

**Department of Education**  
**EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED**  
**Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Request**

**CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language .....	A-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	A-3
Appropriation, Adjustments and Transfers .....	A-5
Summary of Changes .....	A-6
Authorizing Legislation.....	A-7
Appropriations History.....	A-9
Significant Items in FY 2019 Appropriations Reports.....	A-11
Summary of Request .....	A-12
Activities:	
Grants to local educational agencies .....	A-14
Student-centered funding incentive grants.....	A-25
Comprehensive literacy development grants .....	A-28
Innovative approaches to literacy.....	A-33
State agency programs:	
Migrant .....	A-36
Neglected and delinquent.....	A-42
Special programs for migrant students .....	A-49
State Tables*	

State tables reflecting final 2018 allocations and 2019 and 2020 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 [and subpart 2 of part B of title II] of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (referred to in this Act as "ESEA") and section 418A of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (referred to in this Act as "HEA"), [~~\$16,543,790,000~~]\$16,376,790,000, of which [~~\$5,625,990,000~~]\$4,595,269,000 shall become available on July 1, [2019]2020, and shall remain available through September 30, [2020]2021, and of which [~~\$10,841,177,000~~]\$11,681,898,000 shall become available on October 1, [2019]2020, and shall remain available through September 30, [2020]2021, for academic year [2019–2020]2020-2021:<sup>1</sup> *Provided*, That \$6,459,401,000 shall be for basic grants under section 1124 of the ESEA:<sup>2</sup> *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, [2018]2019, to obtain annually updated local educational agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census:<sup>3</sup> *Provided further*, That \$1,362,301,000 shall be for concentration grants under section 1124A of the ESEA:<sup>4</sup> *Provided further*, That \$4,019,050,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA:<sup>5</sup> *Provided further*, That \$4,019,050,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A of the ESEA:<sup>6</sup> [*Provided further*, That \$217,000,000 shall be for carrying out subpart 2 of part B of title II: ]<sup>7</sup> *Provided further*, That \$50,000,000 shall be for local educational agencies to implement weighted per-pupil funding systems through a demonstration agreement with the Secretary under part E of title I of the ESEA:<sup>8</sup> *Provided further*, That \$44,623,000 shall be for carrying out section 418A of the HEA:<sup>9</sup> *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.<sup>10</sup> (*Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2019.*)

NOTE

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><sup>1</sup> ... of which [\$5,625,990,000] <del>\$4,595,269,000</del> shall become available on July 1, <del>[2019]</del>2020, and shall remain available through September 30, <del>[2020]</del>2021, and of which [\$10,841,177,000] <del>\$11,681,898,000</del> shall become available on October 1, <del>[2019]</del>2020, and shall remain available through September 30, <del>[2020]</del>2021, for academic year <del>[2019–2020]</del>2020-2021:</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, funding for demonstration agreements tied to weighted per-pupil funding, State Agency Migrant and Neglected and Delinquent, and Special Programs for Migrant Students. 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><sup>2</sup>...<i>Provided</i>, That \$6,459,401,000 shall be for basic grants under section 1124 of the ESEA:</p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Basic Grants.</p>
<p><sup>3</sup>...<i>Provided further</i>, 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, <del>[2018]</del> 2019, to obtain annually updated local educational agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census:</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><sup>4</sup>...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$1,362,301,000 shall be for concentration grants under section 1124A of the ESEA:</p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Concentration Grants.</p>
<p><sup>5</sup>...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$4,019,050,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA:</p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Targeted Grants.</p>
<p><sup>6</sup>...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$4,019,050,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A of the ESEA:</p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Education Finance Incentive Grants.</p>
<p><sup>7</sup>...<i>[Provided further</i>, That \$217,000,000 shall be for carrying out subpart 2 of part B of title II:]</p>	<p>This language provides funding for Comprehensive literacy development grants and Innovative approaches to literacy. It is deleted because no funding is requested for those programs.</p>

**EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED**

**Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes**

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>8</sup> <u>...Provided further, That \$50,000,000 shall be for local educational agencies to implement weighted per-pupil funding systems through a demonstration agreement with the Secretary under part E of title I of the ESEA:</u></p>	<p>This language would authorize funding to support grants for activities related to refining and implementing student-centered funding systems for local educational agencies with flexibility agreements under Title I, Part E of the ESEA.</p>
<p><sup>9</sup> <u>...Provided further, That \$44,623,000 shall be for carrying out section 418A of the HEA.</u><sup>9</sup></p>	<p>This language provides funding for Special Programs for Migrant Students.</p>
<p><sup>10</sup> <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 override the authorizing statute by raising the maximum percentage of Title I funds that SEAs may reserve to carry out section 1003A from 3 percent to 5 percent.</p>

**EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED**

**Appropriation, Adjustments and Transfers**  
(dollars in thousands)

---

Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers	2018	2019	2020
<b>Discretionary:</b>			
Appropriation .....	<u>\$16,443,790</u>	<u>\$16,543,790</u>	<u>\$16,376,790</u>
Total, discretionary appropriation .....	16,443,790	16,543,790	16,376,790
<b>Advance:</b>			
Advance for succeeding fiscal year .....	-10,841,177	-10,841,177	-11,681,898
Advance from prior year .....	<u>10,841,177</u>	<u>10,841,177</u>	<u>10,841,177</u>
Total, budget authority .....	16,443,790	16,543,790	15,536,069

---

**EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED**

**Summary of Changes**  
(dollars in thousands)

---

2019.....	\$16,543,790
2020.....	<u>16,376,790</u>
Net change .....	-167,000

---

<b>Increases:</b>	<u>2019 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
Provide funding to support new grants for activities related to refining and implementing student-centered funding systems for local educational agencies with flexibility agreements under Title I, Part E of the ESEA.		
	0	<u>+\$50,000</u>
Subtotal, increases		+50,000

