

Department of Education
EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED
Fiscal Year 2022 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language.....	A-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	A-2
Appropriation, Adjustments and Transfers.....	A-3
Summary of Changes.....	A-4
Authorizing Legislation.....	A-5
Appropriations History.....	A-6
Significant Items in FY 2021 Appropriations Reports.....	A-7
Summary of Request.....	A-9
Activities:.....	A-11
Grants to local educational agencies.....	A-11
Title I equity grants.....	A-20
Comprehensive literacy development grants.....	A-27
Innovative approaches to literacy.....	A-32
State agency programs:.....	A-36
Migrant.....	A-36
Neglected and delinquent.....	A-43
Special programs for migrant students.....	A-50

State Tables*

State tables reflecting final 2020 allocations and 2021 and 2022 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"), [~~\$17,226,790,000~~]\$17,246,790,000, of which \$6,306,490,000 shall become available on July 1, [~~2021~~]2022, and shall remain available through September 30, [~~2022~~]2023, and of which \$10,841,177,000 shall become available on October 1, [~~2021~~]2022, and shall remain available through September 30, [~~2022~~]2023, for academic year [~~2021-2022~~]2022-2023:¹ *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, [~~2020~~]2021, 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 \$4,357,550,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA:⁵ *Provided further*, That \$4,357,550,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A of the ESEA:⁶ *Provided further*, That \$220,000,000 shall be for carrying out subpart 2 of part B of title II:⁷ *Provided further*, That [~~\$46,123,000~~]\$66,123,000 shall be for carrying out section 418A of the HEA.⁸ (*Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2021.*)

NOTE

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>¹ ...of which 6,306,490,000 shall become available on July 1, [2021]2022, and shall remain available through September 30, [2022]2023, and of which \$10,841,177,000 shall become available on October 1, [2021]2022, and shall remain available through September 30, [2022]2023, for academic year [2021-2022]2022-2023:</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, 2021, 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 4,357,550,000 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>, 4,357,550,000 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 \$220,000,000 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 [\$46,123,000] \$66,123,000 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	2020	2021	2022
Discretionary:			
Appropriation	<u>\$16,996,790</u>	<u>\$17,226,790</u>	<u>\$37,246,790</u>
Total, discretionary appropriation.....	16,996,790	17,226,790	37,246,790
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	16,996,790	17,226,790	37,246,790

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Changes
(dollars in thousands)

2021	\$17,226,790
2022	<u>37,246,790</u>
Net change	+20,020,000

Increases:	<u>2021 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
Funding for new Title I Equity Grants program to address long-standing disparities between under-resourced school districts and their wealthier counterparts by providing meaningful incentives to examine and address inequalities in school funding systems, ensuring that teachers at Title I schools are paid competitively, increasing preparation for, access to, and success in rigorous coursework, and expanding access to high-quality preschool for underserved children and families.	0	<u>\$20,000,000</u>
Increase funding for Special Programs for Migrant Students to support of the President’s goal to advance equity in education and significantly expand programs that have demonstrated success in helping migrant youth.	\$46,123	<u>+20,000</u>
Net change		+20,020,000

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Authorizing Legislation (dollars in thousands)

Activity	2021 Authorized	2021 Estimate	2022 Authorized	2022 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	To be determined ²	\$6,459,401
Concentration grants (Section 1124A)	(2)	1,362,301	To be determined ²	1,362,301
Targeted grants (Section 1125)	(2)	4,357,550	To be determined ²	4,357,550
Education finance incentive grants (Section 1125A)	(2)	4,357,550	To be determined ²	4,357,550
Title I equity grants (Proposed legislation)	0		0 To be determined	20,000,000
Comprehensive literacy development grants (ESEA-II-B-2, Section 2222)	(3)		To be determined ^{1,3}	
		192,000		192,000
Innovative approaches to literacy (ESEA-II-B-2, Section 2226)	(3)		To be determined ^{1,3}	
		28,000		28,000
State agency programs:				
Migrant (ESEA I-C)	374,751	375,626	To be determined ¹	375,626
Neglected and delinquent (ESEA I-D)	47,614	48,239	To be determined ¹	48,239
Special Programs for Migrant Students (HEA IV-A-5)	<u>0</u> ⁴	<u>46,123</u>	To be determined ⁴	<u>66,123</u>
Total definite authorization	\$16,604,710		\$16,604,710	
Total appropriation		\$17,226,790		\$17,246,790

¹ The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2021. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for fiscal year 2022.

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. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for fiscal year 2022.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2013	\$15,558,649	\$15,208,151 ¹	\$15,840,103 ¹	\$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 ²	15,875,231 ³	15,552,693
(2014 Advance for 2015)	(11,681,898)		(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)
2015	15,377,965	N/A ²	15,566,226 ⁴	15,536,107
(2015 Advance for 2016)	(11,681,898)		(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)
2016	16,592,546	14,869,641 ⁵	15,455,802 ⁵	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 ⁶	16,066,790 ^{6,7}	16,143,790 ^{6,7}
(2017 Advance for 2018)	(10,841,177)	(11,041,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,767,555)
2018	16,347,558	15,953,790 ⁷	16,169,198 ⁷	16,107,781 ⁷
(2018 Advance for 2019)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)
2019	\$15,926,790	\$16,443,790 ⁸	\$16,568,790 ⁸	\$16,543,790 ⁸
(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 ⁹	\$16,996,790
(2020 Advance for 2021)	(11,681,898)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)
2021	0	17,258,290	17,121,790 ¹⁰	17,226,790
(2021 Advance for 2022)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)
2021	17,246,790			
(2021 Advance for 2022)	(10,841,177)			

¹ 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.

² The House allowance is shown as N/A because there was no Subcommittee action.

³ The level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Subcommittee action only.

⁴ The level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Subcommittee action only.

⁵ 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.

⁶ 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.

⁷ 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).

⁸ 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).

⁹ The Senate allowance reflects the Chairman's mark; the Appropriation reflects the Further Consolidated Appropriation Act, 2020 (P.L. 116-94).

¹⁰ The level for the Senate Allowance reflects the Chairman's mark; the Appropriation reflects Division H of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (P.L. 116-260).

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Significant Items in FY 2021 Appropriations Reports

Grants to LEAs

House: The Committee encourages the Department to provide technical assistance and support to State and local educational agencies in implementing evidence-based strategies for improving schools identified for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement under Title I. In particular, the Committee notes the importance of principals and other school leaders in bringing about improvements in student achievement and other outcomes. Research shows there are virtually no documented instances of low-performing schools being turned around without intervention by a powerful leader. Demonstrated effects of successful leadership are considerably greater in schools that are in more difficult circumstances. Additionally, research has found that school leadership is second only to classroom instruction as an influence on student learning, and 97 percent of teachers say that the principal is responsible for determining if a school can attract and retain great teachers. Therefore, the Committee encourages the Department to provide technical assistance to States and school districts on strengthening school leadership as a mechanism for improving results in low-performing schools, particularly those identified for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement within the State's accountability system. The Committee directs the Department to respond to this request in the fiscal year 2022 Congressional Budget Justification.

Response: The Administration shares the Committee's view on the importance of effective leadership in school performance, particularly when it comes to developing and implementing successful school turnaround plans. The fiscal year 2022 request would make critical investments in strengthening school leadership, including \$30 million in new discretionary funding for the School Leader Recruitment and Support program and \$200 million (\$2 billion over 10 years) in mandatory funding under the American Families Plan for a new Expanding Opportunities for Teacher Leadership and Development program. The Department will consider giving priority under both programs to projects that recruit and prepare school leaders to work in schools identified for improvement under the ESEA.

