

Department of Education
EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Fiscal Year 2025 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language	1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	3
Appropriation, Adjustments and Transfers	6
Summary of Changes	7
Authorizing Legislation	8
Appropriations History.....	9
Significant Items in FY 2024 Appropriations Reports.....	10
Summary of Request	12
Activities:	
Grants to local educational agencies	14
Comprehensive literacy development grants	28
Innovative approaches to literacy.....	35
Migrant education	40
Neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth.....	50
Special programs for migrant students	59
Account Summary Table.....	68
State Tables*	

*State tables reflecting actual fiscal year 2023 allocations and fiscal years 2024 and 2025 estimates are posted on the Department's webpage at:
<https://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/statetables/index.html>.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriations Language

For carrying out title I and subpart 2 of part B of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (referred to in this Act as "ESEA") and section 418A of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (referred to in this Act as "HEA"), \$19,287,790,000, of which \$8,359,490,000 shall become available on July 1, 2025, and shall remain available through September 30, 2026, and of which \$10,841,177,000 shall become available on October 1, 2025, and shall remain available through September 30, 2026, for academic year 2025–2026:¹ *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, 2024, to obtain annually updated local educational agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census:³ *Provided further*, That \$1,362,301,000 shall be for concentration grants under section 1124A of the ESEA:⁴ *Provided further*, That \$5,382,550,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA:⁵ *Provided further*, That \$5,382,550,000 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 \$10,000,000 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 subsection (b) of section 1004 of the ESEA shall be applied by substituting the sum of the amounts appropriated for parts A, C, and D of title I of the ESEA by division H of Public Law 117-328 for each of the amounts specified in that subsection:⁸ *Provided further*, That subsection (a)(2) of section 1004 of the ESEA shall be applied by substituting "\$800,000" for "\$400,000" and by substituting "\$100,000" for "\$50,000":⁹ *Provided further*, That \$224,000,000 shall be for carrying out subpart 2 of part B of title II:¹⁰ *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding subsection (f)(1) of section 2222 of the ESEA, each State education agency that receives a grant under section 2222 of the ESEA may use up to 10

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriations Language—continued

percent of its grant funds to evaluate the activities supported by such grant:¹¹ *Provided further,* That \$52,123,000 shall be for carrying out section 418A of the HEA:¹² *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.¹³

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 313. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act for part C and part D of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for subtitle B of title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, the Secretary may use not more than 0.5 percent for a single program of competitive grant awards to State educational agencies for demonstration projects (including by subgrants) to improve service delivery and coordination for at-risk student groups.¹⁴

NOTES

A full-year 2024 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, 2024 and Other Extensions Act (Division A of Public Law 118-15, as amended). The amounts included for 2024 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><u>¹ ...of which \$8,359,490,000 shall become available on July 1, 2025, and shall remain available through September 30, 2026, and of which \$10,841,177,000 shall become available on October 1, 2025, and shall remain available through September 30, 2026, for academic year 2025–2026:...</u></p>	<p>This language provides for funds to be appropriated on a forward-funded basis for the Title I Basic Grants, Concentration Grants, Targeted Grants, Education Finance Incentive Grants, State Agency Migrant and Neglected and Delinquent, and Comprehensive Literacy Development Grants. The language also provides that a portion of the funds is available in an advance appropriation that becomes available for obligation on October 1 of the following fiscal year.</p>
<p><u>²...<i>Provided</i>, That \$6,459,401,000 shall be for basic grants under section 1124 of the ESEA:...</u></p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Basic Grants.</p>
<p><u>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, 2024, to obtain annually updated local educational agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census:...</u></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><u>⁴ ...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$1,362,301,000 shall be for concentration grants under section 1124A of the ESEA:...</u></p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Concentration Grants.</p>
<p><u>⁵ ...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$5,382,550,000 \$6,357,550,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA:...</u></p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Targeted Grants.</p>
<p><u>⁶ ...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$5,382,550,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A of the ESEA:...</u></p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Education Finance Incentive Grants.</p>
<p><u>⁷ ...<i>Provided further</i>, That of the amounts available under the preceding two provisos the Secretary may reserve up to \$10,000,000 to pay the costs of voluntary State school funding equity commissions and the costs of voluntary local education agency equity reviews:...</u></p>	<p>This language would allow the Secretary to reserve up to \$10 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</p>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes—continued

Language Provision	Explanation
	commissions and voluntary local educational agency equity reviews.
<p>⁸ <u>...Provided further, That subsection (b) of section 1004 of the ESEA shall be applied by substituting the sum of the amounts appropriated for parts A, C, and D of title I of the ESEA by division H of Public Law 117-328 for each of the amounts specified in that subsection:...</u></p>	<p>This language would increase the amount of funds States may reserve for administration purposes under Section 1004 of the ESEA by updating the amount States may use to calculate the reservation for program administration to the fiscal year 2023 appropriation levels.</p>
<p>⁹ <u>...Provided further, That subsection (a)(2) of section 1004 of the ESEA shall be applied by substituting "\$800,000" for "\$400,000" and by substituting "\$100,000" for "\$50,000":...</u></p>	<p>This language would increase the minimum amount small States and outlying areas may reserve for administration purposes under Section 1004 of the ESEA from \$400,000 to \$800,000, and from \$50,000 to \$100,000, respectively.</p>
<p>¹⁰ <u>...Provided further, That \$224,000,000 shall be for carrying out subpart 2 of part B of title II:...</u></p>	<p>This language provides funding for Comprehensive literacy development grants and Innovative approaches to literacy.</p>
<p>¹¹ <u>...Provided further, That, notwithstanding subsection (f)(1) of section 2222 of the ESEA, each State education agency that receives a grant under section 2222 of the ESEA may use up to 10 percent of its grant funds to evaluate the activities supported by such grant:...</u></p>	<p>This language allows SEAs to reserve up to 10 percent of their Comprehensive literacy development grant funds for evaluation.</p>
<p>¹² <u>...Provided further, That \$52,123,000 shall be for carrying out section 418A of the HEA:...</u></p>	<p>This language provides funding for Special Programs for Migrant Students.</p>
<p>¹³ <u>...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.</u></p>	<p>This language would allow the Department to override the distribution of funds between the High School Equivalency Program and the College Assistance Migrant Program required by the statute and reduce the percentage of funds available for a program in the event a competition does not yield a sufficient number of high-quality applications for one of the programs.</p>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes—continued

Language Provision	Explanation
<p style="text-align: center;">GENERAL PROVISIONS</p> <p><u>¹⁴SEC. 313. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act for part C and part D of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for subtitle B of title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, the Secretary may use not more than 0.5 percent for a single program of competitive grant awards to State educational agencies for demonstration projects (including by subgrants) to improve service delivery and coordination for at-risk student groups.¹⁴</u></p>	<p>This language would allow the Department to reserve funds from the Migrant Education program, the Neglected, Delinquent, and At-Risk Children and Youth program, and the Education for Homeless Children and Youth program, to make competitive grants to States to improve coordination of services for students who face multiple risk factors and are eligible for multiple Federal programs.</p>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriation, Adjustments and Transfers
(dollars in thousands)

Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers	2023	2024	2025
Discretionary:			
Appropriation	\$19,087,790	\$19,087,790	\$19,287,790
Total, discretionary appropriation	19,087,790	19,087,790	19,287,790
Advance:			
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	-10,841,177	-10,841,177	-10,841,177
Advance from prior year	10,841,177	10,841,177	10,841,177
Total, budget authority	19,087,790	19,087,790	19,287,790

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Changes
(dollars in thousands)

2024 Discretionary	\$19,087,790
2025 Discretionary	<u>19,287,790</u>
Net change	<u>+200,000</u>

Increases:	2024 base	Change from base
<u>Program:</u>		
Increase for Grants to help ensure that all students have access to excellent educational opportunities. 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.	\$18,386,802	+\$200,000
Net change		<u>+200,000</u>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Authorizing Legislation
(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2024 Authorized	2024 Annualized CR	2025 Authorized	2025 Request
Grants to local educational agencies (ESEA-1-A): ¹				
LEA grants formulas:	0		To be determined	
Basic grants (Section 1124)		\$6,459,401		\$6,459,401
Concentration grants (Section 1124A)		1,362,301		1,362,301
Targeted grants (Section 1125)		5,282,550		5,382,550
Education finance incentive grants (Section 1125A)		5,282,550		5,382,550
Comprehensive literacy development grants (ESEA-II-B-2, Section 2222) ¹		194,000	To be determined	194,000
Innovative approaches to literacy (ESEA-II-B-2, Section 2226) ¹		30,000	To be determined	30,000
State agency programs: ¹			To be determined	
Migrant (ESEA I-C)	0	375,626	To be determined	375,626
Neglected and delinquent (ESEA I-D)	0	49,239	To be determined	49,239
Special Programs for Migrant Students (HEA IV-A-5) ²	0	52,123	To be determined	52,123
Total definite authorization	0		To be determined	
Total appropriation		\$19,087,790		\$19,287,790

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2021. Reauthorization for FY 2025 is expected through appropriations action.