<b>Decreases:</b>	<u>2019 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<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.		
	\$190,000	-190,000
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.		
	27,000	<u>-27,000</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-217,000
Net change		-167,000

---

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Authorizing Legislation (dollars in thousands)

Activity	2019 Authorized	2019 Estimate	2020 Authorized	2020 Request
Grants to local educational agencies ( <i>ESEA-1-A</i> ):				
LEA grants formulas:	\$15,897,371		\$16,182,345	
Basic grants ( <i>Section 1124</i> )	(1)	\$6,459,401	(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)	4,019,050	(1)	3,819,050
Education finance incentive grants ( <i>Section 1125A</i> )	(1)	4,019,050	(1)	3,819,050
Student-centered funding incentive grants ( <i>Proposed legislation</i> )	0	0	To be <sup>2</sup> determined	50,000,000
Comprehensive literacy development grants ( <i>ESEA-II-B-2, Section 2222</i> )	(3)	190,000	(3)	0
Innovative approaches to literacy ( <i>ESEA-II-B-2, Section 2226</i> )	(3)	27,000	(3)	0
State agency programs:				
Migrant ( <i>ESEA I-C</i> )	374,751	374,751	374,751	374,751
Neglected and delinquent ( <i>ESEA I-D</i> )	47,614	47,614	47,614	47,614
Special Programs for Migrant Students ( <i>HEA IV-A-5</i> )	<u>0</u> <sup>4</sup>	<u>44,623</u>	<u>determined</u> <sup>4</sup>	<u>44,623</u>

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> Authorizing legislation is sought for fiscal year 2020.

<sup>3</sup> For Part B of Title II, a total of \$469,168 thousand is authorized for fiscal year 2019, and \$489,168 thousand is authorized for fiscal year 2020. Of the total amount appropriated for Title II, Part B, 34.1 percent is authorized in fiscal year 2019 and 38.9 percent is authorized in fiscal year 2020 for Subpart 2 programs.

<sup>4</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2015. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for fiscal year 2020.



**EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED**

**Authorizing Legislation—continued**

Activity	2019 Authorized	2019 Estimate	2020 Authorized	2020 Request
Total definite authorization	0		\$16,604,710	
Total appropriation		\$16,543,790		\$16,376,790
Portion of request subject to reauthorization				44,623

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

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

<sup>1</sup> The level for the House allowance reflects the House-passed full-year continuing resolution.

<sup>2</sup> The level for the Senate allowance reflects Committee action only.

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

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

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

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

<sup>7</sup> The level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Subcommittee action only.

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

<sup>9</sup> 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.

<sup>10</sup> The level for the House allowance reflects floor action on the Omnibus appropriations bill; the Senate allowance reflects Committee action on the regular annual 2018 appropriations bill; the Appropriation reflects the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115-141).

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Appropriations History—continued

---

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2019	\$15,926,790	\$16,443,790 <sup>11</sup>	\$16,568,790 <sup>11</sup>	\$16,543,790 <sup>11</sup>
(2019 Advance for 2020)	(11,681,898)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)
2020	16,376,790			
(2020 Advance for 2021)	(11,681,898)			

---

<sup>11</sup> The levels for the House and Senate Allowance reflect Committee action on the regular annual 2019 appropriations bill; the Appropriation reflects enactment of the Department of Defense and Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Act, 2019 (P.L. 115-245).

---

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Significant Items in FY 2019 Appropriations Reports

#### **Grants to LEAs**

Senate: The Committee directs the Department to make publicly available on its website a request from a State Education Agency to waive the 1-percent alternate assessment cap under section 1111(b)(2)(D)(i)(I) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and its implementing regulations at 34 CFR 200.6(c) and the Department's response to any such request.

Response: ED continues to post all responses to waiver requests in our website, at <https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplan17/waivers/index.html>, and will post the requests on the Department's website in the near future.

#### **Innovative Approaches to Literacy**

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 fiscal year 2018, the Department awarded more than 90 percent of funds available for IAL to grantees that are developing or enhancing effective school library programs in high-need schools in diverse geographic areas across 16 States. Fiscal year 2019 funds will support continuation awards for the 2018 cohort of IAL grantees.

[Click here for accessible version](#)

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2020 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET  
(in thousands of dollars)

	Cat Code	2018 Appropriation	2019 Appropriation	2020 President's Budget	2020 President's Budget Compared to 2019 Appropriation		
					Amount	Percent	
<b>Education for the Disadvantaged</b>							
1. Grants to local educational agencies (ESEA I-A):							
(a) Basic grants (section 1124)							
Annual appropriation	D	4,918,625	5,018,625	4,177,904	(840,721)	-16.75%	
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	1,540,776	1,440,776	2,281,497	840,721	58.35%	
Subtotal		6,459,401	6,459,401	6,459,401	0	0.00%	
(b) Concentration grants (section 1124A)							
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	1,362,301	1,362,301	1,362,301	0	0.00%	
(c) Targeted grants (section 1125)							
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	3,969,050	4,019,050	4,019,050	0	0.00%	
(d) Education finance incentive grants (section 1125A)							
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	3,969,050	4,019,050	4,019,050	0	0.00%	
Subtotal, Grants to LEAs		15,759,802	15,859,802	15,859,802	0	0.00%	
Annual appropriation	D	4,918,625	5,018,625	4,177,904	(840,721)	-16.75%	
Advance for succeeding fiscal year <sup>1</sup>	D	10,841,177	10,841,177	11,681,898	840,721	7.75%	
2. Student-centered funding incentive grants (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	50,000	50,000	---	
3. Comprehensive literacy development grants (ESEA II-B-2, section 2222)	D	190,000	190,000	0	(190,000)	-100.00%	
4. Innovative approaches to literacy (ESEA II-B-2, section 2226)	D	27,000	27,000	0	(27,000)	-100.00%	
5. State agency programs:							
(a) Migrant (ESEA I-C)							
	D	374,751	374,751	374,751	0	0.00%	
(b) Neglected and delinquent (ESEA I-D)							
	D	47,614	47,614	47,614	0	0.00%	
Subtotal, State agency programs		422,365	422,365	422,365	0	0.00%	
6. Special programs for migrant students (HEA IV-A-5)	D	44,623	44,623	44,623	0	0.00%	
<b>Total, Appropriation</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>16,443,790</b>	<b>16,543,790</b>	<b>16,376,790</b>	<b>(167,000)</b>	<b>-1.01%</b>	
Total, Budget authority	D	16,443,790	16,543,790	15,536,069	(1,007,721)	-6.09%	
Current		5,602,613	5,702,613	4,694,892	(1,007,721)	-17.67%	
Prior year's advance		10,841,177	10,841,177	10,841,177	0	0.00%	

