.

⁵ The levels for the House and Senate allowances reflect action on the regular annual 2013 appropriations bill, which proceeded in the 112th Congress only through the House Subcommittee and the Senate Committee.

⁶ The House allowance is shown as N/A because there was no Subcommittee action.

⁷ The level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Subcommittee action only.

⁸ The levels for House and Senate allowances reflect action on the regular annual 2016 appropriations bill, which proceeded in the 114th Congress only through the House Committee and Senate Committee.

⁹ The levels for the House and Senate allowances reflect Committee action on the regular annual 2017 appropriations bill; the Appropriation reflects the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017.

¹⁰ The levels for the House reflect floor action on an Omnibus appropriation bill; Senate allowances reflect Committee action on the regular annual 2018 appropriations bill; the Appropriation reflects the annualized Continuing Resolution level.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriations History—continued

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2019 (2019 Advance for 2020)	\$15,926,790 (11,681,898)			

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Significant Items in FY 2018 Appropriations Reports

Innovative Approaches to Literacy (IAL)

Senate: The Committee continues to direct the Department to reserve no less than 50 percent of funds under this program for grants to develop and enhance effective school library programs, which may include providing professional development to school librarians, books, and up-to-date materials to high-need schools. Further, the Committee continues to direct the Department to ensure that grants are distributed among eligible entities that will serve geographically diverse areas, including rural areas.

Response: In the 2018 IAL competition, the program intends to reserve at least 50 percent of funds for grants that would support effective school library programs in high-need schools and will consider geographic diversity in making awards.

Neglected, Delinquent and At-Risk Youth

Senate: Within 180 days of enactment of this act, the Secretary is directed to submit a report to the Committee describing how each State is meeting the re-entry requirements for youth included in ESSA.

Response: The Department will submit the report as directed.

[Click her for accessible version](#)

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2019 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET
(in thousands of dollars)

	Category Code	2017 Appropriation	2018 Annualized CR	2019 President's Budget	2019 President's Budget Compared to 2018 Annualized CR Amount	Percent
Education for the Disadvantaged						
1. Grants to local educational agencies (ESEA I-A):						
(a) Basic grants (section 1124)						
Annual appropriation	D	4,618,625	4,587,260	3,777,904	(809,356)	-17.64%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	1,828,275	1,840,776	2,681,497	840,721	45.67%
Subtotal		6,446,900	6,428,036	6,459,401	31,365	0.49%
(b) Concentration grants (section 1124A)						
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	1,353,050	1,362,301	1,362,301	0	0.00%
(c) Targeted grants (section 1125)						
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	3,793,115	3,819,050	3,819,050	0	0.00%
(d) Education finance incentive grants (section 1125A)						
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	3,793,115	3,819,050	3,819,050	0	0.00%
Subtotal, Grants to LEAs		15,386,180	15,428,437	15,459,802	31,365	0.20%
Annual appropriation	D	4,618,625	4,587,260	3,777,904	(809,356)	-17.64%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year ^{1,2}	D	10,767,555	10,841,177	11,681,898	840,721	7.75%
2. Comprehensive literacy development grants (ESEA II-B-2, section 2222)						
	D	190,000	188,710	0	(188,710)	-100.00%
3. Innovative approaches to literacy (ESEA II-B-2, section 2226)						
	D	27,000	26,817	0	(26,817)	-100.00%
4. State agency programs:						
(a) Migrant (ESEA I-C)						
	D	374,751	372,206	374,751	2,545	0.68%
(b) Neglected and delinquent (ESEA I-D)						
	D	47,614	47,291	47,614	323	0.68%
Subtotal		422,365	419,497	422,365	2,868	0.68%
5. Special programs for migrant students (HEA IV-A-5)						
	D	44,623	44,320	44,623	303	0.68%
Total, Appropriation	D	16,070,168	16,107,781	15,926,790	(180,991)	-1.12%
Total, Budget authority	D	16,143,790	16,034,159	15,086,069	(948,090)	-5.91%
Current		5,302,613	5,266,604	4,244,892	(1,021,712)	-19.40%
Prior year's advance ¹		10,841,177	10,767,555	10,841,177	73,622	0.68%

NOTES: D = discretionary program; M = mandatory program
Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

¹ The Advance for succeeding fiscal year shown in the 2017 Appropriation column and the Prior year's advance shown in the 2018 Annualized CR column reflects the 0.6791 percent across-the-board reduction authorized by P.L. 115-56, the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018, as amended.

² The amount for Advance for succeeding fiscal year in the 2019 President's Budget column is increased to account for the proposed elimination of advances in Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants in the School Improvement Programs account.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Request

A full-year fiscal year 2018 appropriation was not enacted at the time the fiscal year 2019 Budget was prepared; therefore, the Budget assumes the Department is operating under the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018 (Division D of P.L. 115–96). The amounts included for fiscal year 2018 reflect the annualized level provided by the continuing resolution. The programs in the Education for the Disadvantaged account provide the foundation for school improvement efforts needed to ensure that all children receive a high-quality education. Most of the programs in this account were reauthorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The Administration is requesting a total of \$15.9 billion in fiscal year 2019 for the programs in this account. The President's Budget requests funding for most programs in this account at the fiscal year 2017 level. This amount would restore cuts resulting from the 0.6791 percent across-the-board reduction included in the fiscal year 2018 Annualized Current Resolution level.

The \$15.5 billion request for Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) would support States and LEAs in providing extra academic help to students in high-poverty schools as well as full State and local implementation of the reauthorized ESEA based on the consolidated State plans the Department anticipates approving for all States during the 2017-2018 school year.

The request would provide \$374.8 million for the State agency Migrant program and \$47.6 million for the State agency Neglected and Delinquent program. These programs serve students, who, by definition, are not educated by a single school district. The Migrant program serves students who move across school districts, and the Neglected and Delinquent program serves students who are educated in institutional settings or correctional facilities and will likely transition to local school systems.

Finally, the request includes \$44.6 million for Special Programs for Migrant Students; which funds projects designed to help migrant individuals attain a high school equivalency diploma or get through their first year of college.

The Administration is not requesting funds for Comprehensive literacy development grants and Innovative Approaches to Literacy because the programs have limited impact and duplicate activities that may be supported by other Federal, State, or local funds.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I, Part A)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2019 Authorization: \$15,897,371

Budget authority:

	<u>2018</u> <u>Annualized CR</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>Annualized CR</u>
Basic grants	\$6,428,036	\$6,459,401	+\$31,365
Concentration grants	1,362,301	1,362,301	0
Targeted grants	3,819,000	3,819,000	0
Education finance incentive grants	<u>3,819,000</u>	<u>3,819,000</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	15,428,437	15,459,802	+31,365
Annual appropriation	4,587,260	3,777,904	-809,356
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	10,841,177	11,681,898	+840,721

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) provides supplemental education funding, especially in high-poverty areas, for local programs that provide extra academic support to help students in high-poverty schools meet challenging State academic standards. The program serves an estimated 25 million students in more than 80 percent of school districts and nearly 60 percent of all public schools.

Title I schools help students reach challenging State standards through one of two models: a targeted assistance model that supplements the regular education program for individual students deemed most in need of special assistance, or a schoolwide model that allows schools to use Title I funds—in combination with other Federal, State, and local funds—to improve the overall instructional program for all students in a school. Schools serving attendance areas in which at least 40 percent of students are from low-income families or schools in which such students account for at least 40 percent of enrollment are eligible to operate schoolwide programs; under the reauthorized ESEA, States also may grant waivers to operate these programs to schools not meeting eligibility requirements. In the 2014-2015 school year, States reported that 45,135 schools, or 83 percent of all Title I schools, operated schoolwide programs, which accounted for approximately 96 percent of participating students.

The reauthorized ESEA encourages the use of Title I funds to strengthen the academic program of participating schools, including by establishing preschool programs for eligible children under 6 years of age and dual or concurrent enrollment programs for eligible secondary school students that provide access to college-level coursework through partnerships with institutions of higher education. Schools also must provide ongoing professional development for staff working with disadvantaged students and carry out activities designed to increase parental engagement.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Title I Grants to LEAs provide the foundation for the ESEA's accountability system for all public schools, which emphasizes State and local responsibilities in the areas of challenging academic standards and aligned assessments, measuring annual student progress, reporting on performance, and supporting school improvement. Under the ESSA's transition provisions, responsibilities described under "Standards and Assessments" below generally took effect upon the law's enactment in 2015, and those under "Accountability and School Improvement" took effect beginning in the 2017-2018 school year.

