

Department of Education
EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED
Fiscal Year 2023 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 2022 Appropriations Reports | 10 |
| Summary of Request | 11 |
| Activities: | |
| Grants to local educational agencies..... | 13 |
| Comprehensive literacy development grants | 25 |
| Innovative approaches to literacy | 30 |
| Migrant education | 34 |
| Neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth..... | 41 |
| Special programs for migrant students..... | 49 |
| Account Summary Table..... | 58 |
| State Tables* | |

*State tables reflecting final 2021 allocations and 2022 and 2023 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"), \$21,280,551,000, of which \$10,340,251,000 shall become available on July 1, 2023, and shall remain available through September 30, 2024, and of which \$10,841,177,000 shall become available on October 1, 2023, and shall remain available through September 30, 2024, for academic year 2023-2024:¹

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, 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 \$6,357,550,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA:⁵ *Provided further*, That \$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 \$30,000,000 shall be for competitive grants to support strong partnerships, which may include those among State educational agencies, local educational agencies and child welfare agencies, to create and implement innovative strategies for improving the education of foster children and youth under part D of title I of the ESEA:⁸

Provided further, That the Secretary may reserve up to 10 percent of the amount referred to in the previous proviso to provide technical assistance in the implementation of these grants:⁹

Provided further, That \$220,000,000 shall be for carrying out subpart 2 of part B of title II:¹⁰

Provided further, That \$66,123,000 shall be for carrying out section 418A of the HEA:¹¹

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.¹²

NOTE

A full-year 2022 appropriation for this account was not enacted at the time the budget was prepared; therefore, the budget assumes this account is operating under the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2022 (Division A of P.L. 117-43, as amended). The amounts included for 2022 reflect the annualized level provided by the continuing resolution.

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 \$10,340,251,000 shall become available on July 1, 2023, and shall remain available through September 30, 2024, and of which \$10,841,177,000 shall become available on October 1, 2023, and shall remain available through September 30, 2024, for academic year 2023-2024:...</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, 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 \$6,357,550,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA:...</p> | <p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Targeted Grants.</p> |
| <p>⁶ ...<i>Provided further</i>, \$6,357,550,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A of the ESEA:...</p> | <p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Education Finance Incentive Grants.</p> |

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 \$30,000,000 shall be for competitive grants to support strong partnerships, which may include those among State educational agencies, local educational agencies and child welfare agencies, to create and implement innovative strategies for improving the education of foster children and youth under part D of title I of the ESEA:...</p> | <p>This language would provide \$30 million under the Neglected, Delinquent, and At-Risk Children and Youth program for competitive grants to create and implement innovative strategies for improving the education of foster children and youth.</p> |
| <p>⁹ ...<i>Provided further</i>, That the Secretary may reserve up to 10 percent of the amount referred to in the previous proviso to provide technical assistance in the implementation of these grants:...</p> | <p>This language would allow the Secretary to reserve up to \$3 million from the proposed \$30 million for activities to support foster children and youth to provide technical assistance to grantees.</p> |
| <p>¹⁰ ...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$220,000,000 shall be for carrying out subpart 2 of part B of title II:...</p> | <p>This language provides funding for Comprehensive literacy development grants and Innovative approaches to literacy.</p> |
| <p>¹¹ ...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$66,123,000 shall be for carrying out section 418A of the HEA. ...</p> | <p>This language provides funding for Special Programs for Migrant Students.</p> |
| <p>¹² ...<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 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.</p> |

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriation, Adjustments and Transfers
(dollars in thousands)

| Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Discretionary: | | | |
| Appropriation | \$17,226,790 | \$17,226,790 | \$21,280,551 |
| Total, discretionary appropriation | <u>17,226,790</u> | <u>17,226,790</u> | <u>21,280,551</u> |
| Mandatory (proposed): | | | |
| Appropriation | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>16,000,000</u> |
| Total, mandatory appropriation | 0 | 0 | 16,000,000 |
| Advance: | | | |
| Advance for succeeding fiscal year | -10,841,177 | -10,841,177 | -10,841,177 |
| Advance from prior year | <u>10,841,177</u> | <u>10,841,177</u> | <u>10,841,177</u> |
| Total, budget authority | <u>17,226,790</u> | <u>17,226,790</u> | <u>37,280,551</u> |

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Changes
(dollars in thousands)

| | |
|--------------------|--------------|
| 2022 Discretionary | \$17,226,790 |
| 2023 Discretionary | 21,280,551 |
| 2023 Mandatory | 16,000,000 |
| Net change | +20,053,761 |

| Increases: | 2022 base | Change from base |
|---|--------------|---------------------|
| <u>Program:</u> | | |
| Increase for Grants to LEAs consistent with President Biden’s campaign promise to dramatically increase funding for Title I schools and help address long-standing funding disparities between under resourced school districts and their wealthier counterparts. 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. The proposed increase includes \$16 billion in proposed mandatory funding. | \$16,536,802 | +\$20,000,000 |
| Increase funding for Neglected, Delinquent and At-Risk Children and Youth to provide additional resources for underserved populations covered by the program and for an initiative to fund competitive grants to improve educational opportunities and outcomes of foster children and youth. | 48,239 | +33,761 |
| Increase funding for Special Programs for Migrant Students to support of the President’s goal to advance equity in education and significantly expand programs that have demonstrated success in helping migrant youth. | 46,123 | +20,000 |
| Net change | | +20,053,761 |

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Authorizing Legislation

(dollars in thousands)

| Activity | 2022 Authorized | 2022 Estimate | 2023 Authorized | 2023 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>) | (2) | \$6,459,401 | 2 | \$6,459,401 |
| Concentration grants (<i>Section 1124A</i>) | (2) | 1,362,301 | 2 | 1,362,301 |
| Targeted grants (<i>Section 1125</i>) | (2) | 4,357,550 | 2 | 6,357,550 |
| Targeted grants (<i>Section 1125</i>) - <i>Mandatory, proposed</i> | | | | 8,000,000 |
| Education finance incentive grants (<i>Section 1125A</i>) | (2) | 4,357,550 | 2 | 6,357,550 |
| Education finance incentive grants (<i>Section 1125A</i>) - <i>Mandatory, proposed</i> | | | | 8,000,000 |
| Comprehensive literacy development grants (<i>ESEA-II-B-2, Section 2222</i>) | (3) | 192,000 | To be determined ^{1,3} | 192,000 |
| Innovative approaches to literacy (<i>ESEA-II-B-2, Section 2226</i>) | (3) | 28,000 | To be determined ^{1,3} | 28,000 |
| 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 | 48,239 | To be determined ¹ | 82,000 |
| Special Programs for Migrant Students (<i>HEA IV-A-5</i>) | 0 ⁴ | 46,123 | To be determined ⁴ | 66,123 |
| Total definite authorization | 0 | | To be determined | |
| Total appropriation | | \$17,226,790 | | \$37,280,551 |

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2021. Reauthorization for FY 2023 is expected through appropriations action.