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

<sup>1</sup> The amount for Advance for succeeding fiscal year in the 2020 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

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 \$16.4 billion in fiscal year 2020 for the programs in this account.

The \$15.9 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 approved consolidated State plans.

The request includes \$50 million for the proposed Student-Centered Funding Incentive grants, which are intended to spur LEAs to participate in flexibility agreements under Title I, Part E of the ESEA by supporting activities related to refining and implementing weighted student funding systems.

The request would also provide \$374.7 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 2020 Authorization: \$16,182,345

Budget authority:

	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
Basic grants	\$6,459,401	\$6,459,401	0
Concentration grants	1,362,301	1,362,301	0
Targeted grants	4,019,050	4,019,050	0
Education finance incentive grants	<u>4,019,050</u>	<u>4,019,050</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	15,859,802	15,859,802	0
Annual appropriation	5,018,625	4,177,904	0
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	10,841,177	11,681,898	0

---

### 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 nearly 90 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 2016-2017 school year, States reported that 47,511 schools, or 80 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.

### **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 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 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



## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Grants to local educational agencies

---

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.<sup>1</sup>

Under section 1003(a) of the 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

---

<sup>1</sup> Consistent with the ESSA's transition provisions, the Department permitted States to delay, until the 2018-2019 school year, the identification of schools for comprehensive support and improvement and additional 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

---

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 was 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 2018 allocations were based on LEA poverty estimates for 2015. The Department transfers approximately \$5 million from the annual Title I appropriation to the Census Bureau to finance the preparation of these LEA poverty estimates.

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Grants to local educational agencies

---

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, 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.

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>
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 .....	6,459,401	1,362,301	3,819,050	3,819,050	15,459,802
2018 .....	6,459,401	1,362,301	3,969,050	3,969,050	15,759,802
2019 .....	6,459,401	1,362,301	4,019,050	4,019,050	15,859,802

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Grants to local educational agencies

---

#### **FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$15.9 billion for Title I Grants to LEAs in fiscal year 2020, the same as the fiscal year 2019 appropriation. The request maintains strong support for the Title I program, which is the linchpin of the ESEA and reflects 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.

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 the size of this reservation 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 in low-performing schools have 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 otherwise are unavailable. This increased reservation, together with investments in charter schools and magnet schools, is intended to support the Administration's goal of ensuring that all students, including disadvantaged students, are empowered to obtain a personalized education that meets their individual needs.

#### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES**

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

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
Allocations by LEA Poverty Rate:			
0-15%			
# of LEAs	5,597	5,895	5,895
Dollars	\$2,581,948	\$2,955,311	\$2,949,636
% of Total \$	16.69	18.97	18.94
# of Formula Eligible Children	1,985,428	2,146,177	2,146,177
0-15% \$ Per Formula Child	\$1,300	\$1,377	\$1,374
15-25%			
# of LEAs	4,430	4,349	4,349
Dollars	\$5,406,961	\$5,457,674	\$5,454,251
% of Total \$	34.94	35.04	35.01
# of Formula Eligible Children	3,757,962	3,547,081	3,547,081
15-25% \$ Per Formula Child	\$1,439	\$1,539	\$1,538

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Grants to local educational agencies

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
>25%			
# of LEAs	2,800	2,532	2,532
Dollars	\$7,485,422	\$7,161,918	\$7,173,401
% of Total \$	48.37	45.99	46.05
# of Formula Eligible Children	4,450,026	3,968,829	3,968,829
>25% \$ Per Formula Child	\$1,682	\$1,805	\$1,807
LEA Allocation Subtotal	\$15,474,331	\$15,574,903	\$15,577,288
BIA/Outlying Areas	173,303	174,403	174,403
N&D Program (Part D, Subpart 2)	107,168	105,496	103,111
Census Updates	<u>5,000</u>	<u>5,000</u>	<u>5,000</u>
Grants to LEAs Total	15,759,802	15,859,802	15,859,802

## 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 fiscal year 2020 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 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. The Department is revising the measures for Title I Grants to LEAs to assess more effectively performance consistent with the reauthorized law and will begin reporting on the revised measures beginning with the fiscal year 2021 President’s Budget.

**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.*

## 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 reading assessments.

Year	Target Percentage of Students Who Score At or Above Proficiency	Actual Percentage of Students Who Score At or Above Proficiency
2015	100.0%	39.4%
2016	100.0	40.2
2017	100.0	39.6
2018	100.0	
2019	100.0	
2020	100.0	

**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
2015	100.0%	35.0%
2016	100.0	36.7
2017	100.0	37.0
2018	100.0	
2019	100.0	
2020	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
2015	0.0%	13.0%
2016	0.0	12.8
2017	0.0	12.5
2018	0.0	
2019	0.0	
2020	0.0	

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Grants to local educational agencies

---

**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
2015	0.0%	12.4%
2016	0.0	12.5
2017	0.0	12.2
2018	0.0	
2019	0.0	
2020	0.0	