Standards and Assessments

Under Title I, each State is required to have a system of challenging academic standards and aligned assessments that ensures students are prepared for college and careers, and LEAs must integrate these standards into local instruction. The State must adopt challenging content standards that describe what all students should know and be able to do in at least reading, language arts, mathematics, and science, as well as achievement standards that describe at least three levels of performance with respect to the State's content standards. The reauthorized ESEA requires that each State demonstrate alignment of its standards with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the State's system of higher education as well as relevant State career and technical education standards. The State must also adopt standards for English language proficiency and may adopt alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; both must be aligned with the State's challenging academic content standards.

States are also required to administer academic assessments that measure and provide coherent and timely information about the achievement of all students against State standards. States must administer reading and mathematics assessments annually to all students in grades 3-8 and once in high school, and must administer annual science assessments for at least 1 grade in each of 3 grade spans. These assessments must be valid and reliable, include measures that assess higher-order thinking skills and understanding of challenging content, enable achievement results to be disaggregated by major racial and ethnic groups, gender, and poverty, disability, English proficiency, and migrant status. States may permit LEAs to use State-approved nationally recognized high school assessments in lieu of the State's high school assessments. States must also annually assess the English language proficiency of English learners and may administer alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards to students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, provided that the number of students taking these alternate assessments does not exceed 1 percent of all assessed students in the State.

The Department provides dedicated State formula grant support for the development and implementation of required State assessments (see State Assessments in the School Improvement Programs account).

Accountability and School Improvement

Under the amended Title I, State standards and assessments are used to hold LEAs and schools accountable for performance through State-determined accountability systems. These systems must include interim targets and long-term goals for, at a minimum, student proficiency

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

on State assessments and high school graduation rates, for all students and disaggregated by each student subgroup, as well as progress in attaining English language proficiency for English learners. In addition, State systems must include indicators of: (1) academic achievement based on State assessments; (2) for high schools, 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rates; (3) for elementary and middle schools, another academic indicator (which may be a measure of student growth); (4) progress in achieving English language proficiency; and (5) at least one indicator, of the State's choosing, of school quality or student success. States must use these indicators to meaningfully differentiate school performance annually, with the first four indicators afforded substantial weight individually and much greater weight in the aggregate than indicators of school quality or student success.

States and LEAs receiving Title I funds must disseminate annual report cards that provide information on the performance of the State and its LEAs and schools. These report cards must be concise, presented in an understandable and uniform format, and accessible to the public, and must address minimum content requirements including, among other things: a description of the State's accountability system; information on performance with respect to the interim targets, long-term goals, and indicators discussed above; professional qualifications of teachers; per-pupil expenditures, including actual personnel and nonpersonnel expenditures of Federal, State, and local funds; and, where available, rates at which high school graduates enroll in postsecondary education programs in the year following graduation. Report cards may also include any additional information that the State or LEA determines will best provide parents, students, and the public with information on school progress. States must prepare a report card for the State as a whole, and LEAs must prepare report cards for the LEA as a whole (which must include comparisons of achievement on State assessments between the LEA and State) and for each school (which must include achievement comparisons between the school and the LEA and State).

The State's indicators are also used to identify, at least once every 3 years, a statewide category of schools for comprehensive support and improvement, which must include the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I schools and all high schools with graduation rates below 67 percent. LEAs, in partnership with stakeholders, must develop and implement plans for these schools that, among other things, include evidence-based interventions stemming from a needs assessment. The State must also notify LEAs annually of any schools with consistently underperforming student subgroups or with subgroups performing as poorly as schools in the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I schools. Similarly, these schools must develop and implement targeted support and improvement plans to improve outcomes for those particular subgroups of students using evidence-based interventions. Schools with subgroups performing as poorly as schools in the lowest-performing 5 percent and that have not improved after receiving targeted support and improvement for a State-determined number of years must be identified by the State for comprehensive support and improvement.¹

¹ Consistent with the ESSA's transition provisions, the Department has permitted States to delay, until the 2018-2019 school year, the identification of schools for comprehensive support and improvement and schools for targeted support and improvement because the schools have student subgroups performing as poorly as schools in the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I schools.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Under section 1003(a) of the amended ESEA, States must reserve funds to make subgrants on a formula or competitive basis to LEAs to support schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement or implementing targeted support and improvement plans. Each State must reserve for this purpose the greater of (1) 7 percent of its combined Title I, Part A allocations to its LEAs or (2) the sum of its fiscal year 2016 section 1003(a) reservation (a maximum of 4 percent of its Title I, Part A allocations) and its fiscal year 2016 allocation under the School Improvement Grants program, except that, beginning in fiscal year 2018 (the second fiscal year for which the school improvement reservation is in effect), the amount a State reserves may not result in a decrease in the amount of Title I funds each of its LEAs receives compared to the previous fiscal year.

Allocations

Title I, Part A funds are allocated through four separate formulas. All four formulas are based on the number of children from low-income families in each LEA, and each formula also includes such factors as the LEA's poverty rate and State per-pupil expenditures for education. Other children counted for allocation purposes ("formula children") include children in families above the poverty line receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (the main Federal-State income maintenance program), children in foster homes, and children in local institutions for neglected and delinquent (N&D) children. Eligible LEAs receive funding under one or more of the formulas, but the final outcome of the Federal-State allocation process is a single Title I, Part A award to each qualifying LEA.

Three formulas are based primarily on the number of formula children in each LEA, weighted by State per-pupil expenditures for education. Basic Grants are awarded to school districts with at least 10 formula children who make up more than 2 percent of their school-age population (defined as children ages 5 to 17) and, thus, spread funds thinly across nearly all LEAs. Concentration Grants provide additional funds to LEAs in which the number of formula children exceeds 6,500 or 15 percent of the total school-age population. The Targeted Grants formula weights child counts to make higher payments to school districts with high numbers or percentages of formula students. To be eligible for Targeted Grants, an LEA must have at least 10 formula children counted for Basic Grant purposes, and the count of formula children must equal at least 5 percent of the school age population.

In addition, the statute includes a separately authorized and funded Education Finance Incentive Grants (EFIG) formula. This formula uses State-level "equity" and "effort" factors to make allocations to States that are intended to encourage States to spend more on education and to improve the equity of State funding systems. Once State allocations are determined, sub-allocations to the LEA level are based on a modified version of the Targeted Grants formula.

In determining allocations under each of the four formulas, the statute requires the use of annually updated Census Bureau estimates of the number of children from low-income families in each LEA. There is roughly a 2-year lag between the income year used for LEA poverty estimates and the fiscal year in which those estimates are used to make Title I allocations. For example, the fiscal year 2016 allocations were based on LEA poverty estimates for 2014. The

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Department transfers a small amount of funding from the annual Title I appropriation to the Census Bureau to finance the preparation of these LEA poverty estimates.

LEAs also use poverty data—generally the number of students eligible for free- or reduced-price lunch—to make within-district allocations to schools. LEAs with more than 1,000 students must serve, in rank order by poverty rate, all schools with a poverty rate above 75 percent, including middle and high schools, before serving schools with less needy student populations. Under the reauthorized ESEA, an LEA may lower the service threshold for high schools from 75 to 50 percent if it chooses.

Of the total appropriation for Title I Grants to LEAs, 0.7 percent is reserved for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Indian Education and 0.4 percent for the Outlying Areas (American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Virgin Islands). The amount reserved for the Outlying Areas includes \$1 million for the Republic of Palau. In addition, States are permitted to reserve up to 1 percent, or \$400,000, whichever is greater, to cover State costs of administering Title I programs, except that such amounts may not exceed the level that is provided if the total appropriation for Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA equals \$14 billion, a threshold that has been exceeded each year beginning with fiscal year 2008. Under Subpart 2 of Part D of Title I, a State must also reserve funds from its Title I, Part A allocation to make subgrants, on a formula or competitive basis, to eligible LEAs with high numbers or percentages of children and youth in correctional facilities for children and youth not operated by the State, including public or private institutions and community day programs or schools that serve delinquent children and youth. Finally, under the reauthorized ESEA, a State may also reserve up to 3 percent of its allocation to make grants to LEAs to carry out direct student services, including participation in courses not otherwise available at the student's school and in advanced courses and exams, personalized learning approaches, credit recovery programs, and transportation to enable students to attend higher-performing public schools, including charter schools. In making grants, States must give priority to LEAs with the highest percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, and LEAs must use grant funds to pay for services for students in such schools prior to serving other low-achieving students.