² The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2015. Reauthorization for FY 2025 is expected through appropriations action.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2016 ¹	\$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 ²	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 ³	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 ⁴	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 ⁵	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)
2021 ⁶	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 ⁷	37,246,790	36,756,790	33,802,790	18,229,790
(2022 Advance for 2023)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)
2023 ⁸	37,280,551	21,260,551	20,852,667	19,087,790
(2023 Advance for 2024)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)
2024 ⁹	21,254,551	13,055,290	19,262,790	19,087,790
(2024 Advance for 2025)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)
2025	19,287,790			
(2024 Advance for 2025)	(10,841,177)			

¹ 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.

² 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.

³ 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).

⁴ 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).

⁵ The Senate allowance reflects the Chairman's mark; the Appropriation reflects the Further Consolidated Appropriation Act, 2020 (P.L. 116-94).

⁶ 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).

⁷ The House allowance reflects floor action; the Senate allowance reflects the Chair's mark; and the Appropriation reflects Division H of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2022 (P.L. 117-103).

⁸ The House allowance reflects the regular annual FY 2023 appropriation, which was introduced on the floor; the Senate allowance reflects the Chairman's mark; and the Appropriation reflects the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023 (P.L. 117-328).

⁹ The House allowance reflects Subcommittee action and the Senate allowance reflects Committee action on the regular annual 2024 appropriations bill; the Appropriation reflects the annualized continuing resolution level.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Significant Items in FY 2024 Appropriations Reports

Grants to LEAs

Senate: School Improvement and Support.—The Committee appreciates the Department's targeted monitoring of implementation of ESEA requirements related to resource allocation reviews and resource inequities. The Committee also appreciates this summer's release of a dear colleague letter that shares recommendations for effectively implementing these requirements. The Department also must continue efforts to assist SEAs and LEAs with implementing all of the school improvement requirements of ESEA. The Committee is concerned the Department has not identified any actions or plans to implement direction in the explanatory statement accompanying last year's appropriations act which directed the Department to increase transparency on the amount reserved by each State for the school improvement set aside, method of distribution to eligible LEAs, and uses of such funds. The Committee directs the Department to provide a briefing on actions taken and planned to be taken to provide transparency for school improvement investments, including information required to be reported in State report cards.

In addition, as was noted in the explanatory statement accompanying last year's appropriations act, more must be done to improve transparency on amounts reserved by LEAs under section 1113(c)(3)(A). The Committee understands the Department is planning to analyze the variation of per-homeless-pupil amounts across LEAs within a State and take other steps to improve the quality of reported data. However, this must be accompanied with actions to provide transparency on amounts reserved and spent with funds available under such section, including effective technical assistance and support being provided to title I SEA and LEA leaders on the wide variety of services supported by these funds, implementation of an adequate needs assessment, and determination of a sufficient reservation under such section. The Committee requests a briefing on actions taken and planned on these issues not later than 45 days after enactment of this act.

Response: The Department is exploring ways to promote transparency about how States implement school improvement requirements and how much funding they reserve to support these efforts. In 2024, the Department plans to conduct targeted monitoring in a small number of States (including reviewing information from a few LEAs in each State) on ESEA section 1003 school improvement provisions. While there is no requirement in the ESEA that a State publish the total amount available for school improvement each year under section 1003 of the ESEA, our review will examine promising practices to highlight, which may include what information the State is making publicly available and how it is being made available to support local decision making. Following this targeted monitoring, the Department will provide technical assistance to all States on both common compliance issues identified and promising practices that other States and LEAs may want to incorporate. This may include public reporting of the amount of funds available under ESEA section 1003. In addition, the Department intends to publish on our website information about State Title I allocations

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Significant Items in FY 2024 Appropriations Reports—continued

updated with the Department's estimated amounts for the school improvement reservation under ESEA section 1003. The Department will provide the briefing as requested.

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 resources and provide learning opportunities for all students, particularly those who are less likely to have access to such materials at home. In addition, the Committee directs the Department to ensure that grants are distributed among eligible entities that will serve geographically diverse areas, including rural areas.
- Response: The Department plans to continue funding grants that develop and enhance effective school library programs and serve geographically diverse areas, including rural areas.

Neglected and Delinquent

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Request

The programs in the Education for the Disadvantaged account provide the foundation for school improvement efforts needed to ensure that all children receive a high-quality education. Most of the programs in this account are authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The Administration is requesting a total of \$19.3 billion in fiscal year 2025 for the programs in this account.

The \$18.6 billion request for **Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)** supports President Biden's commitment to increase funding for Title I schools in order to close gaps in funding that undermine the ability of our public education system to prepare all students to succeed, regardless of their zip code, family income, race, ethnicity, or disability. The program supports States and local educational agencies (LEAs) in providing extra academic help to students in high-poverty schools. Program funds can be used flexibly for locally determined programs and interventions across a broad range of areas, including through schoolwide programs that allow Federal and other funds to be consolidated and leveraged for comprehensive school reforms. The request would also support funding for voluntary efforts to identify and address inequities in State and local funding systems, which often favor wealthier districts over districts with concentrated poverty, in order to create more equitable school finance systems.

The \$194 million request for **Comprehensive Literacy Development Grants** would support competitive grants to SEAs to provide targeted, evidence-based literacy intervention in high-need schools. Grantees must subgrant funds to LEAs to support literacy interventions for children from birth through kindergarten entry and for students from kindergarten through grade 12.

The request would provide \$30 million for **Innovative Approaches to Literacy** to continue funding grants to LEAs and national nonprofit organizations, to promote literacy programs that support the development of literacy skills in low-income communities developing and implementing school library programs and providing 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 request would also provide \$49.2 million for the **State agency Neglected and Delinquent program** to support programs that serve students who are educated in institutional settings or correctional facilities and will likely transition to local school systems. The request includes a proposal allowing the Department to reserve funds from these two programs, and the Education for Homeless Children and Youth program, to make competitive grants to States to improve coordination of services for students who face multiple risk factors and are eligible for multiple Federal programs and for whom no one entity is responsible for the totality of their care. This authority would support better coordination of services across funding streams, help ensure more effective and efficient use of Federal resources for benefitting students, reduce duplication

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Request—continued

in services, ensure service continuity, and provide improved service delivery and direct student support.

Finally, the request includes \$52.1 million for **Special Programs for Migrant Students**, continuing support for 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.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2025 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget authority:

	2024 Annualized CR	2025 Request	Change
Basic grants	\$6,459,401	\$6,459,401	0
Concentration grants	1,362,301	1,362,301	0
Targeted grants	5,282,550	5,382,550	+\$100,000
Education finance incentive grants	5,282,550	5,382,550	+100,000
Total	18,386,802	18,586,802	+200,000
Annual appropriation	7,545,625	7,745,625	+200,000
Advance for succeeding year	10,841,177	10,841,177	0

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) provides supplemental education funding, especially in communities of concentrated poverty, for local programs that provide educational opportunities and additional academic support to help students in schools with high rates of poverty meet challenging State academic standards. The program serves an estimated 26 million students in nearly 90 percent of school districts and nearly 60 percent of all public schools.

Title I schools help students reach challenging State academic standards through one of two models: a targeted assistance model that supplements the regular education program for individual students most in need of special assistance, or a schoolwide model that allows schools to use Title I funds—in combination with other Federal, State, and local funds—to improve the overall instructional program for all students in a school. Schools serving attendance areas in which at least 40 percent of students are from low-income backgrounds, or schools in which such students account for at least 40 percent of enrollment, are eligible to operate schoolwide programs.

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

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2021. Reauthorization for FY 2025 is expected through appropriations action.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

children under 6 years of age¹ and dual or concurrent enrollment programs for secondary school students that provide access to college-level coursework through partnerships with institutions of higher education. Schools also must provide ongoing professional development for staff working with underserved students and carry out activities designed to increase parent and caregiver engagement.

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

Standards and Assessments

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

States are also required to administer academic assessments that measure and provide understandable and timely information about the achievement of all students against State standards. States must administer reading and mathematics assessments annually to all students in grades 3-8 and once in high school, and must administer annual science assessments for at least one grade in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9, and 10-12). These assessments must be valid and reliable, include measures that assess higher-order thinking skills and understanding of challenging content (which may include measures of student academic growth and which may be partially delivered in the form of portfolios, projects, or extended performance tasks), and enable achievement results to be disaggregated by major racial and ethnic groups, gender, poverty, disability status, English proficiency, migratory status, foster care status, homeless status, and military connected status. States may permit LEAs to use State-approved, nationally recognized high school assessments in lieu of the State's high school assessments. States must also annually assess the English language proficiency of English learners and may administer alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards to students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, provided that the number of

¹ The Department has recently released updated guidance to assist States, districts, and schools in leveraging Title I, Part A, funds to implement and expand high-quality preschool programs and services.
<https://oese.ed.gov/files/2024/02/Title-I-Preschool-Early-Learning-Guidance-Revised-2023-FINAL.pdf>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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

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

The State's indicators are also used to identify, at least once every 3 years, a statewide category of schools for comprehensive support and improvement (CSI schools), which must include at least the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I schools and all high schools with 4-year graduation rates at or below 67 percent. LEAs, in partnership with stakeholders, must develop and implement plans for these schools that, among other things, include evidence-based interventions stemming from a needs assessment. The State must also notify LEAs annually of any schools with consistently underperforming student subgroups or with

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

allocations. For example, the fiscal year 2021 allocations were based on LEA poverty estimates for 2019. The Department transfers approximately \$5.0 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 under the National School Lunch Program—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 \$1.0 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 \$14.0 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. 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.