Innovative Approaches to Literacy

House: The Committee directs the Department to prioritize in the fiscal year 2021 competition underserved communities in urban school districts in which students from low-income families make up at least 50 percent of enrollment.

Senate: The Committee continues to direct the Department to reserve no less than 50 percent of funds under this program for grants to develop and enhance effective school library programs, which may include providing professional development to school librarians, books, and up-to-date materials to high-need schools. School library programs increase access to a wide range of print and electronic resources and provide learning opportunities for all students, particularly those who are less likely to have access to such materials at home.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Further, the Committee continues to direct the Department to ensure that grants are distributed among eligible entities that will serve geographically diverse areas, including rural areas.

Explanatory
Statement:

The agreement continues to direct the Department to reserve no less than 50 percent of funds under this program for grants to develop and enhance effective school library programs, which may include providing professional development to school librarians, books, and up-to-date materials to high-need schools. Further, the agreement directs the Department to ensure that grants are distributed among eligible entities that will serve geographically diverse areas, including rural areas and underserved communities in urban school districts in which students from low-income families make up at least 50 percent of enrollment.

Response:

The Department is working to incorporate each of the report language directives from Congress into the fiscal year 2021 IAL competition, in part through Notice of Proposed Priorities and Requirement published in the Federal Register on April 6, 2021 (see <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2021-04-06/pdf/2021-07027.pdf>). The deadline for interested parties to submit comments was May 6, 2021, and the Department will take commenters' feedback into consideration when deciding on final priorities.

[Click here for accessible version](#)

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2022 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET
(in thousands of dollars)

	Cat Code	2020 Appropriation	2021 Appropriation	2022 Request	2022 Request Compared to 2021 Appropriation		
					Amount	Percent	
Education for the Disadvantaged							
1. Title I programs							
(a) Grants to local educational agencies (ESEA I-A):							
i. Basic grants (section 1124)							
	D	5,468,625	5,695,625	5,695,625	0	0.00%	
	D	990,776	763,776	763,776	0	0.00%	
ii. Concentration grants (section 1124A)							
	D	1,362,301	1,362,301	1,362,301	0	0.00%	
iii. Targeted grants (section 1125)							
	D	0	0	0	0	---	
	D	4,244,050	4,357,550	4,357,550	0	0.00%	
iv. Education finance incentive grants (section 1125A)							
	D	0	0	0	0	---	
	D	4,244,050	4,357,550	4,357,550	0	0.00%	
	D	16,309,802	16,536,802	16,536,802	0	0.00%	
Subtotal, Grants to LEAs							
	D	0	0	20,000,000	20,000,000	---	
(b) Title I equity grants (proposed legislation)							
	D	16,309,802	16,536,802	36,536,802	20,000,000	120.94%	
	D	5,468,625	5,695,625	5,695,625	0	0.00%	
	D	10,841,177	10,841,177	10,841,177	0	0.00%	
2. Comprehensive literacy development grants (ESEA II-B-2, section 2222)							
	D	192,000	192,000	192,000	0	0.00%	
3. Innovative approaches to literacy (ESEA II-B-2, section 2226)							
	D	27,000	28,000	28,000	0	0.00%	
4. State agency programs:							
	D	374,751	375,626	375,626	0	0.00%	
	D	47,614	48,239	48,239	0	0.00%	
Subtotal, State agency programs							
	D	422,365	423,865	423,865	0	0.00%	
5. Special programs for migrant students (HEA IV-A-5)							
	D	45,623	46,123	66,123	20,000	43.36%	
Total, Appropriation							
	D	16,996,790	17,226,790	37,246,790	20,020,000	116.21%	
Total, Budget authority							
	D	16,996,790	17,226,790	37,246,790	20,020,000	116.21%	
		6,155,613	6,385,613	26,405,613	20,020,000	313.52%	
		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.							

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Request

The programs in the Education for the Disadvantaged account provide the foundation for school improvement efforts needed to ensure that all children receive a high-quality education. Most of the programs in this account are authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The Administration is requesting a total of \$17.2 billion in fiscal year 2022 for the programs in this account.

The \$16.5 billion request for Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) would support States and LEAs in providing extra academic help to students in high-poverty schools. Funds can be used flexibly for locally determined programs and interventions across a broad range of areas, including through schoolwide programs that allow Federal and other funds to be consolidated and leveraged for comprehensive school reforms.

The proposed \$20 billion Title I Equity Grants program would build on the existing Title I program by directly addressing longstanding inequities in our education system, including State and local funding systems that favor wealthier districts over districts with concentrated poverty; competitive pay for teachers; preparation for, access to, and success in rigorous coursework; and expanded high-quality preschool opportunities.

The \$192 million request for Comprehensive Literacy Development Grants would support competitive grants to SEAs to provide targeted, evidence-based literacy intervention in high-need schools. Grantees must subgrant funds to LEAs to support literacy interventions for children from birth through kindergarten entry and for students from kindergarten through grade 12.

The \$28 million request for Innovative Approaches to Literacy would fund competitive grants to LEAs, consortia of LEAs, the Bureau of Indian Education, or national nonprofit organizations, to promote literacy programs that support the development of literacy skills in low-income communities. Grantees would develop and implement school library programs and provide high-quality, developmentally appropriate, and up-to-date reading material to children and adolescents in low-income communities.

The request would also provide \$375.6 million for the State agency Migrant program and \$48.2 million for the State agency Neglected and Delinquent program. These programs serve students, who, by definition, are not educated by a single school district. The Migrant program serves students who move across school districts, and the Neglected and Delinquent program serves students who are educated in institutional settings or correctional facilities and will likely transition to local school systems.

Finally, the request includes \$66.1 million for Special Programs for Migrant Students, an increase of \$20 million, or 43 percent, over the fiscal year 2021 appropriation, in support of the President's goal to advance equity in education. The increase complements requests for other programs authorized under the Higher Education Act that provide student supports to underserved students so they can succeed in and graduate from college, and would support a significant expansion of programs that have demonstrated success in helping migrant youth who are particularly at risk for low educational, employment, and earnings outcomes.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2022 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget authority:

	2021 <u>Appropriation</u>	2022 <u>Request</u>	<u>Change from 2021 to 2022</u>
Basic grants	\$6,459,401	\$6,459,401	0
Concentration grants	1,362,301	1,362,301	0
Targeted grants	4,357,550	4,357,550	0
Education finance incentive grants	<u>4,357,550</u>	<u>4,357,550</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	16,536,802	16,536,802	0
Annual appropriation	5,695,625	5,695,625	0
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	10,841,177	10,841,177	0

¹ The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2021; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2022.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) provides supplemental education funding, especially in communities of concentrated poverty, 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 academic standards through one of two models: a targeted assistance model that supplements the regular education program for individual students 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 backgrounds, 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.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

working with underserved students and carry out activities designed to increase parent and caregiver engagement.

Title I Grants to LEAs provide the foundation for the ESEA's accountability and improvement 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 continuous school improvement.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Department waived for all States for the 2019-2020 school year certain assessment, accountability, school identification, and report card requirements described in the following paragraphs. The Department has also invited States to request waivers of certain accountability and school identification requirements for school year 2020-2021 and has approved or expects to approve waiver requests for the majority of States.

