

Department of Education
EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED
Fiscal Year 2024 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language.....	1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	3
Appropriation, Adjustments and Transfers.....	5
Summary of Changes	6
Authorizing Legislation.....	7
Appropriations History.....	8
Significant Items in FY 2023 Appropriations Reports	10
Summary of Request	12
Grants to local educational agencies.....	13
Comprehensive literacy development grants	26
Innovative approaches to literacy	32
Migrant education	37
Neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth.....	44
Special programs for migrant students.....	52
Account Summary Table.....	62
State Tables*	

*State tables reflecting actual fiscal year 2022 allocations and fiscal years 2023 and 2024 estimates are posted on the Department’s webpage at:
<https://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/statetables/index.html>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriations Language

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"), [~~\$19,087,790,000~~]\$21,254,551,000, of which [~~\$8,159,490,000~~]\$10,317,251,000 shall become available on July 1, [~~2023~~]2024, and shall remain available through September 30, [~~2024~~]2025, and of which \$10,841,177,000 shall become available on October 1, [~~2023~~]2024, and shall remain available through September 30, [~~2024~~]2025, for academic year [~~2023–2024~~]2024–2025.¹ *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, [~~2022~~]2023, 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 [~~\$5,282,550,000~~]\$6,357,550,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA:⁵ *Provided further*, That [~~\$5,282,550,000~~]\$6,357,550,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A of the ESEA:⁶ *Provided further*, That of the amounts available under the preceding two provisos the Secretary may reserve up to \$100,000,000 to pay the costs of voluntary State school funding equity commissions and the costs of voluntary local education agency equity reviews:⁷ *Provided further*, That \$224,000,000 shall be for carrying out subpart 2 of part B of title II:⁸ *Provided further*, That [~~\$52,123,000~~]\$66,123,000 shall be for carrying out section 418A of the HEA:⁹

Provided further, That notwithstanding section 418A(g)(2)(A) of the HEA, the Secretary may reduce the percentage of funds available for a program if the Secretary determines that there are not a sufficient number of high-quality applications for that program.¹⁰ (Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2023.)

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 [\$8,159,490,000]<u>\$10,317,251,000</u> shall become available on July 1, [2023]<u>2024</u>, and shall remain available through September 30, [2024]<u>2025</u>, and of which \$10,841,177,000 shall become available on October 1, [2023]<u>2024</u>, and shall remain available through September 30, [2024]<u>2025</u>, for academic year [2023–2024]<u>2024–2025</u>:...</p>	<p>This language provides for funds to be appropriated on a forward-funded basis for the Title I Basic Grants, Concentration Grants, Targeted Grants, Education Finance Incentive Grants, 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, [2022]<u>2023</u>, 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 [\$5,282,550,000]<u>\$6,357,550,000</u> 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>, That [\$5,282,550,000]<u>\$6,357,550,000</u> 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>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>⁷ ...<i>Provided further</i>, That of the amounts available under the preceding two provisos the Secretary may reserve up to \$100,000,000 to pay the costs of voluntary State school funding equity commissions and the costs of voluntary local education agency equity reviews:...</p>	<p>This language would allow the Secretary to reserve up to \$100 million from the appropriations for Title I Targeted Grants and Education Finance Incentive Grants to support activities to help school systems address inequities in school funding through voluntary State school funding equity commissions and voluntary local educational agency equity reviews.</p>
<p>⁸ ...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$224,000,000 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>⁹ ...<i>Provided further</i>, That [\$52,123,000] <u>\$66,123,000</u> shall be for carrying out section 418A of the HEA.</p>	<p>This language provides funding for Special Programs for Migrant Students.</p>
<p>¹⁰ ...<i>Provided further</i>, That notwithstanding section 418A(g)(2)(A) of the HEA, the Secretary may reduce the percentage of funds available for a program if the Secretary determines that there are not a sufficient number of high-quality applications for that program.</p>	<p>This language would allow the Department to override the distribution of funds between the High School Equivalency Program and the College Assistance Migrant Program required by the statute and reduce the percentage of funds available for a program in the event a competition does not yield a sufficient number of high-quality applications for one of the programs.</p>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriation, Adjustments and Transfers
(dollars in thousands)

Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers	2022	2023	2024
Discretionary:			
Appropriation	\$18,229,790	\$19,087,790	\$21,254,551
Total, discretionary appropriation	18,229,790	19,087,790	21,254,551
Advance:			
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	-10,841,177	-10,841,177	-10,841,177
Advance from prior year	10,841,177	10,841,177	10,841,177
Total, budget authority	18,229,790	19,087,790	21,254,551

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Changes (dollars in thousands)

2023 Discretionary	\$19,087,790
2024 Discretionary	21,254,551
Net change	+2,166,761

Increases:	2023 base	Change from base
<u>Program:</u>		
<p>Increase for Grants to LEAs consistent with President Biden’s commitment to increase funding for Title I schools in order to close gaps in funding that undermine the ability of our public education system to prepare all students to succeed, regardless of their zip code, family income, race, ethnicity, or disability. The increase would also support funding for voluntary efforts to identify and address inequities in State and local funding systems, which often favor wealthier districts over districts with concentrated poverty, in order to create more equitable school finance systems.</p>	\$18,386,802	+\$2,150,000
<p>Increase funding for Neglected and Delinquent to to address resource inequities across our education system, particularly for underserved students such as students in correctional institutions or other institutional settings.</p>	49,239	+2,761
<p>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.</p>	52,123	+14,000
Net change		+2,166,761

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Authorizing Legislation
(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2023 Authorized	2023 Appropriation	2024 Authorized	2024 Request
Grants to local educational agencies (<i>ESEA-1-A</i>):				
LEA grants formulas:	0		To be determined ¹	
Basic grants (<i>Section 1124</i>)		\$6,459,401		\$6,459,401
Concentration grants (<i>Section 1124A</i>)		1,362,301		1,362,301
Targeted grants (<i>Section 1125</i>)		5,282,550		6,357,550
Education finance incentive grants (<i>Section 1125A</i>)		5,282,550		6,357,550
Comprehensive literacy development grants (<i>ESEA-II-B-2, Section 2222</i>)		194,000	To be determined ¹	194,000
Innovative approaches to literacy (<i>ESEA-II-B-2, Section 2226</i>)		30,000	To be determined ¹	30,000
State agency programs:			To be determined	
Migrant (<i>ESEA I-C</i>)	0	375,626	To be determined ¹	375,626
Neglected and delinquent (<i>ESEA I-D</i>)	0	49,239	To be determined ¹	52,000
Special Programs for Migrant Students (<i>HEA IV-A-5</i>)	0	52,123	To be determined ²	66,123
Total definite authorization	0		To be determined	
Total appropriation		\$19,087,790		\$21,254,551

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2021. Reauthorization for FY 2024 is expected through appropriations action.