² Of the total funds appropriated for Grants to LEAs, an amount equal to the fiscal year 2001 appropriation of \$7,397,690 thousand is to be distributed through the Basic Grants formula. An amount equal to the fiscal year 2001 appropriation of \$1,365,031 thousand is to be distributed through the Concentration Grants formula. Amounts appropriated in excess of the fiscal year 2001 appropriation are to be divided equally and distributed through the Targeted Grants and Educational Finance Incentive Grants formulas. In recent years, Congress specified the amounts to be distributed through each formula in the annual appropriations acts.

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

⁴ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2015. Reauthorization for FY 2023 is expected through appropriations action.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

| Year | Budget Estimate to Congress | House Allowance | Senate Allowance | Appropriation |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| 2014 ¹ | \$15,683,649 | N/A | \$15,875,231 | \$15,552,693 |
| (2014 Advance for 2015) | (11,681,898) | | (10,841,177) | (10,841,177) |
| 2015 ² | 15,377,965 | N/A | 15,566,226 | 15,536,107 |
| (2015 Advance for 2016) | (11,681,898) | | (10,841,177) | (10,841,177) |
| 2016 ³ | 16,592,546 | \$14,869,641 | 15,455,802 | 16,016,790 |
| (2016 Advance for 2017) | (10,841,177) | (10,841,177) | (10,841,177) | (10,841,177) |
| 2017 ⁴ | 16,043,790 | 15,986,790 | 16,066,790 | 16,143,790 |
| (2017 Advance for 2018) | (10,841,177) | (11,041,177) | (10,841,177) | (10,767,555) |
| 2018 ⁵ | 16,347,558 | 15,953,790 | 16,169,198 | 16,107,781 |
| (2018 Advance for 2019) | (10,841,177) | (10,841,177) | (10,841,177) | (10,841,177) |
| 2019 ⁶ | \$15,926,790 | \$16,443,790 | \$16,568,790 | \$16,543,790 |
| (2019 Advance for 2020) | (11,681,898) | (10,841,177) | (10,841,177) | (10,841,177) |
| 2020 ⁷ | 16,376,790 | 17,563,802 | 16,543,790 | \$16,996,790 |
| (2020 Advance for 2021) | (11,681,898) | (10,841,177) | (10,841,177) | (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 House allowance is shown as N/A because there was no Subcommittee action. The level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Subcommittee action only.

³ 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.

⁴ 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.

⁵ 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).

⁶ 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).

⁷ 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 | 17,246,790 | 36,756,790 | 33,802,790 | 37,246,790 |
| (2022 Advance for 2023) | (10,841,177) | (10,841,177) | (10,841,177) | (10,841,177) |
| 2023 | 37,280,551 | | | |
| (2023 Advance for 2024) | (10,841,177) | | | |
| Mandatory | 16,000,000 | | | |

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 on the FY 2022 Consolidated Appropriations Act; the Senate allowance reflects the Chairman's mark; and the Appropriation reflects the annualized continuing resolution level.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Significant Items in FY 2022 Appropriations Reports

Innovative Approaches to Literacy

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

Response: The Department incorporated each of the report language directives from Congress into the Notice of Final Priorities and Requirement for the IAL program, published in the Federal Register on July 12, 2021, and in fiscal year 2021 IAL competition. The Department expects to continue to incorporate these priorities when developing a new IAL competition.

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 \$37.2 billion in fiscal year 2023 for the programs in this account, including \$16 billion in mandatory funding.

The \$36.5 billion request for Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) supports President Biden's campaign promise to triple funding for Title I schools to help address long-standing funding disparities between underresourced school districts and their wealthier counterparts. The program provides support 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 \$192 million request for Comprehensive Literacy Development Grants would support competitive grants to SEAs to provide targeted, evidence-based literacy intervention in high-need schools. Grantees must subgrant funds to LEAs to support literacy interventions for children from birth through kindergarten entry and for students from kindergarten through grade 12.

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

The request would 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 \$82 million request for the State agency Neglected and Delinquent program provides a \$3.8 million increase for programs that serve students who are educated in institutional settings or correctional facilities and will likely transition to local school systems, as well as \$30 million for an initiative to fund competitive grants to improve educational opportunities and outcomes of foster children and youth.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Finally, the request includes \$66.1 million for Special Programs for Migrant Students, an increase of \$20 million, or 43 percent, over the fiscal year 2022 CR level, 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 2023 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget authority:

| | 2022 Estimate | 2023 Request | Change |
|--|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| Basic grants | \$6,459,401 | \$6,459,401 | 0 |
| Concentration grants | 1,362,301 | 1,362,301 | 0 |
| Targeted grants | 4,357,550 | 6,357,550 | +\$2,000,000 |
| Education finance incentive grants | 4,357,550 | 6,357,550 | +\$2,000,000 |
| Total | 16,536,802 | 20,536,802 | +\$4,000,000 |
| Annual appropriation | 5,695,625 | 9,695,625 | +\$4,000,000 |
| Advance for succeeding fiscal year | 10,841,177 | 10,841,177 | 0 |
| <u>Mandatory funding, proposed</u> | | | |
| Targeted grants | 0 | 8,000,000 | +8,000,000 |
| Education finance incentive grants | 0 | 8,000,000 | +8,000,000 |
| Total, Mandatory Funding | 0 | 16,000,000 | +16,000,000 |
| Total, Discretionary and Mandatory Request | 16,536,802 | 36,536,802 | +20,000,00 |

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

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2021; reauthorization for FY 2023 is expected through appropriations action.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

English learners and may administer alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards to students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, provided that the number of students taking these alternate assessments does not exceed 1 percent of all assessed students in the State.