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 understandable 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, and 10-12). These assessments must be valid and reliable, include measures that assess higher-order thinking skills and understanding of challenging content (which may include measures of student academic growth and which may be partially delivered in the form of portfolios, projects, or extended performance tasks), and enable achievement results to be disaggregated by major racial and ethnic groups, gender, and poverty, disability, English proficiency, and migratory 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.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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 and improvement systems. These systems must include interim targets and long-term goals for, at a minimum, student proficiency on State assessments and high school graduation rates, for all students and disaggregated by each student subgroup, as well as progress in attaining English language proficiency for English learners. In addition, State systems must include indicators of: (1) academic achievement based on State assessments; (2) for high schools, 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rates and, at the State's discretion, extended-year 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 at least the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I schools and all high schools with 4-year 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. These schools then must develop and implement targeted support and improvement plans to improve outcomes for those particular subgroups of students using evidence-based interventions. Schools with

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

subgroups performing as poorly as schools in at least 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

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 backgrounds 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.

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

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 backgrounds 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 2020 allocations were based on LEA poverty estimates for 2018. 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 serve, in rank order by poverty rate, all schools with a poverty rate above 75 percent, including middle and high schools, before serving other schools. 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 such 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 struggling students.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Basic Grants</u>	<u>Concentration Grants</u>	<u>Targeted Grants</u>	<u>Education Finance Incentive Grants</u>	<u>Total</u>
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
2021.....	6,459,401	1,362,301	4,357,550	4,357,550	16,536,802

FY 2022 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$16.5 billion for Title I Part A Grants to LEAs, the same as the fiscal year 2021 enacted level, supplemented by the proposed Title I Equity Grants Program, which would provide an additional \$20 billion in formula grants to LEAs as part of the President’s commitment to dramatically increase funding for Title I schools.

Title I Part A funds may be used flexibly for locally determined programs and interventions across a broad range of areas, including through schoolwide programs that allow Federal and other funds to be consolidated and leveraged for comprehensive school reforms. Title I Equity Grants will build on these investments by directly addressing longstanding inequities in our education system, including State and local funding systems that favor wealthier districts over districts with concentrated poverty; competitive pay for teachers; preparation for, access to, and success in rigorous coursework; and expanded high quality preschool opportunities.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

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

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>
Allocations by LEA Poverty Rate:			
0-15%			
# of LEAs	6,089	6,525	6,500
Dollars	3,219,278	3,927,758	3,908,331
% of Total \$	20.09	24.18	24.06
# of Formula Eligible Children	2,193,253	2,434,033	2,433,883
0-15% \$ Per Formula Child	\$1,468	\$1,614	\$1,606
15-25%			
# of LEAs	4,301	4,171	4,168
Dollars	3,362,054	6,678,387	6,680,911
% of Total \$	39.71	41.11	41.12
# of Formula Eligible Children	3,784,271	3,543,784	3,543,762
15-25% \$ Per Formula Child	\$1,681	\$1,885	\$1,885

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>
>25%			
# of LEAs	2,364	1,986	1,986
Dollars	6,440,739	5,639,639	5,658,158
% of Total \$	40.20	34.71	34.83
# of Formula Eligible Children	3,466,324	2,789,519	2,789,519
>25% \$ Per Formula Child	\$1,858	\$2,022	\$2,028
LEA Allocation Subtotal	16,022,071	16,245,784	16,247,400
BIA/Outlying Areas	179,353	181,850	181,850
N&D Program (Part D, Subpart 2)	103,387	104,168	102,552
Census Updates	<u>5,000</u>	<u>5,000</u>	<u>5,000</u>
Grants to LEAs Total	16,309,802	16,536,802	16,536,802

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years, and those requested in fiscal year 2022 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

These performance 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 these measures for 2020 are unavailable because the Department waived for all States the requirements in ESEA section 1112(b)(2) to administer State assessments in school year 2019-2020.

The Department will be reviewing GPRA program performance goals, objectives, and measures for Title I Grants to LEAs for possible revision in future years to ensure alignment with Administration policy.

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

reading assessments and the percentage of non-economically disadvantaged 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	65.3
2020	60.0	
2021	64.0	
2022	68.0	

Additional information: Data for 2019 are reported for 49 of 52 States (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico); no data are available for Maryland, New Mexico, and Vermont. Thirty-two States reported decreasing the gap in achievement on reading assessments in 2019. Gap closures for these States averaged 1.35 percentage points and ranged from 0.06 to 16.69 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 mathematics assessments and the percentage of non-economically disadvantaged 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	60.4
2020	58.0	
2021	62.0	
2022	66.0	

Additional information: Data for 2019 are reported for 48 of 52 States; no data are available for Maryland, New Mexico, Vermont, and Virginia. Twenty-nine States reported decreasing the gap in achievement on math assessments in 2019. Gap closures for these States averaged 1.23 percentage points and ranged from 0.01 to 15.30 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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

science assessments and the percentage of non-economically disadvantaged 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	55.8
2020	56.7	
2021	60.7	
2022	64.7	

Additional information: Data for 2019 are reported for 43 States; no data are available for Connecticut, the District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Vermont. Twenty-four States reported decreasing the gap in achievement on science assessments in 2018. Gap closures for these States averaged 1.04 percentage points and ranged from 0.06 to 2.94 points.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2017		50.0%
2018	54.0%	56.3
2019	58.0	58.8
2020	62.0	
2021	66.0	
2022	70.0	

Additional information: Data for 2019 are reported for 51 States; no data are available for Utah. Thirty States reported decreasing the graduation rate gap in 2018. Gap closures for these States averaged 1.67 percentage points and ranged from 0.04 to 8.90 points.

The Department has also established for this program the following two measures, which focus on performance of recently identified CSI schools. Data for these measures are currently unavailable and may be reported in future budget justifications.

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.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Title I equity grants

(Proposed legislation)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2022 Authorization: Proposed legislation

Budget Authority:

<u>2021</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>2022</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>2021 to 2022</u>
0	\$20,000,000	+\$20,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The proposed Title I Equity Grants program would provide additional Title I formula grant funding to States and Title I-eligible school districts to help address long-standing funding disparities between under-resourced school districts and their wealthier counterparts by (1) providing meaningful incentives to examine and address inequalities in school funding systems, (2) ensuring that teachers at Title I schools are paid competitively, (3) increasing preparation for, access to, and success in rigorous coursework, and (4) expanding access to high-quality preschool for underserved children and families.

Funds would be allocated by formula to Title I-eligible local educational agencies (LEAs) through a new formula that builds on the existing, foundational Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program, targets most funds to LEAs with the greatest concentrations of poverty, and provides new incentives for more equitable State and local education funding systems.

States would be required to submit plans describing how they will carry out key activities related to:

More equitable school finance systems

- collect and make publicly available detailed data on the allocation of State and local education funding to school districts and schools, using a consistent definition of per-pupil expenditures; and
- set goals, interim targets, and timelines for improving the equity and adequacy of their school finance systems and close gaps in funding between high- and low-poverty school districts and schools.

Competitive compensation for teachers

- collect and report uniform, comprehensive data on how teacher compensation, including benefits, compares to other professionals with similar education, skills, and experience;

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Title I equity grants

- ensure that LEAs close identified compensation gaps for teachers in Title I schools over a number of years, including by setting goals and targets for closing these gaps and monitoring and reporting on progress toward those goals; and
- use a portion of program funds in Title I schools to support competitive compensation compared to similarly qualified professionals.