² The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2015. Reauthorization for FY 2024 is expected through appropriations action.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2015 ¹ (2015 Advance for 2016)	\$15,377,965 (11,681,898)	N/A	\$15,566,226 (10,841,177)	\$15,536,107 (10,841,177)
2016 ² (2016 Advance for 2017)	16,592,546 (10,841,177)	\$14,869,641 (10,841,177)	15,455,802 (10,841,177)	16,016,790 (10,841,177)
2017 ³ (2017 Advance for 2018)	16,043,790 (10,841,177)	15,986,790 (11,041,177)	16,066,790 (10,841,177)	16,143,790 (10,767,555)
2018 ⁴ (2018 Advance for 2019)	16,347,558 (10,841,177)	15,953,790 (10,841,177)	16,169,198 (10,841,177)	16,107,781 (10,841,177)
2019 ⁵ (2019 Advance for 2020)	15,926,790 (11,681,898)	16,443,790 (10,841,177)	16,568,790 (10,841,177)	16,543,790 (10,841,177)
2020 ⁶ (2020 Advance for 2021)	16,376,790 (11,681,898)	17,563,802 (10,841,177)	16,543,790 (10,841,177)	\$16,996,790 (10,841,177)

¹ The House allowance is shown as N/A because there was no Subcommittee action. The level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Subcommittee action only.

² The levels for the 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.

³ The levels for the House and Senate allowances reflect Committee action on the regular annual 2017 appropriation bill; the Appropriation reflects the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017.

⁴ 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).

⁵ 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).

⁶ The Senate allowance reflects the Chairman's mark; the Appropriation reflects the Further Consolidated Appropriation Act, 2020 (P.L. 116-94).

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriations History—continued

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2021 ¹	0	\$17,258,290	\$17,121,790	\$17,226,790
(2021 Advance for 2022)	\$(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)
2022 ²	37,246,790	36,756,790	33,802,790	18,229,790
(2022 Advance for 2023)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)
2023 ³	37,280,551	21,260,551	20,852,667	19,087,790
(2023 Advance for 2024)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)
2024	21,254,551			
(2024 Advance for 2025)	(10,841,177)			

¹ 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).

² The House allowance reflects floor action; the Senate allowance reflects the Chair's mark; and the Appropriation reflects Division H of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2022 (P.L. 117-103).

³ The House allowance reflects the regular annual FY 2023 appropriation, which was introduced on the floor; the Senate allowance reflects the Chairman's mark; and the Appropriation reflects the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023 (P.L. 117-328).

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Significant Items in FY 2023 Appropriations Reports

Grants to LEAs

House: Transportation and School Improvement.—The Committee recognized a longstanding barrier to the implementation of strategies to increase student diversity as a means of school improvement in the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2019 when it removed two decades-old prohibitions on the use of Federal funds for transportation costs to carry out school desegregation efforts. Subsequently, in the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2021, the Committee removed the last of these long-standing prohibitions in the Federal code in the General Education Provisions Act. With the recent removal of these prohibitions, the Committee remains concerned many States and districts may be unaware of their ability to use ESEA funding to support voluntary school integration efforts. In response, the Committee included a directive in House Report 117–96 requiring the Department to provide technical assistance to school districts regarding the use of school improvement funds under Title I, Part A for transportation to support voluntary school integration efforts. The Committee looks forward to receiving an update on the Department’s progress in carrying out this work by September 30, 2022.

Response: The Department is working on clarifying implementation of school improvement requirements and expects to incorporate information therein regarding how school districts may use Title I, Part A funds for transportation as part of school diversity and improvement efforts.

Joint Explanatory

Statement: The Department shall brief the Committees not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act on the Department’s actions and plans for addressing the challenges identified in GAO’s report on school improvement (GAO-21-199) and assisting state educational agencies (SEAs) and local educational agencies (LEAs) with implementing all of the school improvement requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), including meaningful resource allocation reviews.

Response: The Department provided this briefing on February 23, 2023.

Joint Explanatory

Statement: The Department shall also increase transparency on the amount reserved by each State for the school improvement set aside, method of distribution to eligible LEAs, uses of such funds and the Department’s actions and plans for supporting SEA and LEA implementation of ESEA school improvement requirements, including resource equity requirements, in the fiscal year 2024 and future Congressional Justifications.

Response: The Department is exploring ways to promote transparency about how States implement these requirements and how much funding they reserve to support these efforts.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriations History—continued

Innovative Approaches to Literacy

House: Underserved Urban School Districts.—The Committee directs the Department in any new fiscal year 2023 competition to continue prioritizing 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 including two competitive preference priorities in the fiscal year 2023 competition prioritizing communities in urban school districts and districts that serve students from low-income families that make up at least 50 percent of enrollment.

Neglected and Delinquent

House: Support for At-risk Youth.—The Committee is concerned with findings from the Department's report to Congress on Neglected and Delinquent Programs, which found that State-level data on reentry activities required under ESEA is insufficient to provide an accurate sense of the success of such efforts nationally. Given the disproportionate impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the youth justice system, the Committee believes it is essential that the Department monitor and ensure compliance with re-entry activities required under ESEA. In the fiscal year 2024 Congressional Budget Justification, the Committee requests information regarding how the Department will support each State in meeting the data reporting and re-entry requirements for youth included in ESEA.

Response: The Department will continue its efforts to provide support to States on implementing data reporting and re-entry requirements. Current technical assistance efforts include implementing new monitoring protocols to better understand the data collection carried out at the State level, efforts to adjust and improve data requirements to expand States' ability to complete their Consolidated State Performance Reports, as well as development of toolkits and other resources for States.

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 \$21.3 billion in fiscal year 2024 for the programs in this account.

The \$20.5 billion request for Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) supports President Biden's commitment to increase funding for Title I schools in order to close gaps in funding that undermine the ability of our public education system to prepare all students to succeed, regardless of their zip code, family income, race, ethnicity, or disability. The program supports States and LEAs in providing extra academic help to students in high-poverty schools. Program 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 request would also support funding for voluntary efforts to identify and address inequities in State and local funding systems, which often favor wealthier districts over districts with concentrated poverty, in order to create more equitable school finance systems.

The \$194 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 \$30 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 provide \$375.6 million for the State agency Migrant program to help children of migratory farmworkers and fishers meet the same academic standards as other children; and graduate from high school or a high school equivalency program with an education that prepares them for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.

The \$52 million request for the State agency Neglected and Delinquent program provides a \$2.8 million increase for programs that serve 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 \$14 million, in support of the President's goal to advance equity in education through a significant expansion of programs that have demonstrated success in helping migratory 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 2024 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget authority:

	<u>2023 Appropriation</u>	<u>2024 Request</u>	<u>Change</u>
Basic grants	\$6,459,401	\$6,459,401	0
Concentration grants	1,362,301	1,362,301	0
Targeted grants	5,282,550	6,357,550	+\$1,075,000
Education finance incentive grants	5,282,550	6,357,550	+1,075,000
Total	18,386,802	20,536,802	+2,150,000
Annual appropriation	7,545,625	9,695,625	+2,150,000
Advance for succeeding year	10,841,177	10,841,177	0

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 educational opportunities and additional academic support to help students in schools with high rates of poverty 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.

The reauthorized ESEA encourages the use of Title I funds to strengthen the academic program of participating schools, including, for example, by establishing preschool programs for eligible

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2021. Reauthorization for FY 2024 is expected through appropriations action.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

children under 6 years of age and dual or concurrent enrollment programs for secondary school students that provide access to college-level coursework through partnerships with institutions of higher education. Schools also must provide ongoing professional development for staff working with underserved students and carry out activities designed to increase parent and caregiver engagement.

Title I Grants to LEAs provide the foundation for ESEA's accountability and improvement system for all public schools, which emphasizes State and local responsibilities in the areas of meeting challenging academic standards and implementing aligned assessments, measuring annual student progress, reporting on performance, and supporting continuous school improvement.