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

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

Fiscal Year	Basic Grants	Concentration Grants	Targeted Grants	Education Finance Incentive Grants	Total
2020	\$6,459,401	\$1,362,301	\$4,244,050	\$4,244,050	\$16,309,802
2021	6,459,401	1,362,301	4,357,550	4,357,550	16,536,802
2022	6,459,401	1,362,301	4,857,550	4,857,550	17,536,802
2023	6,459,401	1,362,301	5,282,550	5,282,550	18,386,802
2024 Annualized CR	6,459,401	1,362,301	5,282,550	5,282,550	18,386,802

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

FY 2025 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2025, the Administration requests \$18.6 billion for Title I Grants to LEAs, \$200.0 million more than a fiscal year 2024 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2023 appropriation. The request supports President Biden’s commitment to increase funding for Title I schools in order to help close gaps in funding that undermine the ability of our public education system to prepare all students to succeed, regardless of their zip code, family income, race, ethnicity, or disability. The request would support the Administration’s efforts to assist States and districts in achieving academic excellence by supporting the conditions to accelerate learning, support student achievement, and offer a comprehensive and rigorous education for every student as part of the “Raise the Bar: Lead the World” initiative to transform prekindergarten through grade 12 (P-12) education. Furthermore, this funding is vital for sustaining the instructional supports for educators and students to improve mathematics and literacy achievement levels that exceed pre-pandemic performance and close underlying opportunity and achievement gaps in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The requested funds are particularly critical in the context of expiring COVID-relief funds. An external analysis of districts’ plans for spending American Rescue Plan Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief Funds found that LEAs planned to spend an estimated \$57 billion on staffing and academic recovery efforts.¹ Title I Grants to LEAs funding will be even more critical in fiscal year 2025 as LEAs seek to continue these efforts.

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

Sustaining Supports That Are Helping Students Recover

SEAs and LEAs are using the historic level of funding provided in the CARES Act, Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act, and the American Rescue Plan (ARP Act) to address the significant academic, social, emotional and mental health needs of students resulting from the pandemic. This includes support to reverse the disproportionately negative impacts the pandemic has had on already underserved students, including students of color,

¹ <https://www.future-ed.org/financial-trends-in-local-schools-covid-aid-spending/>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

English learners, students with disabilities, students experiencing homelessness, and students from low-income backgrounds. Such efforts include investments to launch and expand evidence-based tutoring programs; provide additional summer learning, and afterschool or extended learning time programs; hire additional instructional and mental health staff; increase the diversity of staff; develop educators to design and implement strategies that support the social, emotional, and academic development and needs of students; and trauma-informed approaches that support students who have experienced significant trauma.

COVID-19 funding has been critical to responding to the pandemic and essential to helping States and LEAs address longstanding inequities in education and education-related supports exacerbated by the pandemic. The President’s Council of Economic Advisers found that the Biden-Harris Administration’s unprecedented investment in education helped the U.S. navigate the COVID-19 pandemic and stay focused on student success and academic recovery, providing crucial supports at a time when other nations saw their rankings fall. Schools, teachers, and districts have contributed significantly to this outcome.¹ Still, about 44 percent of public-school students started the 2023–24 school year behind grade level in at least one subject, according to the National Center for Education Statistics’ School Pulse Panel (a study collecting information on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic).² However, the final tranche of COVID-19 funds—those provided under the ARP Act—expire on September 30, 2024. Consequently, the Department’s Title I request would help alleviate the pressure that States and LEAs will be facing upon the expiration of ARP Act funds and provide additional resources to ensure that students are able to continue to receive the supports they need to recover fully from the long-term effects of lost instructional time due to the pandemic. Title I funds can support implementation of proven, evidence-based practices to help students recover from the effects of the pandemic and accelerate academic achievement such as addressing chronic absenteeism, and providing high-dosage tutoring, and summer, and extended or afterschool learning; support for educators, such as math and literacy coaching; increasing access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12; and reengaging and supporting students who have become disengaged from learning.

Promoting Equity in Education Funding Systems

To create more equitable school finance systems, the request for fiscal year 2025 would continue to support voluntary efforts to identify and address inequities in State and local funding systems, which often favor wealthier districts over districts with concentrated poverty. Nearly all Federal funding for elementary and secondary education is supplemental funding, intended to help States and school districts provide high quality educational opportunities and additional supports to underserved students, including students from low-income backgrounds in schools with high rates of poverty, students with disabilities, and English learners. The underlying principle of such supplemental funding, as reflected in the supplement, not supplant and

¹ “Weathering the Storm”: Federal Efforts Helped Bolster U.S. Education Standing Among Peer Nations. The White House (<https://www.whitehouse.gov/cea/written-materials/2023/12/05/weathering-the-storm-federal-efforts-helped-bolster-u-s-education-standing-among-peer-nations/>) and <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2023/08/28/fact-sheet-biden-harris-administration-highlights-efforts-to-support-k-12-education-as-students-go-back-to-school/>.

² <https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/spp/results.asp>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

comparability requirements in section 1118 of Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, is that it is provided in addition to an equitable and adequate base of State and local education funding.

Unfortunately, in many States, school districts, and schools, Federal education funding compensates for, rather than supplements, an inequitable and inadequate base of State and local funds. Nationwide, a 2018 report from The Education Trust found that “the highest poverty districts receive about \$1,000, or 7 percent, less per pupil in State and local funding than the lowest poverty districts.” The funding gap is even starker for students of color, with districts enrolling the most students of color receiving roughly \$1,800 or 13 percent less per student than school districts serving the fewest students of color.¹

These data are all the more alarming because of the growing evidence that increased per-pupil funding wisely spent leads to improved student outcomes, as do the kinds of changes that extra resources can provide, such as more competitive teacher compensation that attracts and retains effective educators, early childhood programs, smaller class sizes, and additional student supports.² 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, and in many States, funding is inadequate for all but the districts with the lowest rates of poverty.³ These “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.”⁴

The Department is proposing 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 \$10 million in competitive funding to States to support comprehensive reviews of school finance systems. These funds would pay the costs of (1) helping States to set up voluntary school funding equity commissions and (2) helping local educational agency perform voluntary equity reviews. Both activities would include significant and meaningful family and community engagement. Voluntary State equity commissions could carry out activities such as identification of funding and educational opportunity gaps based on measures of equity and adequacy; development of action plans to address existing gaps, including new formulas and plans to transition to new formula allocation processes; and public reporting on the State’s progress in addressing school funding inequities. Local educational agency equity reviews would also examine educational opportunity and funding gaps based on measures of equity and adequacy, including analysis of Federal, State, and local resource allocation within an LEA and its impact on student opportunities to learn. LEAs 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.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Supporting Program Implementation and Compliance

The Department plans to continue to monitor and expand support for State implementation of key provisions in current statute that support educational equity. In 2022, the Department carried out a pilot monitoring project in nine States that targeted implementation of resource equity provisions in Title I. On July 11, 2023, the Department issued a Dear Colleague letter outlining recommendations and additional resources to help States implement school support and improvement provisions.¹ This letter included a description of the requirement that States must periodically conduct a resource allocation review to support school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a significant number of schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement (CSI), targeted support and improvement (TSI), and additional targeted support and improvement (ATSI). The Department encourages States to consider broadening this review to include a comprehensive examination of their school finance system that incorporates family and community engagement and encompasses activities such as the identification of funding gaps based on measures of equity and adequacy and the development of action plans to address such gaps.

In 2023, the Department conducted targeted monitoring in nine States on the public reporting requirements in the ESEA, including all State and local report card requirements in ESEA section 1111(h) and the reporting requirement regarding progress in addressing disproportionate rates of access to ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers in ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B). Similar to the process used in the 2022 pilot targeted monitoring mentioned above, the Department issued letters to each State outlining areas that required further action to be in compliance with statutory requirements. In addition, the Department is currently determining how best to provide technical assistance to all States regarding the lessons learned and best practices for these requirements.