Access to rigorous coursework

- report on current access to and success in rigorous and advanced coursework, disaggregated by school poverty level and student subgroups;
- develop plans, in collaboration with their LEAs, for closing gaps in student preparation, access, and success, including advanced content and courses across K-12, access to foundational middle school content, skills, gateway courses, and the provision of supports necessary to succeed; and
- use a portion of funds to expand access to and success in these courses, and provide the supports needed to succeed, including qualified educators.

Access to Preschool

- collect and report data on access to preschool;
- set goals for increasing access to and enrollment in high-quality programs that focus on first meeting the needs of underserved communities;
- report on progress toward those access and enrollment goals; and
- provide resources districts may use to expand access to preschool.

The Title I Equity Grants proposal also includes a reservation of \$50 million for voluntary State School Funding Equity Commissions. These commissions would (1) identify funding and educational opportunity gaps based on measures of equity and adequacy; (2) through extensive community engagement, develop detailed action plans for addressing existing gaps that include goals, interim targets, and timelines for closing identified gaps; and (3) report on progress toward these goals and targets.

FY 2022 BUDGET REQUEST

The fiscal year 2022 request includes \$20 billion for a new Title I Equity Grants program as part of President Biden's commitment to dramatically increase funding for Title I schools. The new funds would help close the estimated \$23 billion annual funding gap between majority white and majority non-white school districts, as well as gaps in the allocation of State and local education funds to districts serving high concentrations of students from low-income backgrounds and districts enrolling a majority of students from wealthier families.

As called for by the President, this historic new investment would build on the existing \$16.5 billion in Title I funding by directly addressing longstanding inequities in our education system, including State and local funding systems that favor wealthier districts over districts with concentrated poverty; competitive pay for teachers; preparation for, access to, and success in rigorous coursework; and expanded high-quality preschool opportunities.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Title I equity grants

The Administration is developing, for later transmittal to Congress, appropriations language supporting the implementation of the proposals described below.

More Equitable State Education Finance Systems

Nearly all Federal funding for elementary and secondary education is supplemental funding, intended to help States and school districts provide high quality educational opportunities and additional supports to students based on identified needs that are closely associated with students from low-income families in high-poverty schools, students with disabilities, and English learners. The underlying principle of such supplemental funding, as reflected in the supplement, not supplant and comparability requirements in section 1118 of Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, is that it is provided in addition to an equitable and adequate base of State and local education funding.

Unfortunately, in many States, school districts, and schools, Federal education funding instead compensates for, rather than supplements an inequitable and inadequate base of State and local funds. Nationwide, a 2018 report from The Education Trust found that “the highest poverty districts receive about \$1,000, or 7 percent, less per pupil in State and local funding than the lowest poverty districts.” The funding gap is even starker for students of color, with districts enrolling the most students of color receiving roughly \$1,800 less per student than school districts serving the fewest students of color.¹

These data are all the more alarming because of the growing evidence that increased per-pupil funding wisely spent leads to improved student outcomes, as do the kinds of changes that extra resources can provide, such as more competitive teacher compensation, early childhood programs, smaller class sizes, and additional student supports.² The impact of education funding is called out in a report from the Education Law Center at Rutgers University, *The Real Shame of the Nation: The Causes and Consequences of Interstate Inequity in Public School Investments*, which examined the ability of States to achieve a common student achievement outcome and assessed the costs associated with such outcomes. The report found that most States fall below the funding levels necessary for their children living in the highest poverty communities to achieve national average outcomes, while also noting that in many States funding is inadequate for all but the lowest-poverty districts. These findings led the report’s authors to conclude that “extreme interstate variations in funding and student achievement outcomes require a new and enhanced Federal role aimed at reducing interstate inequality in order to advance the national interest in improved outcomes across States.”³

A second study from the Education Law Center at Rutgers University, *Is School Funding Fair? A National Report Card*, documents some of the key areas for consideration in reviewing State and local school finance systems, including directing funding based on student need as measured primarily by family income; providing progressively more funds to districts with

¹ https://edtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/FundingGapReport_2018_FINAL.pdf.

² See <https://www.shankerinstitute.org/resource/does-money-matter-second-edition>, https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w20847/w20847.pdf, and https://edlawcenter.org/assets/files/pdfs/publications/Is_School_Funding_Fair_7th_Editi.pdf.

³ <https://www.shankerinstitute.org/sites/default/files/The%20Real%20Shame%20of%20the%20Nation.pdf>.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Title I equity grants

greater concentrations of poverty; and ensuring a sufficient overall level of education funding. The study highlights significant disparities among States in the area of overall funding, reports a decline in the number of States with progressive funding systems from 22 in 2008 to just 11 in 2015 (meaning that the majority of State systems do not provide additional support to high-poverty districts), and describes wide gaps in State fiscal effort when it comes to funding elementary and secondary education.¹

The Administration's Title I Equity Grants proposal would require each State to collect and make publicly available detailed data on the allocation of State and local education funding to school districts and schools. Reporting would include the use of a consistent definition of per-pupil expenditures (to be established through rulemaking) to support identification and mitigation of disparities in funding for high-poverty districts and schools. States would set goals, interim targets, and timelines for closing identified gaps and would need to demonstrate progress in improving the equity and adequacy of their funding systems to be eligible for future increases in funding under this program.

In addition, the proposal encourages all States to undertake a comprehensive review of their school finance systems through a \$50 million reservation for voluntary State School Funding Equity Commissions. These commissions would (1) identify funding and educational opportunity gaps based on measures of equity and adequacy; (2) through extensive community engagement, develop detailed action plans for addressing existing gaps that include goals, interim targets, and timelines for closing identified gaps; and (3) report on progress toward these goals and targets.

Competitive Compensation for Teachers

Our schools face significant teacher shortages, in part because of the widespread failure to pay competitive compensation that provides teachers the with the salaries they need to thrive in their critical roles as educators. A recent IES study found that 18 percent of all public school teachers have a second job outside the school system during the school year. Teachers earn less than their peer group of college-educated workers, discouraging future educators from entering the profession. In 2017, public school teachers earned 18.7 percent less in their weekly wage than their peer group of college educated workers, up from 1.8 percent in 1994. Including benefits, teachers earned 10.2 percent less than their peers. According to an analysis by the Center for American Progress, in many states, teachers with 10 years of experience who head a household of four may qualify for federally funded benefit programs designed for families in need of financial assistance.²

The inability to provide competitive compensation also undermines teacher retention. In their analysis of California's teacher shortage, Linda Darling Hammond and co-authors note that "teachers are more likely quit when they work in districts with lower wages and when their salaries are low relative to alternative wage opportunities, especially in high-demand fields like

¹ https://edlawcenter.org/assets/files/pdfs/publications/Is_School_Funding_Fair_7th_Edit.pdf.

² Ulrich Boser and Chelsea Straus, "Mid- and Late-Career Teachers Struggle with Paltry Incomes" (Washington: Center for American Progress, 2014), available at <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education-k-12/reports/2014/07/23/94168/mid-and-late-career-teachers-struggle-with-paltry-incomes/>.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Title I equity grants

math and science.”¹ The stakes are even higher for students of color and students from low-income backgrounds, who too often encounter out-of-field, inexperienced, and ineffective teachers in their classrooms in part as a result of low teacher pay, and with a direct impact on educational opportunities and outcomes for these students.