Standards and Assessments

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

States are also required to administer academic assessments that measure and provide 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, poverty, disability status, English proficiency, migratory status, foster care status, homeless status, and military connected 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 and identify where additional resources and other supports are needed. 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 adjusted cohort graduation rates; (3) for elementary and middle schools, another academic indicator (which may be a measure of student growth); (4) progress in achieving English language proficiency; and (5) at least one indicator, of the State's choosing, of school quality or student success. States must use these indicators to meaningfully differentiate school performance annually, with the first four indicators afforded substantial weight individually and much greater weight in the aggregate than indicators of school quality or student success.

States and LEAs receiving Title I funds must disseminate annual report cards that provide information on the performance of the State and its LEAs and schools. These report cards must be concise, presented in an understandable and uniform format, and accessible to the public, and must address minimum content requirements including, among other things: a description of the State's accountability system; information on performance with respect to the interim targets, long-term goals, and indicators discussed above; professional qualifications of teachers; per-pupil expenditures, including actual personnel and non-personnel 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 at or 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 at least 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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

interventions. Schools with 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.

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 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.

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 2021 allocations were based on LEA poverty estimates

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

for 2019. 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. 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.

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

Fiscal Year	Basic Grants	Concentration Grants	Targeted Grants	Education Finance Incentive Grants	Total
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
2022	6,459,401	1,362,301	4,857,550	4,857,550	17,536,802
2023	6,459,401	1,362,301	5,282,550	5,282,550	18,386,802

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

FY 2024 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2024, the Administration requests \$20.5 billion for Title I Grants to LEAs, \$2.2 billion more than the fiscal year 2023 appropriation. The request supports President Biden’s commitment to increase funding for Title I schools in order to close gaps in funding that undermine the ability of our public education system to prepare all students to succeed, regardless of their zip code, family income, race, ethnicity, or disability.

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, Part A targets funds to schools in which students face concentrated poverty, which allows this program to help ensure that all students have access to excellent educational opportunities. By expanding this program, school districts can increase services for students that meet their local needs, such as by increasing access to and support for preschool, rigorous coursework, providing additional individualized support to students, and increasing connections with community partners to meet students’ and families’ needs. Title I Grants to LEAs also provide the foundation for rigorous statewide Title I accountability systems, which (1) measure student and school performance against State-determined academic, English language proficiency, and graduation rate indicators; (2) support comprehensive and targeted school improvement efforts; and (3) provide transparency around educational performance through State and local report cards.

Sustaining Supports That Are Helping Students Recover

SEAs and LEAs are using the historic funds provided in the CARES Act, Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act, and the American Rescue Plan (ARP Act) to address the significant academic, social, emotional and mental health needs of students resulting from the pandemic. This includes support to reverse the disproportionately negative impacts the pandemic has had on already underserved students, including students of color, English learners, students with disabilities, students experiencing homelessness, and students from low-income backgrounds. Such efforts include investments to launch and expand tutoring programs; provide additional summer learning and afterschool programs; hire additional instructional and mental health staff; increase the diversity of staff; train educators in strategies that accelerate learning and support the social and emotional development and needs of students; and trauma-informed approaches that support students that have experienced significant trauma over the past several school years.

COVID-19 funding has been critical to responding to the pandemic and essential to helping States and LEAs address longstanding inequities in education and education-related supports exacerbated by the pandemic. However, the final tranche of COVID-19 funds—those provided under the ARP Act—expire on September 30, 2024. Consequently, the Department’s Title I request would help alleviate the financial “cliff” otherwise created by the expiration of ARP Act funds and provide additional resources to ensure that students are able to continue to receive the supports they need to recover fully from the long-term effects of lost instructional time due to the pandemic.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Promoting Equity in Education Funding Systems

To create more equitable school finance systems, the request for fiscal year 2024 would continue to support voluntary efforts to identify and address inequities in State and local funding systems, which often favor wealthier districts over districts with concentrated poverty. 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 underserved students, including students from low-income backgrounds in schools with high rates of poverty, 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 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 or 13 percent 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 that attracts and retains effective educators, 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 and youth living in communities with the highest rates of poverty to achieve national average outcomes, while also noting that in many States funding is inadequate for all but the districts with the lowest rates of poverty. 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

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

Grants to local educational agencies

measured primarily by family income; providing progressively more funds to districts with 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 districts with high rates of poverty), and describes wide gaps in State fiscal effort when it comes to funding elementary and secondary education.¹

The Department's proposal would include appropriations language to encourage and support States and LEAs to undertake efforts to identify and develop plans to address inequities in their school finance systems and educational opportunities through a proposed reservation of funds that would provide up to \$100 million to support comprehensive reviews of school finance systems. These funds would pay the costs of (1) voluntary State school funding equity commissions and (2) voluntary local educational agency equity reviews, both of which would include significant and meaningful family and community engagement. Voluntary State equity commissions could carry out activities such as identification of funding and educational opportunity gaps based on measures of equity and adequacy; development of action plans to address existing gaps, including new formulas and plans to transition to new formula allocation processes; and public reporting on the State's progress in addressing school funding inequities. Local educational agency equity reviews would also examine educational opportunity and funding gaps based on measures of equity and adequacy, including analysis of Federal, State, and local resource allocation within an LEA and its impact on student opportunities to learn. LEA grantees might also develop plans to more equitably, adequately, and effectively target existing Federal, State, and local resources, and identify areas in which more resources are needed.

Supporting Program Implementation and Compliance

The Department plans to continue to monitor and expand support for State and LEA implementation of key provisions in current statute that support educational equity. In 2022, the Department carried out a pilot monitoring project that targeted implementation of resource equity provisions in Title I, and is considering additional technical assistance efforts, based on the outcomes from that effort. The Department plans to share the results of those monitoring reviews with grantees and the field as well.

The Department is exploring ways to promote transparency about how States implement school improvement requirements and how much funding they reserve to support these efforts. ESEA provisions for school support and improvement activities require States to periodically review resource allocation to support school improvement for each LEA that is serving a significant number of schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement or implementing targeted support and improvement plans. At the local level, LEAs must identify resource inequities in their support and improvement plans for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement or implementing targeted support and improvement plans.

¹ https://edlawcenter.org/assets/files/pdfs/publications/Is_School_Funding_Fair_7th_Editio.pdf.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Another key area identified for additional support and technical assistance are provisions related to ensuring educational stability for students in foster care. The Department plans to update the non-regulatory guidance published in 2016 and is exploring other efforts to support foster students. The Department recently published exemplar models of data sharing between SEAs and child welfare agencies.¹

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

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

Output Measures	2022	2023	2024
Allocations by LEA Poverty Rate:			
0-15%			
# of LEAs	7,096	6,295	6,295
Dollars	\$4,784,656	\$4,063,356	\$4,520,705
% of Total \$	27.75	22.46	22.47
# of Formula Eligible Children	2,636,900	2,424,339	2,424,339
\$ Per Formula Child	\$1,815	\$1,676	\$1,865
15-25%			
# of LEAs	4,033	4,426	4,426
Dollars	\$7,272,274	\$7,627,186	\$8,478,719
% of Total \$	42.17	42.17	42.15
# of Formula Eligible Children	3,389,746	3,833,943	3,833,943
15-25% \$ Per Formula Child	\$2,145	\$1,989	\$2,211
>25%			
# of LEAs	1,543	2,015	2,015
Dollars	\$5,186,048	\$6,397,615	\$7,116,330
% of Total \$	30.08	35.37	35.38
# of Formula Eligible Children	2,249,742	2,846,067	2,846,067
>25% \$ Per Formula Child	\$2,305	\$2,248	\$2,500
LEA Allocation Subtotal	\$17,242,980	\$18,088,157	\$20,115,754
BIA/Outlying Areas	\$192,850	\$202,200	\$224,750
N&D Program (Part D, Subpart 2)	\$95,974	\$91,445	\$91,298
Census Updates	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000
Funding for State and local equity reviews	0	0	100,000
Grants to LEAs Total	\$17,536,802	\$18,386,802	\$20,536,802

¹ Available at <https://oese.ed.gov/offices/office-of-formula-grants/school-support-and-accountability/students-foster-care/resources/>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, program 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.