The Department is also exploring ways to promote transparency about how States implement school improvement requirements and how much funding they reserve to support these efforts. In 2024, the Department plans to conduct targeted monitoring in a small number of States (including reviewing information from a few LEAs in each State) on ESEA section 1003 school improvement provisions. While there is no requirement in the ESEA that a State publish the total amount available for school improvement each year under section 1003 of the ESEA, our review will examine promising practices to highlight, which may include what information the State is making publicly available and how it is being made available to support local decision making. Following this targeted monitoring, the Department will provide technical assistance to all States on both common compliance issues identified and promising practices that other States and LEAs may want to incorporate. This may include public reporting of the amount of funds available under ESEA section 1003. In addition, the Department intends to publish on its website information about State Title I allocations updated with the Department's estimated amounts for the school improvement reservation under ESEA section 1003.

Another key area identified for additional support and technical assistance are provisions related to ensuring educational stability for students in foster care. The Department is currently working

¹ DCL-Title-I-Resource-Equity-for-posting.pdf (ed.gov)

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

with the Department of Health and Human Services on updating the 2016 guidance for students in foster care, to include additional sections on students in foster care who also have disabilities, are English learners, may also be eligible for McKinney Vento services, or are in a Title I, Part D facility, and other topics based on questions received since 2016. The updated guidance is expected to be released later in 2024. Additionally, in order to support SEAs and LEAs in meeting the educational stability requirements for students in foster care, the Department has undertaken a number of technical assistance activities, including webinars, communities of practice, tools, and additional resources, which will continue in 2024. These technical assistance resources will cover all aspects of implementing the ESEA's educational stability requirements, with a focus on data-related practices. This technical assistance builds upon the Data-Sharing Snapshots published in March 2023, which highlight the ways eight States are sharing data and information across education and child welfare systems to support students in foster care and meet reporting requirements.¹

The Administration is also proposing appropriations language to increase the amount of funds States may reserve for administration purposes under Section 1004 of the ESEA. Although the 2016 reauthorization of the Act contained new accountability requirements, the limitation on administration funds was left unchanged and, as a result, the amount States can set aside for this purpose is capped at a level that has not been updated since the No Child Left Behind Act was enacted over 20 years ago. Under the new accountability provisions, States are required to create a complex system to meaningfully differentiate and identify comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) schools; targeted support and improvement (TSI) schools; and additional targeted support and improvement (ATSI) schools, and work with LEAs to provide support and technical assistance for these schools. Successful implementation of these provisions under Title I, Part A requires sustained and adequate resources, particularly from a State's program administration reservation. However, current provisions limit the base amount that may be used to calculate the funds a State may use for administration to a level of appropriations that was surpassed over a decade ago. States may reserve for administration 1 percent of a State's allocation under Title I, Part A, Title I, Part C (Migrant Education), and Title I, Part D (Neglected and Delinquent); or \$400,000 (\$50,000 in the case of an outlying area), whichever is greater, based on what the appropriation for these programs would be if the total amount appropriated by Congress for those programs is \$14.0 billion or less. This \$14 billion cap means that it has been years since States have been able to reserve a full 1 percent and the relative amount available for program administration has significantly declined over the years. For example, comparing the 2002 Title I reservation (converted to 2023 dollars) to the actual capped State reservation in 2023 shows that the reservation has decreased by 40% for small States and, for a large State like California, it has decreased by 37%. The Administration's proposal would update the amount States may use to calculate the reservation for program administration to the fiscal year 2023 appropriation levels (approximately \$18.9 billion) and double the minimum amount small States and outlying areas may reserve (from \$400,000 to \$800,000, and from \$50,000 to \$100,000, respectively).

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

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

Output Measures	2023	2024	2025
Allocations by LEA Poverty Rate:			
0-15%			
# of LEAs	6,310	6,611	6,611
Dollars	\$4,093,050	\$4,586,766	\$4,607,258
% of Total \$	22.63%	25.36%	25.19%
# of Formula Eligible Children	2,442,203	2,566,016	2,566,016
\$ Per Formula Child	\$1,676	\$1,788	\$1,795
15-25%			
# of LEAs	4,428	4,118	4,118
Dollars	\$7,622,674	\$7,355,905	\$7,448,587
% of Total \$	42.14%	40.66%	40.73%
# of Formula Eligible Children	3,821,704	3,448,354	3,448,354
\$ Per Formula Child	\$1,995	\$2,133	\$2,160
>25%			
# of LEAs	1,996	1,926	1,926
Dollars	\$6,371,358	\$6,147,407	\$6,234,054
% of Total \$	35.23%	33.98%	34.08%
# of Formula Eligible Children	2,830,211	2,614,758	2,614,758
\$ Per Formula Child	\$2,251	\$2,351	\$2,384
LEA Allocation Subtotal	\$18,087,082	\$18,090,078	\$18,279,899
BIA/Outlying Areas	\$202,200	\$202,200	\$204,400
N&D Program (Part D, Subpart 2)	\$92,520	\$89,524	\$87,503
Census Updates	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000
Funding for State and local equity reviews	0	0	\$10,000
Grants to LEAs Total	\$18,386,802	\$18,386,802	\$18,586,802

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 information primarily as specified through the annual “report card” requirements described in Section 1111(h) of the ESEA.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Measure: The percentage of States that decrease the difference between the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 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
2020	60.0	Not available
2021	64.0	57.6%
2022	68.0	
2023	68.0	
2024	72.0	
2025	76.0	

Additional information: Data for 2021 are not based on the usual methodology for reporting this measure. Performance measures are intended to compare outcomes between consecutive years. However, due to waivers of assessment requirements in response to the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020, data for 2021 are compared to data from 2019. Data for 2021 are reported for 33 of 52 SEAs; data are not available for 4 SEAs (Delaware, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Vermont). In addition, because the data may not be sufficiently representative for an SEA, data are not included for 15 SEAs (Alaska, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Virginia). Nineteen SEAs reported decreasing the gap in achievement on reading assessments in 2021. These results reflect data reported to the Department by SEAs and reviewed through the Department's data quality review processes. The COVID-19 pandemic disrupted the collection and reporting of assessment data beginning in the 2019-20 school year. Due to disruptions and restarts in schools due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and changes in State assessment practices, the Department urges abundant caution when using assessment data for the 2020-2021 school year. The Department continues to provide technical assistance to SEAs to improve the quality of the data. Normal reporting will resume for 2022, examining the change from the 2020-2021 school year to the 2021-2022 school year. Data for 2022 will be available in late Spring 2024 and will be included in the fiscal year 2026 Congressional Justification.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Measure: The percentage of States that decrease the difference between the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 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
2020	58.0	Not available
2021	62.0	68.6%
2022	66.0	
2023	66.0	
2024	70.0	
2025	74.0	

Additional information: Data for 2021 are not based on the usual methodology for reporting this measure, Performance measures are intended to compare outcomes between consecutive years. However, due to waivers of assessment requirements in response to the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020, data for 2021 are compared to data from 2019. Data for 2021 are reported for 35 of 52 SEAs data are not available for 4 SEAs (Delaware, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Vermont). In addition, because the data may not be sufficiently representative for an SEA, data are not included for 13 SEAs (Alaska, California, Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Virginia). Twenty-four SEAs reported decreasing the gap in achievement on mathematics assessments in 2021. These results reflect data reported to the Department by SEAs and reviewed through the Department’s data quality review processes. The COVID-19 pandemic disrupted the collection and reporting of assessment data beginning in the 2019-20 school year. Due to disruptions and restarts in schools due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and changes in State assessment practices, the Department urges abundant caution when using assessment data for the 2020-2021 school year. The Department continues to provide technical assistance to SEAs to improve the quality of the data. Normal reporting will resume for 2022, examining the change from the 2020-2021 school year to the 2021-2022 school year. Data for 2022 will be available in late Spring 2024 and will be included in the fiscal year 2026 Congressional Justification.

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
2020	56.7	Not available
2021	60.7	63.0%
2022	64.7	
2023	64.7	
2024	68.7	
2025	72.7	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Additional information: Data for 2021 are not based on the usual methodology for reporting this measure Performance measures are intended to compare outcomes between consecutive years. However, due to waivers of assessment requirements in response to the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020, data for 2021 are compared to data from 2019. Data for 2021 are reported for 27 of 52 SEAs; data are not available for 16 SEAs (Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Idaho, Illinois, Maine, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oregon, Puerto Rico, Tennessee, and Vermont). In addition, because the data may not be sufficiently representative for an SEA, data are not included for 9 SEAs (California, District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, and Pennsylvania). Seventeen SEAs reported decreasing the gap in achievement on science assessments in 2021. These results reflect data reported to the Department by SEAs and reviewed through the Department's data quality review processes. The COVID-19 pandemic disrupted the collection and reporting of assessment data beginning in the 2019-20 school year. Due to disruptions and restarts in schools due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and changes in State assessment practices, the Department urges abundant caution when using assessment data for the 2020-2021 school year. The Department continues to provide technical assistance to SEAs to improve the quality of the data. Normal reporting will resume for 2022, examining the change from the 2020-2021 school year to the 2021-2022 school year. Data for 2022 will be available late Spring 2024 and will be included in the fiscal year 2026 Congressional Justification.