Title I Grants to LEAs is a forward-funded program that includes advance appropriations. A portion of funds becomes available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remains available for Federal obligation for 15 months. The remaining funds become available on October 1 of the following fiscal year and remain available for Federal obligation for 12 months, expiring at the same time as the forward-funded portion.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years, in thousands of dollars, were:

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Basic Grants</u>	<u>Concentration Grants</u>	<u>Targeted Grants</u>	<u>Education Finance Incentive Grants</u>	<u>Total</u>
2014	\$6,459,401	\$1,362,301	\$3,281,550	\$3,281,550	\$14,384,802
2015	6,459,401	1,362,301	3,294,050	3,294,050	14,409,802
2016	6,459,401	1,362,301	3,544,050	3,544,050	14,909,802
2017	6,446,900	1,353,050	3,793,115	3,793,115	15,386,180
2018	6,428,036	1,362,301	3,819,050	3,819,050	15,428,437

FY 2019 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$15.5 billion for Title I Grants to LEAs in fiscal year 2019, an increase of \$31 million, to restore funding to the fiscal year 2017 enacted level. The request maintains strong support for the Title I program, and fiscal year 2019 funds would support full State and local implementation of the reauthorized ESEA based on the consolidated State plans the Department anticipates approving for all States during the 2017-2018 school year.

Title I Grants to LEAs are the linchpin of the ESEA and reflect the longstanding Federal role of providing extra academic support to our Nation’s economically disadvantaged students in order to close achievement gaps. LEAs can use Title I funds flexibly for locally determined programs and interventions across a broad range of areas, including through schoolwide programs that allow Federal and other funds to be consolidated and leveraged for comprehensive school reforms.

To further increase flexibility in the use of Federal education funds and promote equity of opportunity for disadvantaged students, the Department intends to invite LEAs in early 2018 to enter into local flexibility demonstration agreements under Title I, Part E, which allows a limited number of LEAs to consolidate Federal funds together with State and local funds to generate weighted per-pupil allocations, better known as weighted student funding (WSF) systems. To receive this flexibility, an LEA must agree to allocate a significant portion of its total funding to schools through the WSF system, which must use weights that result in substantially higher per-pupil allocations for students from low-income families, English learners, and other disadvantaged students identified by the LEA, compared to other students. These initial flexibility agreements will serve as a foundation for the proposed Open Enrollment Grants (described under “Opportunity Grants” in the Innovation and Improvement account), which would support participants in combining the funding flexibility under Title I, Part E with an open enrollment policy, thereby enabling the funds a student generates to follow him or her to a public school of choice.

Additionally, the request includes appropriations language increasing from 3 percent to 5 percent the maximum amount that States are permitted to reserve for Direct Student Services under section 1003A of the ESEA. Increasing this amount would provide States and LEAs with greater flexibility to support innovative services for students and enhance public school choice options, including ensuring that disadvantaged students trapped in low-performing schools have

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

the opportunity to transfer to other, higher-performing schools. For example, this funding can be used by LEAs to provide transportation to public schools of choice and expand access to rigorous coursework and career and technical education opportunities for students enrolled in schools where such opportunities are unavailable. This increased reservation, together with the WSF pilot and investments in charter schools and magnet schools, reflect a comprehensive approach to reaching the long-term goal of giving every student, particularly disadvantaged students, the opportunity to attend a school of his or her choice.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands, except whole dollar per-child amounts)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>
Allocations by LEA Poverty Rate:			
0-15%			
# of LEAs	5,289	5,270	5,253
Dollars	\$2,274,650	\$2,245,901	\$2,255,251
% of Total \$	15.06	14.83	14.86
# of Formula Eligible Children	1,898,984	1,898,444	1,898,355
0-15% \$ Per Formula Child	\$1,198	\$1,183	\$1,188
15-25%			
# of LEAs	4,470	4,474	4,469
Dollars	\$4,688,701	\$4,711,026	\$4,733,836
% of Total \$	31.05	31.10	31.18
# of Formula Eligible Children	3,608,961	3,608,943	3,608,906
15-25% \$ Per Formula Child	\$1,299	\$1,305	\$1,312
>25%			
# of LEAs	3,083	3,083	3,078
Dollars	\$8,137,974	\$8,189,168	\$8,191,258
% of Total \$	53.89	54.07	53.96
# of Formula Eligible Children	5,312,837	5,312,838	5,312,796
>25% \$ Per Formula Child	\$1,532	\$1,541	\$1,542
LEA Allocation Subtotal	\$15,101,325	\$15,146,095	\$15,180,345
BIA/Outlying Areas	169,193	169,658	170,002
N&D Program (Part D, Subpart 2)	110,662	107,684	104,455
Census Updates	<u>5,000</u>	<u>5,000</u>	<u>5,000</u>
Grants to LEAs Total	15,386,180	15,428,437	15,459,802

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information and results based on GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2019 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The performance measures for Title I Grants to LEAs shown below were developed prior to reauthorization of the ESEA; in particular, they reflect the role of the 100 percent proficiency goals established by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) in assessing program performance. These measures rely on data submitted annually through the ESEA Consolidated State Performance Reports, which include State and local performance information primarily as specified through the annual “report card” requirements described in Section 1111(h) of the ESEA. Once State plans implementing the new law are approved, the Department will revise the measures and targets for Title I Grants to LEAs to more effectively assess performance consistent with the long-term goals and intermediate indicators established by States.

Goal: At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.

Objective: *The performance of low-income students will increase substantially in reading and mathematics.*

Measure: The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at or above the proficient level on State reading assessments.

Year	Target Percentage of Students Who Score At or Above Proficiency	Actual Percentage of Students Who Score At or Above Proficiency
2014	100.0%	54.1%
2015	100.0	39.4
2016	100.0	40.2
2017	100.0	
2018	100.0	
2019	100.0	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Measure: The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at or above the proficient level on State mathematics assessments.

Year	Target Percentage of Students Who Score At or Above Proficiency	Actual Percentage of Students Who Score At or Above Proficiency
2014	100.0%	51.1%
2015	100.0	35.0
2016	100.0	36.7
2017	100.0	
2018	100.0	
2019	100.0	

Measure: The difference between the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at or above the proficient level on State reading assessments and the percentage of all students in grades 3-8 scoring at or above the proficient level on State reading assessments.

Year	Target Gap in Proficiency Percentage Between Economically Disadvantaged Students and All Students	Actual Gap in Proficiency Percentage Between Economically Disadvantaged Students and All Students
2014	0.0%	10.7%
2015	0.0	13.0
2016	0.0	12.8
2017	0.0	
2018	0.0	
2019	0.0	

Measure: The difference between the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at or above the proficient level on State mathematics assessments and the percentage of all students in grades 3-8 scoring at or above the proficient level on State mathematics assessments.

Year	Target Gap in Proficiency Percentage Between Economically Disadvantaged Students and All Students	Actual Gap in Proficiency Percentage Between Economically Disadvantaged Students and All Students
2014	0.0%	11.1%
2015	0.0	12.4
2016	0.0	12.5
2017	0.0	
2018	0.0	
2019	0.0	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Additional information: Performance targets for these measures were established based on the goal of 100 percent student proficiency in reading and mathematics by 2014 under NCLB.

The decreases in the percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring at or above the proficient level and the increases in the proficiency gap for these students in 2015 can be explained, in part, by States' transition to more rigorous assessments based on college- and career-ready standards.

Two States (Alaska and Tennessee) did not submit data for these measures for 2016. The 2017 data for these measures are expected to be available in early summer 2018.

Other Performance Information

The Title I Program at a Glance

In the 2014-2015 school year, the most recent year for which complete data are available, the Title I program served approximately 25 million students, or nearly half of the total student population. The table below provides information on participation by type of Title I program.

Type of Title I School	# of Schools	# of Students, in millions
Schoolwide program	45,135	24.1
Targeted assistance program	9,503	1.0
Total	54,638	25.1

More detailed information on students in Title I schools, compared to the overall public school population, is displayed in the table below.

Student Group	# of Students, All Schools	# of Students, Title I Schools	% of Students, Title I Schools
All students	50,732,995	25,094,990	49%
American Indian or Alaska Native	566,846	367,045	65
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,666,919	960,046	36
Black	7,813,913	5,342,364	68
Hispanic	13,178,197	9,118,283	69
White	24,897,175	8,377,799	34
Two or more races	1,609,945	702,356	44
Eligible for free lunch	22,554,732	16,292,508	72
English learners	4,825,906	3,809,746	79
Students with disabilities	5,956,494	3,416,069	57

Additional information: Descriptive data are from the National Center for Education Statistics' Common Core of Data (CCD), the Consolidated State Performance Reports, and other collections through the Department's ED*Facts* system for the 2014-15 school year. The number of students in Title I schools for the "all students" group reflects the students served by the

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

program (whether through a schoolwide or targeted assistance program); for all other student groups, the number of students in Title I schools includes all enrolled students from the group.