Performance measures for this program 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.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2019	56.0%	65.3%
2020	60.0	Not available
2021	64.0	57.6
2022	68.0	
2023	68.0	
2024	72.0	

Additional information: Data for 2021 are not based on the usual methodology for reporting this measure. Performance measures are intended to compare outcomes between consecutive years. However, due to waivers of assessment requirements in response to the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020, data for 2021 are compared to data from 2019. Data for 2021 are reported for 33 of 52 SEAs; data are not available for 4 SEAs (Delaware, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Vermont). In addition, because the data may not be sufficiently representative for an SEA, data are not included for 15 SEAs (Alaska, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Virginia). Nineteen SEAs reported decreasing the gap in achievement on reading assessments in 2021. These results reflect data reported to the Department by SEAs and reviewed through the Department’s data quality review processes. The COVID-19 pandemic disrupted the collection and reporting of assessment data beginning in the 2019-20 school year. Due to disruptions and restarts in schools due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and changes in State assessment practices, the Department urges abundant caution when using

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

assessment data for the 2020-2021 school year. The Department continues to provide technical assistance to SEAs to improve the quality of the data.

Normal reporting will resume for 2022, examining the change from the 2020-2021 school year to the 2021-2022 school year. Data for 2022 will be available in late 2023.

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
2019	54.0%	60.4%
2020	58.0	Not available
2021	62.0	68.6
2022	66.0	
2023	66.0	
2024	70.0	

Additional information: Data for 2021 are not based on the usual methodology for reporting this measure, Performance measures are intended to compare outcomes between consecutive years. However, due to waivers of assessment requirements in response to the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020, data for 2021 are compared to data from 2019. Data for 2021 are reported for 35 of 52 SEAs data are not available for 4 SEAs (Delaware, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Vermont). In addition, because the data may not be sufficiently representative for an SEA, data are not included for 13 SEAs (Alaska, California, Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Virginia). Twenty-four SEAs reported decreasing the gap in achievement on mathematics assessments in 2021. These results reflect data reported to the Department by SEAs and reviewed through the Department's data quality review processes. The COVID-19 pandemic disrupted the collection and reporting of assessment data beginning in the 2019-20 school year. Due to disruptions and restarts in schools due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and changes in State assessment practices, the Department urges abundant caution when using assessment data for the 2020-2021 school year. The Department continues to provide technical assistance to SEAs to improve the quality of the data.

Normal reporting will resume for 2022, examining the change from the 2020-2021 school year to the 2021-2022 school year. Data for 2022 will be available in late 2023.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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

Year	Target	Actual
2019	52.7%	55.8%
2020	56.7	Not available
2021	60.7	63.0
2022	64.7	
2023	64.7	
2024	68.7	

Additional information: Data for 2021 are not based on the usual methodology for reporting this measure. Performance measures are intended to compare outcomes between consecutive years. However, due to waivers of assessment requirements in response to the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020, data for 2021 are compared to data from 2019. Data for 2021 are reported for 27 of 52 SEAs; data are not available for 16 SEAs (Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Idaho, Illinois, Maine, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oregon, Puerto Rico, Tennessee, and Vermont). In addition, because the data may not be sufficiently representative for an SEA, data are not included for 9 SEAs (California, District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, and Pennsylvania). Seventeen SEAs reported decreasing the gap in achievement on science assessments in 2021. These results reflect data reported to the Department by SEAs and reviewed through the Department's data quality review processes. The COVID-19 pandemic disrupted the collection and reporting of assessment data beginning in the 2019-20 school year. Due to disruptions and restarts in schools due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and changes in State assessment practices, the Department urges abundant caution when using assessment data for the 2020-2021 school year. The Department continues to provide technical assistance to SEAs to improve the quality of the data.

Normal reporting will resume for 2022, examining the change from the 2020-2021 school year to the 2021-2022 school year. Data for 2022 will be available in late 2023.

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
2019	58.0%	58.8%
2020	62.0	60.0
2021	66.0	35.4
2022	70.0	
2023	74.0	
2024	78.0	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Additional information: Data for 2021 are reported for 48 SEAs; data are not available for 3 SEAs (Illinois, Texas and Washington). In addition, because the data may not be sufficiently representative for an SEA, data are not included for 1 SEA (Mississippi). Seventeen SEAs reported decreasing the graduation rate gap in 2021. These results reflect data reported to the Department by SEAs and reviewed through the Department's data quality review processes. The COVID-19 pandemic disrupted the collection and reporting of assessment data beginning in the 2019-20 school year. Due to disruptions and restarts in schools and changes in State policy (e.g., requirements for graduation), including modified graduation requirements, due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Department urges abundant caution when using graduation rate data for the 2020-2021 school year. The Department continues to provide technical assistance to SEAs to improve the quality of the data. Data for 2022 will be available in late 2023.

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 2024 Authorization: To be determined ¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2023 Appropriation</u>	<u>2024 Request</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$194,000	\$194,000	0

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grants program provides competitive grants to State educational agencies (SEAs) to develop or enhance comprehensive literacy instruction plans and to make subgrants to eligible entities to support efforts to improve literacy instruction in high-need schools and early childhood education programs.

In awarding Comprehensive Literacy State Development 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 and youth, such as children and youth from low-income backgrounds, children with disabilities, or English learners, and must represent diverse geographical areas. Early childhood education programs that receive subgrants must also 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

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2021. Reauthorization for FY 2024 is expected through appropriations action.

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 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 also reserve up to 5 percent for national activities, including a national evaluation, technical assistance and training, data collection, and reporting.

Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grants is a forward-funded program, 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)
2019	\$190,000
2020	192,000
2021	192,000
2022	192,000
2023	194,000

FY 2024 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2024, the Administration requests \$194 million for Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grants, level with the fiscal year 2023 appropriation. The request would support new and continuation awards for approximately 12 SEAs implementing plans for comprehensive literacy instruction, particularly for underserved students.

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 the 2019 National Assessment of Educational Progress, just 35 percent of 4th-grade students, 34 percent of 8th-grade students, and 37 percent of 12th-grade students scored at or above the proficient level in reading. The results also show continued, wide gaps in reading performance between students from low-income backgrounds and their peers: 51 percent of 4th-grade students from higher-income families scored at or above proficient 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 at or above proficient, compared to 20 percent of 8th-grade students from low-income backgrounds. We also know that the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted educational opportunities and outcomes for many students, including reading proficiency.

Research also shows that students who fail to read well by 4th-grade have a greater likelihood of not graduating high school, leading to a lifetime of diminished earnings and other poor outcomes. Further, significant differences in reading skills, including pre-literacy skills, have

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

been observed between children from low-income backgrounds and other children. For example, the size of the working vocabulary of 4-year-old children from low-income backgrounds are approximately one-third that of children from middle-income backgrounds. Research also shows that these early differences in children’s skills persist over time without supports and interventions. The Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, which is conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics and follows the academic progress of children from kindergarten through 5th grade, has 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.

The Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grants program has been successful in improving literacy for participating students. The percentage of participating high school students who met or exceeded proficiency on State English language arts assessments increased from 41 percent in 2019 to 61 percent in 2022. Similarly, the percentage of participating students who met or exceeded proficiency on State English language arts assessments increased from 44 percent in 2019 to 59 percent in 2022 for 5th-grade students and from 44 percent in 2019 to 60 percent in 2022 for 8th-grade students.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

Output Measures	2022	2023	2024
Funding for new awards	0	\$140,057	\$48,903
Number of new awards	0	9	3
Funding for continuation awards	\$187, 043	\$48,903	\$140,057
Number of continuation awards	24	16	9
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$100	\$100
Amount for Bureau of Indian Education	\$960	\$970	\$970
Amount for Outlying Areas	\$960	\$970	\$970
National activities (including evaluation)	\$3,037	\$3,000	\$3,000

NOTES:

The Department generally carries Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grants funds over into the subsequent fiscal year. Accordingly, the funding from the fiscal year 2022 appropriation shown above will generally be obligated in fiscal year 2023.

The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grants, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. While the Department did not reserve funds from Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grants for this purpose in fiscal year 2022, it may do so in fiscal year 2023 or 2024.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, program 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 this program.

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2019	52%	66%
2020	52	75
2021	75	54
2022	59	58
2023	64	
2024	62	

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. Data for 2023 will be available in 2024.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2019	43%	44%
2020	43	Not applicable
2021	43	34
2022	39	59
2023	44	
2024	63	

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 2023 will be available in 2024.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2019	42%	44%
2020	42	Not applicable
2021	43	38
2022	43	60
2023	64	
2024	64	

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 2023 will be available in 2024.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2019	39%	41%
2020	39	Not applicable
2021	42	40
2022	45	61
2023	65	
2024	67	

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 2023 will be available in 2024.

Measure: The percentage of evidence-based activities implemented by subgrantees that meet the requirements of strong or moderate evidence.

Year	Target	Actual
2022	74%	62%
2023	65	
2024	68	

Additional information: Data reflect State-level determinations of subgrantee adherence to evidence standards defined in section 8101 of the ESEA.

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 2024 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

	2023 Appropriation	2024 Request	Change
	\$30,000	\$30,000	0

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Innovative Approaches to Literacy 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 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 funds to (1) develop or enhance existing school library programs by providing professional learning opportunities to school librarians or updating library materials in underserved 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)
2019	\$27,000
2020	27,000
2021	28,000
2022	29,000
2023	30,000

FY 2024 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2024, the Administration requests \$30 million for Innovative Approaches to Literacy, level with the fiscal year 2023 appropriation. Funds would be used to continue awards initially made in fiscal years 2021 and 2023.

Many schools and districts across the Nation, especially those that serve students from low-income backgrounds, do not have school libraries that deliver high-quality literacy programming. Furthermore, many schools do not have qualified library media specialists or adequate books

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2021. Reauthorization for FY 2024 is expected through appropriations action.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Innovative approaches to literacy

and other resources. In addition, underserved students in many communities have limited access to developmentally appropriate reading material in their homes. Innovative Approaches to Literacy helps address these challenges by supporting research-based school library and early literacy activities and book distribution efforts that are designed to increase student motivation and achievement in reading.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

Output Measures	2022	2023	2024
Funding for new awards	0	\$9,078	0
Number of new awards	0	16	0
Peer review	0	\$300	0
Funding for continuation awards	\$29,000	\$20,622	\$30,000
Number of continuation awards	40	40	56

NOTE: The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including Innovative Approaches to Literacy, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. While the Department did not reserve funds from Innovative Approaches to Literacy for this purpose in fiscal year 2022, it may do so in fiscal years 2023 and 2024.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, program goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the Federal resources provided for the program, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by the program.

The Department established the following performance measures for grantees under this program. Note that grantees were required to report only on measures applicable to the student populations served through the project, 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
2019	70	30
2020	50	67
2021	50	57
2022	50	28
2023	50	N/A
2024	50	

Additional information: Data in this table represents the FY 2018 and FY 2019 cohorts. The FY 2022 data for this measure represents the FY 2019 cohort of IAL grantees. All FY 2019 grantees reported data for this measure. Note that the IAL program discontinued use of this measure in the FY 21 IAL grant competition. This decision was made due to many LEAs not required to provide direct educational service to pre-k students. Grantees continue to have to option to support birth to four-year-old children with IAL activities but are no longer required to provide data on this measure.

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
2019	70	20
2020	30	31
2021	30	41
2022	30	38
2023	30	
2024	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. For 2022, 28 of 40 (70 percent) grantees reported data for this measure. Two of the 40 grantees did not include 4th grade students in their grant program and the remaining ten grantees did not report data. Because this is the first reporting year for the FY 2021 cohort, some grantees used year one as a baseline year and will report student 4th grade student growth data in years 2-5.

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
2019	70	29
2020	30	29
2021	32	40
2022	32	49
2023	32	
2024	35	

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. For 2022, 27 of 40 (68 percent) grantees reported data for this measure. Two of the 40 grantees did not include 8th grade students in their grant program and the remaining eleven grantees did not report data. Because this is the first reporting year for the FY 21 cohort, some grantees used year one as a baseline year and will report 8th grade student growth data in years 2-5.

Measure: The percentage of schools participating in the project whose book to- student ratios increase from the previous year.

Year	Target	Actual
2019	100	98%
2020	99	100
2021	99	99
2022	99	99
2023	99	
2024	99	

Additional Information: For 2022, 33 of 40 (83 percent) grantees reported data for this measure. Because this is the first reporting year for the FY 21 cohort, some grantees used year one as a baseline year and will report their increase in book-to-student ratios in years 2-5.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Innovative approaches to literacy

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

Year	Target	Actual
2019	100	98
2020	98	100
2021	99	99
2022	99	89
2023	99	
2024	99	

Additional Information: For 2022, 38 of 40 (95 percent) grantees reported data for this measure.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2024 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2023 Appropriation</u>	<u>2024 Request</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$375,626	\$375,626	0

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Migrant Education program (MEP) provides financial assistance to State educational agencies (SEAs) to establish and improve programs of education for children of migratory farmworkers and fishers. The goal of the MEP is to enable migratory children and youth: (1) to meet the same challenging State academic standards as other children and youth; and (2) to graduate from high school or a high school equivalency program with an education that prepares them for responsible citizenship, continued education, and employment. To help achieve this objective, program services help migratory children and youth 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 and youth 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 and youth who made a qualifying move in the previous year and children and youth who have left school without a diploma 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.

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

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2021. Reauthorization in FY 2024 is expected through appropriations action.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education

credit accrual and exchange programs for migratory students. The Department is required to consult with States receiving allocations of \$1 million or less about whether they can increase the cost-effectiveness of their programs by entering into inter-state consortium arrangements; in fiscal year 2021, 14 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)
2019	\$374,751
2020	374,751
2021	375,626
2022	375,626
2023	375,626

FY 2024 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2024, the Administration requests \$375.6 million for the Title I Migrant Education Program (MEP), level with the fiscal year 2023 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 and youth represent an especially underserved and hard-to-serve group due to multiple risk factors. In particular, the high mobility of these children and youth 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 and youth. The MEP assists in the coordination of services among States and districts to meet their needs, 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, the challenges the States faced during the COVID-19 pandemic, such as school closures and social distancing, exacerbated these obstacles and highlighted the need for States to continue identifying eligible migratory children and youth outside of traditional

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education

school settings, and to adapt instructional and support services to address the changing needs of migratory children and youth.