**Additional information:** Two States (Alaska and Tennessee) did not submit data for these measures for 2016.

### Other Performance Information

#### The Title I Program at a Glance

In the 2016-2017 school year, the most recent year for which data are available, the Title I program served approximately 24.6 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	Number of Schools	Number of Students, in millions
Schoolwide program	47,511	23.7
Targeted assistance program	12,232	0.9
Total	59,743	24.6

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Grants to local educational agencies

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

Student Group	Number of Students, All Schools	Number of Students, Title I Schools	Percentage of Students, Title I Schools
All students	50,995,188	24,578,941	48%
American Indian or Alaska Native	553,920	364,602	66
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,784,100	1,014,056	36
Black	7,759,559	5,349,225	69
Hispanic	13,693,274	9,597,545	70
White	24,366,012	8,111,123	33
Two or more races	1,837,878	843,038	46%
English learners	4,975,045	3,831,530	77
Students with disabilities	6,152,428	3,575,761	58

**Additional information:** Descriptive data are from the National Center for Education Statistics' Common Core of Data, the Consolidated State Performance Reports, and other collections through the Department's *EDFacts* system for the 2016-17 school year. The number of students in Title I schools for the "all students" group reflects the students served by the 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.

### Study of Title I Schoolwide and Targeted Assistance Programs

In April 2018, the Department released the final report from the Study of Title I Schoolwide and Targeted Assistance Programs.<sup>1</sup> The study examined how Title I schools are using the flexibility offered by the schoolwide program (SWP) option and is based on nationally representative surveys of Title I districts and schools (including both SWP and targeted assistance program (TAP) schools), as well as interviews and extant data analysis in 35 case study sites. The study notably found that SWP schools tended to use Title I funds for a broader array of staff types and services than TAP schools and be more involved in decision-making about how to use Title I funds. Although reading and math instruction continue to be a major focus for Title I staff in both TAP and SWP schools, some case study schools provided examples of more novel uses of Title I funds, such as social-emotional supports, digital learning technologies, summer bridge programs, and academic enrichment. Other findings from the study include:

- Few principals of SWP schools said that their school consolidated Title I funds with other Federal, state, and local funds (6 percent), but a larger proportion (50 percent) indicated that they coordinated the use of Title I funds with other funds. Among the case study schools, those that reported coordinating the use of Title I funds and other funds often

<sup>1</sup> See <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oepdp/ppss/reports.html#school-finance>.



## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### **Grants to local educational agencies**

---

described co-funding staff positions or services in a way that may have a similar practical result as consolidating funds.

- The biggest perceived challenge for consolidating Title I funds with other sources was State accounting rules that require separate accounting for Federal programs..

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

---

### **Student-centered funding incentive grants**

(Proposed legislation)

FY 2020 Authorization: To be determined

Budget Authority:

<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
0	\$50,000	+\$50,000

---

### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The proposed Student-Centered Funding Incentive Grants are intended to spur local educational agencies (LEAs) to participate in agreements under ESEA Title I, Part E, which authorizes the Department to give LEAs flexibility to consolidate Federal funds together with State and local funds in student-centered funding systems based on weighted per-pupil allocations. Student-Centered Funding Incentive Grants would help demonstrate the viability of moving from traditional school finance systems to weighted student funding models and the potential impact of those models on improving student outcomes while reducing LEA red tape. These grants would be available to LEAs with existing flexibility agreements for activities related to refining and implementing these systems, which could include temporary payments to individual schools to offset reduced funding and allow for a smooth transition to these new systems. The Department could also use a portion of funds for grants to LEAs committed to seeking flexibility agreements to assist them in developing and preparing for the implementation of student-centered funding systems that meet the terms of an agreement.

To receive flexibility under Title I, Part E, an LEA must allocate a significant portion of its total funding (based on school-level actual personnel and nonpersonnel expenditures, including staff salary differentials for years of employment) to schools through a student-centered funding 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. Under the statute, the LEA must ensure that, in its first year of flexibility, each high-poverty school receives more per-pupil funding than in the prior year for students from low-income families, and at least as much per-pupil funding for English learners; in subsequent years, the LEA must show for those schools at least equal per-pupil funding for these student subgroups compared to the prior year.

The Department enters into initial flexibility agreements with LEAs for a period of up to 3 years and may renew an initial agreement for additional 3-year terms if the LEA continues to demonstrate compliance with statutory requirements. Student-Centered Funding Incentive Grants could mirror the term of an LEA's initial agreement and or could be awarded before an initial agreement, provided that the LEA can demonstrate a commitment to seeking an agreement. In making awards, the Department could give special consideration to LEAs with the highest concentrations of poverty.

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Student-centered funding incentive grants

---

#### **FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$50 million for the proposed Student-Centered Funding Incentive Grants, which would be authorized through appropriations language and would support grants to up to 10 LEAs.

Student-centered funding systems based on weighted per-pupil allocations have important advantages compared to traditional district allocation methods. These systems allocate funds to schools based on the characteristics of the school's student body, making the amount that each school receives transparent, quantifiable, and tied to challenges students may face. School leaders are typically granted greater decision-making authority under these systems to direct investments toward the areas they believe are most in need. And, perhaps most importantly, basing funding on student characteristics helps ensure that the schools with the highest number of disadvantaged students will receive the funding needed to provide them with a high-quality education. Traditional district allocation methods have been shown to create significant disparities in funding between Title I and non-Title I schools. One Department of Education study sampled a large number of districts and found that 46 percent of Title I elementary schools had state and local personnel expenditures per pupil that were below the average for non-Title I elementary schools in their district.<sup>1</sup> Student-centered funding systems hold the promise to reduce or eliminate these inequities and enhance local autonomy.

For an LEA that enters into a flexibility agreement, the Department is authorized to waive those provisions of the ESEA that would otherwise prevent the LEA from using eligible Federal funds as part of such an agreement. For example, if an LEA wishes to use its Title I, Part A funds in its student-centered funding system, the Department may waive requirements in section 1113(c)(1)-(2) regarding allocating those funds to schools based on a rank-order of poverty. Relieving an LEA from certain ESEA requirements in this manner enables the LEA to use the Federal funds allocated through its student-centered funding system flexibly, provided it meets the requirements of the agreement and the purposes of each Federal education program supported by the consolidated Federal funds.