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

Accountability and School Improvement

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

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

The State's indicators are also used to identify, at least once every 3 years, a statewide category of schools for comprehensive support and improvement (CSI schools), which must include 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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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 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.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

In determining allocations under each of the four formulas, the statute requires the use of annually updated Census Bureau estimates of the number of children from low-income backgrounds in each LEA. There is roughly a 2-year lag between the income year used for LEA poverty estimates and the fiscal year in which those estimates are used to make Title I allocations. For example, the fiscal year 2021 allocations were based on LEA poverty estimates 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.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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 |
|---------------|--------------|----------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|--------------|
| 2018 | \$6,459,401 | \$1,362,301 | \$3,969,050 | \$3,969,050 | \$15,759,802 |
| 2019 | 6,459,401 | 1,362,301 | 4,019,050 | 4,019,050 | 15,859,802 |
| 2020 | 6,459,401 | 1,362,301 | 4,244,050 | 4,244,050 | 16,309,802 |
| 2021 | 6,459,401 | 1,362,301 | 4,357,550 | 4,357,550 | 16,536,802 |
| 2022 Estimate | 6,459,401 | 1,362,301 | 4,357,550 | 4,357,550 | 16,536,802 |

FY 2023 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2023, the Administration requests \$36.5 billion for Title I Grants to LEAs, including \$20.5 billion in discretionary funds and \$16 billion in mandatory funds. This request, \$20 billion more than a fiscal year 2022 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2021 appropriation, makes significant progress towards President Biden’s commitment to dramatically 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’s 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 dramatically expanding this program, school districts can increase services for students that meet their local needs, such as by increasing access to and support for 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 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 other student subgroups. For example, this includes investments to launch and expand tutoring programs; hire additional instructional and mental health staff; train educators in strategies that accelerate

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

learning and to 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.

While these investments are critical to responding to the pandemic, in many communities they are long overdue, and essential to ensuring that students receive the support they need. To ensure that these critical supports for students are sustained, SEAs and LEAs need additional long-term funding. Additional Title I funds will help SEAs and LEAs continue strategies that they find to have the greatest impact on students, as well as sustain additional support for students. These investments will not only help students recover but address the underlying disparities that impacted students prior to the pandemic. The requested funds will also help districts continue to confidently invest ARP and other relief funds, and address concerns about hitting a financial cliff when the relief funds expire.

PROMOTING EQUITY IN EDUCATION FUNDING SYSTEMS

The proposed additional \$20 billion in funding will make significant progress towards closing the estimated \$23 billion funding gap between majority white and majority non-white school districts, as well as gaps in the allocation of State and local education funds to districts serving high concentrations of students from low-income backgrounds and districts enrolling a majority of students from wealthier families. These gaps in funding produce inequitable access to key determinants of future success, including high-quality preschool, rigorous coursework, and effective educators. However, as federal funding only comprises approximately 8 percent of total public elementary and secondary education funding in typical years (excluding COVID-relief funds), this problem cannot be solved through increased federal funding alone.

In order to create more equitable school finance systems, the request for fiscal year 2023 would help 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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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, 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 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.⁴

The Administration's proposal includes 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 by paying 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 throughout the process. 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 a plan to transition to a new formula; and

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_Edit.pdf.

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

⁴ https://edlawcenter.org/assets/files/pdfs/publications/Is_School_Funding_Fair_7th_Edit.pdf.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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.

The 2023 request also supports efforts to increase transparency through development of a P-12 equity data dashboard at the Department (see description of request in the [Program Administration](#) account). The dashboard would aggregate existing information about factors affecting P-12 educational opportunity and equity and make such data readily available to the public. The dashboard could include school-level data on resources (including per-pupil expenditures), school environmental factors, opportunities to engage in high-quality learning, access to well-rounded coursework, entry into college and career pathways, access to most prepared and effective school staff, or other factors that can increase student well-being and lead to success. This type of information would help increase transparency, increase meaningful engagement with diverse stakeholders, and promote informed decision making that can lead to strategies for eliminating inequities in the P-12 system.

The Department will also continue to support State and LEA efforts to address educational equity through monitoring on and technical assistance for meeting resource equity requirements that exist under current statute. 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.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

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

| Output Measures | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Allocations by LEA Poverty Rate: | | | |
| 0-15% | | | |
| # of LEAs | 6,556 | 7,081 | 7,081 |
| Dollars | \$3,996,811 | \$4,513,906 | \$9,608,614 |
| % of Total \$ | 24.60 | 27.77 | 26.78 |
| # of Formula Eligible Children | 2,462,624 | 2,638,311 | 2,638,311 |
| \$ Per Formula Child | \$1,623 | \$1,711 | \$3,642 |
| 15-25% | | | |
| # of LEAs | 4,158 | 4,042 | 4,042 |
| Dollars | \$6,644,217 | \$6,813,561 | \$15,077,583 |
| % of Total \$ | 40.88 | 41.91 | 42.01 |
| # of Formula Eligible Children | 3,519,898 | 3,379,938 | 3,379,938 |
| 15-25% \$ Per Formula Child | \$1,888 | \$2,016 | \$4,461 |
| >25% | | | |
| # of LEAs | 1,964 | 1,549 | 1,549 |
| Dollars | \$5,610,375 | \$4,928,096 | \$11,201,148 |
| % of Total \$ | 34.52 | 30.32 | 31.21 |
| # of Formula Eligible Children | 2,765,235 | 2,268,229 | 2,268,229 |
| >25% \$ Per Formula Child | \$2,029 | \$2,173 | \$4,938 |
| LEA Allocation Subtotal | \$16,251,403 | \$16,255,563 | \$35,887,345 |
| BIA/Outlying Areas | \$181,850 | \$181,850 | \$400,750 |
| N&D Program (Part D, Subpart 2) | \$98,549 | \$94,389 | \$143,707 |
| Census Updates | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 |
| Funding for State and local equity reviews | 0 | 0 | \$100,000 |
| Grants to LEAs Total | \$16,536,802 | \$16,536,802 | \$36,536,802 |

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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 |
|------|--------|---------------|
| 2018 | 52.0% | 58.8% |
| 2019 | 56.0 | 65.3 |
| 2020 | 60.0 | Not available |
| 2021 | 64.0 | |
| 2022 | 68.0 | |
| 2023 | 68.0 | |

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 |
|------|--------|---------------|
| 2018 | 50.0% | 37.3% |
| 2019 | 54.0 | 60.4 |
| 2020 | 58.0 | Not available |
| 2021 | 62.0 | |
| 2022 | 66.0 | |
| 2023 | 66.0 | |

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 |
|------|--------|---------------|
| 2018 | 48.7% | 45.0% |
| 2019 | 52.7 | 55.8 |
| 2020 | 56.7 | Not available |
| 2021 | 60.7 | |
| 2022 | 64.7 | |
| 2023 | 64.7 | |

Additional information: Due to the extraordinary circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, the U.S. Department of Education waived Title I, Part A assessment requirements for all States for the 2019-2020 school year. As a result, data on the performance of students on

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

State reading assessments for the 2019-2020 school year is not available. Data for 2021 will be available in late fall of 2022.