Moreover, the characteristics of the migratory population create a need for educational services that go beyond those traditionally supported with State and local education funds. In addition to being highly mobile, migratory children and youth tend to live in poverty, have limited English proficiency, and their families are more likely to experience food and job insecurity as well as poor health and housing conditions. During the 2020-21 school year, 270,959 children, ages birth through 21 years old, were identified as eligible for services; about 33 percent of these children had moved within the past 12 months and nearly 9 percent were identified as students with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. In addition, almost 43 percent of eligible children and youth, aged 3 through 21 years old, were English learners and just over 29 percent were classified as having priority for services under the program (meaning they had moved within the past 12 months and were at risk for not meeting State standards or left school without a diploma.)

Migratory children and youth may also help their families perform agricultural work, and a large number of migratory "emancipated youth" travel without a parent or guardian to obtain migratory work in the fields and in agricultural processing. In 2020-21, approximately 8 percent of children, birth through 21 years old, were identified as out-of-school youth or school-aged youth who do not attend school.

During school year 2020-21, States and local entities provided services under this program to 195,665 identified migratory children and youth, ages birth through 21 years old. Services included supplemental instruction in reading, math, and other academic areas, as well as 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. Of the 9,891 eligible children aged birth through 2 years old, 2,803 received services; of the 27,975 aged 3 through 5 years old (not kindergarten), 17,446 received services; of the 210,271 in kindergarten through grade 12, 160,679 received services; and of the 22,791 identified as out-of-school youth, 14,714 received services. The Department expects to support a similar level of services using fiscal year 2024 funds.

The Department would continue to reserve approximately \$10 million in fiscal year 2024 for coordination activities to serve migratory children and youth, 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, including administration and technical assistance related to the Migrant Student Information Exchange System (MSIX).

In addition, the request includes a \$10 million increase under the Special Education Educational Technology, Media, and Materials program to support the development of innovative technology tools to make Individual Education Programs for children with disabilities, including migrant children with disabilities, more portable to reduce service gaps. The request further includes a \$16 million increase to the Special Education Parent Training and Information Centers program, \$4 million of which would be used to support the creation of a national technical assistance

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education

center to support parents and families of highly mobile children with disabilities to ensure that their learning needs are met, no matter where they receive services. The remaining additional funding would support the creation of new Parent Training Centers, which would support parents and families in particular regions across the country, including parents and families of migratory children and youth.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

Output Measures	2022	2023	2024
Number of eligible children aged birth through 21	270,959	270,959	270,959
SEA program:			
Amount for State grants	\$365,626	\$365,626	\$365,626
Range of State awards	0-\$113,366	0-\$112,301	0-\$112,301
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, program 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 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.

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.*

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education

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
2019	33.4%	26.9%
2020	33.4	Not available
2021	30.0	21.4
2022	31.0	
2023	33.0	
2024	33.0	

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
2019	32.5%	25.7%
2020	32.5	Not available
2021	30.0	17.2
2022	31.0	
2023	33.0	
2024	33.0	

Additional information: The source of the data is ED*Facts*, the Department's system for States to submit kindergarten through grade 12 data. Data for 2020 are not available because the Department waived assessment requirements for 2019-20 due to widespread closures related to the COVID-19 pandemic. Furthermore, given the continued impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on assessment administration and reporting, 2020-2021 data may be incomplete and should be interpreted with caution. Data for 2022 will be available in late summer of 2023.

The Department established measures for grade promotion/graduation and success in Algebra I (a critical subject for helping students attain high school diplomas and enroll in postsecondary education or training) but has not reported or established targets for these measures yet. Department staff have been working with States on data quality for these measures and will report data and targets once the Department has collected enough data to set a baseline and determine targets.

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 education

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

Year	Target	Actual
2019	46	46
2020	46	46
2021	46	46
2022	46	
2023	46	
2024	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/oepdp/ppss/reports.html#migrant>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education

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 have been used to guide the Department's future technical assistance efforts.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2024 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2023 Appropriation</u>	<u>2024 Request</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$49,239	\$52,000	+\$2,761

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The overall purpose of Title I, Part D of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) is to support prevention and intervention programs for children and youth who are neglected, delinquent, or at-risk (1) to help them meet the same challenging State academic standards that all children and youth in the State are expected to meet; (2) to provide them the services needed to make a successful transition from institutionalization to further schooling or employment; and (3) to prevent at-risk youth from dropping out of school, and to provide disconnected youth and students who have dropped out or are returning from correctional facilities or institutions for neglected or delinquent children and youth, with a support system to ensure their continued education and the involvement of their families and communities.

Subpart 1 of Title I Part D receives a direct appropriation to provide financial assistance to State educational agencies (SEAs), which in turn must make subgrants to State agencies which provide free public education to neglected and delinquent (N and D) 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.

The 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, Part A Grants to Local Educational Agencies program, all juvenile facilities may operate institution-wide education programs in which they use 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

¹ The GEPA extension applied through September 30, 2021. Reauthorization for FY 2024 is expected through appropriations action.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth

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 program participants make the transition from State institutions to locally operated programs or to support the successful entry of youth into postsecondary and career and technical education programs.

Subpart 2 of Part D of Title I authorizes a separate companion program that provides funding for local educational agencies (LEAs). SEAs use funds reserved from their allocations under Title I, Part A to make subgrants to eligible LEAs with high numbers or percentages of children and youth in locally operated correctional facilities for children and youth, including public or private institutions and community day programs or schools that serve 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)
2019	\$47,614
2020	47,614
2021	48,239
2022	48,239
2023	49,239

FY 2024 BUDGET

For fiscal year 2024, the Administration requests \$52 million for the Neglected, Delinquent and At-Risk program, \$2.8 million more than the fiscal year 2023 appropriation. The 2015 reauthorization of the ESEA included expanded requirements for Subpart 1 grant recipients, such as emphasizing the attainment of regular high school diplomas as the preferred program outcome, and requiring more effective transitions for youth between correctional facilities and local education programs and schools, particularly to provide for educational continuity, to ensure credit accrual, and to support the successful completion of high school and pathways into postsecondary education and the workforce. The Request reflects the Administration's commitment to address resource inequities across our education system, particularly for underserved students such as students in correctional institutions or other institutional settings.

High-quality education in correctional institutions can help equip students with the skills needed to successfully reenter their communities and either continue their education or join the

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth

workforce.¹ Correctional facilities face unique challenges in educating children and youth in their care. The length of stay in correctional facilities and participation in educational programs by eligible children and youth vary widely, ranging from a few months to several years in State adult correctional facilities and days to months in juvenile detention facilities. This means Subpart 1 grantees must develop a variety of strategies to help ensure the continuity of the education of the students they serve and a successful transition back into their communities and schools. To support Subpart 1 grantees, the Department is examining ways in which technical assistance can be provided to improve and accelerate the transition for youth leaving correctional facilities. The Department will continue its efforts to provide support to States on implementing data reporting and re-entry requirements. Current technical assistance efforts include implementing new monitoring protocols to better understand the data collection carried out at the State level, efforts to adjust and improve data requirements to expand States' ability to respond to the Consolidated State Performance Report, as well as development of various toolkits and other resources for States.