Implementation of Title I/II Program Initiatives

In January 2017, the Department released an initial report from the Implementation of Title I/II Program Initiatives study.¹ The report presents findings from surveys of States, LEAs, schools, and teachers and describes the implementation, during the 2013-2014 school year, of policies and practices related to Title I and Title II, as administered under NCLB and ESEA Flexibility, in core areas including State academic standards, assessments, accountability, and educator evaluation and support. The Department intends to conduct additional data analyses under this study focusing on the transition to and initial implementation of the reauthorized ESEA. An interim report with data on these topics from the 2017-2018 school year is expected to be released in 2019, and final report with data from the 2019-2020 school year is planned to be completed in 2021.

¹ See https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/other_titleI.asp.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title II, Part B, Subpart 2, Section 2222)

FY 2019 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾

Budget Authority:

<u>2018</u> <u>Annualized CR</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>Annualized CR</u>
\$188,710	0	-\$188,710

¹A total of \$469,168 thousand is authorized for Part B of Title II. Of the total amount appropriated for Title II, Part B, 34.1 percent is authorized for the Comprehensive Literacy Development and Innovative Approaches to Literacy Grants programs under Subpart 2.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Comprehensive Literacy Development (CLD) Grants program provides competitive grants to State educational agencies (SEAs) that then award subgrants to eligible entities to support efforts to improve literacy instruction in high-need schools or early childhood education programs.

In awarding CLD Grants, the Department gives priority to SEAs that will use grant funds for evidence-based activities. Each SEA that receives a grant must use at least 95 percent of its award to make competitive subgrants to one or more local educational agencies (LEAs) or, for the purposes of providing early literacy services, to one or more early childhood education programs. LEAs or early childhood education programs that receive subgrants from SEAs under this program must serve a high percentage of disadvantaged children, such as children from low-income families, children with disabilities, or English learners, and must represent diverse geographical areas. Early childhood education programs that receive subgrants must have a demonstrated record of providing comprehensive literacy instruction for children aged birth through 5. SEAs must ensure that at least 15 percent of funds is used to serve children from birth through age 5, 40 percent to serve students in kindergarten through grade 5, and 40 percent to serve students in grades 6 through 12. In addition, funds must be distributed equitably among grades within the kindergarten through grade 5 and grades 6 through 12 bands.

A SEA may reserve up to 5 percent of grant funds for activities related to implementing its comprehensive literacy plan and administering subgrants, including providing technical assistance to subgrantees to design and implement their literacy programs, coordinating with institutions of higher education to enhance pre-service courses for students preparing to teach in early childhood education programs or elementary and secondary schools, reviewing and updating State literacy licensure or certification standards, sharing information on promising literacy instructional practices, training literacy coaches, and evaluating grant-funded activities. Eligible entities receiving subgrants must use program funds for services and activities that have the characteristics of effective, evidence-based comprehensive literacy instruction, as defined by the statute. Allowable activities include professional development and training for early

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

childhood educators and related school staff, coordinating activities designed to increase family engagement in children’s literacy development, and other research-based methods of improving classroom instruction and practice.

Of the amount appropriated for CLD grants in a given fiscal year, the Department must reserve: (1) one-half of 1 percent for the Department of the Interior to carry out comprehensive literacy programs in schools operated or funded by the Bureau of Indian Education and (2) one-half of 1 percent for the Outlying Areas. The Department may reserve up to 5 percent for national activities, which includes a national evaluation, technical assistance and training, data collection, and reporting.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were as follows:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2014	\$158,000
2015	160,000
2016	190,000
2017	190,000
2018	188,710

FY 2019 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration’s fiscal year 2019 request does not include funding for CLD grants because of the program’s limited impact and duplication of activities that may be supported by other Federal, State, or local funds. For example, the Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program provides \$15.5 billion annually to more than 14,000 school districts that may be used to support effective, evidence-based reading instruction. By comparison, in fiscal year 2017, the Department used nearly \$370 million in combined fiscal year 2016 and 2017 funds to make new, fully funded CLD grants to just 11 States.

The Department intends to use this final cohort of grantees to test the effectiveness of interventions and strategies that could be funded through Title I or other Federal formula grant programs. Selected 2017 grantees will be rigorously evaluated to identify effective practices and maximize the impact of the investment in this final cohort by disseminating those practices widely. In fiscal year 2018, the Department will run a competition for new awards and may frontload those awards so as not to incur continuation costs in 2019 and future years.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>
Funding for new awards	\$364,441	\$190,490	0
Number of new awards	11	3-4	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$191	\$500	0
Amount for Bureau of Indian Education	\$1,900	\$944	0
Amount for Outlying Areas	\$1,900	\$944	0
National activities (including evaluation)	\$6,000	\$1,400	0

NOTES: The fiscal year 2016 funds for this program were carried over for use in fiscal year 2017. The Department used the amounts available from fiscal years 2016 and 2017 to fund a single fiscal year 2017 competition. Similarly, approximately \$5,500 thousand in 2017 funds were carried over into 2018; the Department will use those funds for new awards.

The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including CLD, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. The Department may reserve CLD funds in fiscal years 2018 and 2019 for this purpose.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program. Data shown are for the 2011 cohort of the predecessor Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy program. The Department is in the process of setting targets for the 2017 cohort of CLD grantees.

Objective: *To advance literacy skills, including pre-literacy skills, reading, and writing, for students from birth through grade 12, including English learners and students with disabilities.*

Measure: The percentage of participating 4-year-old children who achieve significant gains in oral language skills.

Year	Target	Actual
2014	68%	63%
2015	68	61
2016	68	47
2017	N/A	N/A
2018	set a baseline	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

Additional information: The Department defines “significant gains” as a positive change in assessment score for which the effect size was at least 0.20 standard deviations. This approach allows the Department to report standard performance data across States with varying assessments. Four-year-old children who are eligible for testing are children in early childhood education classrooms participating in a Striving Readers subgrant program. Data and targets are not shown for 2017-2019 because the predecessor program ended in 2016 and the Department is developing new targets for the 2017 CLD cohort.

Measure: The percentage of participating 5th-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on State English language arts assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2014	75%	77%
2015	75	72
2016	75	57
2017	N/A	N/A
2018	set a baseline	

Additional information: Data reflect cumulative results across States for all students who participated in the Striving Readers program, completed pre- and post-assessments, and met or exceeded proficiency levels on the State English language arts assessments. Data and targets are not shown for 2017-2019 because the predecessor program ended in 2016 and the Department is developing new targets for the 2017 CLD cohort.

Measure: The percentage of participating 8th-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on State English language arts assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2014	76%	71%
2015	76	60
2016	76	55
2017	N/A	N/A
2018	set a baseline	

Additional information: Data reflect cumulative results across States for all students who participated in the Striving Readers program, completed pre- and post-assessments and met or exceeded proficiency levels on the State English language arts assessments. Data and targets are not shown for 2017-2019 because the predecessor program ended in 2016 and the Department is developing new targets for the 2017 CLD cohort.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

Measure: The percentage of participating high school students who meet or exceed proficiency on State English language arts assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2014	75%	65%
2015	75	62
2016	75	64
2017	N/A	N/A
2018	set a baseline	

Additional information: Data reflect cumulative results across States for all students who participated in the Striving Readers program, completed pre- and post-assessments and met or exceeded proficiency levels on the State English language arts assessments. For 2016, the reported percentage does not include data from one State. Data and targets are not shown for 2017-2019 because the predecessor program ended in 2016 and the Department is developing new targets for the 2017 CLD cohort.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Innovative approaches to literacy

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title II, Part B, Subpart 2, Section 2226)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2019 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾

Budget Authority:

<u>2018</u> <u>Annualized CR</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>Annualized CR</u>
\$26,817	0	-\$26,817

