

Department of Education
EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED
Fiscal Year 2021 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language	B-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	B-2
Appropriation, Adjustments and Transfers	B-3
Summary of Changes	B-4
Authorizing Legislation.....	B-5
Appropriations History.....	B-6
Summary of Request	B-7
Activities:	
Grants to local educational agencies.....	B-9
Comprehensive literacy development grants.....	B-19
Innovative approaches to literacy	B-24
State agency programs:	
Migrant	B-28
Neglected and delinquent.....	B-34
Special programs for migrant students	B-40
State tables*	

State tables reflecting final 2019 allocations and 2020 and 2021 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"), \$16,996,790,000, of which \$6,077,990,000 shall become available on July 1, 2020, and shall remain available through September 30, 2021, and of which \$10,841,177,000 shall become available on October 1, 2020, and shall remain available through September 30, 2021, for academic year 2020-2021:¹ *Provided*, That \$6,459,401,000 shall be for basic grants under section 1124 of the ESEA:² *Provided further*, That up to \$5,000,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary of Education (referred to in this title as "Secretary") on October 1, 2019, to obtain annually updated local educational agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census:³ *Provided further*, That \$1,362,301,000 shall be for concentration grants under section 1124A of the ESEA:⁴ *Provided further*, That \$4,244,050,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA:⁵ *Provided further*, That \$4,244,050,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A of the ESEA:⁶ *Provided further*, That \$219,000,000 shall be for carrying out subpart 2 of part B of title II:⁷ *Provided further*, That \$45,623,000 shall be for carrying out section 418A of the HEA.]⁸ (*Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2020.*)

NOTES

The appropriations language for the Education for the Disadvantaged account is deleted because the fiscal year 2021 President's Budget Request would consolidate most formula and competitive grant programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended, and related programs, into an Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant in a new Improving Elementary and Secondary Education account.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>¹ [...of which \$6,077,990,000 shall become available on July 1, 2020, and shall remain available through September 30, 2021, and of which \$10,841,177,000 shall become available on October 1, 2020, and shall remain available through September 30, 2021, for academic year 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, State Agency Migrant and Neglected and Delinquent, and Comprehensive Literacy Development Grants. The language also provides that a portion of the funds is available in an advance appropriation that becomes available for obligation on October 1 of the following fiscal year.</p>
<p>² [...<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>³ [...<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, 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>⁴ [...<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>⁵ [...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$4,244,050,000 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>⁶ [...<i>Provided further</i>, \$4,244,050,000 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>⁷ [...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$219,000,000 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.</p>
<p>⁸ [...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$45,623,000 shall be for carrying out section 418A of the HEA.]</p>	<p>This language provides funding for Special Programs for Migrant Students.</p>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriation, Adjustments and Transfers
(dollars in thousands)

Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers	2019	2020	2021
Discretionary:			
Appropriation	<u>\$16,543,790</u>	<u>\$16,996,790</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, discretionary appropriation	16,543,790	16,996,790	0
Advance:			
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	-10,841,177	-10,841,177	-10,841,177
Advance from prior year	<u>10,841,177</u>	<u>10,841,177</u>	<u>10,841,177</u>
Total, budget authority	16,543,790	16,996,790	0

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Changes
(dollars in thousands)

2020	\$16,996,790
2021	<u>0</u>
Net change.....	-16,996,790

Decreases:	<u>2020 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
Eliminate separate funding for the programs in this account because the fiscal year 2021 President' Budget Request would consolidate most elementary and secondary formula and competitive grant programs into an Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED Block Grant) in a new Improving Elementary and Secondary Education account. The ESED Block Grant would provide States with more flexible resources to allow them to determine how best to serve their students.	\$16,996,790	<u>-\$16,996,790</u>
Net change		-16,996,790