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 |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2018 | 54.0% | 56.3% |
| 2019 | 58.0 | 58.8 |
| 2020 | 62.0 | 60.0 |
| 2021 | 66.0 | |
| 2022 | 70.0 | |
| 2023 | 74.0 | |

Additional information: Data for 2020 are reported for 50 States, including DC and Puerto Rico; data are not available for Illinois and Texas. Thirty States reported decreasing the graduation rate gap in 2020. These results reflect data reported to the Department by States and reviewed through the Department's data quality review processes. The results may reflect data quality issues. The Department continues to provide technical assistance to States to improve the quality of the data. In addition, the results may reflect changes in State policy (e.g., requirements for graduation), including modified graduation requirements for the 2019-2020 school year due to the extraordinary circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic.

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 2023 Authorization: To be determined ¹

Budget Authority:

| <u>2022</u> <u>Estimate</u> | <u>2023</u> <u>Request</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|
| \$192,000 | \$192,000 | 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, such as children from low-income backgrounds, children with disabilities, or English learners, and must represent diverse geographical areas. Early childhood education programs that receive subgrants must 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 2023 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) |
|---------------|------------------------|
| 2018 | \$190,000 |
| 2019 | 190,000 |
| 2020 | 192,000 |
| 2021 | 192,000 |
| 2022 Estimate | 192,000 |

FY 2023 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2023, the Administration requests \$192 million for Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grants, level with a fiscal year 2022 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2021 appropriation. The request would support new or continuation awards for approximately 25 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 21 percent of 8th-grade students from low-income backgrounds.

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 been observed between children from low-income backgrounds and other children. For

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

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.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

| <u>Output Measures</u> | <u>2021</u> | <u>2022</u> | <u>2023</u> |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Funding for new awards | 0 | 0 | \$138,077 |
| Number of new awards | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Funding for continuation awards | \$187,086 | \$187,080 | \$48,903 |
| Number of continuation awards | 24 | 24 | 16 |
| Peer review of new award applications | 0 | 0 | \$100 |
| Amount for Bureau of Indian Education | \$960 | \$960 | \$960 |
| Amount for Outlying Areas | \$960 | \$960 | \$960 |
| National activities (including evaluation) | \$2,994 | \$3,000 | \$3,000 |

NOTES:

The Department generally carries Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grants funds over into the subsequent fiscal year. Accordingly, the outputs from fiscal year 2021 appropriations shown above, for example, will generally be obligated in the following year.

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 2021, it may do so in fiscal year 2022 or 2023.

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 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.*

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2018 | 52% | 51% |
| 2019 | 52 | 66 |
| 2020 | 52 | 75 |
| 2021 | 75 | 54 |
| 2022 | 59 | |
| 2023 | 64 | |

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 2022 will be available in 2023.

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|----------------|----------------|
| 2018 | Set a baseline | |
| 2019 | 43% | 44% |
| 2020 | 43 | Not applicable |
| 2021 | 43 | 34 |
| 2022 | 39 | |
| 2023 | 44 | |

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 2022 will be available in 2023.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| 2018 | Set a baseline | 41% |
| 2019 | 42% | 44 |
| 2020 | 42 | Not applicable |
| 2021 | 43 | 38 |
| 2022 | 43 | |
| 2023 | 48 | |

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 2022 will be available in 2023.

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| 2018 | Set a baseline | 38% |
| 2019 | 39% | 41 |
| 2020 | 39 | Not applicable |
| 2021 | 42 | 40 |
| 2022 | 45 | |
| 2023 | 50 | |

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 2022 will be available in 2023.

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 2023 Authorization: To be determined ¹

Budget Authority:

| <u>2022</u> <u>Estimate</u> | <u>2023</u> <u>Request</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|
| \$28,000 | \$28,000 | 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) |
|---------------|------------------------|
| 2018 | \$27,000 |
| 2019 | 27,000 |
| 2020 | 27,000 |
| 2021 | 28,000 |
| 2022 Estimate | 28,000 |

FY 2023 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2023, the Administration requests \$28 million for Innovative Approaches to Literacy, level with a fiscal year 2022 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2021 appropriation. Funds would be used to continue awards initially made in fiscal years 2021 and 2022.

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2021; reauthorization for FY 2023 is expected through appropriations action.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Innovative approaches to literacy

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. In particular, many schools do not have qualified library media specialists or adequate books and other resources. In addition, underserved students in many communities have limited access to developmentally appropriate reading material in the home. 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)

| <u>Output Measures</u> | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |
|---------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Funding for new awards | \$25,348 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of new awards | 40 | 0 | 0 |
| Peer review | \$206 | 0 | 0 |
| Funding for continuation awards | \$2,446 | \$28,000 | \$28,000 |
| Number of continuation awards | 4 | 40 | 40 |

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 2021, it may do so in fiscal years 2022 and 2023.

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 populations served, and, therefore, not all grantees reported on each performance measure.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Innovative approaches to literacy

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2018 | 70% | 70% |
| 2019 | 70 | 30 |
| 2020 | 50 | 67 |
| 2021 | 50 | 57 |
| 2022 | 50 | |
| 2023 | 50 | |

Additional information: Data reported for fiscal year 2019 included data from some 2018 grantees reporting for the first time; since then, the Department has worked with each grantee to improve the quality and timely submission of data. Many 2018 grantees structured their projects to focus primarily on increasing access to books and materials, resulting in a shift in focus away from academic achievement in the first year. Despite setbacks in the 2019-2020 school year due to the COVID-19 pandemic, grantees performed well on this measure in 2020. Data for 2021 will be available in 2023.

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2018 | 70% | 54% |
| 2019 | 70 | 20 |
| 2020 | 30 | 31 |
| 2021 | 30 | 41 |
| 2022 | 30 | |
| 2023 | 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 2020, 17 grantees reported data for this measure. Data for 2022 will be available in 2023.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Innovative approaches to literacy

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2018 | 70% | 58% |
| 2019 | 70 | 29 |
| 2020 | 30 | 29 |
| 2021 | 32 | 40 |
| 2022 | 32 | |
| 2023 | 32 | |

Additional information: This measure was introduced with the 2016 cohort of IAL grantees; the first year for which grantees reported performance data was fiscal year 2018. Data reported for fiscal year 2019 includes data from some 2018 grantees reporting for the first time; since then, the Department has worked with each grantee to improve the quality and timely submission of data. Many 2018 grantees structured their projects to focus primarily on increasing access to books and materials, resulting in a shift in focus away from academic achievement in the first year. For 2020, 18 grantees reported data for this measure. Data for 2022 will be available in 2023.