¹ A total of \$469,168 thousand is authorized for Part B of Title II. Of the total amount appropriated for Title II, Part B, 34.1 percent is authorized for the Innovative Approaches to Literacy and Comprehensive Literacy Development Grants programs under Subpart 2.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Innovative Approaches to Literacy (IAL) program supports a wide range of projects that develop the literacy skills of children and adolescents in low-income communities. The program may award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to (1) one or more local educational agencies in which at least 20 percent of the students are from low-income families, (2) the Bureau of Indian Education, or (3) eligible national non-profit organizations. Grantees may use IAL funds to develop or enhance existing school library programs by providing professional learning opportunities to school librarians or updating library materials in high-need schools; support early literacy services, including conducting outreach to parents of young children to ensure that families have access to developmentally appropriate materials and are encouraged to read aloud to their young children; and distribute high-quality books to children and adolescents to increase students' reading motivation, performance, and frequency.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were as follows:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2014.....	\$24,538
2015.....	23,109
2016.....	27,000
2017.....	27,000
2018.....	26,817

FY 2019 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration's fiscal year 2019 request eliminates funding for IAL because it has limited impact and duplicates activities that may be supported with other Federal, State, local, or private funding sources. The roughly 14,000 school districts and 55,000 schools that participate in the \$15.5 billion Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program may support the full range of IAL-type activities as part of their Title I schoolwide programs and, in some cases, Targeted Assistance projects. In fiscal year 2019, Department will run a competition for new awards and

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Innovative approaches to literacy

may frontload those awards so as not to incur continuation costs in fiscal year 2019 and beyond.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>
Funding for new awards	0	\$26,549	0
Number of new awards	0	15	0
Funding for continuation awards	\$27,000	0	0
Number of continuation awards	31	0	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$268	0

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Administration established the following performance measures for grantees under this program.

Measure: The percentage of 4-year-old children participating in the project who achieve significant gains in oral language skills.

Year	Target	Actual
2014	70%	70%
2015	70	76
2016	70	76
2017	70	83
2018	70	
2019	70	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Innovative approaches to literacy

Measure: The percentage of participating 3rd-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on State reading or language arts assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2014	70%	52%
2015	70	46
2016	70	50
2017	70	
2018	70	
2019	70	

Measure: The percentage of participating 8th-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on State reading or language arts assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2014	70%	53%
2015	70	55
2016	70	55
2017	70	
2018	70	
2019		

Measure: The percentage of participating high school students who meet or exceed proficiency on State reading or language arts assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2014	70%	61%
2015	70	55
2016	70	63
2017	70	
2018	70	
2019	70	

Note that grantees were required to report only on measures applicable to the populations served, and, therefore, not all grantees reported on each performance measure. The Department is not including performance targets for 2019 because the 2019 request would eliminate this program.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I, Part C)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2019 Authorization: \$374,751

Budget Authority:

<u>2018</u> <u>Annualized CR</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>Annualized CR</u>
\$374,751	\$372,206	+\$2,545

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Migrant Education program (MEP) provides financial assistance to State educational agencies (SEAs) to establish and improve programs of education for children of migratory farmworkers and fishers. The goal of the MEP is to enable migrant children: (1) to meet the same academic standards as other children; and (2) to graduate from high school or a high school equivalency program with an education that prepares them for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment. To help achieve this objective, program services help migratory children overcome the educational disruption that results from repeated moves. The program statute encourages activities to promote coordination of needed services across States and encourages greater access for migratory children to services available under Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) and other programs authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), so that MEP funds can be used for services not already available from those programs to meet the unique needs of migrant students.

Eligible children are children of migratory agricultural workers or migratory fishers, or who are migratory agricultural workers or fishers themselves, and who have made a "qualifying move" within the last 3 years. A move is considered to be a qualifying move if it is a change of residence due to economic necessity and (1) involves crossing school district boundaries; (2) is made in order to obtain, or resulted in, temporary or seasonal work in agriculture or fishing; and (3) was made in the preceding 36 months. Migratory children who made a qualifying move in the previous year and children who have dropped out of school receive priority for services under the program.

Funds are allocated through a statutory formula based on each State's per-pupil expenditure for education, its average count of eligible migratory students aged 3 through 21 residing within the State in the preceding 3 years, and its count of students who received services in summer or intersession programs provided by the State during the previous year. Under a hold-harmless provision, States are assured at least 90 percent of their previous years' allocations for fiscal years 2017 through 2019.

The Department may set aside up to \$10 million from the annual MEP appropriation for contracts and grants to improve inter- and intra-State migrant coordination activities, including academic credit accrual and exchange programs for migrant students. The Department is

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

required to consult with States receiving allocations of \$1 million or less about whether they can increase the cost-effectiveness of their programs by entering into inter-state consortium arrangements, and the Department may reserve up to \$3 million a year from coordination funds for incentive grants of not more than \$250,000 to such consortia.

Other coordination funds are used primarily for the Migrant Student Information Exchange System (MSIX), which supports the electronic transfer of migrant student records. MSIX enables States to exchange migrant student data records efficiently and expeditiously and helps to provide an accurate, unduplicated count of the number of migrant students on both a statewide and national basis.

This is a forward-funded program. Funds become available for obligation from July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available through September 30 of the following year.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal year	(dollars in thousands)
2014	\$374,751
2015	374,751
2016	374,751
2017	374,751
2018	372,206

FY 2019 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$374.8 million for fiscal year 2019 for the Title I Migrant program, an increase of \$2.5, to restore funding to the fiscal year 2017 level. The fiscal year 2019 request would continue to support activities that identify highly mobile migratory children and youth, provide them comprehensive services that address their specific needs, and promote coordination of the Federal resources available to serve this population. The request reflects the Administration's commitment to maintain strong support for State formula grant programs that help school districts and schools meet the academic and non-academic needs of vulnerable student populations.

Migrant students represent an especially disadvantaged, hard-to-serve group due to multiple risk factors. In particular, the high mobility of these children across school districts and State boundaries (sometimes within the school term or year) means that, in general, no single school district or State has ongoing responsibility for the education of these students, thus creating a need for Federal support to assist in the coordination of services to meet their educational needs. This high mobility creates additional challenges for both students and the school systems serving them, such as the need for additional supports to students to overcome the effects of disruptions in their education and helping high school students accrue credits towards high school graduation.

Moreover, the characteristics of the migrant population create a need for educational services that go beyond services traditionally supported with State and local education budgets. In

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

addition to being highly mobile, migrant students tend to live in poverty, have limited English proficiency, and belong to families that are likely to experience food and job insecurity and poor health and housing conditions. Of the children and youth eligible to receive services under the program during school year 2015-2016, 31.4 percent had moved within the previous 12 months. In addition, 38.4 percent of eligible children and youth were English learners and 6.9 percent of eligible children and youth were eligible to receive services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Migrant children and youth may also help their families perform agricultural work, and a large number of migrant "emancipated youth" travel without a parent or guardian to obtain migratory work in the fields and in processing plants. A significant proportion of migrant individuals eligible for services under the program (10.2 percent of the eligible population in 2015-2016) are school-aged youth who do not attend school.

During school year 2015-16 school year, 316,276 children were identified as eligible under the program. States and local entities provided services to 216,564 migrant students, 96,352 of which received services during the summer or intersessions. Program funds supported 3,108 projects that operated during the school day, 503 projects that provided an extended school day during the regular school year, 142 summer or intersession projects, and 936 year-round projects. The program served 3,309 children aged birth through 2; 15,784 children aged 3 through 5; 185,183 children and youth in kindergarten through grade 12; and 12,288 out-of-school youth. Services included supplemental instruction in reading, math, and other academic areas; family literacy and preschool instruction; and high school credit accrual. Program funds were also used to provide such support services as counseling, health and nutrition services, advocacy and referrals for migrant students with disabilities, and (especially in the summer) transportation. The Department expects to support a similar level of services using fiscal year 2019 funds.

The Department would reserve approximately \$10 million from the fiscal year 2019 request for migrant coordination and national activities, including \$3 million for consortium incentive grants. The remainder of the funds would be used for activities related to inter- and intra-State coordination, primarily for maintenance and operation of the Migrant Student Exchange System (MSIX), including for technical assistance to States as they continue to implement their systems for collecting and exchanging data on migrant students.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>
Number of eligible children	316,276	316,276	316,276
SEA program:			
Amount for State grants	\$364,751	\$362,206	\$364,751
Range of State awards	0-\$115,791	0-\$114,372	0-\$118,610
Coordination activities:			
Consortium incentive grants	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000
Migrant student information exchange and related coordination activities	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years, and those requested in fiscal year 2019 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department started collecting data for the grade promotion/graduation and Algebra I measures for school year 2016-17, when changes in the MSIX took effect and enabled the Department to collect these data. The Department will report on the data once it has reviewed it and determined that the data are complete and reliable.