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Authorizing Legislation

(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2020 Authorized	2020 Estimate	2021 Authorized	2021 Request
Grants to local educational agencies (ESEA-1-A):				
LEA grants formulas:	\$16,182,345		\$16,182,345 ¹	
Basic grants (Section 1124)	(2)	\$6,459,401	(2)	0
Concentration grants (Section 1124A)	(2)	1,362,301	(2)	0
Targeted grants (Section 1125)	(2)	4,244,050	(2)	0
Education finance incentive grants (Section 1125A)	(2)	4,244,050	(2)	0
Comprehensive literacy development grants (ESEA-II-B-2, Section 2222)	(3)	192,000	(1)(3)	0
Innovative approaches to literacy (ESEA-II-B-2, Section 2226)	(3)	27,000	(1)(3)	0
State agency programs:				
Migrant (ESEA I-C)	374,751	374,751	374,751 ¹	0
Neglected and delinquent (ESEA I-D)	47,614	47,614	47,614 ¹	0
Special Programs for Migrant Students (HEA IV-A-5)	<u>0</u> ⁴	<u>45,623</u>	<u>0</u> ⁴	<u>0</u>
Total definite authorization	\$16,604,710		\$16,604,710	
Total appropriation		\$16,996,790		0

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2021.

² 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.

³ For Part B of Title II, a total of \$489,168 thousand is authorized for fiscal year 2020. Of the total amount appropriated for Title II, Part B, 38.9 percent is authorized for Subpart 2 programs.

⁴ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2015. No reauthorizing legislation is sought for fiscal year 2021.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2012	\$16,253,026	\$15,949,319 ¹	\$15,741,703 ¹	\$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 ²	15,840,103 ²	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 ³	15,875,231 ⁴	15,552,693
(2014 Advance for 2015)	(11,681,898)		(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)
2015	15,377,965	N/A ³	15,566,226 ⁵	15,536,107
(2015 Advance for 2016)	(11,681,898)		(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)
2016	16,592,546	14,869,641 ⁶	15,455,802 ⁶	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 ⁷	16,066,790 ⁷	16,143,790 ⁷
(2017 Advance for 2018)	(10,841,177)	(11,041,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,767,555)
2018	16,347,558	15,953,790 ⁸	16,169,198 ⁸	16,107,781 ⁸
(2018 Advance for 2019)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)
2019	\$15,926,790	\$16,443,790 ⁹	\$16,568,790 ⁹	\$16,543,790 ⁹
(2019 Advance for 2020)	(11,681,898)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)
2020	16,376,790	17,563,802	16,543,790 ¹⁰	\$16,996,790
(2020 Advance for 2021)	(11,681,898)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)
2021	0			
(2021 Advance for 2022)	0			

¹ The level for the House allowance reflects an introduced bill and the level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Committee action only.

² The levels for the House and Senate allowances reflect action on the regular annual 2013 appropriations bill, which proceeded in the 112th Congress only through the House Subcommittee and the Senate Committee.

³ The House allowance is shown as N/A because there was no Subcommittee action.

⁴ The level for the House allowance reflects the House-passed full-year continuation resolution.

⁵ The level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Subcommittee action only.

⁶ The levels for House and Senate allowances reflect action on the regular annual 2016 appropriations bill, which proceeded in the 114th Congress only through the House Committee and Senate Committee.

⁷ 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.

⁸ 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).

⁹ 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).

¹⁰ The Senate allowance reflects the Chairman's mark; the Appropriation reflects the Further Consolidated Appropriation Act, 2020 (P.L. 116-94).

[Click here for accessible version](#)

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2021 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET
(in thousands of dollars)

	Cat Code	2019 Appropriation	2020 Appropriation	2021 President's Budget	2021 President's Budget Compared to 2020 Appropriation	
					Amount	Percent
Education for the Disadvantaged						
1. Grants to local educational agencies (ESEA I-A):						
(a) Basic grants (section 1124)						
Annual appropriation	D	5,018,625	5,468,625	0	(5,468,625)	-100.00%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	1,440,776	990,776	0	(990,776)	-100.00%
Subtotal		6,459,401	6,459,401	0	(6,459,401)	-100.00%
(b) Concentration grants (section 1124A)						
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	1,362,301	1,362,301	0	(1,362,301)	-100.00%
(c) Targeted grants (section 1125)						
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	4,019,050	4,244,050	0	(4,244,050)	-100.00%
(d) Education finance incentive grants (section 1125A)						
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	4,019,050	4,244,050	0	(4,244,050)	-100.00%
Subtotal, Grants to LEAs		15,859,802	16,309,802	0	(16,309,802)	-100.00%
Annual appropriation	D	5,018,625	5,468,625	0	(5,468,625)	-100.00%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	10,841,177	10,841,177	0	(10,841,177)	-100.00%
2. Comprehensive literacy development grants (ESEA II-B-2, section 2222)						
	D	190,000	192,000	0	(192,000)	-100.00%
3. Innovative approaches to literacy (ESEA II-B-2, section 2226)						
	D	27,000	27,000	0	(27,000)	-100.00%
4. State agency programs:						
(a) Migrant (ESEA I-C)						
	D	374,751	374,751	0	(374,751)	-100.00%
(b) Neglected and delinquent (ESEA I-D)						
	D	47,614	47,614	0	(47,614)	-100.00%
Subtotal, State agency programs		422,365	422,365	0	(422,365)	-100.00%
5. Special programs for migrant students (HEA IV-A-5)						
	D	44,623	45,623	0	(45,623)	-100.00%
Total, Appropriation	D	16,543,790	16,996,790	0	(16,996,790)	-100.00%
Total, Budget authority	D	16,543,790	16,996,790	10,841,177	(6,155,613)	-36.22%
Current		5,702,613	6,155,613	0	(6,155,613)	-100.00%
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.