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2018 | 100% | 99% |
| 2019 | 100 | 98 |
| 2020 | 98 | 100 |
| 2021 | 99 | 99 |
| 2022 | 99 | |
| 2023 | 99 | |

Data for 2022 will be available in 2023.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2023 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

| 2022 Estimate | 2023 Request | Change |
|---------------|--------------|--------|
| \$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, further learning, and productive employment. To help achieve this objective, program services help migratory children overcome the educational disruption that results from repeated moves. The program statute encourages activities to promote coordination of needed services across States and encourages greater access for migratory children to services available under Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) and other programs authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), so that MEP funds can be used for services not already available from those programs to meet the unique needs of migratory students.

Eligible children are children of migratory agricultural workers or migratory fishers, or who are migratory agricultural workers or fishers themselves, and who have made a "qualifying move" within the last 3 years. A move is considered to be a qualifying move if it is a change of residence due to economic necessity and (1) involves crossing school district boundaries; (2) resulted in temporary or seasonal work in agriculture or fishing; and (3) was made in the preceding 36 months. Migratory children 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 for FY 2023 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) |
|---------------|------------------------|
| 2018 | \$374,751 |
| 2019 | 374,751 |
| 2020 | 374,751 |
| 2021 | 375,626 |
| 2022 Estimate | 375,626 |

FY 2023 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2023, the Administration requests \$375.6 million for the Title I Migrant Education Program (MEP), level with a fiscal year 2022 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2021 appropriation. The request would support the President's goal to advance equity in education through activities to identify highly mobile migratory children, provide them comprehensive services that address their specific needs, and promote coordination of the Federal resources available to serve this population. In particular, migratory children would benefit from the expansion of resources and services supported by the significant increase proposed for Title I activities in the 2023 request.

Migratory children 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. 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, States continue to deal with the challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic, such as school closures and social distancing, which have exacerbated these obstacles. The COVID-19

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education

pandemic has also highlighted the need for States to continue identifying eligible migratory children and youth outside of traditional school settings, and to adapt instructional and support services to address the changing needs of migratory children.

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 belong to families that are likely to experience food and job insecurity as well as poor health and housing conditions. During the 2019-20 school year, 281,271 children birth through 21 years old were identified as eligible for services, and 27.9 percent of these children had moved within the past 12 months and 8.5 percent were identified as students with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. In addition, nearly 43.6 percent of eligible children and youth aged 3 through 21 years old were English learners and 28.7 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 failing to meet 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 2019-20, 7.6 percent of these children were identified as out-of-school youth or school-aged youth who do not attend school.

During school year 2019-20, States and local entities provided services under this program to 200,732 identified migratory children 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 10,918 children aged birth through 2 years old, 3,071 received services; of the 30,586 aged 3 through 5 years old (not kindergarten), 18,107 received services; of the 218,287 in kindergarten through grade 12, 167,435 received services; and of the 21,405 identified as out-of-school youth, 12,085 received services. The Department expects to support a similar level of services using fiscal year 2023 funds.

The Department would continue to reserve approximately \$10 million in fiscal year 2023 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).

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

| Output Measures | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Number of eligible children aged birth through 21 | 281,271 | 281,271 | 281,271 |
| SEA program: | | | |
| Amount for State grants | \$365,626 | \$365,626 | \$365,626 |
| Range of State awards | 0-\$115,956 | 0-\$113,491 | 0-\$113,491 |
| 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 |
|------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 2018 | 33.4% | 26.0% |
| 2019 | 33.4 | 26.9 |
| 2020 | 33.4 | Not available |
| 2021 | 30.0 | |
| 2022 | 31.0 | |
| 2023 | 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 |
|------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 2018 | 32.5% | 25.4% |
| 2019 | 32.5 | 25.7 |
| 2020 | 32.5 | Not available |
| 2021 | 30.0 | |
| 2022 | 31.0 | |
| 2023 | 33.0 | |

Additional information: The source of the data is *EDFacts*, 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. Data for 2021 will be available in late summer of 2022.

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 |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2018 | 46 | 46 |
| 2019 | 46 | 46 |
| 2020 | 46 | 46 |
| 2021 | 46 | |
| 2022 | 46 | |
| 2023 | 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 State MEP directors also agreed that MSIX had moderately or substantially improved these other practices.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education

- 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 2023 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

| 2022 Estimate | 2023 Request | Change |
|---------------|--------------|-----------|
| \$48,239 | \$82,000 | +\$33,761 |

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 and (1) to help them meet the same challenging State academic standards that all children 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) for provision of education services 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 education services in order to meet participants' educational and occupational training needs.

¹ The GEPA extension applied through September 30, 2021; reauthorization for FY 2023 is expected through appropriations action.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected, delinquent and at-risk children and youth

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 offenders 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:

| <u>Fiscal Year</u> | <u>(dollars in thousands)</u> |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| 2018 | \$47,614 |
| 2019 | 47,614 |
| 2020 | 47,614 |
| 2021 | 48,239 |
| 2022 Estimate | 48,239 |

FY 2023 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2023, the Administration requests \$82 million for the Neglected, Delinquent and At-Risk program, \$33.8 million more than a fiscal year 2022 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2021 appropriation. The request would provide \$52 million, an increase of \$3.8 million, for the Subpart 1 program, and \$30 million for a new initiative to support children and youth in foster care.

The proposed increase for Subpart 1 programs provides additional resources to this underserved population after almost a decade that included reductions in funding. Furthermore, 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 proposed increase also reflects the Administration's commitment to address resource inequities across our education system,

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected, delinquent and at-risk children and youth

particularly for underserved students such as students in correctional institutions or other institutional settings.

High-quality education in correctional institutions can help equip their students with the skills needed to successfully reenter their communities and either continue their education or join the workforce.¹ Correctional facilities face unique challenges to educating children and youth in their care. The length of stay in correctional facilities and participation in educational programs by eligible children and youth 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 into their communities and schools. In addition, approximately 34 percent (21,661) of the youth served by the program in 2018-19 were students with disabilities. 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.