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
2020	62.0	60.0%
2021	66.0	35.4
2022	70.0	
2023	74.0	
2024	78.0	
2025	82.0	

Additional information: Data for 2021 are reported for 48 SEAs; data are not available for 3 SEAs (Illinois, Texas and Washington). In addition, because the data may not be sufficiently representative for an SEA, data are not included for 1 SEA (Mississippi). Seventeen SEAs reported decreasing the graduation rate gap in 2021. These results reflect data reported to the Department by SEAs and reviewed through the Department's data quality review processes. The COVID-19 pandemic disrupted the collection and reporting of assessment data beginning in the 2019-20 school year. Due to disruptions and restarts in schools and changes in State policy (e.g., requirements for graduation), including modified graduation requirements, due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Department urges abundant caution when using graduation rate data for the 2020-2021 school year. The Department continues to provide technical assistance to SEAs to improve the quality of the data. Data for 2022 will be available in late Spring 2024 and will be included in the fiscal year 2026 Congressional Justification.

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 2025 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2024 Annualized CR</u>	<u>2025 Request</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$194,000	\$194,000	0

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

In awarding funds under the Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grants program, the Department gives priority to SEAs that will use grant funds for evidence-based activities. Each SEA that receives a grant must use at least 95 percent of its award to make competitive subgrants to one or more local educational agencies (LEAs) or, for the purposes of providing early literacy services, to one or more early childhood education programs. LEAs or early childhood education programs that receive subgrants from SEAs under this program must serve a high percentage of underserved children and youth, such as children and youth from low-income backgrounds, children with disabilities, or English learners, and must represent diverse geographical areas. Early childhood education programs that receive subgrants must also have a demonstrated record of providing comprehensive literacy instruction for children aged birth through 5. SEAs must ensure that at least 15 percent of funds are used to serve children from birth through age 5, 40 percent to serve students in kindergarten through grade 5, and 40 percent to serve students in grades 6 through 12. In addition, funds must be distributed equitably among grades within the kindergarten through grade 5 and grades 6 through 12 bands.

An SEA may reserve up to 5 percent of grant funds for activities related to implementing its comprehensive literacy plan and administering subgrants, including providing technical assistance to subgrantees to design and implement their literacy programs, coordinating with institutions of higher education to enhance pre-service courses for students preparing to teach in early childhood education programs or elementary and secondary schools, reviewing and updating State literacy licensure or certification standards, sharing information on promising literacy instructional practices, training literacy coaches, and evaluating grant-funded activities. Eligible entities receiving subgrants must use program funds for services and activities that have

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2021. Reauthorization for FY 2025 is expected through appropriations action.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

the characteristics of effective, evidence-based comprehensive literacy instruction, as defined by the statute. Allowable activities include professional development and training for early childhood educators and related school staff, coordinating activities designed to increase family engagement in children’s literacy development, and other research-based methods of improving classroom instruction and practice.

Of the amount appropriated 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:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2020	\$192,000
2021	192,000
2022	192,000
2023	194,000
2024 Annualized CR	194,000

FY 2025 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2025, the Administration requests \$194.0 million for Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grants, level with a fiscal year 2024 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2023 appropriation. The request would support continuation awards for approximately 25 SEAs implementing plans for comprehensive literacy instruction, particularly for underserved students. Reading on grade level by third grade is crucial to future academic success. When students read on grade level, they are more likely to come to school, be engaged, and graduate on time. The request would support the Administration’s efforts to assist States and districts in achieving academic recovery and excellence by supporting the conditions to accelerate learning and offer a comprehensive and rigorous education for every student as part of the “Raise the Bar: Lead the World” initiative to transform P-12 education.

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 2022 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), just 33 percent of 4th-grade students¹ and 31 percent of 8th-grade students² scored at or above the proficient level in reading. In the 2019 NAEP, 37 percent of 12th-grade students scored at or above the proficient

¹ <https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading/nation/achievement/?grade=4>

² <https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading/nation/achievement/?grade=8>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

level in reading. The results also show continued, wide gaps in reading performance between students from low-income backgrounds and their peers: 46 percent of 4th-grade students from higher-income families scored at or above proficient in 2022, compared to 19 percent of 4th-grade students from low-income backgrounds;¹ and 41 percent of 8th-grade students from higher-income backgrounds scored at or above proficient, compared to 19 percent of 8th-grade students from low-income backgrounds.² We also know that the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted educational opportunities and outcomes for many students, including reading proficiency.

Research shows there are wide benefits to exposing children to a wide variety of high-quality reading materials for which they can see themselves in and experience other cultures and 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.³ Further, significant differences in reading skills, including pre-literacy skills, have been observed between children from low-income backgrounds and other children. For example, the size of the working vocabulary of 4-year-old children from low-income backgrounds are approximately one-third that of children from middle-income backgrounds.⁴ 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.⁵

The request includes appropriations language to increase the percent of grant funds States are allowed to reserve for evaluation.

¹ <https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading/nation/achievement/?grade=4>

² <https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading/nation/achievement/?grade=8>

³ Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2010). *Early warning! Why reading by the end of third grade matters. KIDS COUNT special report*. Baltimore, MD: Author. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED509795>.

⁴ Fernald, A., V.A. Marchman, & A. Weisleder. 2013. "SES Differences in Language Processing Skill and Vocabulary Are Evident at 18 Months." *Developmental Science* 16 (2): 234–48.

⁵ <https://nces.ed.gov/ecls/>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

Output Measures	2023 ¹	2024	2025
Funding for new awards	\$186,221	0	0
Number of new awards	25	0	0
Funding for continuation awards	\$4,853	\$191,060	\$191,060
Number of continuation awards	0	25	25
Peer review of new award applications	\$200	0	0
Amount for Bureau of Indian Education	\$970	\$970	\$970
Amount for Outlying Areas	\$970	\$970	\$970
National activities (including evaluation) ²	\$786	\$1,000	\$1,000

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 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.*

¹ The Department generally carries Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grants funds over into the subsequent fiscal year. Accordingly, the funding from the fiscal year 2023 appropriation shown below will generally be obligated in fiscal year 2024.

² 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 2023, it may do so in fiscal year 2024 or 2025.

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
2020	52%	75%
2021	75	54
2022	59	58
2023	64	64
2024	62	
2025	68	

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 2024 will be available in 2025.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2020	43%	Not applicable
2021	43	34%
2022	39	59
2023	44	37
2024	39	
2025	41	

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 2024 will be available in 2025.

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
2020	42%	Not applicable
2021	43	38%
2022	43	60
2023	62	37
2024	39	
2025	41	

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 2024 will be available in 2025.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2020	39%	Not applicable
2021	42	40%
2022	45	61
2023	65	39
2024	41	
2025	43	

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 2024 will be available in 2025.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2021	Baseline	69
2022	74%	62
2023	65	85
2024	64	
2025	89	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

Additional information: Evidence-based activities that meet the requirements of strong or moderate evidence is determined by States based on the definition of evidence-based in section 8101 of the ESEA.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Innovative approaches to literacy

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title II, Part B, Subpart 2, Section 2226)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2025 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2024 Annualized CR</u>	<u>2025 Request</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$30,000	\$30,000	0

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Innovative Approaches to Literacy (IAL) program supports a wide range of projects that develop the literacy skills of children and adolescents in communities of concentrated poverty. The program may award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to local educational agencies 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 books and reading materials to children and adolescents to increase students' reading motivation, performance, and frequency.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>(dollars in thousands)</u>
2020	\$27,000
2021	28,000
2022	29,000
2023	30,000
2024 Annualized CR	30,000

FY 2025 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2025, the Administration requests \$30.0 million for Innovative Approaches to Literacy, level with a fiscal year 2024 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2023 appropriation. Funds would be used to support continuation awards for grants awarded in fiscal years 2021 and 2023 as well as approximately \$11.0 million in new awards.

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2021. Reauthorization for FY 2025 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. Furthermore, 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 their homes. Over the last several years, districts across the country reported losing a total of 1,800 school librarians.¹ 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. Research shows there are wide benefits to exposing children to a wide variety of high-quality reading materials for which they can see themselves in and experience other cultures and backgrounds.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

Output Measures ²	2023	2024	2025
Funding for new awards	\$7,720	0	\$11,000
Number of new awards	12	0	15-20
Peer review	\$115	0	\$300
Funding for continuation awards	\$22,165	\$30,000	\$18,700
Number of continuation awards	40	52	52

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

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.

¹ Lance, K., & Kachel, D. (2022). <https://libslide.org/pubs/Pre-Post-COVID-Analysis-Special-Report.pdf>.