B-7

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Request

The Administration is not requesting funds for any of the programs in the Education for the Disadvantaged account for fiscal year 2021. Instead, the request would consolidate these programs into the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED Block Grant). ESED Block Grant funds would be allocated by formula to State and local educational agencies (LEAs), which would have discretion to use those funds for any authorized purpose of the consolidated programs, including activities currently supported by the programs in this account. For more information on the ESED Block Grant, see the Improving Elementary and Secondary Education account.

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: \$16,182,345¹

Budget authority:

	2020 <u>Appropriation</u>	2021 <u>Request</u>	Change from <u>2020 to 2021</u>
Basic grants	\$6,459,401	0	-\$6,459,401
Concentration grants	1,362,301	0	-1,362,301
Targeted grants	4,244,050	0	-4,244,050
Education finance incentive grants	<u>4,244,050</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-4,244,050</u>
Total	16,309,802	0	-16,309,802
Annual appropriation	5,468,625	0	-5,468,625
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	10,841,177	0	-10,841,177

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2021.

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. 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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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.

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 (3-5, 6-9, 10-12). 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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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

¹ Consistent with the ESSA's transition provisions, the Department 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

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. States must generally reserve for this purpose 7 percent of combined Title I, Part A allocations to LEAs, 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 2019 allocations were based on LEA poverty estimates for 2017. 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.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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>
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
2020	6,459,401	1,362,301	4,244,050	4,244,050	16,309,802

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

FY 2021 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2021, the request would consolidate the Title I Grants to LEAs program into the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED Block Grant), which would combine nearly all currently funded formula and competitive grant programs authorized by the ESEA, as well as several related programs, into a single State formula grant program.

ESED Block Grant funds would be allocated to States and LEAs using the Title I formulas, and grantees would have discretion to use funds for any authorized purpose of the consolidated programs, including activities currently authorized under Title I. In addition, States would continue to meet key Title I accountability and reporting requirements aimed at protecting students, supporting meaningful school improvement efforts, and giving parents the information they need to support a high-quality education for their children. LEAs would develop and submit to their States for approval plans consistent with Section 1112 of the ESEA, which requires LEAs to monitor student progress in meeting challenging State academic standards, identify students at risk of failing to meet those standards, and provide assistance to such students.

For more information on the ESED Block Grant, see the Improving Elementary and Secondary Education account.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

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

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
Allocations by LEA Poverty Rate:			
0-15%			
# of LEAs	5,892	6,069	0
Dollars	\$2,961,225	\$3,219,867	0
% of Total \$	19.01	20.10	0
# of Formula Eligible Children	2,151,657	2,193,691	0
0-15% \$ Per Formula Child	\$1,376	\$1,468	0
15-25%			
# of LEAs	4,336	4,325	0
Dollars	\$5,459,263	\$6,328,182	0
% of Total \$	35.05	39.49	0
# of Formula Eligible Children	3,547,676	3,770,288	0
15-25% \$ Per Formula Child	\$1,539	\$1,678	0
>25%			
# of LEAs	2,547	2,362	0
Dollars	\$7,155,646	\$6,474,805	0
% of Total \$	45.94	40.41	0
# of Formula Eligible Children	3,962,900	3,478,009	0
>25% \$ Per Formula Child	\$1,806	\$1,862	0

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
LEA Allocation Subtotal	\$15,576,134	\$16,022,854	0
BIA/Outlying Areas	174,403	179,353	0
N&D Program (Part D, Subpart 2)	104,265	102,595	0
Census Updates	<u>5,000</u>	<u>5,000</u>	<u>0</u>
Grants to LEAs Total	15,859,802	16,309,802	0