Despite this offer of Federal support free of certain rigid ESEA requirements, few LEAs have sought flexibility agreements. The Administration believes that resources may help overcome the reluctance of LEAs to participate. Student-Centered Funding Incentive Grants could, in particular, help LEAs develop procedures to implement effectively the requirement to charge schools based on actual personnel expenditures, as opposed to the more-customarily used average personnel expenditures. Student-Centered Funding Incentive Grants would also help mitigate the potential negative impact on some schools of the transition to a student-centered funding system.

To further attract participation, the Department could make a limited amount of funds available to LEAs seeking flexibility agreements to help them develop systems that meet applicable

---

<sup>1</sup> See <https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/title-i/school-level-expenditures/school-level-expenditures.pdf>

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Student-centered funding incentive grants

---

requirements. In addition, the Department could consider using its existing authority to extend to 6 years the initial flexibility agreement of an LEA receiving a Student-Centered Funding Incentive Grant award.

Consistent with requirements in Title I, Part E, the Department would use funds pooled for evaluation under section 8601 of the ESEA to evaluate agreement and grant implementation, including its impact on the equitable distribution of funding, the demographic distribution of students, and student achievement and other academic outcomes, such as high school graduation rates.

### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES**

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2020</u>
Amount for new awards	\$50,000
Number of new awards	5–10

### **PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

#### **Performance Measures**

The Department will establish goals and performance indicators to assess the impact of the activities that receive support under this program, based in part on the targets and goals established by grantees. The development of these measures would build on our experience in creating performance measures for other programs, and the Department would also seek to align program measures for Student-Centered Funding Incentive Grants with measures for related programs.

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

---

### **Comprehensive literacy development grants**

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

FY 2020 Authorization: <sup>(1)</sup>

Budget Authority:

	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$190,000	0	-\$190,000

---

<sup>1</sup> A total of \$489,168 thousand is authorized for Part B of Title II. Of the total amount appropriated for Title II, Part B, 36.8 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.

An 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 childhood educators and related school staff, coordinating activities designed to increase family

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Comprehensive literacy development grants

---

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.

CLD grants are forward-funded, with funds becoming available on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remaining available for 15 months through September 30 of the following year.

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

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2015 .....	\$160,000
2016 .....	190,000
2017 .....	190,000
2018 .....	190,000
2019 .....	190,000

### **FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration’s fiscal year 2020 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 nearly \$15.9 billion annually to States and school districts that may be used to support effective, evidence-based reading instruction.

The Department intends to fully fund a final cohort of grantees in fiscal year 2019, using fiscal year 2018 and fiscal year 2019 funds, to test the effectiveness of interventions and strategies that could be funded through Title I or other Federal formula grant programs. Selected 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.

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Comprehensive literacy development grants

---

#### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES**

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
Funding for new awards	0	\$363,666	0
Number of new awards	0	6-8	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$400	0
Amount for Bureau of Indian Education	0	\$1,900	0
Amount for Outlying Areas	0	\$1,900	0
National activities (including evaluation)	0	\$12,134	0

NOTES: 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. While the Department did not reserve funds from the CLD program for this purpose in fiscal year 2018, it may do so in fiscal year 2019.

The Department carried over fiscal year 2018 funds for this program and will use the amounts available from fiscal years 2018 and 2019 to support a single 2019 competition.

#### **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 Department is in the process of setting targets for the 2017 cohort of CLD grantees and anticipates using similar measures and targets for the 2019 cohort. The Department is not including performance targets for 2020 because the 2020 request would eliminate this program.

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Comprehensive literacy development grants

---

**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	2011 Cohort Actual	2017 Cohort Actual
2015	68%	61%	
2016	68	47	
2017	Set a baseline		
2018			51%
2019			

**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 (for the 2011 cohort) or CLD (for the 2017 cohort) subgrant program.

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

Year	Target	2011 Cohort Actual	2017 Cohort Actual
2015	75%	72%	
2016	75	57	
2017	Set a baseline		
2018			42%
2019			

**Additional information:** Data reflect cumulative results across States for all students who participated in the Striving Readers (for the 2011 cohort) or CLD (for the 2017 cohort) program, completed pre- and post-assessments, and met or exceeded proficiency levels on the State English language arts assessments.

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

Year	Target	2011 Cohort Actual	2017 Cohort Actual
2015	76%	60%	
2016	76	55	
2017	Set a baseline		
2018			41%
2019			



## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Comprehensive literacy development grants

---

**Additional information:** Data reflect cumulative results across States for all students who participated in the Striving Readers (for the 2011 cohort) or CLD (for the 2017 cohort) program, completed pre- and post-assessments and met or exceeded proficiency levels on the State English language arts assessments.

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

Year	Target	2011 Cohort Actual	2017 Cohort Actual
2015	75%	62%	
2016	75	64	
2017	Set a baseline		
2018			38%
2019			

**Additional information:** Data reflect cumulative results across States for all students who participated in the Striving Readers (for the 2011 cohort) or CLD (for the 2017 cohort) 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.

**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 2020 Authorization: <sup>(1)</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$27,000	0	-\$27,000

---

<sup>1</sup> A total of \$489,168 thousand is authorized for Part B of Title II. Of the total amount appropriated for Title II, Part B, 36.8 percent is authorized for the Comprehensive Literacy Development and Innovative Approaches to Literacy 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)
2015.....	\$23,109
2016.....	27,000
2017.....	27,000
2018.....	27,000
2019.....	27,000

**FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration's fiscal year 2020 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 \$15.9 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.