² 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 2023 but may do so in fiscal years 2024 and 2025.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Innovative approaches to literacy

Performance Measures

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

Year	Target	Actual
2020	50%	67%
2021	50	57
2022	50	28
2023	50	

Additional information: Data in this table represents the fiscal year 2018 and fiscal year 2019 cohorts. The fiscal year 2022 data for this measure represents the fiscal year 2019 cohort of IAL grantees. All fiscal year 2019 grantees reported data for this measure. Note that the IAL program discontinued use of this measure in the fiscal year 2021 IAL grant competition. This decision was made due to many LEAs not required to provide direct educational service to pre-k students. Grantees continue to have to option to support birth to four-year-old children with IAL activities but are no longer required to provide data on this measure. Fiscal year 2023 data for the fiscal year 2019 grantees is expected to be available in December 2024 and will be included in the fiscal year 2026 Congressional Justification.

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.

Year	Target	Actual
2020	30%	31%
2021	30	41
2022	30	38
2023	30	
2024	30	
2025	30	

Additional information: For 2022, 28 of 40 (70 percent) grantees reported data for this measure. Two of the 40 grantees did not include 4th grade students in their grant program and the remaining ten grantees did not report data. Because this is the first reporting year for the fiscal year 2021 cohort, some grantees used year one as a baseline year and will report student 4th grade student growth data in years 2-5. Fiscal year 2023 performance data is expected to be available in June 2024 and will be included in the fiscal year 2026 Congressional Justification.

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.

Year	Target	Actual
2020	30%	29%
2021	32	40
2022	32	49
2023	32	
2024	35	
2025	35	

Additional information: For 2022, 27 of 40 (68 percent) grantees reported data for this measure. Two of the 40 grantees did not include 8th grade students in their grant program and the remaining eleven grantees did not report data. Because this is the first reporting year for the fiscal year 2021 cohort, some grantees used year one as a baseline year and will report 8th grade student growth data in years 2-5. Fiscal year 2023 performance data is expected to be available in June 2024 and will be included in the fiscal year 2026 Congressional Justification.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2020	99%	100%
2021	99	99
2022	99	99
2023	99	
2024	99	
2025	99	

Additional information: For 2022, 33 of 40 (83 percent) grantees reported data for this measure. Because this is the first reporting year for the fiscal year 2021 cohort, some grantees used year one as a baseline year and will report their increase in book-to-student ratios in years 2-5. Fiscal year 2023 performance data is expected to be available in June 2024 and will be included in the fiscal year 2026 Congressional Justification.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Innovative approaches to literacy

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

Year	Target	Actual
2020	98%	100%
2021	98	99
2022	99	89
2023	99	
2024	99	
2025	99	

Additional information: For 2022, 38 of 40 (95 percent) grantees reported data for this measure. Fiscal year 2023 performance data is expected to be available in June 2024 and will be included in the fiscal year 2026 Congressional Justification.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2025 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2024 Annualized CR</u>	<u>2025 Request</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$375,626	\$375,626	0

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Migrant Education program (MEP) provides financial assistance to State educational agencies (SEAs) to establish and improve programs of education for children of migratory farmworkers and fishers. The goal of the MEP is to enable migratory children and youth: (1) to meet the same challenging State academic standards as other children and youth; and (2) to graduate from high school or a high school equivalency program with an education that prepares them for responsible citizenship, continued education, and employment. To help achieve this objective, program services help migratory children and youth overcome the educational disruption that results from repeated moves. The program statute encourages activities to promote coordination of needed services across States and encourages greater access for migratory children to services available under Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) and other programs authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), so that MEP funds can be used for services not already available from those programs to meet the unique needs of migratory students.

Eligible children and youth are children of migratory agricultural workers or migratory fishers, or who are migratory agricultural workers or fishers themselves, and who have made a “qualifying move” within the last 3 years. A move is considered to be a qualifying move if it is a change of residence due to economic necessity and (1) involves crossing school district boundaries; (2) resulted in temporary or seasonal work in agriculture or fishing; and (3) was made in the preceding 36 months. Migratory children and youth who made a qualifying move in the previous year and children and youth who have left school without a diploma receive priority for services under the program.

Funds are allocated through a statutory formula based on each State’s per-pupil expenditure for education, its average count of eligible migratory students aged 3 through 21 residing within the State in the preceding 3 years, and its count of students who received services in summer or intersession programs provided by the State during the previous year.

The Department may reserve up to \$10.0 million from the annual MEP appropriation for contracts and grants to improve inter- and intra-State migrant coordination activities, including

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2021. Reauthorization for FY 2025 is expected through appropriations action.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education

academic credit accrual and exchange programs for migratory students. The Department is required to consult with States receiving allocations of \$1.0 million or less about whether they can increase the cost-effectiveness of their programs by entering into inter-state consortium arrangements; in fiscal year 2023, 12 States received allocations under \$1.0 million, but none had entered into consortia with other States under this provision. The Department may reserve up to \$3.0 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)
2020	\$374,751
2021	375,626
2022	375,626
2023	375,626
2024 Annualized CR	375,626

FY 2025 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2025, the Administration requests \$375.6 million for the Title I Migrant Education Program (MEP), level with a fiscal year 2024 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2023 appropriation. The request would support the Administration's efforts to assist States and districts in achieving academic recovery and excellence by supporting the conditions to accelerate learning and offer a comprehensive and rigorous education for every student as part of the "Raise the Bar: Lead the World" initiative to transform P-12 education.

Migratory children and youth represent an especially underserved and hard-to-serve group due to multiple risk factors. In particular, the high mobility of these children and youth across school districts and State boundaries (sometimes within the school term or year) often means that no single school district or State has ongoing responsibility for the education of these children and youth. The MEP assists in the coordination of services among States and districts to meet their needs, such as the need for additional supports to help students to overcome the effects of disruptions in their education and helping high school students accrue credits towards graduation. Additionally, the challenges the States faced during the COVID-19 pandemic, such as school closures and social distancing, exacerbated these obstacles and highlighted the need for States to continue identifying eligible migratory children and youth outside of traditional

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education

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

Moreover, the characteristics of the migratory population create a need for educational services that go beyond those traditionally supported with State and local education funds. In addition to being highly mobile, migratory children and youth tend to live in poverty, have limited English proficiency, and their families are more likely to experience food and job insecurity as well as poor health and housing conditions. During the 2021-22 school year, 274,258 children, ages birth through 21 years old, were identified as eligible for services through the Migrant Education Program (MEP). Of these children, 8.6 percent were identified as students with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. In addition, of eligible children ages 3 through 21 years old, 44.6 percent were English learners and 31.8 percent were classified as having priority for services under the program (meaning they had made a qualifying move within the past 12 months, and either failed or were most at risk of failing to meet State standards or had left school without a diploma.)

Migratory children and youth may also help their families perform agricultural work, and many migratory "emancipated youth" travel without a parent or guardian to obtain migratory work in the fields and in agricultural processing. In 2021-22, 10.9 percent of eligible children and youth aged birth through 21 years old were identified as out-of-school youth or school-aged youth who do not attend school.

During school year 2021-22, States and local entities provided instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with program funds to 192,856 migratory children or youth ages birth through 21 years old. Instructional services included supplemental instruction in reading, mathematics, and other academic areas, as well as high school credit accrual. Program funds were also used to provide support services such as counseling, health and nutrition services, advocacy, social services, and (especially in the summer) transportation. The Department expects to support a similar level of services using fiscal year 2025 funds.

The Department would continue to reserve approximately \$10.0 million in fiscal year 2025 for coordination activities to serve migratory children and youth, including \$3.0 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).

Improving Service Delivery and Coordination for Highly At-Risk Students

The fiscal year 2025 request also includes a proposal to improve coordination of services for students who face multiple risk factors and, as a result, are eligible for multiple Federal programs, including students who are migratory. Each of these programs is designed to support the unique needs of students through coordination with multiple agencies and systems, such as state and local child welfare agencies, housing agencies and providers, and community-based organizations. The number of students who qualify for services provided under multiple federal

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education

programs and deal with life circumstances that jeopardize their educational stability and success is significant. For example,

- A report published in 2021 by the Children’s Data Network showed that almost two-thirds of youth in the Los Angeles County juvenile justice system were previously involved with the county’s child welfare system.¹
- A report published in 2021 by the Poverty Solutions at the University of Michigan found that students who were homeless in school year 2014-15 were 14 times more likely to enter foster care in school year 2015-16 than students who were not homeless the previous school year.²
- In Colorado 28% of students enrolled in the Migrant Education Program experienced homelessness in school year 2017-18.³

Because students are often eligible to receive services from multiple programs, no one entity is responsible for the totality of their care and they risk being overlooked or losing out on critical services, in particular if they are highly mobile and change schools frequently. As a result, it can be difficult for SEAs and LEAs to properly identify students who qualify for services under multiple programs and effectively coordinate and target services across multiple funding streams. Since these programs can be part of different systems (e.g., child welfare system, justice system, school system), tracking the services requires a degree of collaboration that often does not exist. Families are then left to bridge the gaps in these systems to advocate for the needs of their students, which can be a daunting task. These challenges can contribute to lower engagement and academic performance for such students and a disruption of student supports such as special education and mental health services. Furthermore, there are limited resources to engage in meaningful coordination and alignment of activities across these existing programs to ensure that eligible students benefit from the full array of services and supports available, including data sharing and analysis, staff cross-training, and formalizing partnerships with other pertinent agencies and community-based organizations.