In addition, approximately 34 percent (18,801) of the youth served by the program in school year 2019-20 were students with disabilities. The large share of students with disabilities presents additional considerations for institutions because such students typically require additional, specialized support and attention to be successful in school and beyond. Research has shown that a significant portion of individuals impacted by the criminal justice system have dyslexia² which can negatively impact academic and behavioral outcomes. To address this issue, the Department will explore strategies to provide technical assistance on targeting and improving services to students with disabilities, particularly those with dyslexia, both while in correctional settings and during transition and re-entry into their communities and schools.

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

² Cassidy, *Journal of Correctional Education*, Sep 2021, Vol. 72 Issue 2, p61-81; Moody KC, "Prevalence of dyslexia among Texas prison inmates". *Tex Med*. June 2000.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

Output Measures	2022	2023	2024
Number of participating institutions	728	728	728
Estimated number of students served	55,361	55,361	55,361
Average Federal contribution per child (whole dollars)	\$850	\$916	\$966
Range of awards to States	0-\$3,187	0-\$3,327	0-\$3,451
Average State award	\$904	\$941	\$994
Technical assistance	\$1,206	\$1,231	\$1,300

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, program 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 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.*

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth

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
2019	20.8%	13.5%
2020	21.8	13.6
2021	22.8	14.4
2022	23.8	
2023	23.8	
2024	23.8	

Additional information: The source of the data is *EDFacts*, the Department’s system for States to submit kindergarten through grade 12 data. The percentage of students obtaining their GED or high school diploma in 2021 increased from the previous year. Actual values for 2021 represent 49 (of 51) grantees reporting both age data and at a minimum one of two outcomes—receiving a GED or high school diploma. Data are unavailable for two States and three additional States did not report outcomes of students after their departure of a Title I, Part D program. Twenty-one additional States reported zeroes for outcomes after students exited the program. This may be due, in part, to legal prohibitions against collecting data on students after facility exit in some States, or difficulty tracking students across academic settings.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2019	63.6%	53.6%
2020	64.6	52.1
2021	65.6	61.7
2022	66.6	
2023	66.6	
2024	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 juvenile detention and juvenile correctional institutions, and not students in adult correctional institutions. The percentage of students obtaining high school course credits increased in 2021 from the previous year. Actual values for 2021 represent 47 grantees (of 51 with applicable programs) reporting age and outcome data for programs other than adult corrections. Data are unavailable for two States and two States reported students earning high school course credits only in adult corrections.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth

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
2019	78.4%	62.8%
2020	79.4	58.8
2021	80.4	61.7
2022	81.4	
2023	81.4	
2024	81.4	

Additional information: The percentage of students showing improvement in reading increased in 2021 from the previous year. The discrepancy between the target and actual numbers of students achieving the outcome may be attributable to a number of factors, including the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on both education and testing. Moreover, the long-term students who completed reading pre- and post-test exams only represented 51 percent of the total number of long-term students (an increase from the 46 percent of students reporting reading assessment data in 2020, but still lower than the 56 percent of students reporting these data in 2019). Furthermore, the States that reported data on long-term students who completed reading pre- and post-test exams in 2021 represented 48 (of 51) grantees, compared with 51 grantees that reported results in 2020.

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
2019	79.9%	63.1%
2020	80.9	59.3
2021	81.9	61.0
2022	82.9	
2023	82.9	
2024	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. The percentage of students showing improvement in mathematics in 2021 increased from the previous year. The discrepancy between the target goal and actual numbers of students achieving the outcome may be attributable to a number of factors, including the quality of the data reported by facilities and challenges to educational programs or testing due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Additionally, the long-term students who completed mathematics pre- and post-test exams in 2021 only represented 50 percent of the total number of long-term students reported, which is an increase from 2020, but still lower than in 2019. Furthermore, the States that reported data on long-term students who completed mathematics

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth

pre- and post-test exams in 2021 represented 48 grantees (out of 51), compared with 51 grantees that reported results in 2020.

Efficiency measures

Measure: The cost per high school diploma or equivalent.

Year	Target	Actual
2019	\$4,211	\$7,070
2020	4,170	8,127
2021	4,128	11,479
2022	4,087	
2023	4,087	
2024	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. The substantial increase in cost for 2021 may in part be due to educational disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, including a decrease in the number of students receiving diplomas.

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.
- State facilities spent the majority of their funds on personnel expenses; however, many State agency coordinators (54 percent) reported shortages of qualified instructional and support staff, and about one-third of State agency coordinators reported that it was a major or moderate challenge to hire staff within their credentialed content area.

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, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

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 2024 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2023 Appropriation</u>	<u>2024 Request</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$52,123	\$66,123	+\$14,000

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 farm work.

Projects funded under the High School Equivalency Program (HEP) recruit migratory 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 migratory 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.

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2015. Reauthorization for FY 2024 is expected through appropriations action.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

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

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2019	\$44,623
2020	45,623
2021	46,123
2022	48,123
2023	52,123

FY 2024 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2024, the Administration requests \$66.1 million for Special Programs for Migrant Students, \$14 million more than a fiscal year 2023 appropriation. The request would continue to support the planned expansion of programs that have demonstrated success in helping migratory youth, who are particularly at risk for low educational, employment, and earnings outcomes, in obtaining a high school equivalency certificate or helping first-year undergraduate migrant students successfully complete their first year of postsecondary education.

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, full-time degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates at 4-year institutions was 82 percent from 2019 to 2020, and 61 percent at 2-year institutions during the same period.¹

Data from a 2021 US Department of Labor research report (Findings from the National Agricultural Workers Survey 2017-18: A Demographic and Employment Profile of United States Farmworkers)² show that a significant proportion of farmworkers tend to be young, under-educated, unlikely to be proficient in English, and from low-income backgrounds. In 2019-20, individuals aged 14-19 constituted five percent of farmworkers, and one-third of farmworkers overall were younger than 35; average educational attainment was 9th grade; only 32 percent of

¹ National Center for Education Statistics. (2022). Undergraduate Retention and Graduation Rates. Condition of Education. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. Retrieved February 13, 2023, from <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/ctr>

² https://wdr.doleta.gov/research/FullText_Documents/ETAOP2022-16_NAWS_Research_Report_16_508c.pdf

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

respondents said they could speak English well; and 20 percent of farmworkers had family incomes below the poverty level.

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,”¹ the median annual wage for agricultural workers in 2021 was \$29,680, 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 2020 the median earnings for full-time, year-round workers aged 25-34 were \$36,600 for a person with a high school diploma or equivalent; \$44,100 for a person with an associate’s degree; and \$59,600 for a person with a bachelor’s degree.² 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.

The Administration is requesting appropriations language that would allow the Department to override the distribution of funds between the HEP and CAMP programs required by the statute and reduce the percentage of funds available for a program in the event a competition does not yield a sufficient number of high-quality applications for one of the programs.

¹ Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, Agricultural Workers, at <https://www.bls.gov/ooh/farming-fishing-and-forestry/agricultural-workers.htm> (visited February 13, 2023).