Improving Outcomes for Children and Youth in Foster Care

Children and youth in foster care, who have a high likelihood of changing schools when first entering care and when moving between foster homes, and higher rates of chronic absenteeism than non-foster students, are especially at risk for poor educational outcomes. These include low reading achievement, low rates of high school completion, and low rates of enrollment in postsecondary education and attainment of a bachelor's degree compared to students who are not in foster care. In addition, the rate of students in foster care receiving special education services is more than twice that of their peers who are not in foster care. Students in foster care are also more likely to have out-of-school suspensions and be expelled from school than students who are not in foster care.²

The most recent reauthorization of the ESEA in 2015 included important provisions to help improve the educational stability of children and youth in foster care. However, ESEA does not require States and districts to set aside funds to implement these provisions or more generally to help address the special needs of students in foster care for support services, whether they be academic, social, emotional or mental health services. As a result, State and district implementation of these provisions and other strategies for supporting students in foster care has varied widely, underscoring the need for dedicated funding to help this vulnerable group.

The \$30 million initiative to support children and youth in foster care would fund competitive grants for partnerships among SEAs, one or more LEAs, and State or county child welfare agencies to improve the educational outcomes of children and youth in foster care. The partnerships would use the grants to strengthen their implementation of ESEA foster youth

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 Legal Center for Foster Care Education. Fast Facts: Foster Care and Education Data at a Glance. January 2022. <https://www.fostercareandeducation.org/OurWork/NationalDatasheet2022.aspx>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected, delinquent and at-risk children and youth

school stability and data requirements and to provide students in foster care with academic, social, emotional, and mental health services that would improve their school outcomes. Such services may include matching students in foster care with tutors and mentors as well with educational decisionmakers and advocates who would help ensure these students receive the support they need from their school districts and child welfare agencies to thrive in school. The education and child welfare agencies in the partnerships would also use the grants to collect and share data on the educational experiences and outcomes of children in foster care and leverage this data to improve their services and policies for these children.

Recipients would be required to carry out evaluation activities and disseminate information on promising strategies and lessons learned. In addition, the Department would reserve \$3 million for a national effort to highlight and disseminate in the field best practices for improving the educational outcomes of foster youth and to provide technical assistance to grantees.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

| Output Measures | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------------|
| Number of participating institutions | 680 | 680 | 680 |
| Estimated number of students served | 63,596 | 63,596 | 63,596 |
| Average Federal contribution per child (whole dollars) | \$740 | \$740 | \$798 |
| Range of awards to States | 0-\$3,308 | 0-\$3,002 | 0-\$3,443 |
| Average State award | \$904 | \$904 | \$975 |
| Technical assistance | \$1,206 | \$1,206 | \$1,300 |
| Foster care initiative: | | | |
| Funding for new awards | 0 | 0 | \$26,900 |
| Number of new awards | 0 | 0 | 9-13 |
| Range of awards | 0 | 0 | \$2,000-3,000 |
| Average award | 0 | 0 | \$2,500 |
| Peer review | 0 | 0 | \$100 |
| Technical assistance | 0 | 0 | \$3,000 |

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected, delinquent and at-risk children and youth

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.

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 |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2018 | 19.8% | 13.7% |
| 2019 | 20.8 | 13.5 |
| 2020 | 21.8 | 13.6 |
| 2021 | 22.8 | |
| 2022 | 23.8 | |
| 2023 | 23.8 | |

Additional information: The source of the data is *EDFacts*, the Department’s system for States to submit kindergarten through grade 12 data. Data for 2020 represent all 51 participating states reporting both age data and at a minimum one of two outcomes—receiving a GED or high school diploma. However, four states did not report outcomes of students after their departure of a Title I, Part D program. Twenty-four additional states reported zeroes for outcomes after students exited the program. Many States have reported that they are unable to collect data on students after they leave institutions and return to their communities, and in some States there are legal prohibitions against collecting data on students after they exit facilities. In addition, students in institutional facilities were disproportionately affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, as they were unable to meet with their families and friends during quarantine periods. Data from 2021 will be available in late fall of 2022.

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2018 | 62.6% | 52.1% |
| 2019 | 63.6 | 53.6 |
| 2020 | 64.6 | 52.1 |
| 2021 | 65.6 | |
| 2022 | 66.6 | |
| 2023 | 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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected, delinquent and at-risk children and youth

the program. The measure includes students between the ages of 13 and 21 in neglected, juvenile detention, and juvenile correctional institutions, and not students in adult correctional institutions. Students in institutional facilities were disproportionately affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, as they were unable to meet with their families and friends during quarantine periods. Many States have reported that they are unable to collect data on students after they leave institutions and return to their communities, and in some States there are legal prohibitions against collecting data on students after they exit facilities. Data from 2021 will be available in late fall of 2022.

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 |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2018 | 77.4 | 64.5 |
| 2019 | 78.4 | 62.8 |
| 2020 | 79.4 | 58.8 |
| 2021 | 80.4 | |
| 2022 | 81.4 | |
| 2023 | 81.4 | |

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2018 | 78.9% | 67.0% |
| 2019 | 79.9 | 63.1 |
| 2020 | 80.9 | 59.3 |
| 2021 | 81.9 | |
| 2022 | 82.9 | |
| 2023 | 82.9 | |

Additional information: The source of the data is *EDFacts*, the Department’s system for States to submit kindergarten through grade 12 data. Student counts are based on the number of long-term students (those enrolled in a participating program or facility for 90 or more consecutive calendar days) who complete pre- and post-testing in reading and mathematics. These are not the same as the State assessments required under ESEA Title I and do not necessarily reflect State proficiency levels. A number of factors may have contributed to the variability in performance for these measures, including the quality of the data reported by facilities, changeover in staff overseeing data reporting, and changes in reporting systems. In addition, a major goal of the program is to move students out of institutions and back into communities; consequently, while the program may be serving significantly fewer students, these students often face greater academic challenges. Performance 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. Students in institutional facilities were also disproportionately affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, as they were unable to meet with their families and friends during quarantine periods. Many States have reported that they are unable to collect data on students after they leave institutions and return to their communities, and in

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected, delinquent and at-risk children and youth

some States there are legal prohibitions against collecting data on students after they exit facilities. Data from 2021 will be available in late fall of 2022.

Efficiency measures

Measure: The cost per high school diploma or equivalent.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|---------|---------|
| 2018 | \$4,255 | \$6,554 |
| 2019 | 4,211 | 7,070 |
| 2020 | 4,170 | 8,127 |
| 2021 | 4,128 | |
| 2022 | 4,087 | |
| 2023 | 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 2020 may in part be due to educational disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, including a decrease in the number of students receiving diplomas. Data from 2021 will be available in late fall of 2022.