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 as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department recently revised the measures for Title I Grants to LEAs to assess more effectively performance consistent with the reauthorized law. 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. Fiscal year 2017 serves as the baseline for the measures, which examine gaps in achievement and graduation rates for educationally disadvantaged students. Data for 2019 are expected to be available in fall 2020. No targets are shown for 2021 because the program is proposed for consolidation into the ESED Block Grant.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2017		48.0%
2018	52.0%	58.8
2019	56.0	
2020	60.0	

Additional information: Data for 2017 are reported for 50 of 52 States (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico); no data are available for Alaska or Tennessee. Data for 2018 are reported for 51 States; no data are available for Vermont. Thirty States reported decreasing the gap in achievement on reading assessments in 2018. Gap closures for these States averaged 0.87 percentage points and ranged from 0.07 to 3.60 points.

Measure: The percentage of States that decrease the difference between the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at or above proficient on State

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

mathematics assessments and the percentage of all students in grades 3-8 scoring at or above proficient on State mathematics assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2017		46.0%
2018	50.0%	37.3
2019	54.0	
2020	58.0	

Additional information: Data for 2017 are reported for 50 of 52 States (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico); no data are available for Alaska or Tennessee. Data for 2018 are reported for 51 States; no data are available for Vermont. Nineteen States reported decreasing the gap in achievement on math assessments in 2018. Gap closures for these States averaged 0.93 percentage points and ranged from 0.02 to 4.83 points.

Measure: The percentage of States that decrease the difference between the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-9 scoring at or above proficient of States science assessments and the percentage of all students in grades 3-9 scoring at or above proficient on State science assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2017		44.7%
2018	48.7%	45.0
2019	52.7	
2020	56.7	

Additional information: Data for 2017 are reported for 47 States; data are incomplete or unavailable from Alaska, California, the District of Columbia, Kansas, and Kentucky. Data for 2018 are reported for 40 States; data are incomplete or unavailable from California, Connecticut, the District of Columbia, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Vermont; and excluded from analysis were Delaware, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, and Missouri due to data quality concerns. Eighteen States reported decreasing the gap in achievement on science assessments in 2018. Gap closures for these States averaged 1.35 percentage points and ranged from 0.08 to 4.52 points.

Measure: The percentage of States that decrease the difference between the graduation rate of economically disadvantaged students and the graduation rate of all students.

Year	Target	Actual
2017		50.0%
2018	54.0%	56.3
2019	58.0	
2020	62.0	

Additional information: Data for 2017 are reported for 50 States; no data are available for Alabama or Puerto Rico. Data for 2018 are reported for 48 States; no data are available for

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Alabama, Delaware, Utah, or Puerto Rico. Twenty-seven States reported decreasing the graduation rate gap in 2018. Gap closures for these States averaged 1.53 percentage points and ranged from 0.04 to 5.85 points.

The Department has also established for this program the following two measures, which focus on performance of recently identified CSI schools and for which data are expected to be available beginning in fall 2020.

Measure: The percentage of States that increase the percentage of students in CSI schools scoring at or above the proficient level on State reading assessments.

Measure: The percentage of States that increase the percentage of students in CSI schools scoring at or above the proficient level on State mathematics assessments.

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

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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.¹ 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 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.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2021 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾

Budget Authority:

<u>2020</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>2021</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>2020 to 2021</u>
\$192,000	0	-\$192,000

¹ A total of \$489,168 thousand is authorized for Part B of Title II in FY 2020. 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.

² The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2021.

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 are 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.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

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 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.

The CLD Grants program is 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)
2016	\$190,000
2017	190,000
2018	190,000
2019	190,000
2020	192,000

FY 2021 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2021, the Request would consolidate the CLD program into the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED Block Grant), which would combine nearly all currently funded formula and competitive grant programs authorized by the ESEA, as well as several related programs, into a single State formula grant program.

ESED Block Grant funds would be allocated by formula to SEAs and LEAs, which would have discretion to use those funds for any authorized purpose of the consolidated programs, including the provision of comprehensive, evidence-based literacy instruction. For more information on the ESED Block Grant, see the Improving Elementary and Secondary Education account.