Some states have taken steps to address the need to improve coordination across relevant education and social service programs. For example, Colorado established the Educational Stability Grant Program in 2018 to improve the educational progress and outcomes of highly mobile students including students of migratory families, students involved in child welfare, and students whose housing is unstable or who are homeless. As part of this program, ten school districts in that State received a total of approximately \$805,662 annually, with an average grant

¹ Herz, D. C., Eastman, A., McCroskey, J., Guo, L., & Putnam-Hornstein, E. (n.d.). The Intersection of Child Welfare & Juvenile Justice: Key findings from the Los Angeles dual system youth study AUTHORS. Datanetwork.org. Retrieved October 9, 2023, from <https://www.datanetwork.org/wpcontent/uploads/LADS-study.pdf>.

² Erb-Downward, J., Cooney, P., Blakeslee, M., Nothaft, A., Merchant, S., Evangelist, M., & Peterson, N. (2021). The educational implications of homelessness and housing instability in Detroit. Poverty Solutions, University of Michigan. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED614809.pdf>.

³ Myers, K., & Rosa, J. (2019). Educational stability grant program annual evaluation report. State.Co.Us. <https://www.cde.state.co.us/studentssupport/20192020esgrpt>.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education

amount of \$80,000. Recipients use these funds to coordinate across programs within the district and with local county agencies and community-based organizations. In just two short years, these pilots have contributed to improved student attendance and academic performance.¹ The Administration is requesting appropriations language under General Provisions to authorize a limited demonstration project to provide additional resources to SEAs and LEAs to address the challenge of coordinating services for students.

The proposal would authorize the Department to reserve up to one-half of one percent of funds appropriated for the Migrant Education, Neglected and Delinquent, and Education for Homeless Children and Youths program for the Department to make competitive grants to SEAs to improve service delivery and coordination for at-risk students who are eligible to receive services under multiple Federal education programs. SEAs would have the authority to make subgrants to LEAs to carry out these activities. Ultimately, this authority would support better coordination of services across funding streams, help ensure more effective and efficient use of Federal resources for benefitting students, reduce duplication in services, ensure service continuity, and provide improved service delivery and direct student support. Funding could support personnel, training and professional development, data collection and analysis, and documentation of best practices to shore up SEA and LEA capacity to address needs of students that qualify for multiple programs (like migratory students and students experiencing homelessness) across ED grant funds.

The Department would evaluate this demonstration project and disseminate information on best practices in this area. The Department may also seek appropriations language in the future to allow SEAs to also reserve funds from their allocations under specified programs to expand their work on enhancing service delivery and promoting coordination of services for students through technical assistance and funding to LEAs and schools for this purpose.

¹ Burciaga, J., & Brett, B. (2021). Educational stability grant program annual evaluation report. State.Co.Us. <https://www.cde.state.co.us/studentsupport/20202021esgrpt-0>.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

Output Measures	2023	2024	2025
Number of eligible children aged birth through 21	274,258	274,258	274,258
SEA program:			
Amount for State grants	\$365,626	\$365,626	\$363,743
Range of State awards	0-\$112,301	0-\$120,507	0-\$119,806
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
Improving Service Delivery and Coordination	0	0	\$1,883

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
2020	33.4%	Not available
2021	30.0	21.4%
2022	31.0	22.7
2023	33.0	
2024	33.0	
2025	26.6	

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 2019-2020 due to widespread closures related to the COVID-19 pandemic. Furthermore, given the continued impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on assessment administration and reporting, 2020-2021 data may be incomplete and should be interpreted with caution. The Department re-set the target starting in 2025 to account for the lingering effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on the proficiency results for migratory students, and has also undertaken targeted technical assistance efforts to States. Data for 2023 will be available in late summer of 2024 and will be included in the fiscal year 2026 Congressional Justification.

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
2020	32.5%	Not available
2021	30.0	17.2%
2022	31.0	18.0
2023	33.0	
2024	33.0	
2025	20.4	

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 2019-2020 due to widespread closures related to the COVID-19 pandemic. Furthermore, given the continued impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on assessment administration and reporting, 2020-2021 data may be incomplete and should be interpreted with caution. The Department re-set the target starting in 2025 to account for the lingering effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on the proficiency results for migratory students, and has also undertaken targeted technical assistance efforts to States. Data for 2023 will be available in late summer of 2024 and will be included in the fiscal year 2026 Congressional Justification.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education

Measure: The percentage of MEP students who were enrolled in grades seven through twelve, and graduated or were promoted to the next grade level.

Year	Target Percentage	Actual Percentage
2020	N/A	67.3%
2021	N/A	70
2022	N/A	69
2023	N/A	
2024	67.0	
2025	68.8%	

Additional information: The source of the data is *EDFacts*, the Department's system for States to submit kindergarten through grade 12 data. 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 had not established targets for these measures until there sufficient quality data was available to set targets. The current target is based on a 3-year average of actual data. Data for 2023 will be available in late summer of 2024 and will be included in the fiscal year 2026 Congressional Justification.

Measure: The percentage of MEP students who entered 11th grade that had received full credit for Algebra I or equivalent.

Year	Target Percentage	Actual Percentage
2020	N/A	37.1%
2021	N/A	42
2022	N/A	42
2023	N/A	
2024	39.0	
2025	40.4%	

Additional information: The source of the data is *EDFacts*, the Department's system for States to submit kindergarten through grade 12 data. 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 had not established targets for these measures until there sufficient quality data was available to set targets. The current target is based on a 3-year average of actual data. Data for 2023 will be available in late summer of 2024 and will be included in the fiscal year 2026 Congressional Justification.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education

information, student assessment data, and credit accrual information for secondary school students.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2020	46	46
2021	46	46
2022	46	46
2023	46	
2024	46	
2025	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. Data for 2023 will be available in late summer of 2024 and will be included in the FY 2026 Congressional Justification.

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

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education

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.

- 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 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 2025 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2024 Annualized CR</u>	<u>2025 Request</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$49,239	\$49,239	0

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

Subpart 1 of Title I Part D receives a direct appropriation to provide financial assistance to State educational agencies (SEAs), which in turn must make subgrants to State agencies which provide free public education to neglected and delinquent (“N and D”) children and youth who are in State-run institutions, attending community day programs, and in correctional facilities. Funds are allocated to States through a formula based on a count of children and youth in State-operated institutions and per-pupil education expenditures for the State. Each State’s N and D count is based on the number of children and youth enrolled for at least 20 hours of instruction a week in State institutions or community day programs for neglected or delinquent children and youth, or at least 15 hours of instruction in adult correctional institutions. State institutions serving children with an average length of stay of at least 30 days are eligible to receive funds. Adult correctional institutions must give priority for services to youth who are likely to be released within a 2-year period.

The program requires institutions receiving funds to gear their services to the same college- and career-ready State academic standards that all children are expected to meet under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Similar to the school-wide program option under the Title I, Part A Grants to Local Educational Agencies program, all juvenile facilities may operate institution-wide education programs in which they use program funds in combination with other available Federal and State funds. This option allows juvenile institutions to serve a larger proportion of their eligible population and to align their programs more closely with other

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2021. Reauthorization for FY 2025 is expected through appropriations action.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth

education services in order to meet participants' educational and occupational training needs. States are required to reserve between 15 and 30 percent of their allocations for projects to help program participants make the transition from State institutions to locally operated programs or to support the successful entry of youth into postsecondary and career and technical education programs.

Subpart 2 of Part D of Title I authorizes a separate companion program that provides funding for local educational agencies (LEAs). SEAs use funds reserved from their allocations under Title I, Part A to make subgrants to eligible LEAs with high numbers or percentages of children and youth in locally operated correctional facilities for children and youth, including public or private institutions and community day programs or schools that serve children and youth. SEAs have the option of awarding subgrants to eligible LEAs by formula or through a discretionary grant process.

The Department may reserve up to 2.5 percent of the appropriation for national activities, including technical assistance to help build the capacity of State agency programs.

This is a forward-funded program. Funds become available for obligation from July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available through September 30 of the following year.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2020	\$47,614
2021	48,239
2022	48,239
2023	49,239
2024 Annualized CR	49,239

FY 2025 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2025, the Administration requests \$49.2 million for the Neglected, Delinquent and At-Risk Children and Youth program, level with a fiscal year 2024 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2023 appropriation. The 2015 reauthorization of the ESEA included expanded requirements for Subpart 1 grant recipients, such as emphasizing the attainment of regular high school diplomas as the preferred program outcome, and requiring more effective transitions for youth between correctional facilities and local education programs and schools, particularly to provide for educational continuity, to ensure credit accrual, and to support the successful completion of high school and pathways into postsecondary education and the workforce. The request reflects the Administration's commitment to address resource inequities across our education system, particularly for underserved students such as students in correctional institutions or other institutional settings.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth

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

In addition, approximately 33 percent (13,870) of the youth served by the program in school year 2021-2022 were students with disabilities. The large share of students with disabilities presents additional considerations for institutions because such students typically require additional, specialized support and attention to be successful in school and beyond. Research has shown that a significant portion of individuals impacted by the criminal justice system have dyslexia² which can negatively impact academic and behavioral outcomes. To address this issue, the Department will explore strategies to provide technical assistance on targeting and improving services to students with disabilities, particularly those with dyslexia, both while in correctional settings and during transition and re-entry into their communities and schools.