Other performance information

In March 2019 the Department released *Promoting Education and Transition Success for Neglected and Delinquent Youth: An Evaluation of the Title I, Part D Program*,¹ which included surveys and case studies of State grantees and local subgrantees to examine the types of services and strategies that N and D funds support, how State and local agencies assist students in transitioning back to schools, how State correctional facilities implement institution-wide N and D projects, and how grantees assess the educational outcomes of participating students. Highlights from the report include:

- Program funds represented less than 10 percent of education budgets for State agencies responsible for providing education services to neglected and delinquent children and youth who are in State-run institutions, attending community day programs, and in correctional facilities. On average, State facilities received \$82,000 in program funds.
- SEA coordinators reported a greater focus on reviewing subgrantee applications, supporting Federal data collection, and conducting program compliance monitoring than on assisting with program planning and implementation.

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

- At the time of the data collection, few State agency coordinators reported that their facility implemented an institution-wide N and D project.
- State facilities spent the majority of their funds on personnel expenses; however, many State agency coordinators (54 percent) reported shortages of qualified instructional and support staff, and about one-third of State agency coordinators reported that it was a major or moderate challenge to hire staff within their credentialed content area.
- Nearly all State agency coordinators reported that their facilities provided career and technical education; the most common career pathways available included construction and architecture, consumer and culinary services, and computer and information sciences.
- Most facilities evaluated students to determine if they had a disability and needed special education and related services; 91 percent of State agency coordinators and 77 percent of local agency coordinators responded that their facilities provided such services.
- Almost all State agency coordinators (94 percent) reported that their facilities assessed students' education outcomes. Outcomes were most often assessed via information assessments and standardized formation and summative assessments.
- Transition plans were generally created while in placement, and youths tended to be substantially involved in transition planning activities. However, substantial involvement of parents and other family members in transitional planning was not as prevalent.
- Once youth exited placement, more than half of State facilities provided some form of aftercare services (such as support for continued secondary or postsecondary education, and counseling), although the duration was usually less than 2 months after exiting the facility. However, State coordinators generally reported that it was very difficult to track academic outcomes for students after exiting, and 58 percent reported that facilities were unable to track outcomes for any youth after they exited placement.
- For State facilities that were able to track post-placement outcomes, the most tracked outcomes were high school equivalency credentials, followed by employment and other labor market outcomes and high school graduation rates.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2023 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

| 2022 Estimate | 2023 Request | Change |
|---------------|--------------|-----------|
| \$46,123 | \$66,123 | +\$20,000 |

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,

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2015; reauthorization for FY 2023 is expected through appropriations action.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

quality, and promise of applications received.

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

| Fiscal Year | (dollars in thousands) |
|---------------|------------------------|
| 2018 | \$44,623 |
| 2019 | 44,623 |
| 2020 | 45,623 |
| 2021 | 46,123 |
| 2022 Estimate | 46,123 |

FY 2023 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2023, the Administration requests \$66.1 million for Special Programs for Migrant Students, \$20 million more than a fiscal year 2022 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2021 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 81 percent from 2018 to 2019, and 62 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 2017-86: 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 2015-16, individuals aged 14-19 constituted six percent of farmworkers, and one-third of farmworkers

¹ U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2021). *The Condition of Education 2021* (NCES 2021-144), Undergraduate and Retention Rates. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_ctr.asp

² <https://www.dol.gov/sites/dolgov/files/ETA/naws/pdfs/NAWS%20Research%20Report%2014.pdf>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

overall were younger than 35; average educational attainment was 9th grade; only 35 percent of respondents said they could speak English well; and 21 percent of farmworkers had family incomes below the poverty level. However, a sizable group of survey respondents expressed interest in pursuing further education or training and 24 percent of farmworkers surveyed reported having taken at least one adult education class. Among the most common courses respondents attended were English language instruction, job training, college or university classes, and high school equivalency classes; however, their limited education and income affects their ability to pursue postsecondary education or obtain skilled work that pays higher wages.

HEP and CAMP provide participants with assistance that can enable them to improve their earnings potential dramatically. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics “Occupational Outlook Handbook,”¹ the median annual wage for agricultural workers in 2020 was \$28,900, and these types of workers are often paid based on how much they do instead of how many hours they work. By comparison, according to the National Center for Education Statistics, in 2018 the median earnings for full-time, full-year wage and salary workers aged 25-34 were \$34,900 for a person with a high school diploma or equivalent; \$40,000 for a person with an associate’s degree; and \$54,700 for a person with a bachelor’s degree.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 19, 2022).

² U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2020). *The Condition of Education 2020* (NCES 2020-144), Annual Earnings. <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=77>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

| Output Measures | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |
|---|----------|----------|----------|
| Outreach, technical assistance, and professional development | \$231 | \$231 | \$331 |
| HEP: | | | |
| Number of students served | 4,054 | 4,054 | 5,800 |
| Funding for new awards | \$6,640 | \$1,695 | \$9,800 |
| Number of new awards | 14 | 3-4 | 16-21 |
| Peer review of new award applications | \$47 | \$50 | \$150 |
| Average new award | \$474 | \$423 | \$475 |
| Funding for continuation awards | \$16,067 | \$21,201 | \$22,946 |
| Number of continuation awards | 35 | 45 | 49 |
| Average continuation award | \$459 | \$471 | \$468 |
| Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars) | \$5,612 | \$5,660 | \$5,660 |
| CAMP: | | | |
| Number of students served | 2,246 | 2,246 | 3,200 |
| Funding for new awards | \$7,086 | \$4,052 | \$9,800 |
| Number of new awards | 15 | 7-9 | 18-22 |
| Peer review of new award applications | \$47 | \$50 | \$150 |
| Average new award | \$472 | \$450 | \$450 |
| Funding for continuation awards | \$16,005 | \$18,844 | \$22,946 |
| Number of continuation awards | 38 | 45 | 54 |
| Average continuation award | \$421 | \$419 | \$425 |
| Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars) | \$10,302 | \$10,216 | \$10,216 |

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

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

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2018 | 69.0% | 64.9% |
| 2019 | 69.0 | 66.6 |
| 2020 | 69.0 | 62.0 |
| 2021 | 69.0 | |
| 2022 | 69.0 | |
| 2023 | 69.0 | |

Additional information: The source of data is grantee performance reports. Targets have remained the same over the past several years because changes to State academic standards for elementary and secondary education have led to more challenging high school equivalency assessments that have resulted in fluctuations in student performance. 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. Data collected for fiscal year 2021 will be available in late 2022.