During initial implementation of the ESED Block Grant, the Department would reserve sufficient funds to pay continuation awards to existing CLD grantees through the end of their approved project periods.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
Funding for new awards	\$182,940	0	0
Number of new awards	13	0	0
Funding for continuation awards	0	\$185,045	\$189,006
Number of continuation awards	0	13	13
Peer review of new award applications	\$196	0	0
Amount for Bureau of Indian Education	\$950	\$950	\$960
Amount for Outlying Areas	\$950	\$950	\$960
National activities (including evaluation)	\$4,964	\$3,055	\$1,074

NOTES:

The Department carried over fiscal year 2018 funds for this program and used those funds to support a 2019 competition. Consequently, the Department intends to use fiscal year 2019 funds in fiscal year 2020 and fiscal year 2020 funds in fiscal year 2021. Beginning in fiscal year 2022, continuation costs for the 2019 cohort would be provided under the ESED Block Grant.

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 2019, it may do so in fiscal year 2020 or 2021.

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 Federal resources provided for the program as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by the program. The Department is in the process of setting performance targets for fiscal year 2021.

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.*

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

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
2016	68%	47%	
2017	Set a baseline		
2018			51%
2019	52		
2020	52		

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
2016	75%	57%	
2017			
2018	Set a baseline		42%
2019	43		
2020	43		

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
2016	76%	55%	
2017			
2018	Set a baseline		41%
2019	42		
2020	42		

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
2016	75%	64%	
2017			
2018	Set a baseline		38%
2019	39		
2020	39		

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.

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 2021 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾

Budget Authority:

<u>2020</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>2021</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>2020 to 2021</u>
\$27,000	0	-\$27,000

¹ 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.

² The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2021.

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 local educational agencies (LEAs) in which at least 20 percent of the students are from low-income families, the Bureau of Indian Education, or eligible national non-profit organizations. Awards typically are for 3 years, and grantees may use IAL funds to (1) develop or enhance existing school library programs by providing professional learning opportunities to school librarians or updating library materials in high-need schools; (2) 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 (3) 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)
2016.....	\$27,000
2017.....	27,000
2018.....	27,000
2019.....	27,000
2020.....	27,000

FY 2021 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2021, the Request would consolidate the IAL program into the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED Block Grant), which would combine nearly all currently funded formula and competitive grant programs

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Innovative approaches to literacy

authorized by the ESEA, as well as several related programs, into a single State formula grant program.

ESED Block Grant funds would be allocated by formula to State educational agencies and LEAs, which would have discretion to use those funds for any authorized purpose of the consolidated programs, including supporting LEAs and schools to develop effective school library programs. For more information on the ESED Block Grant, see the Improving Elementary and Secondary Education account.

During initial implementation of the ESED Block Grant the Department would reserve sufficient funds to pay continuation awards to existing IAL grantees through the end of their approved project periods.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
Funding for new awards	\$2,447	0	0
Number of new awards	4	0	0
Funding for continuation awards	\$24,553	\$27,000	0
Number of continuation awards	40	44	0

NOTES:

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 2019, it may do so in fiscal year 2020.

Continuation costs of approximately \$2,446 thousand for projects would be provided under the fiscal year 2021 request for the ESED Block Grant.

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 Federal resources provided for the program as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by the 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.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Innovative approaches to literacy

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

Year	Target	Actual
2016	70%	76%
2017	70	83
2018	70	70
2019	70	30
2020	50	
2021	50	

Additional information: Data reported for fiscal year 2019 includes data from some 2018 grantees reporting for the first time; the Department is currently working with each grantee to improve the quality and timely submission of data. Many 2018 grantees structured their projects to focus primarily on increasing access to books and materials, resulting in a shift in focus away from academic achievement in the first year.

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	20
2020	30	
2021	30	

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. Data reported for fiscal year 2019 includes data from some 2018 grantees reporting for the first time; the Department is currently working with each grantee to improve the quality and timely submission of data. Many 2018 grantees structured their projects to focus primarily on increasing access to books and materials, resulting in a shift in focus away from academic achievement in the first year.

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	29
2020	30	
2021	32	

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. Data reported for fiscal year 2019 includes data from some 2018 grantees reporting for the first time; the

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Innovative approaches to literacy

Department is currently working with each grantee to improve the quality and timely submission of data. Many 2018 grantees structured their projects to focus primarily on increasing access to books and materials, resulting in a shift in focus away from academic achievement in the first year.