Goal: To assist all migrant students in meeting challenging academic standards and achieving graduation from high school (or a high school equivalency credential program) with an education that prepares them for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

Objective: *Along with other Federal programs and State and local reform efforts, the Migrant Education Program will contribute to improved school performance of migrant children.*

Measure: The percentage of migrant students in grades 3-8 who scored at the proficient level or above on reading/language arts assessments.

Year	Target Percentage	Actual Percentage
2014	44.1%	49.6%
2015	44.1	27.8
2016	44.1	29.4
2017	31.4	
2018	33.4	
2019		

Measure: The percentage of migrant students in grades 3-8 who scored at the proficient level or above on mathematics assessments.

Year	Target Percentage	Actual Percentage
2014	47.6%	49.5%
2015	47.6	26.2
2016	47.6	28.5
2017	30.5	
2018	32.5	
2019	33.4	

Additional information: The source of the data is the Consolidated State Performance Reports that States submit to the Department. States made changes to their standards and assessments systems to comply with the requirements that assessments be based on college- and career-ready standards by school year 2014-15, resulting in more rigorous assessments. The Department may reset targets once data for the 3-year period after implementation of the newer assessments is available to re-calculate a new baseline. Data for 2017 will be available in summer 2018.

Efficiency Measures

The Department established an efficiency measure associated with the transfer of migrant student records through the MSIX system that tracks how many States are collecting the three types of data elements collected in MSIX for migrant students: basic student information, student assessment data, and credit accrual information for secondary students.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

Measure: The number of States collecting all the types of data elements collected in MSIX.

Year	Target	Actual
2014	31	34
2015	31	36
2016	35	44
2017	43	
2018	46	
2019	46	

Additional information: At the end of fiscal year 2016, 44 out of 46 States participating in the migrant education program were collecting all the types of data elements collected in MSIX. The Department developed a three-phase plan to help States fully participate in MSIX. Under phase one, States were to collect and make available all data elements for basic student information, which is required for all migrant students. Under phase two, States would add student assessment data, which is required only for migrant students taking State assessments. Under phase three, States would add credit accrual information for secondary students. At the time that targets were established, State participation in MSIX was voluntary. On May 10, 2016, final regulations for the MEP were published in the Federal Register. These regulations became effective June 9, 2016. Because the Department issued regulations requiring States to collect and share data through MSIX, targets were adjusted to reflect the expectation that all 46 States participating in the MEP would collect all three types of data elements by 2018.

Other performance information

In late 2016, the Department began a study of the Migrant Education Program (MEP) at the state and local levels. In particular, it will examine how states, districts, local operating agencies, and schools or projects identify and serve the educational and other needs of children of migratory agricultural workers; address the needs of migratory students in designing their accountability systems; collaborate with other agencies and organizations to deliver services to migratory children and their families; and provide MEP-funded instructional and support services to help migratory children complete high school. The final report is due at the end of calendar year 2018, and will be used to inform oversight and continuous improvement of the program in support of children of migratory agricultural workers.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I, Part D, Subpart 1)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2019 Authorization: \$47,614

Budget Authority:

<u>2018</u> <u>Annualized CR</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>Annualized CR</u>
\$47,291	\$47,614	+\$323

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Title I Neglected and Delinquent (N and D) program provides financial assistance to State educational agencies (SEAs) for provision of education services to neglected and delinquent children and youth in State-run institutions, attending community day programs, and in correctional facilities. Funds are allocated to States through a formula based on the number of children in State-operated institutions and per-pupil education expenditures for the State. Each State's N and D allocation is generated by child counts in State institutions that provide at least 20 hours of instruction a week from non-Federal funds; adult correctional institutions must provide 15 hours a week. State institutions serving children with an average length of stay of at least 30 days are eligible to receive funds. Adult correctional institutions must give priority for services to youth who are likely to be released within a 2-year period.

Like other Title I programs, the N and D program requires institutions receiving funds to gear their services to the same college- and career-ready State academic standards that all children are expected to meet under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Similar to the school-wide program option under the Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program, all juvenile facilities may operate institution-wide education programs in which they use N and D program funds in combination with other available Federal and State funds. This option allows juvenile institutions to serve a larger proportion of their eligible population and to align their programs more closely with other education services in order to meet participants' educational and occupational training needs. States are required to reserve between 15 and 30 percent of their allocations for projects to help N and D participants make the transition from State institutions to locally operated programs or to support the successful entry of youth offenders into postsecondary and career and technical education programs.

The ESEA also authorizes, under Subpart 2 of Part D of Title I, a separate companion program that provides funding for local educational agencies (LEAs). From funds reserved by the State from its allocation under Title I, Part A, an SEA awards subgrants to eligible LEAs with high numbers or percentages of children and youth in locally operated correctional facilities for children and youth, including public or private institutions and community day programs or schools that serve delinquent children and youth. The SEA has the option of awarding subgrants to eligible LEAs by formula or through a discretionary grant process.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

The Department may reserve up to 2.5 percent of the appropriation for national activities, including technical assistance to help build the capacity of State agency programs.

This is a forward-funded program. Funds become available for obligation from July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available through September 30 of the following year.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2014	\$47,614
2015	47,614
2016	47,614
2017	47,614
2018	47,291

FY 2019 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$47.6 million for fiscal year 2019 for the Neglected and Delinquent (N and D) program, an increase of \$323,000, to restore funding to the fiscal year 2017 level. The activities supported with this funding would help N and D students return to and complete school and obtain employment after they are released from State institutions. The request reflects the Administration's commitment to maintain strong support for State formula grant programs that help school districts and schools meet the academic and non-academic needs of vulnerable student populations.

The population served by the N and D program is extremely disadvantaged and isolated. Research has shown that the youth served are up to 3 years behind in grade level and generally lack job skills. A study of youth incarcerated in three long-term correctional facilities by Harris, Baltodano, Bal, Jolivette, and Mulcahy (2009) found low levels of reading achievement among this population, with significantly lower levels for certain ethnic and racial groups and for students in special education. Overall, the youth in the study performed approximately one standard deviation below the mean, considerably below average, in standardized reading tests; scores for students receiving special education services were between one and two standard deviations from the mean. In another study documenting the academic performance of incarcerated youth, Krezmien, Mulcahy, and Leone (2008) found that the youth in the study scored on average about 4 years below their age-equivalent peers on standardized tests in reading and math. This problem was documented as early as 1996, when a study from the Educational Testing Service showed that while most of the inmates in America's prisons would eventually be paroled, two-thirds did not have the literacy skills needed to function in society. The findings of these reports show the importance of programs focused on improving educational outcomes for neglected and delinquent youth and preparing these students for further education or to enter the workforce.

Furthermore, a large number of youth in correctional settings are students with disabilities. The 2015-16 count of students with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

showed that roughly 12,000 children and youth served under that program were in correctional settings. In addition, for school year 2014-15, grantees under the N and D program reported that over 23,000 youth served in State-operated juvenile detention and correction facilities and over 66,000 youth served in locally operated juvenile detention and correction facilities were students with disabilities. These large numbers of students with disabilities pose additional challenges for institutions because such students typically require additional, specialized support and attention to be successful in school and beyond.

Most young people served by N and D grantees will reenter our communities, schools, and postsecondary institutions; consequently, educating these youth is crucial for reducing re-incarceration rates, supporting their future success, and strengthening communities. High-quality education in correctional institutions can help equip them with the skills needed to successfully reenter their communities and either continue their education or join the workforce.¹

In order to support effective implementation of the N and D program, including new requirements (following reauthorization by the Every Student Succeeds Act) to help justice-involved youth make a successful transition back to traditional school settings, the Department has supported development of technical assistance materials related to transition by the National Technical Assistance Center for the Education of Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (NDTAC).² These materials build on the Department's previous work with the Department of Justice that focused on reducing the number of youth who enter the juvenile justice system and improving the quality of the services provided in residential and secure facilities.

For 2019, the Department would reserve approximately \$1.2 million to continue to provide technical assistance and other services through the NDTAC. NDTAC activities include: (1) developing a national model for evaluating the effectiveness of N and D programs; (2) collecting and disseminating information on tools and effective practices that can be used to support N and D youth; and (3) providing technical assistance, using experts and practitioners, to State agencies.

¹ Lois M. Davis et al., "How Effective Is Correctional Education, and Where Do We Go from Here? The Results of a Comprehensive Evaluation" (2014); Lois M. Davis et al., "Evaluating the Effectiveness of Correctional Education: A Meta-Analysis of Programs That Provide Education to Incarcerated Adults" (2013).