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 |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2018 | 80.0% | 82.1% |
| 2019 | 80.0 | 83.9 |
| 2020 | 80.0 | |
| 2021 | 80.0 | |
| 2022 | 80.0 | |
| 2023 | 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. Data collected for fiscal year 2021 will be available in late 2022.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

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 |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2018 | 86.0% | 83.5% |
| 2019 | 86.0 | 87.9 |
| 2020 | 86.0 | 85.8 |
| 2021 | 86.0 | |
| 2022 | 86.0 | |
| 2023 | 86.0 | |

Additional information: The source of data is grantee performance reports. Data for projects completing their first year of implementation are not included in the data for any given year because projects receive their initial funding in the fall, after the school year may have already started. Thus, the measure reflects the percentage of participants completing the first year of their postsecondary program between the second and fifth years of the project. 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 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 |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2018 | 88.0% | 96.2% |
| 2019 | 90.0 | 96.4 |
| 2020 | 92.0 | 96.1 |
| 2021 | 92.0 | |
| 2022 | 92.0 | |
| 2023 | 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 2021 will be available in late 2022.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

Efficiency measures

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

HEP Efficiency Measures

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

| Year | Target Cost Per Commuter Participant | Actual Cost Per Commuter Participant |
|------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 2017 | \$9,931 | \$9,009 |
| 2018 | 10,030 | 9,408 |
| 2019 | 10,131 | 8,594 |
| 2020 | 10,232 | |
| 2021 | 10,334 | |
| 2022 | 10,438 | |

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

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

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

| Year | Target Cost Per Participant in Combined Programs | Actual Cost Per Participant in Combined Programs |
|------|--|--|
| 2017 | \$15,653 | \$13,932 |
| 2018 | 15,810 | 13,650 |
| 2019 | 15,968 | 16,378 |
| 2020 | 16,127 | |
| 2021 | 16,289 | |
| 2022 | 16,451 | |

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

Additional information: The Department established different costs for programs serving participants who commute, programs serving participants who reside at the institution of higher education where the program is based, and programs with both types of participants. Targets are based on actual costs in 2011 (the baseline year), multiplied by an estimated rate of inflation for college-associated costs and then decreased by an expected improvement in efficiency annually of 1 percent. Actual costs for HEP programs have fluctuated since 2015, in part, due to substantial increases in costs for high school equivalency testing, along with decreases in the number of HEP participants receiving a high school equivalency credential resulting from an increase in rigor in such testing. 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. Data collected for fiscal year 2021 will be available in late 2022.

CAMP Efficiency Measures

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

| Year | Target Cost Per Commuter Participant | Actual Cost Per Commuter Participant |
|-------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 2017 | \$14,958 | \$12,009 |
| 2018 | 15,197 | 11,393 |
| 2019 | 15,440 | 10,061 |
| 2020 | 15,688 | |
| 2021 | 15,939 | |
| 2022 | 16,194 | |

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

| Year | Target Cost Per Residential Participant | Actual Cost Per Residential Participant |
|-------------|---|---|
| 2017 | \$23,972 | \$14,823 |
| 2018 | 24,356 | 13,105 |
| 2019 | 24,745 | 13,429 |
| 2020 | 25,141 | |
| 2021 | 25,543 | |
| 2022 | 25,952 | |

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

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

| Year | Target Cost Per Participant for Combined Programs | Actual Cost Per Participant for Combined Programs |
|------|---|---|
| 2017 | \$18,229 | \$13,765 |
| 2018 | 18,521 | 12,939 |
| 2019 | 18,817 | 11,551 |
| 2020 | 19,118 | |
| 2021 | 19,424 | |
| 2022 | 19,735 | |

Additional information: The Department established different costs for programs serving participants who commute, programs serving participants who reside at the institution of higher education where the program is based, and programs with both types of participants. Targets are based on actual costs in 2011 (the baseline year), multiplied by an estimated rate of inflation for college-associated costs and then decreased by an expected improvement in efficiency annually of 1 percent. 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 2022.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Account Summary Table

[Click here for accessible version](#)

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2023 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET (in thousands of dollars)

| | Cat Code | 2021 Appropriation | 2022 Estimate | 2023 Request | 2023 Request to 2022 Estimate | |
|--|----------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|
| | | | | | 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 | 0 | 0 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | --- |
| Mandatory appropriation | M | 0 | 0 | 8,000,000 | 8,000,000 | --- |
| Advance for succeeding fiscal year | D | 4,357,550 | 4,357,550 | 4,357,550 | 0 | 0.00% |
| (d) Education finance incentive grants (section 1125A) | | | | | | |
| Annual appropriation | D | 0 | 0 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | --- |
| Mandatory appropriation | M | 0 | 0 | 8,000,000 | 8,000,000 | --- |
| Advance for succeeding fiscal year | D | 4,357,550 | 4,357,550 | 4,357,550 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Subtotal, Grants to LEAs | | 16,536,802 | 16,536,802 | 36,536,802 | 20,000,000 | 120.94% |
| Discretionary | D | 16,536,802 | 16,536,802 | 20,536,802 | 4,000,000 | 24.19% |
| Mandatory | M | 0 | 0 | 16,000,000 | 16,000,000 | --- |
| Current | | 5,695,625 | 5,695,625 | 25,695,625 | 20,000,000 | 351.15% |
| Advance for succeeding fiscal year | | 10,841,177 | 10,841,177 | 10,841,177 | 0 | 0.00% |
| 2. Comprehensive literacy development grants (ESEA II-B-2, section 2222) | | | | | | |
| | D | 192,000 | 192,000 | 192,000 | 0 | 0.00% |
| 3. Innovative approaches to literacy (ESEA II-B-2, section 2226) | | | | | | |
| | D | 28,000 | 28,000 | 28,000 | 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 | 48,239 | 82,000 | 33,761 | 69.99% |
| Subtotal, State agency programs | | 423,865 | 423,865 | 457,626 | 33,761 | 7.97% |
| 5. Special programs for migrant students (HEA IV-A-5) | | | | | | |
| | D | 46,123 | 46,123 | 66,123 | 20,000 | 43.36% |
| Total, Appropriation | | 17,226,790 | 17,226,790 | 37,280,551 | 20,053,761 | 116.41% |
| Total, Budget authority | D | 17,226,790 | 17,226,790 | 21,280,551 | 4,053,761 | 23.53% |
| Mandatory | M | 0 | 0 | 16,000,000 | 16,000,000 | --- |
| Current | | 6,385,613 | 6,385,613 | 26,439,374 | | 314.05% |
| Prior year's advance | | 10,841,177 | 10,841,177 | 10,841,177 | 0 | 0.00% |

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