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Innovative approaches to literacy

---

In fiscal year 2018, the Department awarded a final cohort of new, 3-year awards. The Department will provide continuation awards in fiscal year 2019, but will encourage IAL grantees to seek other funding from Federal, State, local, or private funding sources to complete their projects in fiscal year 2020.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
Funding for new awards	\$26,732	0	0
Number of new awards	40	0	0
Funding for continuation awards	0	\$27,000	0
Number of continuation awards	0	40	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$268	0	0

NOTE: The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including IAL, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. While the Department did not reserve funds from the IAL program for this purpose in fiscal year 2018, it may do so in fiscal year 2019.

### 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. 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 2020 because the 2020 request would eliminate 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
<b>2015</b>	70%	76%
<b>2016</b>	70	76
<b>2017</b>	70	83
<b>2018</b>	70	70
<b>2019</b>	70	

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Innovative approaches to literacy

---

**Measure:** The percentage of fourth graders participating in the project who demonstrated individual student growth (i.e., an improvement in their achievement) over the past year on State reading or language arts assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA.

Year	Target	Actual
2018	70%	54%
2019	70	

**Additional information:** This measure was introduced with the 2016 cohort of IAL grantees; the first year for which grantees reported performance data was fiscal year 2018.

**Measure:** The percentage of eighth graders participating in the project who demonstrated individual student growth (i.e., an improvement in their achievement) over the past year on State reading or language arts assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA.

Year	Target	Actual
2018	70%	58%
2019	70	

**Additional information:** This measure was introduced with the 2016 cohort of IAL grantees; the first year for which grantees reported performance data was fiscal year 2018.

**Measure:** The percentage of participating children who receive at least one free, grade- and language-appropriate book of their own.

Year	Target	Actual
2018	100%	99%
2019	100	

**Additional information:** This measure was introduced with the 2016 cohort of IAL grantees; the first year for which grantees reported performance data was fiscal year 2018.

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

---

### **Migrant**

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2020 Authorization: \$374,751

Budget Authority:

	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$374,751	\$374,751	0

---

### **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. Starting in fiscal year 2020, a hold-harmless provision that assured States at least 90 percent of their prior year allocations will no longer apply.

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 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

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Migrant

---

arrangements; in fiscal year 2018 13 States received allocations under \$1 million, but none had entered into consortia with other States under this provision. 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. Funds not reserved for consortia are used for formula grants.

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)
2015 .....	\$374,751
2016 .....	374,751
2017 .....	374,751
2018 .....	374,751
2019 .....	374,751

### FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$374.8 million for the Title I Migrant program, the same as the fiscal year 2019 level. The 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 Secretary'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.

Migratory 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) often means that 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 migratory population create a need for educational services that go beyond services traditionally supported with State and local education budgets. In addition to being highly mobile, migratory students tend to live in poverty, have limited English

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Migrant

---

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 program services during school year 2016-2017, one-third had moved within the previous 12 months. In addition, nearly 40 percent of eligible children and youth were English learners and 7.1 percent of eligible children and youth were eligible to receive services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Migratory children and youth may also help their families perform agricultural work, and a large number of migratory "emancipated youth" travel without a parent or guardian to obtain migratory work in the fields and in processing plants. A significant proportion of migratory individuals eligible for services under the program (9.2 percent of the eligible population in 2016-2017) are school-aged youth who do not attend school.

During school year 2016-17, 302,361 children and youth were identified as eligible under the program. States and local entities provided services to 223,763 migratory students, 93,135 of whom received services during the summer or intersessions. Program funds supported 2,911 projects that operated during the school day, 755 projects that provided an extended school day during the regular school year, 131 summer or intersession projects, and 880 year-round projects. The program served 4,008 children aged birth through 2; 20,727 children aged 3 through 5; 166,901 children and youth in kindergarten through grade 12; and 17,395 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 migratory students with disabilities, and (especially in the summer) transportation. The Department expects to support a similar level of services using fiscal year 2020 funds.

The Department would continue to reserve approximately \$10 million in fiscal year 2020 for migratory 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 Information Exchange System (MSIX), as well as technical assistance to States as they continue to implement their systems for collecting and exchanging data on migratory students.

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Migrant

---

#### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES**

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
Number of eligible children	302,361	302,000	302,000
SEA program:			
Amount for State grants	\$364,751	\$364,751	\$364,751
Range of State awards	0-\$114,481	0-\$119,488	0-\$126,474
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 2020 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department started collecting data for 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 is working with States to ensure that accurate and complete data are submitted for these two measures. Once the Department has determined that data are accurate and complete it will start report data and establish targets for these measures.

**Goal: To assist all migratory 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 migratory children.*

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

Year	Target Percentage	Actual Percentage
2015	44.1%	27.8%
2016	44.1	29.4
2017	31.4	28.3
2018	33.4	
2019	33.4	
2020	33.4	

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

Year	Target Percentage	Actual Percentage
2015	47.6%	26.2%
2016	47.6	28.5
2017	30.5	28.5
2018	32.5	
2019	32.5	
2020	32.5	

**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. In 2017, the percentage of students proficient in both reading/language arts decreased for the migratory subgroup and similar subgroups, including Hispanic, low-income, and English Learner students. Data for 2018 will be available in summer 2019.

### Efficiency Measures

The Department established an efficiency measure associated with the transfer of migratory student records through the MSIX system that tracks how many States are collecting the three types of data elements collected in MSIX for migratory children and youth: 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
2015	31	36
2016	35	44
2017	43	44
2018	46	46
2019	46	
2020	46	

**Additional information:** By September 2018, all 46 states were certified to submit all three phases of MSIX data, including basic student information, student assessment data, and credit accrual information.

### 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 or fishers; 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 by summer of calendar year 2019, and will be used to inform oversight and continuous improvement of the program in support of children of migratory agricultural workers and fishers.