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	98
2020	98	
2021	99	

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 2021 Authorization: \$374,751¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2020</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>2021</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>2020 to 2021</u>
\$374,751	0	-\$374,751

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2021.

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) 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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

required to consult with States receiving allocations of \$1 million or less about whether they can increase the cost-effectiveness of their programs by entering into inter-state consortium arrangements; in fiscal year 2019 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 as required by statute. 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)
2016	\$374,751
2017	374,751
2018	374,751
2019	374,751
2020	374,751

FY 2021 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2021, the request would consolidate the Title I Migrant program into the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED Block Grant), which would combine nearly all currently funded formula and competitive grant programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as well as several related programs, into a single State formula grant program.

ESED Block Grant funds would be allocated by formula to State educational agencies and local educational agencies (LEAs), which would have discretion to use those funds for any authorized purpose of the consolidated programs, including activities currently supported by the Title I Migrant program. In addition, LEAs would develop and submit to their States for approval plans consistent with those currently required by Section 1112 of the ESEA, which includes provisions describing how LEAs will meet the needs of migrant students. For more information on the ESED Block Grant, see the Improving Elementary and Secondary Education account.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
Number of eligible children aged birth through 21	304,480	304,480	0
SEA program:			
Amount for State grants	\$364,751	\$364,751	0
Range of State awards	0-\$114,386	0-\$121,736	0
Coordination activities:			
Consortium incentive grants	\$3,000	\$3,000	0
Migrant student information exchange and related coordination activities	\$7,000	\$7,000	0

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the Federal resources provided for the program as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by the program. No targets are provided for fiscal year 2021 because under the President's Request no grants would be funded in that year.

The Department started collecting data for new grade promotion/graduation and Algebra I measures for school year 2016-17, when changes in the MSIX took effect that 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 State reading/language arts assessments.

Year	Target Percentage	Actual Percentage
2016	44.1%	29.4%
2017	31.4	28.3
2018	33.4	26.0
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 State mathematics assessments.

Year	Target Percentage	Actual Percentage
2016	47.6%	28.5%
2017	30.5	28.5
2018	32.5	25.4
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 began using more rigorous assessments in recent years, which may help explain current low achievement levels. Data for 2019 will be available in summer 2020.

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.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2016	35	44
2017	43	44
2018	46	46
2019	46	
2020	46	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

Additional information: By September 2018, all 46 participating states were certified to submit all three phases of MSIX data, including basic student information, student assessment data, and credit accrual information. Since the target has been achieved, the Department will work on development of a new efficiency measure for the program.

Other performance information

In August 2019 the Department released the *Study of the Implementation of the ESEA Title I, Part C Migrant Education Program* report¹. The study examined how State MEP grantees and local/regional subgrantees implemented the program's four central components—identification and recruitment, records transfer, service delivery, and coordination and collaboration—to help reduce barriers to school success for the children of migratory agricultural workers and migratory fishers. The study included surveys of State MEP grantees and local/regional MEP subgrantees, as well as interviews with a sample of State, regional, and local MEP grantees. Highlights from the report include:

- States play a significant role in recruiter training, monitoring, and quality control, but many rely on their local/regional MEP subgrantees and outside contractors to manage the identification and recruitment process, including hiring, deploying, and supervising MEP recruiters.
- MEP coordinators used both academic performance and academic risk factors to determine migratory children's Priority for Services status.
- More than two-thirds of State MEP directors and local/regional MEP coordinators reported that MSIX moderately or substantially improved timely notification when migratory children moved across States. The majority of local/regional MEP coordinators reported that MSIX moderately or substantially improved other practices intended to mitigate educational disruptions for migratory children, such as the facilitation of course credit accrual (62 percent), appropriateness of course placements (63 percent), appropriateness of grade placements (63 percent), timeliness of school enrollment (59 percent), and reduction in unnecessary immunizations (53 percent). About half of the State MEP directors agreed that MSIX had moderately or substantially improved these other practices.
- Most State MEP directors considered multiple data sources and factors in determining what services to provide or fund for migratory children, including results from the needs assessments of migratory children (100 percent of State MEP directors), the amount of MEP funding available (98 percent), migratory student outcome data (98 percent), and availability of services from other programs.
- More than a third of State MEP grantees directly provided supplemental instructional services and other academic supports to migratory children, including college and career supports and subject-area instruction. At the local level, 93 percent of local/regional MEP subgrantees directly provided supplemental instructional services and academic supports to

¹ <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/opepd/ppss/reports.html#migrant>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

migratory children, the most common of which included reading and language arts instruction, mathematics instruction, and academic guidance and advocacy.