The Department will leverage and expand existing teacher-related reporting requirements to enable States to collect and report uniform, comprehensive data on how teacher compensation, including benefits, compares to other professionals with similar education, skills, and experience. States then would develop plans for ensuring that LEAs close identified compensation gaps for teachers in Title I schools over a number of years, consistent with collective bargaining rights, set goals and targets for closing these gaps, and monitor and report on progress toward those goals. The Administration’s proposal also would require States and school districts to use a portion of Equity Grant funds in Title I schools to support competitive compensation compared to similarly qualified professionals.

Meaningful Access to Rigorous Coursework

One of the ways that inequitable State and local funding systems, teacher shortages, and low pay for teachers harms students of color and students from low-income background is through lack of access to, and preparation for, the advanced coursework that opens the door to success in postsecondary education and in-demand, high-paying careers. Recent analyses of data on access to rigorous coursework, based on data from the U.S. Department of Education’s Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC), leaves no doubt that high schools enrolling either high proportions of students of color or high proportions students from low-income backgrounds are significantly less likely to offer advanced mathematics and science courses than high schools with high proportions of white students or low concentrations of students from low-income families. More specifically, just over half of schools with high proportions of students of color offer calculus, compared to three-quarters of schools enrolling low proportions of students of color. The calculus gap is even wider for high-poverty schools (45 percent) compared to low-poverty schools (87 percent).²

CRDC data also highlight the importance of preparation for rigorous mathematics coursework in the grades before high school. A 2018 U.S. Department of Education report, *A Leak in the STEM Pipeline: Taking Algebra Early*, found that just 12 percent of 8th grade Black students and 13 percent of 8th grade Hispanic students took Algebra I, compared to 24 percent of white 8th-graders taking this critical “gatekeeper” course that paves the way for success in more advanced mathematics and science courses.³

As the title of the Department’s study suggests, lack of access to and preparation for success in mathematics and science coursework ultimately has an impact on the outcomes achieved by Black and Latino students in high-paying, in-demand science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields. Data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress

¹ <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/addressing-californias-emerging-teacher-shortage>.

² *Inequitable Opportunity Learn: Access to Advanced Mathematics and Science Courses*, Learning Policy Institute, <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/crdc-course-access-report>.

³ https://www2.ed.gov/datastory/st_em/algebra/index.html#data-story-title.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Title I equity grants

consistently show lower proficiency rates for Black and Hispanic students, and that Black and Hispanic college students are more likely to leave STEM fields than other students.¹

States would be required to report on current access to and success in rigorous and advanced coursework, disaggregated by school poverty level and student subgroups; identify barriers to more equitable access and success (including ensuring that both foundational and advanced courses are taught by teachers certified in the subjects they are teaching); and develop plans, in collaboration with their LEAs, for closing gaps in student preparation, access, and success, including access to advanced content and courses across K-12, foundational middle school content, skills, and gateway courses, and the provision of supports necessary to succeed. States would also describe how they would support LEAs in leveraging Title I Equity Grant funds to implement these plans, and LEAs would be required to use a portion of these funds to expand access to and success in these courses, and provide the supports needed to succeed, including qualified educators.

Access to High-Quality Preschool

President Biden's American Families Plan would invest \$200 billion to provide access to preschool for all three- and four-year-old children. Research shows that children who attend preschool are more likely to take honors classes, less likely to repeat a grade, and more likely to graduate from high school and go to college. This evidence makes universal access to high-quality preschool a core principle of the President's education equity agenda, especially because race, income, and zip code can predict whether children have the opportunity to participate in a high-quality preschool program. The President's proposal in the American Families Plan would first prioritize underserved areas and enable communities and families to choose the settings that work best for them—including school-based child care, Head Start, and other community-based providers. Title I Equity Grants would complement this investment in universal preschool by requiring States to collect and report data on access to preschool, set goals for increasing access to and enrollment in high-quality programs that focus on underserved communities first, report on progress toward those access and enrollment goals, and provide additional resources districts may use to expand access to high-quality preschool.

Allocation Formula

Currently authorized Title I allocation formulas succeed in delivering a significant share of Title I appropriations to the highest poverty school districts.² Nevertheless, the formulas also yield per-pupil allocations that vary widely from State to State and district to district (both across and within States), even across school districts with similar shares of students from low-income backgrounds. The Administration recommends that the Title I Equity Grants program allocate funds through an even more targeted formula that advances equity to the greatest extent possible. This new program builds on—and leaves in place—the existing, foundational Title I

¹ <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education-k-12/news/2019/08/28/473876/advancing-racial-equity-career-technical-education-enrollment/>.

² Over the past quarter century Title I has consistently delivered about 50 percent of appropriated funds to the highest-poverty quartile of local educational agencies.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Title I equity grants

Grants to Local Educational Agencies program, including the current formulas for existing funds. All States and districts would receive dramatically more funds under this proposal.

A new allocation formula would leverage the proposed Title I Equity Grants on behalf of students from low-income backgrounds and students of color in districts and schools with the greatest concentrations of poverty. In addition to directing a greater share of Federal funds to the highest poverty districts, the new formula would create new incentives for more equitable State and local education funding systems.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2022</u>
Amount for grants to States	\$19,710,000
Average grant size	379,038
School funding equity commissions	50,000
Amount for Bureau of Indian Education	140,000
Amount for Outlying Areas	80,000
National activities (including evaluation)	20,000

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

The Department will establish goals and performance indicators to assess the impact of State and local activities supported through this program, based in part on the targets and goals established in State plans. The Department also may develop opportunity to learn and student outcome measures related to the program, such as student academic achievement, graduation rates, and college enrollment and persistence.

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 2022 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2021</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>2022</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>2021 to 2022</u>
\$192,000	\$192,000	0

¹ The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2021; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2022.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) 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 CLSD 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 underserved children, such as children from low-income backgrounds, 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. 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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

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 CLSD 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.

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

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

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2017	\$190,000
2018	190,000
2019	190,000
2020	192,000
2021	192,000

FY 2022 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2022, the Administration requests \$192 million for CLSD, the same as the fiscal year 2021 enacted level. At the requested level, the Department would award continuation grants to 24 current CLSD grantees and provide technical assistance.

Research and assessment data provide strong justification for a continued Federal investment in a large-scale reading program based on scientific reading research. For example, in 2019, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reported lower percentages of 4th- and 8th-grade students reading at the proficient level compared to 2017. Overall, 35 percent of 4th-grade students and 34 percent of 8th-grade students were proficient in reading in 2019. In particular, 8th-grade reading scores decreased by one percent from 2017 to 2019 for students from low-income backgrounds (as defined by eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch) and students with disabilities. The results also show continued, wide gaps in reading performance between students from low-income backgrounds and students from higher-income backgrounds: 51 percent of 4th-grade students from higher-income backgrounds scored Proficient or Advanced in 2019, compared to 21 percent of 4th-grade students from low-income backgrounds and 46 percent of 8th-grade students from higher-income backgrounds scored Proficient or Advanced, compared to 21 percent of 8th-grade students from low-income backgrounds.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

Research also shows that students who fail to read well by 4th-grade have a greater likelihood of dropping out of school, leading to a lifetime of diminished earnings. Further, the differences in demonstrating the reading skills, including pre-literacy skills, and knowledge of children from low-income background as compared to demonstrating the skills and knowledge of children from higher-income backgrounds are significant. For example, the size of the working vocabulary of 4-year-old children from low-income backgrounds is approximately one-third that of children from middle-income backgrounds (Hart & Risley, 2003). Research also shows that these early differences in children's skills persist over time. The NCES "Early Childhood Longitudinal Study," which followed the academic progress of children from kindergarten through 5th grade, found, for example, that differences in children's reading skills and knowledge that are usually seen in later grades appear to be present as children begin school unless supports and interventions are provided.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>
Funding for new awards	\$37,140	0	0
Number of new awards	11	0	0
Funding for continuation awards	\$147,817	\$187,856	\$189,006
Number of continuation awards	13	24	24
Peer review of new award applications	\$88	0	0
Amount for Bureau of Indian Education	\$950	\$960	\$960
Amount for Outlying Areas	\$950	\$960	\$960
National activities (including evaluation)	\$3,055	\$2,224	\$1,074

NOTES:

The Department carried over fiscal year 2019 funds into fiscal year 2020 and intends to use fiscal year 2021 funds in fiscal year 2022.