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

---

### **Neglected and delinquent**

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2020 Authorization: \$47,614

Budget Authority:

	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$47,614	\$47,614	0

---

### **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 who are in State-run institutions, attending community day programs, and in correctional facilities. Funds are allocated to States through a formula based on a count of children and youth in State-operated institutions and per-pupil education expenditures for the State. Each State's N and D count is based on the number of child and youth enrolled for at least 20 hours of instruction a week in State institutions or community day programs for neglected or delinquent children and youth, or at least 15 hours of instruction in adult correctional institutions. 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). SEAs use funds reserved from their allocations under Title I, Part A to make 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. SEAs have 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)
2015 .....	\$47,614
2016 .....	47,614
2017 .....	47,614
2018 .....	47,614
2019 .....	47,614

### FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$47.6 million for the Neglected and Delinquent (N and D) program, the same as the fiscal year 2019 level, to support activities that help N and D students return to and complete school and obtain employment after they are released from State institutions. The request reflects the Secretary'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, Jolivet, 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.

Furthermore, a large number of youth in correctional settings are students with disabilities. Approximately 30 percent (21,680) of the youth served by the program in 2015-16 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.

An additional challenge for the institutions serving the population of neglected and delinquent children and youth is the fact that the length of stay in correctional facilities and participation in

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Neglected and delinquent

---

educational programs varies widely, ranging from a few months to several years in state adult correctional facilities and days to months in juvenile detention facilities. Nevertheless, the goal of the program is both critical and essential: to help young people served by N and D grantees to reenter our communities, schools, and postsecondary institutions in order to support their future success, strengthen communities, and reduce re-incarceration rates. High-quality education in correctional institutions can help equip these students with the skills needed to successfully reenter their communities and either continue their education or join the workforce.<sup>1</sup>

In order to support effective implementation of the N and D program, including requirements 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).<sup>2</sup> 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 2020, 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.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
Number of participating institutions	671	671	671
Estimated number of students served	67,353	67,353	67,353
Average Federal contribution per child (whole dollars)	\$580	\$580	\$580
Range of awards to States	0-\$2,443	0-\$2,521	0-\$2,512
Average State award	\$899	\$893	\$892
NDTAC	\$1,190	\$1,190	\$1,190

---

<sup>1</sup> 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).

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

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Neglected and delinquent

---

#### 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 2020 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
2015	16.8%	11.4%
2016	17.8	12.9
2017	18.8	12.5
2018	19.8	
2019	20.8	
2020	21.8	

**Additional information:** The source of the data is the Consolidated State Performance Reports that States submit to the Department. Data from 2018 will be available in late fall of 2019.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2015	59.6%	53.9%
2016	60.6	58.5
2017	61.6	56.0
2018	62.6	
2019	63.6	
2020	64.6	

**Additional information:** The source of the data is the Consolidated State Performance Reports that States submit to the Department. This measure includes high school course credits earned while in the N and D program as well as those earned up to 90 days after exiting the program. The measure includes students between the ages of 13 and 21 in neglected, juvenile detention,

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Neglected and delinquent

---

and juvenile correctional institutions, and not students in adult correctional institutions. Data from 2018 will be available in late fall of 2019.

**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
2015	74.4%	65.6%
2016	75.4	65.6
2017	76.4	59.6
2018	77.4	
2019	78.4	
2020	79.4	

**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
2015	75.9%	66.6%
2016	76.9	66.7
2017	77.9	61.1
2018	78.9	
2019	79.9	
2020	80.9	

**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 decreased performance for these measures from 2016 to 2017. 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 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 2018 will be available in late fall of 2019.

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Neglected and delinquent

---

#### Efficiency measures

**Measure:** The cost per high school diploma or equivalent.

Year	Target	Actual
2015	\$4,386	\$6,431
2016	4,341	6,337
2017	4,298	6,692
2018	4,255	
2019	4,211	
2020	4,170	

**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 2018 will be available in late fall of 2019.

#### Other performance information

In March 2019 the Department released *Promoting Education and Transition Success for Neglected and Delinquent Youth: An Evaluation of the Title I, Part D Program*,<sup>1</sup> a report on a study of educational services provided to children and youth in State and local juvenile justice and child welfare facilities and institutions through the N and D program. The study included 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. Highlights from the report include:

- Program funds represented less than 10 percent of state agency education budgets; on average, State facilities received \$82,000 in program funds.
- SEA coordinators reported a greater focus on reviewing subgrantee applications, supporting Federal data collection, and conducting program compliance monitoring than on assisting with program planning and implementation.
- At the time of the data collection, few State agency coordinators reported that their facility implemented an institution-wide N and D project.
- State facilities spent the majority of their funds on personnel expenses; however, many State agency coordinators (54 percent) reported shortages of qualified instructional and

---

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, Policy and Program Studies Service, *Promoting Education and Transition Success for Neglected and Delinquent Youth: An Evaluation of the Title I, Part D Program*, Washington, DC, 2019. Available at <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oeped/ppss/reports.html>.



## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Neglected and delinquent

---

support staff, and about one-third of State agency coordinators reported that it was a major or moderate challenge to hire staff within their credentialed content area.

- Nearly all State agency coordinators reported that their facilities provided career and technical education; the most common career pathways available included construction and architecture, consumer and culinary services, and computer and information sciences.
- Most facilities evaluated students to determine if they had a disability and needed special education and related services, and provided such services.
- Almost all State agency coordinators (94 percent) reported that their facilities assessed students' education outcomes. Outcomes were most often assessed via information assessments and standardized formation and summative assessments.
- Transition plans were generally created while in placement, and youths tended to be substantially involved in transition planning activities. However, substantial involvement of parents and other family members in transitional planning was not as prevalent.
- Once youth exited placement, more than half of State facilities provided some form of aftercare services (such as support for continued secondary or postsecondary education, and counseling), although the duration was usually less than 2 months after exiting the facility. However, State coordinators generally reported that it was very difficult to track academic outcomes for students after exiting, and 58 percent reported that facilities were unable to track outcomes for any youth after they exited placement.
- For State facilities that were able to track post-placement outcomes, the most tracked outcomes were high school equivalency credentials, followed by employment and other labor market outcomes and high school graduation rates.