- Local/regional MEP coordinators also reported providing instructional services and other academic supports to out-of-school youth, the most common of which were academic guidance and advocacy, reading and language arts instruction, career exploration and guidance, and mathematics instruction.
- State MEP grantees and local/regional MEP subgrantees also provided an array of support services to address the social, emotional, and health issues that migratory children regularly experience that can impact their ability to attend and fully focus at school. More than a third of State MEP grantees provided direct support services to migratory children, including leadership development and language support. Ninety-two percent of local/regional coordinators reported providing direct support services to migratory children, including distribution of school supplies, language supports (e.g., translation or interpretation services), and individual student advocacy services.
- Most State MEP directors and local/regional MEP coordinators participated in outreach activities to engage with other agencies and organizations in supporting the needs of migratory children. However, half or fewer State MEP grantees and local/regional MEP subgrantees had formal agreements articulating their commitments to collaborate with other agencies and organizations to address the needs of migratory children.

The findings offer a clearer picture of the services States and local/regional subgrantees provide to migratory children and youth and will be used to guide the Department's future technical assistance efforts.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2021 Authorization: \$47,614¹

Budget Authority:

	<u>2020</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>2021</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>2020 to 2021</u>
	\$47,614	0	-\$47,614

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2021.

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 children 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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

delinquent children and youth. SEAs have the option of awarding subgrants to eligible LEAs by formula or through a discretionary grant process.

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)
2016	\$47,614
2017	47,614
2018	47,614
2019	47,614
2020	47,614

FY 2021 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2021, the request would consolidate the Title I Neglected and Delinquent (N and D) program into the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED Block Grant), which would combine nearly all currently funded formula and competitive grant programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as well as several related programs, into a single State formula grant program.

ESED Block Grant funds would be allocated by formula to State educational agencies and local educational agencies (LEAs), which would have discretion to use those funds for any authorized purpose of the consolidated programs, including activities currently supported through the N and D program. In addition, LEAs would develop and submit to their States for approval plans consistent with those currently required by Section 1112 of the ESEA, which includes provisions describing how the LEA will meet the needs of neglected and delinquent students. For more information on the ESED Block Grant, see the Improving Elementary and Secondary Education account.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
Number of participating institutions	682	682	0
Estimated number of students served	67,353	67,353	0
Average Federal contribution per child (whole dollars)	\$580	\$580	0
Range of awards to States	0-\$2,604	0-\$2,573	0
Average State award	\$893	\$893	0
Technical assistance	\$1,190	\$1,190	0

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the Federal resources provided for the program as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by the program. No targets are provided for fiscal year 2021 because under the President's Request no grants would be funded in that year.

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
2016	17.8%	12.9%
2017	18.8	12.5
2018	19.8	13.7
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 2019 will be available in late fall of 2020.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

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

Year	Target	Actual
2016	60.6%	58.5%
2017	61.6	56.0
2018	62.6	52.1
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, and juvenile correctional institutions, and not students in adult correctional institutions. Data from 2019 will be available in late fall of 2020.

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
2016	75.4%	65.6%
2017	76.4	59.6
2018	77.4	64.5
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
2016	76.9%	66.7%
2017	77.9	61.1
2018	78.9	67.0
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 the variability in performance for these measures from 2016 to 2018. 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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

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 2019 will be available in late fall of 2020.

Efficiency measures

Measure: The cost per high school diploma or equivalent.

Year	Target	Actual
2016	\$4,341	\$6,337
2017	4,298	6,692
2018	4,255	6,554
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 2019 will be available in late fall of 2020.

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*,¹ which 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 education budgets for state agencies responsible for providing education services to neglected and delinquent children and youth who are in State-run institutions, attending community day programs, and in correctional facilities. 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.

¹ 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/oepdp/ppss/reports.html>.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

- State facilities spent the majority of their funds on personnel expenses; however, many State agency coordinators (54 percent) reported shortages of qualified instructional and 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 2021 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2020</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>2021</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>2020 to 2021</u>
\$45,623	0	-\$45,623

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2015; no reauthorizing legislation is sought for fiscal year 2021.