² <https://www2.ed.gov/students/prep/juvenile-justice-transition/transition-toolkit-3.pdf>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>
Number of participating institutions	673	673	673
Estimated number of students served	79,084	79,084	79,084
Average Federal contribution per child (whole dollars)	\$587	\$586	\$587
Range of awards to States	0-\$3,426	0-\$3,404	0-\$3,427
Average State award	\$893	\$823	\$893
National activities	\$1,190	\$1,190	\$1,190

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years, and those requested in fiscal year 2019 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Goal: To ensure that neglected and delinquent children and youth will have the opportunity to meet the challenging State standards needed to further their education and become productive members of society.

Objective: *Neglected or delinquent students will improve academic and vocational skills needed to further their education.*

Measure: The percentage of students supported through the N and D program who obtain a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent.

Year	Target	Actual
2014	15.8%	13.3%
2015	16.8	11.4
2016	17.8	12.9
2017	18.8	
2018	19.8	
2019	20.8	

Additional information: The source of the data is the Consolidated State Performance Reports that States submit to the Department. Data from 2017 will be available in July 2018.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

Measure: The percentage of students supported through the N and D program earning high school course credits.

Year	Target	Actual
2014	58.6%	53.2%
2015	59.6	53.9
2016	60.6	58.5
2017	61.6	
2018	62.6	
2019	63.6	

Additional information: The source of the data is the Consolidated State Performance Reports that States submit to the Department. This measure includes students between the ages of 13 and 21 in neglected, juvenile detention, and juvenile correctional institutions, and not students in adult correctional institutions. Data from 2017 will be available in July 2018.

Measure: The percentage of long-term students supported through the N and D program who improve reading skills as measured through State-approved assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2014	73.4%	67.8%
2015	74.4	65.6
2016	75.4	65.6
2017	76.4	
2018	77.4	
2019	78.4	

Measure: The percentage of long-term students supported through the N and D program who improve mathematics skills as measured through State-approved assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2014	74.9%	68.6%
2015	75.9	66.6
2016	76.9	66.7
2017	77.9	
2018	78.9	
2019	79.9	

Additional information: The source of the data is the Consolidated State Performance Reports that States submit to the Department. Student counts are based on the number of long-term students (those enrolled in a participating program or facility for 90 or more consecutive calendar days) who complete pre- and post-testing in reading and mathematics. These are not the same as the State assessments required under ESEA Title I and do not necessarily reflect State proficiency levels. A number of factors may have contributed to unchanged performance for these measures from 2015 to 2016. In particular, States are implementing efforts to move students out of institutions and back into communities; consequently, while the program may be serving significantly fewer students, these students often had greater academic challenges. In

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

addition, several States are implementing ongoing changes to their reporting systems and are encountering challenges in moving from paper and pencil to electronic systems, as well as with the interoperability of electronic systems within their States. Data from 2017 will be available in July 2018.

Efficiency measures

Measure: The cost per high school diploma or equivalent.

Year	Target	Actual
2014	\$4,430	\$5,283
2015	4,386	6,431
2016	4,341	6,337
2017	4,298	
2018	4,255	
2019	4,211	

Additional information: This measure attempts to determine program cost efficiency by tracking the ratio of the number of participating students achieving a high school diploma or its equivalent to the cost of the program. Data from 2017 will be available in July 2018.

Other performance information

In 2016, the Department began an implementation evaluation of the N and D program to study educational services provided to children and youth in State and local juvenile justice and child welfare facilities and institutions. The study will conduct surveys and case studies of State grantees and local subgrantees to examine the types of services and strategies that N and D funds support, how State and local agencies assist students in transitioning back to schools, how State correctional facilities implement institution-wide N and D projects, and how grantees assess the educational outcomes of participating students. The final report is due at the end of calendar year 2018 and will be used to inform continuous program improvement, increase the research base, and improve outcomes for students served by this and other similar education programs.

Special programs for migrant students
 (Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part A, Subpart 5, Section 418A)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2019 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2018</u> <u>Annualized CR</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>Annualized CR</u>
\$44,320	\$44,623	+\$303

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2015; reauthorizing legislation is sought for fiscal year 2019.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Special Programs for Migrant Students provide 5-year grants to institutions of higher education (IHEs) and private nonprofit organizations to support educational programs designed for students who are engaged in, or whose families are engaged in, migrant and other seasonal farmwork.

Projects funded under the High School Equivalency Program (HEP) recruit migrant students aged 16 and over and provide academic and support services (including counseling, health services, stipends, and placement) to help those students obtain a high school equivalency certificate and subsequently to gain employment or admission to a postsecondary institution or training program.

Projects funded by the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) provide tutoring, academic assistance, and counseling services, as well as stipends, tuition, and room and board, to first-year undergraduate migrant students and assist those students in obtaining student financial aid for their remaining undergraduate years.

HEP projects, located in college or university settings, operate residential and commuter programs of instructional services for out-of-school migrant youth; some HEP projects employ a commuter model in which students attend GED classes after work. Most CAMP projects use an on-campus residential design and provide a high level of support services in order to assist participants, virtually all of whom have had no prior contact with a college campus, to adjust to life at an institution of higher education. In making awards under both programs, the Department is required to consider applicants' prior experience in operating HEP and CAMP projects.

The Department may reserve up to one half of 1 percent of the funds appropriated for Special Programs for Migrant Students for outreach, technical assistance, and professional development activities. If the total amount appropriated is below \$40 million, the remaining funds are to be distributed between the two programs in the same proportion as the amounts available for each program the previous year. If the appropriation is over \$40 million, 45 percent of the remaining funds must be used for HEP and 45 percent for CAMP, and the remainder may be used for either program, based on the number, quality, and promise of applications received.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were as follows:

Fiscal Years	(dollars in thousands)
2014	\$34,623
2015	37,474
2016	44,623
2017	44,623
2018	44,320

FY 2019 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests a total of \$44.6 million for 2019 for the Special Programs for Migrant Students, an increase of \$303,000, to restore funding to the fiscal year 2017 level. The request would support continued implementation of programs that have demonstrated success in helping migrant youth who are particularly at risk for poor educational, employment, and earnings outcomes.

Data from a 2016 US Department of Labor research report (Findings from the National Agricultural Workers Survey (NAWS) 2011-12: A Demographic and Employment Profile of United States Farmworkers) show that a significant proportion of farmworkers tend to be young, poorly educated, unlikely to be proficient in English, and poor. In 2011-12, individuals aged 14-21 constituted 11 percent of farmworkers; average educational attainment was 8th-grade; only 33 percent of respondents said they could speak English well; and 30 percent of farmworkers had family incomes below the poverty level. However, a sizable group of survey respondents seem interested in pursuing further education or training; 34 percent of farmworkers surveyed reported having taken at least one adult education class. Among the most common classes respondents attended were English, job training, and high school equivalency classes; however, their limited education and income affects their ability to pursue postsecondary education or obtain skilled work that pays higher wages.

Not only are many agricultural workers very young, but a large number of migrant youth are living on their own or do not attend school. State educational agencies reported that 10.2 percent of the population eligible to receive services under the Migrant Education program authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (32,161 youths in school year 2015-16) were school-aged youth who do not attend school.

The HEP and CAMP programs provide participants with assistance that can enable them to improve their earnings potential dramatically. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics “Occupational Outlook Handbook,”¹ the median hourly wage for agricultural workers in 2016 was \$10.83, and these types of workers are often paid based on how much they do instead of how many hours they work. By comparison, the National Center for Education Statistics reports in “The Condition of Education 2017” that in 2015, the median earnings for full-time, full-year wage and salary workers aged 25-34 with a high school diploma or equivalent were \$30,500 (equivalent to \$14.66 per hour) and the median was \$36,900 for a person with an associate’s

¹ Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, Agricultural Workers, on the Internet at <https://www.bls.gov/ooh/farming-fishing-and-forestry/agricultural-workers.htm> (visited January 02, 2018).

degree (equivalent to \$17.74 per hour). Furthermore, the “Occupational Outlook Handbook” indicates that periods of unemployment between jobs can cause stress for migrant and seasonal farmworkers, and agricultural work can be dangerous due to risk of exposure to pesticides or working with farm machinery that can cause serious injuries. Agricultural workers frequently leave the occupation due to the intense physical nature of the work, but, because of their poor education and lack of resources, these workers are likely to need support to pursue educational opportunities that would allow them to obtain other jobs.