The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including CLSD, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. While the Department did not reserve funds from the CLSD program for this purpose in fiscal year 2020, it may do so in fiscal year 2021 or 2022.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years, and those requested in fiscal year 2022 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program. The Department will be reviewing GPRA program performance goals, objectives, and measures for CLSG for possible revision in future years to ensure alignment with Administration policy.

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

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

Year	Target	2017 Cohort Actual	2019 Cohort Actual
2018	52%	51%	
2019	52		
2020	52		
2021			
2022			

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 CLSD subgrant program. The Department waived assessment requirements for the 2019-2020 school year due to widespread closures related to the COVID-19 pandemic; therefore, the Department does not expect to report actual data for these measures for 2020. Data for 2019 will be available in fall 2021 and data for 2021 will be available in 2022.

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

Year	Target	2017 Cohort Actual	2019 Cohort Actual
2018	Set a baseline		
2019	43%	42%	
2020	43		
2021			
2022			

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

Additional information: Data reflect cumulative results across States for all students who participated in the CLSD program, completed pre- and post-assessments, and met or exceeded proficiency levels on the State English language arts assessments. The Department waived assessment requirements for the 2019-2020 school year due to widespread closures related to the COVID-19 pandemic; therefore, the Department does not expect to report actual data for these measures for 2020. Data for 2021 will be available in 2022.

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

Year	Target	2017 Cohort Actual	2019 Cohort Actual
2018	Set a baseline	41%	
2019	42%		
2020	42		
2021			
2022			

Additional information: Data reflect cumulative results across States for all students who participated in the CLSD program, completed pre- and post-assessments and met or exceeded proficiency levels on the State English language arts assessments. The Department waived assessment requirements for the 2019-2020 school year due to widespread closures related to the COVID-19 pandemic; therefore, the Department does not expect to report actual data for these measures for 2020. Data for 2019 will be available in fall 2021 and data for 2021 will be available in 2022.

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

Year	Target	2017 Cohort Actual	2019 Cohort Actual
2018	Set a baseline	38%	
2019	39%		
2020	39		
2021			
2022			

Additional information: Data reflect cumulative results across States for all students who participated in the CLSD program, completed pre- and post-assessments, and met or exceeded proficiency levels on the State English language arts assessments. The Department waived assessment requirements for the 2019-2020 school year due to widespread closures related to the COVID-19 pandemic; therefore, the Department does not expect to report actual data for these measures for 2020. Data for 2019 will be available in fall 2021 and data for 2021 will be available in 2022.

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 2022 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2021</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>2022</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>2021 to 2022</u>
\$28,000	\$28,000	0

¹ The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2021; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2022.

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 communities of concentrated poverty. 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 backgrounds, 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)
2017	\$27,000
2018	27,000
2019	27,000
2020	27,000
2021	28,000

FY 2022 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$28 million, the same as the fiscal year 2021 appropriation, for IAL. Funds would support continuation grants for the fiscal year 2021 cohort.

Many schools and districts across the Nation do not have school libraries that deliver high-quality literacy programming to children and their families, especially those that serve students from low-income backgrounds. Additionally, many schools do not have qualified library media

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Innovative approaches to literacy

specialists or sufficient library facilities. Where facilities do exist, they may lack adequate books and other materials and resources. In many communities, underserved students, and particularly students from low-income backgrounds, have limited access to developmentally appropriate reading material in their homes. In light of these challenges, IAL grants support research-based activities and book distribution efforts that are designed to increase student achievement and motivation in reading. For example, one previous grantee distributed over 150,000 books to children through community book fairs, summer story hours at local libraries, and end-of-school events. The grantee organized events where volunteers work with parents to model how to read with a child, and also provided incentives to children to read with their families for specific lengths of time. Another grantee partnered with a resource center and a local library to provide developmentally appropriate books for young children, encouraged parents to read with their children, and provided a health and wellness presentation in a low-income community.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>
Funding for new awards	0	\$25,284	0
Number of new awards	0	40	0
Peer review	0	\$270	0
Funding for continuation awards	\$27,000	\$2,446	\$28,000
Number of continuation awards	44	4	40

NOTE: The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including IAL, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. While the Department did not reserve funds from the IAL program for this purpose in fiscal year 2020, it may do so in fiscal years 2021 and 2022.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years, and those requested in fiscal year 2022 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program. The Department will be reviewing GPRA program performance goals, objectives, and measures for IAL for possible revision in future years to ensure alignment with Administration policy.

The Department 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
2017	70%	83%
2018	70	70
2019	70	30
2020	50	67
2021	50	
2022	50	

Additional information: Data reported for fiscal year 2019 included data from some 2018 grantees reporting for the first time; since then, the Department has worked 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. Despite setbacks in the 2019-2020 school year due to the COVID-19 pandemic, grantees performed well on this measure in 2020.

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	31
2021	30	
2022	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 included data from some 2018 grantees reporting for the first time; since then, the Department has worked 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.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Innovative approaches to literacy

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	29
2021	32	
2022	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; since then, the Department has worked 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	100
2021	99	
2022	99	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2022 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2021</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>2022</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>2021 to 2022</u>
\$375,626	\$375,626	0

¹ The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2021; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2022.

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 migratory 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 migratory 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. A hold-harmless provision that assured States at least 90 percent of their prior year allocations was phased out in fiscal year 2020.

The Department may reserve 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 migratory students. The Department is required to

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

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 migratory 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 migratory 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)
2017	374,751
2018	374,751
2019	374,751
2020	374,751
2021	375,626

FY 2022 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2022, the Administration requests \$375.6 million for the Title I Migrant Education Program (MEP), the same level as the fiscal year 2021 appropriation. The request would support the President’s goal to advance equity in education through activities to identify highly mobile migratory children, provide them comprehensive services that address their specific needs, and promote coordination of the Federal resources available to serve this population.

Migratory children represent an especially underserved and hard-to-serve group due to multiple risk factors. In particular, the high mobility of these children across school districts and State boundaries (sometimes within the school term or year) often means that no single school district or State has ongoing responsibility for the education of these children, thus creating a need for Federal support to assist in the coordination of services to meet their educational needs. This high mobility creates additional challenges for both students and the school systems serving them, such as the need for additional supports to help students to overcome the effects of disruptions in their education, and helping high school students accrue credits towards graduation. Additionally, States continue to deal with the challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic, such as school closures and social distancing, which have exacerbated these obstacles.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

Moreover, the characteristics of the migratory population create a need for educational services that go beyond services traditionally supported with State and local education budgets. In addition to being highly mobile, migratory children tend to live in poverty, have limited English proficiency, and belong to families that are likely to experience food and job insecurity as well as poor health and housing conditions. Of the children eligible to receive program services during school year 2018-2019, one-third (34.2 percent) moved within the past 12 months. In addition, nearly 43.4 percent of children were English learners and 8.1 percent of children were eligible to receive services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Migratory children may also help their families perform agricultural work, and a large number of migratory youth travel without a parent or guardian to obtain migratory work in the fields and in processing plants. In 2018-19, 8.8 percent of the migratory children were out-of-school youth, or school-aged youth who do not attend school.