² National Center for Education Statistics. (2022). Annual Earnings by Educational Attainment. Condition of Education. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. Retrieved February 13, 2023, from <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cba>.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

Output Measures	2022	2023	2024
Outreach, technical assistance, and professional development	\$194	\$261	\$331
HEP:			
Number of students served	3,796	4,503	5,609
Funding for new awards	\$2,843	\$3,136	\$13,769
Number of new awards	6	7	30
Peer review of new award applications	\$49	0	\$100
Average new award	\$474	\$448	\$457
Funding for continuation awards	\$20,824	\$22,795	\$19,027
Number of continuation awards	44	50	41
Average continuation award	\$473	\$456	\$464
Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars)	\$6,247	\$5,759	\$5,865
CAMP:			
Number of students served	2,047	2,088	2,592
Funding for new awards	\$5,208	\$931	\$14,089
Number of new awards	11	2	31
Peer review of new award applications	\$47	0	\$100
Average new award	\$473	\$454	\$475
Funding for continuation awards	\$18,720	\$24,999	\$18,707
Number of continuation awards	45	56	41
Average continuation award	\$416	\$446	\$456
Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars)	\$11,712	\$12,419	\$12,691
Pooled evaluation¹	\$241		

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, program goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of

¹ Funds transferred to HEA Pooled Evaluation Authority pursuant to Section 312 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2022 (Public Law 117-103, March 15, 2022; 136 Stat. 49), which states the Secretary may reserve not more than 0.5 percent from any amount made available in this Act for an HEA program, except for any amounts made available for subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the HEA, to carry out rigorous and independent evaluations and to collect and analyze outcome data for any program authorized by the HEA. The Department may reserve funds in future years.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the Federal resources provided for the program as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by the program.

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

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2019	69.0%	66.6%
2020	69.0	62.0
2021	69.0	65.2
2022	69.0	
2023	69.0	
2024	69	

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. Grantee performance for 2020 was affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in the closure of many testing centers that administer high school equivalency tests. In addition, grantees had to develop strategies to provide services remotely and online in the middle of their project periods. Grantees indicated that disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic continued during 2021, including limited opportunities for participants to take high school equivalency tests because of lack of open test sites and prolonged wait times. Data collected for fiscal year 2022 will be available in late 2023.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

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
2019	80.0%	83.9%
2020	80.0	75.1
2021	80.0	84.5
2022	80.0	
2023	80.0	
2024	80.0	

Additional information: The source of data is grantee performance reports. Data for this measure are based on actual placement after receipt of a high school equivalency credential. Grantee performance for 2020 was affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in the closure of many testing centers that administer high school equivalency tests. In addition, grantees had to develop strategies to provide services remotely and online in the middle of their project periods. Grantees indicated that disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic continued during 2021, including limited opportunities for participants to take high school equivalency tests because of lack of open test sites and prolonged wait times. Data collected for fiscal year 2022 will be available in late 2023.

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
2019	86.0%	87.9%
2020	86.0	85.8
2021	86.0	70.8
2022	86.0	
2023	86.0	
2024	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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

their postsecondary program between the second and fifth years of the project. Grantee performance for 2020 was affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, which required grantees to develop strategies to provide services remotely and online in the middle of their project periods. Grantees indicated that disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic continued during 2021, such as staff shortages and professional development and training, and cancellation of events that are particularly important for first generation students like student orientations, campus tours, and parent seminars. The lack of staff meant reduced advisory and other support services. Data collected for fiscal year 2021 will be available in late 2022.

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
2019	90.0	96.4
2020	92.0	96.1
2021	92.0	96.4
2022	92.0	
2023	92.0	
2024	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. Grantee performance for 2020 was affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, which required grantees to develop strategies to provide services remotely and online in the middle of their project periods. Data collected for fiscal year 2022 will be available in late 2023.

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.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

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
2019	\$10,131	\$8,594
2020	10,232	12,458
2021	10,334	12,104
2022	10,438	
2023	10,541	
2024	10,647	

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

Year	Target Cost Per Residential Participant	Actual Cost Per Residential Participant
2019	\$19,727	\$15,197
2020	19,924	19,168
2021	20,123	10,733
2022	20,324	
2023	20,527	
2024	20,732	

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
2019	\$15,968	\$16,378
2020	16,127	28,120
2021	16,289	29,688
2022	16,451	
2023	16,616	
2024	16,782	

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

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. Grantee performance for 2020 was affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in the closure of many testing centers that administer high school equivalency tests, thus reducing the number of participants earning a high school equivalency credential, which is the basis for these cost measures. Data collected for fiscal year 2021 will be available in late 2023.

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
2019	\$15,440	\$10,061
2020	15,688	11,393
2021	15,939	
2022	16,194	
2023	16,453	
2024	16,716	

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
2019	\$24,745	\$13,429
2020	25,141	13,804
2021	25,543	
2022	25,952	
2023	26,367	
2024	26,789	

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
2019	\$18,817	\$11,551
2020	19,118	15,850
2021	19,424	
2022	19,735	
2023	20,051	
2024	20,372	

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. Grantee performance for 2020 was affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, which required grantees to develop strategies to provide services remotely and online in the middle of their project periods. Data collected for fiscal year 2021 will be available in late 2023.

Account Summary Table

[Click here for the online version](#)

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2024 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET
(in thousands of dollars)

	Cat Code	2022 Appropriation	2023 Appropriation	2024 President's Budget Request	FY 2024 President's Budget Request Compared to FY 2023 Appropriation	
					Amount	Percent
Education for the Disadvantaged						
1. Grants to local educational agencies (ESEA I-A):						
(a) Basic grants (section 1124)						
Annual appropriation	D	5,695,625	5,695,625	5,695,625	0	0.00%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	763,776	763,776	763,776	0	0.00%
Subtotal	D	6,459,401	6,459,401	6,459,401	0	0.00%
(b) Concentration grants (section 1124A)						
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	1,362,301	1,362,301	1,362,301	0	0.00%
(c) Targeted grants (section 1125)						
Annual appropriation	D	500,000	925,000	2,000,000	1,075,000	116.22%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	4,357,550	4,357,550	4,357,550	0	0.00%
Subtotal		4,857,550	5,282,550	6,357,550	1,075,000	20.35%
(d) Education finance incentive grants (section 1125A)						
Annual appropriation	D	500,000	925,000	2,000,000	1,075,000	116.22%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	4,357,550	4,357,550	4,357,550	0	0.00%
Subtotal		4,857,550	5,282,550	6,357,550	1,075,000	20.35%
Subtotal, Grants to LEAs		17,536,802	18,386,802	20,536,802	2,150,000	11.69%
Discretionary	D	17,536,802	18,386,802	20,536,802	2,150,000	11.69%
Current		6,695,625	7,545,625	9,695,625	2,150,000	28.49%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year		10,841,177	10,841,177	10,841,177	0	0.00%
2. Comprehensive literacy state development grants (ESEA II-B-2, section 2222)						
	D	192,000	194,000	194,000	0	0.00%
3. Innovative approaches to literacy (ESEA II-B-2, section 2226)						
	D	29,000	30,000	30,000	0	0.00%
4. State agency programs:						
(a) Migrant (ESEA I-C)						
	D	375,626	375,626	375,626	0	0.00%
(b) Neglected, delinquent and at-risk children and youth (ESEA I-D)						
	D	48,239	49,239	52,000	2,761	5.61%
Subtotal, State agency programs		423,865	424,865	427,626	2,761	0.65%
5. Special programs for migrant students (HEA IV-A-5)						
	D	48,123	52,123	66,123	14,000	26.86%
Total, Appropriation		18,229,790	19,087,790	21,254,551	2,166,761	11.35%
Discretionary	D	18,229,790	19,087,790	21,254,551	2,166,761	11.35%
Current		7,388,613	8,246,613	10,413,374	2,166,761	26.27%
Prior year's advance		10,841,177	10,841,177	10,841,177	10,841,177	0.00%

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