HEP and CAMP programs focus on finding and assisting migrant youth who have not been able to complete high school or go on to postsecondary education due to limited or inconsistent educational opportunity. HEP and CAMP projects emphasize services to out-of-school-youth and other eligible individuals by conducting extensive outreach in locations where these youth live and work (e.g., farms, production facilities, and labor camps) and providing services at locations and times that meet the needs of an out-of-school, working population. Program performance data show that the programs’ academic and support services are successful at helping participants attain their high school equivalency credentials or complete their first academic year in a postsecondary program. Program outcomes compare favorably with outcomes for the general population. For example, 96.5 percent of the CAMP participants who completed their first academic year in a postsecondary program continued their postsecondary education. In contrast, data from the National Center of Education Statistics’ “The Condition of Education 2017” show that the retention rate of first-time degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates at 4-year institutions was 81 percent from 2014 to 2015, and 61 percent at 2-year institutions during the same period.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>
Outreach, technical assistance, and professional development	\$223	\$222	\$223
HEP:			
Number of students served	5,712	5,712	5,355
Funding for new awards	\$1,414	0	\$6,578
Number of new awards	3	0	14
Peer review of new award applications	\$62	0	\$75
Average new grant award	\$471	0	\$471
Funding for continuation awards	\$20,798	\$22,028	\$15,547
Number of continuation awards	45	48	31
Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars)	\$3,889	\$3,839	\$4,132
CAMP:			
Number of students served	2,491	2,491	2,538
Funding for new awards	\$4,198	0	\$4,970
Number of new awards	10	0	12
Peer review of new award	\$62	0	\$75

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>
applications			
Average new grant award	\$420	0	\$414
Funding for continuation awards	\$17,866	\$22,070	\$17,155
Number of continuation awards	43	53	42
Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars)	\$8,882	\$8,860	\$8,747

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years, and those requested in fiscal year 2019 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Goal: To assist migrant and seasonal farmworker students in obtaining the equivalent of a high school diploma, and, subsequently, in beginning postsecondary education, entering military service, or obtaining employment.

Objective: *An increasing percentage of HEP participants will receive their high school equivalency credential.*

Measure: The percentage of HEP participants receiving a high school equivalency credential.

Year	Target	Actual
2014	69.0%	66.6%
2015	69.0	42.6
2016	69.0	70.3
2017	69.0	
2018	69.0	
2019	69.0	

Additional information: The source of data is grantee performance reports. Over the last several years, changes to State academic standards for elementary and secondary education have driven changes to adult education standards and high school equivalency assessments that have made such assessments more challenging. The changes in standards have also led to HEP projects having to redesign their curricula and professional development. In addition, the GED Testing Service announced in 2016 that it was lowering the passing score for its GED test and that it was applying this change retroactively for students who had taken the test through January of 2014. Due to the fluctuation in student performance during the time these changes occurred performance targets remain static. Data collected for fiscal year 2017 will be available in the summer of 2018.

Objective: *An increasing percentage of HEP recipients of a high school equivalency credential will enter postsecondary education programs, upgraded employment, or the military.*

Measure: The percentage of HEP high school equivalency credential recipients who enter postsecondary educational programs, career positions, or the military.

Year	Target	Actual
2014	80.0%	79.9%
2015	80.0	78.2
2016	80.0	78.7
2017	80.0	
2018	80.0	
2019	80.0	

Additional information: The source of data is grantee performance reports. Data for this measure are based on actual placement after receipt of a high school equivalency credential. Upgraded employment means a move to a job that provides more hours (and, as a result, increased pay); a job with increased benefits; a move to a supervisory position; a move to a new job with predefined career ladder, regardless of wage change (for example, becoming a management trainee or entering a formal apprenticeship); or a move to a job with higher hourly wages or a higher salary. Participants who were unemployed prior to participation in a HEP program and who obtain a job after participation and attainment of a high school equivalency credential are also included in this measure. The Department is providing technical assistance to grantees on collecting data on program participants after they are no longer receiving program services. Data for 2017 will be available in the summer of 2018.

Goal: **Assist migrant and seasonal farmworker students in successfully completing their first academic year of college and in continuing their postsecondary education.**

Objective: *All CAMP students will complete their first academic year at a postsecondary institution in good standing.*

Measure: The percentage of CAMP participants completing the first year of their postsecondary program.

Year	Target	Actual
2014	86.0%	86.7%
2015	86.0	84.5
2016	86.0	88.1
2017	86.0	
2018	86.0	
2019	86.0	

Additional information: The source of data is grantee performance reports. Data for projects completing their first year of implementation are not included in the data for any given year because projects receive their initial funding in the fall, after the school year may have already started. Thus, the measure reflects the percentage of participants completing the first year of their postsecondary program between the second and fifth year of the project. Data collected for fiscal year 2017 will be available in the summer of 2018.

Objective: A majority of CAMP students who successfully complete their first academic year of college will continue in postsecondary education.

Measure: The percentage of CAMP participants who, after completing the first academic year of college, continue their postsecondary education.

Year	Target	Actual
2014	85.0%	96.2%
2015	85.0	96.7
2016	85.0	96.5
2017	85.0	
2018	88.0	
2019	90.0	

Additional information: The source of data is grantee performance reports. Data for this measure are based on actual placement after completion of the first year of college. The Department is providing technical assistance to grantees on collecting data on program participants once the participants are no longer receiving program services. Data for 2017 will be available in the summer of 2018.

Efficiency measures

The Department established a cost-per-participant outcome measure to assess program efficiency for HEP and CAMP. For HEP, the measure is the cost per participant earning a GED credential and, for CAMP, it is the cost per participant who completes his or her first year of postsecondary education and then continues that postsecondary education.

HEP Efficiency Measures

Measure: Cost per participant earning a high school equivalency credential (HSE), commuter programs.

Year	Target Cost Per Commuter Participant	Actual Cost Per Commuter Participant
2014	\$8,718	\$5,985
2015	9,104	12,882
2016	9,509	8,075
2017	9,931	
2018	10,030	
2019	10,131	

Measure: Cost per participant earning a high school equivalency credential, residential programs.

Year	Target Cost Per Residential Participant	Actual Cost Per Residential Participant
2014	\$16,962	\$12,750
2015	17,719	22,847
2016	18,511	10,649
2017	19,338	
2018	19,531	
2019	19,727	

Measure: Cost per participant earning a high school equivalency credential, programs with both commuting and resident students.

Year	Target Cost Per Participant in Combined Programs	Actual Cost Per Participant in Combined Programs
2014	\$13,732	\$7,433
2015	14,344	15,377
2016	14,984	10,438
2017	15,653	
2018	15,810	
2019	15,968	

Additional information: The Department established different costs for programs serving participants who commute, programs serving participants who reside at the institution of higher education where the program is based, and programs with both types of participants. Targets are based on actual costs in 2011 (the baseline year), multiplied by an estimated rate of inflation for college-associated costs and then decreased by an expected improvement in efficiency annually of 1 percent. Costs for HEP programs increased in 2015, in part, due to substantial increases in costs for high school equivalency testing, along with the decrease in the number of HEP participants receiving a high school equivalency credential. Data for 2017 will be available in the summer of 2018.

CAMP Efficiency Measures

Measure: Cost per participant completing the first year of postsecondary education and continuing postsecondary education, commuter programs.

Year	Target Cost Per Commuter Participant	Actual Cost Per Commuter Participant
2014	\$13,107	\$10,170
2015	13,697	10,326
2016	14,314	10,161
2017	14,958	
2018	15,197	
2019	15,440	

Measure: Cost per participant completing the first year of postsecondary education and continuing postsecondary education, residential programs.

Year	Target Cost Per Residential Participant	Actual Cost Per Residential Participant
2014	\$21,007	\$12,521
2015	21,952	12,354
2016	22,940	13,279
2017	23,972	
2018	24,356	
2019	24,745	

Measure: Cost per participant completing the first year of postsecondary education and continuing postsecondary education, programs with both commuting and resident students.

Year	Target Cost Per Participant for Combined Programs	Actual Cost Per Participant for Combined Programs
2014	\$15,974	\$11,512
2015	16,693	11,503
2016	17,444	12,311
2017	18,229	
2018	18,521	
2019	18,817	

Additional information: The Department established different costs for programs serving participants who commute, programs serving participants who reside at the institution of higher education where the program is based, and programs with both types of participants. Targets are based on actual costs in 2011 (the baseline year), multiplied by an estimated rate of inflation for college-associated costs and then decreased by an expected improvement in efficiency annually of 1 percent. Data for 2017 will be available in the summer of 2018.