During school year 2018-19, 303,739 children, were identified as eligible under the program. States and local entities provided services to 215,787 migratory children, 93,729 of whom received services during the summer or intersession periods. Of the 13,510 children aged birth through 2 years old, 3,674 received services; of the 33,000 children aged 3 through 5 years old, 19,956 received services; of the 230,283 children in kindergarten through grade 12, 177,654 received services; and of the 26,818 out-of-school youth, 14,425 received services. Services included supplemental instruction in reading, math, and other academic areas, and high school credit accrual. Program funds were also used to provide educationally related services such as counseling, health and nutrition services, advocacy and referrals for migratory students with disabilities, and (especially in the summer) transportation. The Department expects to support a similar level of services using fiscal year 2022 funds.

The Department would continue to reserve approximately \$10 million in fiscal year 2022 for migratory coordination and national activities, including \$3 million for consortium incentive grants. The remainder of the funds would be used for contract activities related to inter- and intra-State coordination, e.g., the RESULTS Interstate Website and Coordination Activities contract, and the Migrant Student Information Exchange System (MSIX), for maintenance and operation of the system as well as for technical assistance to States as they continue to implement their systems for collecting and exchanging data on migratory students.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>
Number of eligible children aged birth through 21	303,739	303,739	303,739
SEA program:			
Amount for State grants	\$364,751	\$365,626	\$365,626
Range of State awards	0-\$114,641	0-\$115,952	0-\$115,952
Coordination activities:			
Consortium incentive grants	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000
Migrant student information exchange and related coordination activities	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years, and those requested in fiscal year 2022 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program. The Department will be reviewing GPRA program performance goals, objectives, and measures for the Migrant program for possible revision in future years to ensure alignment with Administration policy.

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 they collect and report data for these two measures. Once all participating States report the data and the Department has determined that data are accurate and complete it will start reporting data and establishing 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
2017	31.4%	28.3%
2018	33.4	26.0
2019	33.4	26.9
2020	33.4	
2021	30.0	
2022	31.0	

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
2017	30.5%	28.5%
2018	32.5	25.4
2019	32.5	25.7
2020	32.5	
2021	30.0	
2022	31.0	

Additional information: The source of the data is ED*Facts*, the Department's system for States to submit kindergarten through grade 12 data. States began using more rigorous assessments in recent years, which may help explain current low achievement levels. Data for 2019 is based on 45 out of 46 participating States. The Department waived assessment requirements for 2019-20 due to widespread closures related to the COVID-19 pandemic; therefore, the Department does not expect to report actual data for these measures for 2020. Data for 2021 will be available in 2022.

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 school students.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

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	46
2020	46	
2021	46	
2022	46	

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. Although the target has been achieved, the Department continues to work with States to ensure the completeness and quality of the data entered into the system. The Department is also exploring 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* report.¹ 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

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

State MEP directors also 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 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 succeed 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 2022 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

2021	2022	Change from
<u>Appropriation</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>2021 to 2022</u>
\$48,239	\$48,239	0

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2021; reauthorizing legislation is sought for fiscal year 2022.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

youth, including public or private institutions and community day programs or schools that serve 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)
2017.....	\$47,614
2018.....	47,614
2019.....	47,614
2020.....	47,614
2021.....	48,239

FY 2022 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$48.2 million for the Neglected and Delinquent (N and D) program, the same as the fiscal year 2021 level, to help young people served by N and D grantees to reenter our communities, schools, and postsecondary education institutions and thereby support their future success, strengthen communities, and reduce re-incarceration rates. High-quality education in correctional institutions can help equip these students with the skills needed to successfully reenter their communities and either continue their education or join the workforce.¹

Correctional facilities face unique challenges to educating children and youth in their care. The length of stay in correctional facilities and participation in educational programs by eligible children and youth varies widely, ranging from a few months to several years in State adult correctional facilities and days to months in juvenile detention facilities. This means N and D grantees must develop a variety of strategies to help ensure the continuity of the education of the students they serve and a successful transition into their communities and schools. In addition, approximately 34 percent (21,661) of the youth served by the program in 2018-19 were students with disabilities. These large numbers of students with disabilities pose additional challenges for institutions because such students typically require additional, specialized support and attention to be successful in school and beyond.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

Consequently, both the quantity and quality of educational programs in correctional facilities varies widely. The Department's Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC) for school year 2013-14¹ gathered data on educational conditions in justice facility programs for youth in confinement from approximately 630 institutions. Respondents reported offering 26 hours per week of educational programming on average, but 15 percent of respondents offered less than 20 hours per week during the school year, and 21 percent of respondents required having fewer than 180 days of instruction in a regular school year, which is what most States require of public schools. In addition, institutions reported that teachers who work in justice facility educational programs are more likely to be absent than teachers in public schools, and that justice facilities are less likely to offer essential math and science courses than public high schools.

The Department provides technical assistance and other support to States in addressing these concerns through the National Technical Assistance Center for the Education of Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (NDTAC). NDTAC also collects and disseminates information on tools and effective practices that can be used to support N and D youth; in 2016 it released a toolkit to help justice-involved youth make a successful transition back to traditional school settings.² For 2022, the Department would reserve approximately \$1.2 million for NDTAC.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>
Number of participating institutions	680	680	680
Estimated number of students served	63,596	63,596	63,596
Average Federal contribution per child (whole dollars)	\$730	\$740	\$740
Range of awards to States	0-\$2,809	0-\$3,284	0-\$3,284
Average State award	\$893	\$904	\$904
Technical assistance	\$1,190	\$1,206	\$1,206

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

¹ <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/2013-14-juvenile-justice.pdf>

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years, and those requested in fiscal year 2022 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program. The Department will be reviewing GPRA program performance goals, objectives, and measures for the Neglected and Delinquent program for possible revision in future years to ensure alignment with Administration policy.

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
2017	18.8%	12.5%
2018	19.8	13.7
2019	20.8	13.5
2020	21.8	
2021	22.8	
2022	23.8	

Additional information: The source of the data is *EDFacts*, the Department's system for States to submit kindergarten through grade 12 data. Data for 2019 is based on 50 out of 51 participating States. Many States have reported that they are unable to collect data on students after they leave institutions and return to their communities. Data from 2020 will be available in late fall of 2021.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2017	61.6%	56.0%
2018	62.6	52.1
2019	63.6	53.6
2020	64.6	
2021	65.6	
2022	66.6	

Additional information: The source of the data is *EDFacts*, the Department's system for States to submit kindergarten through grade 12 data. 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 for 2019 is based on 49 out of 51 participating States. Many States have

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

reported that they are unable to collect data on students after they leave institutions and return to their communities. Data from 2020 will be available in late fall of 2021.

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
2017	76.4%	59.6%
2018	77.4	64.5
2019	78.4	62.8
2020	79.4	
2021	80.4	
2022	81.4	

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
2017	77.9%	61.1%
2018	78.9	67.0
2019	79.9	63.1
2020	80.9	
2021	81.9	
2022	82.9	

Additional information: The source of the data is *EDFacts*, the Department's system for States to submit kindergarten through grade 12 data. 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, including the quality of the data reported by facilities, changeover in staff overseeing data reporting, and changes in reporting systems. In addition, a major goal of the program is to move students out of institutions and back into communities; consequently, while the program may be serving significantly fewer students, these students often face greater academic challenges. Data for 2019 is based on 50 out of 51 participating States. Many States have reported that they are unable to collect data on students after they leave institutions and return to their communities. Data from 2020 will be available in late fall of 2021.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

Efficiency measures

Measure: The cost per high school diploma or equivalent.