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)
2016	\$44,623
2017	44,623
2018	44,623
2019	44,623
2020	45,623

FY 2021 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2021, the Request would consolidate the Special Programs for Migrant Students into the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED Block Grant), which would combine nearly all currently funded formula and competitive grant programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as well as related programs such as Special Programs for Migrant Students, into a single State formula grant program.

ESED Block Grant funds would be allocated by formula to State and local educational agencies, which would have discretion to use those funds for any authorized purpose of the consolidated programs, including activities currently supported under HEP. For more information on the ESED Block Grant, see the Improving Elementary and Secondary Education account.

States would have flexibility to support CAMP services under the proposed Student Supports Block Grant, which would transform the competitive TRIO programs into a single State formula grant. For more information on the Student Supports Block Grant, see Federal TRIO Programs in the Higher Education Programs account.

Migrant students could also continue to receive services similar to those provided under the HEP and CAMP programs under other existing Federal programs, such as the Adult Education Basic State Grants program, which provides services to help adults become literate, obtain the knowledge and skills necessary for employment and self-sufficiency, obtain a secondary school diploma, and transition to postsecondary education and training.

During initial implementation of the ESED Block Grant, the Department would reserve sufficient funds to pay continuation awards to current grantees through the end of their approved project periods.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
Outreach, technical assistance, and professional development	\$222	\$228	0
HEP:			
Number of students served	4,985	5,500	0
Funding for new awards	\$7,692	\$6,413	0
Number of new awards	17	14	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$56	\$227	0
Average new award	\$452	\$475	0

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
Funding for continuation awards	\$14,584	\$16,058	0
Number of continuation awards	32	36	0
Average continuation award	\$456	\$446	0
Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars)	\$4,469	\$4,365	0
CAMP:			
Number of students served	2,429	2,450	0
Funding for new awards	\$5,072	\$5,702	0
Number of new awards	12	13	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$56	\$227	0
Average new award	\$423	\$418	0
Funding for continuation awards	\$16,941	\$16,768	0
Number of continuation awards	41	40	0
Average continuation award	\$413	\$419	0
Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars)	\$9,062	\$9,139	0

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$14,803 thousand for projects with outstanding continuation costs under HEP and \$14,759 thousand under CAMP would be provided under the fiscal year 2021 request for the Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant.

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 Federal resources provided for the program as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by the 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
2016	69.0%	70.3%
2017	69.0	67.5
2018	69.0	64.9
2019	69.0	
2020	69.0	
2021	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 2019 will be available in the summer of 2020.

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
2016	80.0%	78.7%
2017	80.0	85.6
2018	80.0	82.1
2019	80.0	
2020	80.0	
2021	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 2019 will be available in the summer of 2020.

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
2016	86.0%	88.1%
2017	86.0	88.2
2018	86.0	83.5
2019	86.0	
2020	86.0	
2021	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 2019 will be available in the summer of 2020.

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
2016	85.0%	96.5%
2017	85.0	96.6
2018	88.0	96.2
2019	90.0	
2020	92.0	
2021	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 2019 will be available in the summer of 2020.

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, commuter programs.

Year	Target Cost Per Commuter Participant	Actual Cost Per Commuter Participant
2016	\$9,509	\$8,075
2017	9,931	9,009
2018	10,030	9,408
2019	10,131	
2020	10,232	
2021	10,334	

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

Year	Target Cost Per Residential Participant	Actual Cost Per Residential Participant
2016	\$18,511	\$10,649
2017	19,338	14,036
2018	19,531	13,164
2019	19,727	
2020	19,924	
2021	20,123	

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
2016	\$14,984	\$10,438
2017	15,653	13,932
2018	15,810	13,650
2019	15,968	
2020	16,127	
2021	16,289	

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 decreases in the number of HEP participants receiving a high school equivalency credential resulting from an increase in rigor in such testing. Data for 2019 will be available in the summer of 2020.

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
2016	\$14,314	\$10,161
2017	14,958	12,009
2018	15,197	11,393
2019	15,440	
2020	15,688	
2021	15,939	

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
2016	\$22,940	\$13,279
2017	23,972	14,823
2018	24,356	13,105
2019	24,745	
2020	25,141	
2021	25,543	

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
2016	\$17,444	\$12,311
2017	18,229	13,765
2018	18,521	12,939
2019	18,817	
2020	19,118	
2021	19,424	

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 2019 will be available in the summer of 2020.