These and other findings suggest a number of areas where the Department can undertake technical assistance efforts, both directly and through its technical assistance arm, the National Technical Assistance Center for the Education of Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth.

## Special programs for migrant students

(Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part A, Subpart 5, Section 418A)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2020 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$44,623	\$44,623	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2015; reauthorizing legislation is sought for fiscal year 2020.

---

### 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 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)
2015 .....	\$37,474
2016 .....	44,623
2017 .....	44,623
2018 .....	44,623
2019 .....	44,623

## **FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$44.6 million for Special Programs for Migrant Students in fiscal year 2020, the same as the fiscal year 2019 appropriation. 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 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 8<sup>th</sup>-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 expressed interest in pursuing further education or training and fully one-third of farmworkers surveyed reported having taken at least one adult education class. Among the most common courses respondents attended were English language instruction, 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 and do not attend school. State educational agencies reported that 9.2 percent of the population eligible to receive services under the Title I Migrant Education program authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (27,845 youths in school year 2016-17) were school-aged youth who do not attend school.

HEP and CAMP provide participants with assistance that can enable them to improve their earnings potential dramatically. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics “Occupational Outlook Handbook,”<sup>1</sup> the median hourly wage for agricultural workers in 2017 was \$11.41, and these types of workers are often paid based on how much they do instead of how many hours they work. By comparison, according to the National Center for Education Statistics, the median earnings for full-time, full-year wage and salary workers aged 25-34 with a high school diploma or equivalent were \$31,800 in 2016 (equivalent to \$15.29 per hour) and the median was

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 August 13, 2018).

\$38,000 for a person with an associate’s degree (equivalent to \$18.27 per hour).<sup>2</sup> 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, 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. 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, 96.6 percent of CAMP participants who completed their first academic year in a postsecondary program continued their postsecondary education. In contrast, NCES data show that the retention rate of first-time degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates at 4-year institutions was 81 percent from 2014 to 2015, and 62 percent at 2-year institutions during the same period.<sup>2</sup>

## **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES**

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
<b>Outreach, technical assistance, and professional development</b>	\$169	\$223	\$223
<b>HEP:</b>			
Number of students served	4,869	4,869	4,869
Funding for new awards	0	\$6,578	\$6,972
Number of new awards	0	14	15
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$75	\$75
Average new award	0	\$459	\$464
Funding for continuation awards	\$22,167	\$15,547	\$15,153

<sup>2</sup> McFarland, J., Hussar, B., Wang, X., Zhang, J., Wang, K., Rathbun, A., Barmer, A., Forrest Cataldi, E., and Bullock Mann, F. (2018). *The Condition of Education 2018* (NCES 2018-144). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved January 11, 2019 from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2018144>.

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
<b>HEP (continued):</b>			
Number of continuation awards	48	34	33
Average continuation award	\$462	\$457	\$459
Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars)	\$4,550	\$4,514	\$4,514
<b>CAMP:</b>			
Number of students served	2,119	2,119	2,119
Funding for new awards	0	\$4,970	\$5,507
Number of new awards	0	11	13
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$75	\$75
Average new award	0	\$438	\$424
Funding for continuation awards	\$22,287	\$17,155	\$16,618
Number of continuation awards	53	41	39
Average continuation award	\$421	\$418	\$425
Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars)	\$10,524	\$10,407	\$10,407

## **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 2020 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
2015	69.0%	42.6%
2016	69.0	70.3
2017	69.0	67.5
2018	69.0	
2019	69.0	
2020	69.0	

**Additional information:** The source of data is grantee performance reports. Targets have remained the same over the past several years because changes to State academic standards for elementary and secondary education have led to more challenging high school equivalency assessments that have resulted in fluctuations in student performance. Data collected for fiscal year 2018 will be available in the summer of 2019.

**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, upgraded employment, or the military.

Year	Target	Actual
2015	80.0%	78.2%
2016	80.0	78.7
2017	80.0	85.6
2018	80.0	
2019	80.0	
2020	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. Data for 2018 will be available in the summer of 2019.

**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
2015	86.0%	84.5%
2016	86.0	88.1
2017	86.0	88.2
2018	86.0	
2019	86.0	
2020	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 years of the project. Data collected for fiscal year 2018 will be available in the summer of 2019.

**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
2015	85.0%	96.7%
2016	85.0	96.5
2017	85.0	96.6
2018	88.0	
2019	90.0	
2020	92.0	

**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. Data for 2018 will be available in the summer of 2019.

### 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
2015	\$9,104	\$12,882
2016	9,509	8,075
2017	9,931	9,009
2018	10,030	
2019	10,131	
2020	10,232	

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

Year	Target Cost Per Residential Participant	Actual Cost Per Residential Participant
2015	\$17,719	\$22,847
2016	18,511	10,649
2017	19,338	14,036
2018	19,531	
2019	19,727	
2020	19,924	

**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
2015	\$14,344	\$15,377
2016	14,984	10,438
2017	15,653	13,932
2018	15,810	
2019	15,968	
2020	16,127	

**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. Actual costs for HEP programs have fluctuated since 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 2018 will be available in the summer of 2019.



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
2015	\$13,697	\$10,326
2016	14,314	10,161
2017	14,958	12,009
2018	15,197	
2019	15,440	
2020	15,688	

**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
2015	\$21,952	\$12,354
2016	22,940	13,279
2017	23,972	14,823
2018	24,356	
2019	24,745	
2020	25,141	

**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
2015	\$16,693	\$11,503
2016	17,444	12,311
2017	18,229	13,765
2018	18,521	
2019	18,817	
2020	19,118	

**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 2018 will be available in the summer of 2019.