Year	Target	Actual
2017	\$4,298	\$6,692
2018	4,255	6,554
2019	4,211	7,070
2020	4,170	
2021	4,128	
2022	4,087	

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 2020 will be available in late fall of 2021.

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

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

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; 91 percent of State agency coordinators and 77 percent of local agency coordinators responded that their facilities 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.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2022 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

	2021	2022	Change from
	<u>Appropriation</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>2021 to 2022</u>
	\$46,123	\$66,123	+\$20,000

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2015. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for fiscal year 2022.

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.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

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

Fiscal Years	(dollars in thousands)
2017.....	44,623
2018.....	44,623
2019.....	44,623
2020.....	45,623
2021.....	46,123

FY 2022 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2022, the Administration requests \$66.1 million for Special Programs for Migrant Students, an increase of \$20 million, or 43 percent, over the fiscal year 2021 appropriation, in support of the President’s goal to advance equity in education. The increase complements requests for other programs authorized under the Higher Education Act that provide student supports to underserved students so they can succeed in and graduate from college.

The request would support a significant expansion of programs that have demonstrated success in helping migrant youth who are particularly at risk for low educational, employment, and earnings outcomes. HEP and CAMP programs focus on finding and assisting migrant youth who have not been able to complete high school or go on to postsecondary education due to limited or inconsistent educational opportunity. Projects emphasize services to out-of-school-youth and other eligible individuals by conducting extensive outreach in locations where these youth live and work (e.g., farms, production facilities, and labor camps) and providing services at locations and times that meet the needs of an out-of-school, working population. Program performance data show that the programs’ academic and support services are successful at helping participants attain their high school equivalency credentials or complete their first academic year in a postsecondary program. Program outcomes compare favorably with outcomes for the general population. For example, approximately 96 percent of CAMP participants who completed their first academic year in a postsecondary program continued their postsecondary education. In contrast, NCES data show that the retention rate of first-time degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates at 4-year institutions was 81 percent from 2017 to 2018, and 62 percent at 2-year institutions during the same period.¹

Data from a 2018 US Department of Labor research report (Findings from the National Agricultural Workers Survey 2015-16: A Demographic and Employment Profile of United States Farmworkers) show that a significant proportion of farmworkers tend to be young, poorly educated, unlikely to be proficient in English, and poor. In 2015-16, individuals aged 14-19 constituted seven percent of farmworkers; average educational attainment was 8th grade; only 29 percent of respondents said they could speak English well; and one-third of farmworkers had family incomes below the poverty level. However, a sizable group of survey respondents

¹ U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2020). *The Condition of Education 2020* (NCES 2020-144), Undergraduate and Retention Rates. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_ctr.asp

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

expressed interest in pursuing further education or training and 35 percent of farmworkers surveyed reported having taken at least one adult education class. Among the most common courses respondents attended were English language instruction, job training, and high school equivalency classes; however, their limited education and income affects their ability to pursue postsecondary education or obtain skilled work that pays higher wages.

HEP and CAMP provide participants with assistance that can enable them to improve their earnings potential dramatically. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics “Occupational Outlook Handbook,”² the median annual wage for agricultural workers in 2020 was \$28,900, and these types of workers are often paid based on how much they do instead of how many hours they work. By comparison, according to the National Center for Education Statistics, in 2018 the median earnings for full-time, full-year wage and salary workers aged 25-34 were \$34,900 for a person with a high school diploma or equivalent; \$40,000 for a person with an associate’s degree; and \$54,700 for a person with a bachelor’s degree.³ Furthermore, the “Occupational Outlook Handbook” indicates that periods of unemployment between jobs can cause stress for migrant and seasonal farmworkers, and agricultural work can be dangerous due to risk of exposure to pesticides or working with farm machinery that can cause serious injuries. Agricultural workers frequently leave the occupation due to the intense physical nature of the work, but, because of the barriers to attain a quality education, they are likely to need support to pursue educational opportunities that would allow them and their families to obtain other jobs.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>
Outreach, technical assistance, and professional development	\$209	\$231	\$331
HEP:			
Number of students served	4,054	4,054	5,766
Funding for new awards	\$6,935	\$6,640	\$11,367
Number of new awards	15	14	23-30
Peer review of new award applications	\$40	\$47	\$328
Average new award	\$462	\$474	\$475
Funding for continuation awards	\$15,418	\$16,067	\$21,201

² Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, Agricultural Workers, on the Internet at <https://www.bls.gov/ooh/farming-fishing-and-forestry/agricultural-workers.htm> (visited May 6, 2021).

³ U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2020). *The Condition of Education 2020* (NCES 2020-144), Annual Earnings. <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=77>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>
Number of continuation awards	36	35	46
Average continuation award	\$429	\$459	\$461
Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars)	\$5,514	\$5,601	\$5,648
CAMP:			
Number of students served	2,246	2,246	3,195
Funding for new awards	\$6,894	\$7,086	\$13,724
Number of new awards	16	15	30-37
Peer review of new award applications	\$40	\$47	\$328
Average new award	\$431	\$473	\$450
Funding for continuation awards	\$16,087	\$16,005	\$18,844
Number of continuation awards	40	38	43
Average continuation award	\$402	\$421	\$438
Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars)	\$10,232	\$10,281	\$10,194

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.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

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
2017	69.0%	67.5%
2018	69.0	64.9
2019	69.0	66.6
2020	69.0	
2021	69.0	
2022	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 2020 will be available in the summer of 2021.

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
2017	80.0%	85.6%
2018	80.0	82.1
2019	80.0	83.9
2020	80.0	
2021	80.0	
2022		

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 2020 will be available in the summer of 2021.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

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
2017	86.0%	88.2%
2018	86.0	83.5
2019	86.0	87.9
2020	86.0	
2021	86.0	
2022	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 2020 will be available in the summer of 2021.

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
2017	85.0%	96.6%
2018	88.0	96.2
2019	90.0	96.4
2020	92.0	
2021	92.0	
2022	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 2020 will be available in the summer of 2021.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

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
2017	\$9,931	\$9,009
2018	10,030	9,408
2019	10,131	8,594
2020	10,232	
2021	10,334	
2022	10,438	

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

Year	Target Cost Per Residential Participant	Actual Cost Per Residential Participant
2017	\$19,338	\$14,036
2018	19,531	13,164
2019	19,727	15,197
2020	19,924	
2021	20,123	
2022	20,324	

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
2017	\$15,653	\$13,932
2018	15,810	13,650
2019	15,968	16,378
2020	16,127	
2021	16,289	
2022	16,451	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

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 2020 will be available in the summer of 2021.

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
2017	\$14,958	\$12,009
2018	15,197	11,393
2019	15,440	10,061
2020	15,688	
2021	15,939	
2022	16,194	

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
2017	\$23,972	\$14,823
2018	24,356	13,105
2019	24,745	13,429
2020	25,141	
2021	25,543	
2022	25,952	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

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
2017	\$18,229	\$13,765
2018	18,521	12,939
2019	18,817	11,551
2020	19,118	
2021	19,424	
2022	19,735	

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 2020 will be available in the summer of 2021.