Improving Service Delivery and Coordination for Highly At-Risk Students

The fiscal year 2025 request also includes a proposal to improve coordination of services for students who face multiple risk factors and, as a result, are eligible for multiple Federal programs, including students who are neglected and delinquent. Each of these programs is designed to support the unique needs of students through coordination with multiple agencies and systems, such as state and local child welfare agencies, housing agencies and providers, and community-based organizations. The number of students who qualify for services provided under multiple federal programs and deal with life circumstances that jeopardize their educational stability and success is significant. For example,

- A report published in 2021 by the Children's Data Network showed that almost two-thirds of youth in the Los Angeles County juvenile justice system were previously involved with the county's child welfare system.³

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

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

³ Herz, D. C., Eastman, A., McCroskey, J., Guo, L., & Putnam-Hornstein, E. (n.d.). *THE INTERSECTION OF CHILD WELFARE & JUVENILE JUSTICE: Key findings from the Los Angeles dual system youth study* AUTHORS. Datanetwork.org. Retrieved October 9, 2023, from <https://www.datanetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/LADS-study.pdf>.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth

- A report published in 2021 by the Poverty Solutions at the University of Michigan found that students who were homeless in school year 2014-2015 were 14 times more likely to enter foster care in school year 2015-2016 than students who were not homeless the previous school year.¹
- In Colorado 28% of students enrolled in the Migrant Education Program experienced homelessness in school year 2017-2018.²

Because students are often eligible to receive services from multiple programs, no one entity is responsible for the totality of their care and they risk being overlooked or losing out on critical services, in particular if they are highly mobile and change schools frequently. As a result, it can be difficult for SEAs and LEAs to properly identify students who qualify for services under multiple programs and effectively coordinate and target services across multiple funding streams. Since these programs can be part of different systems (e.g., child welfare system, justice system, school system), tracking the services requires a degree of collaboration that often does not exist. Families are then left to bridge the gaps in these systems to advocate for the needs of their students, which can be a daunting task. These challenges can contribute to lower engagement and academic performance for such students and a disruption of student supports such as special education and mental health services. Furthermore, there are limited resources to engage in meaningful coordination and alignment of activities across these existing programs to ensure that eligible students benefit from the full array of services and supports available, including data sharing and analysis, staff cross-training, and formalizing partnerships with other pertinent agencies and community-based organizations.

Some states have taken steps to address the need to improve coordination across relevant education and social service programs. For example, Colorado established the Educational Stability Grant Program in 2018 to improve the educational progress and outcomes of highly mobile students including students of migratory families, students involved in child welfare, and students whose housing is unstable or who are homeless. As part of this program, ten school districts in that State received a total of approximately \$805,662 annually, with an average grant amount of \$80,000. Recipients use these funds to coordinate across programs within the district and with local county agencies and community-based organizations. In just two short years, these pilots have contributed to improved student attendance and academic performance.³ The Administration is requesting appropriations language under General Provisions to authorize a limited demonstration project to provide additional resources to SEAs and LEAs to address the challenge of coordinating services for students.

¹ Erb-Downward, J., Cooney, P., Blakeslee, M., Nothhaft, A., Merchant, S., Evangelist, M., & Peterson, N. (2021). The educational implications of homelessness and housing instability in Detroit. *Poverty Solutions, University of Michigan*. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED614809.pdf>.

² Myers, K., & Rosa, J. (2019). Educational stability grant program annual evaluation report. State.Co.Us. <https://www.cde.state.co.us/studentssupport/20192020esgrpt>.

³ Burciaga, J., & Brett, B. (2021). Educational stability grant program annual evaluation report. State.Co.Us. <https://www.cde.state.co.us/studentssupport/20202021esgrpt-0>.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth

The proposal would authorize the Department to reserve up to one-half of one percent of funds appropriated for the Migrant Education, Neglected and Delinquent, and Education for Homeless Children and Youths program for the Department to make competitive grants to SEAs to improve service delivery and coordination for at-risk students who are eligible to receive services under multiple Federal education programs. SEAs would have the authority to make subgrants to LEAs to carry out these activities. Ultimately, this authority would support better coordination of services across funding streams, help ensure more effective and efficient use of Federal resources for benefitting students, reduce duplication in services, ensure service continuity, and provide improved service delivery and direct student support. Funding could support personnel, training and professional development, data collection and analysis, and documentation of best practices to shore up SEA and LEA capacity to address needs of students that qualify for multiple programs (like migratory students and students experiencing homelessness) across ED grant funds.

The Department would evaluate this demonstration project and disseminate information on best practices in this area. The Department may also seek appropriations language in the future to allow SEAs to also reserve funds from their allocations under specified programs to expand their work on enhancing service delivery and promoting coordination of services for students through technical assistance and funding to LEAs and schools for this purpose.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

Output Measures	2023	2024	2025
Number of participating institutions	728	728	728
Estimated number of students served	55,361	55,361	55,361
Average Federal contribution per child (whole dollars)	\$867	\$867	\$867
Range of awards to States	0-\$3,436	0-\$3,487	0-\$3,469
Average State award	\$923	\$923	\$918
Technical assistance	\$1,231	\$1,231	\$1,231
Improving Service Delivery and Coordination	0	0	\$246

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

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. Fiscal year 2023 performance

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth

data is expected to be available in April 2024 and will be included in the fiscal year 2026 Congressional Justification.

Performance Measures

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
2020	21.8%	13.6%
2021	22.8	14.4
2022	23.8	16.3
2023	23.8	
2024	23.8	
2025	23.8	

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2020	64.6%	52.1%
2021	65.6	61.7
2022	66.6	50.4
2023	66.6	
2024	66.6	
2025	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 juvenile detention and juvenile correctional institutions, and not students in adult correctional institutions. The percentage of students obtaining high school course credits increased in 2021 from the previous year. Actual values for 2021 represent 47 grantees (of 51 with applicable programs) reporting age and outcome data for programs other than adult corrections. Data are unavailable for two States and two States reported students earning high school course credits only in adult corrections.

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
2020	79.4%	58.8%
2021	80.4	61.7
2022	81.4	56.0
2023	81.4	
2024	81.4	
2025	81.4	

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2020	80.9%	59.3%
2021	81.9	61.0
2022	82.9	56.8
2023	82.9	
2024	82.9	
2025	82.9	

Additional information: The source of the data is *EDFacts*, the Department’s system for States to submit kindergarten through grade 12 data. Student counts are based on the number of long-term students (those enrolled in a participating program or facility for 90 or more consecutive calendar days) who complete pre- and post-testing in reading and mathematics. These are not the same as the State assessments required under ESEA Title I and do not necessarily reflect State proficiency levels. The percentage of students showing improvement in

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth

mathematics in 2021 increased from the previous year. The discrepancy between the target goal and actual numbers of students achieving the outcome may be attributable to a number of factors, including the quality of the data reported by facilities and challenges to educational programs or testing due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Additionally, the long-term students who completed mathematics pre- and post-test exams in 2021 only represented 50 percent of the total number of long-term students reported, which is an increase from 2020, but still lower than in 2019. Furthermore, the States that reported data on long-term students who completed mathematics pre- and post-test exams in 2021 represented 48 grantees (out of 51), compared with 51 grantees that reported results in 2020.

Efficiency measures

Measure: The cost per high school diploma or equivalent.

Year	Target	Actual
2020	\$4,170	\$8,127
2021	4,128	11,479
2022	4,087	9,585
2023	4,087	
2024	4,087	
2025	4,087	

Additional information: This measure attempts to determine program cost efficiency by tracking the ratio of the number of participating students achieving a high school diploma or its equivalent to the cost of the program. The substantial increase in cost for 2021 may in part be due to educational disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, including a decrease in the number of students receiving diplomas.

Other performance information

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

- Program funds represented less than 10 percent of education budgets for State agencies responsible for providing education services to neglected and delinquent children and youth

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

who are in State-run institutions, attending community day programs, and in correctional facilities. On average, State facilities received \$82,000 in program funds.

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

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2025 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

2024 Annualized CR	2025 Request	Change
\$52,123	\$52,123	0

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 \$40.0 million, 45 percent of the remaining funds must be used for HEP and

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2015. Reauthorization for FY 2025 is expected through appropriations action.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

45 percent for CAMP, and the remainder may be used for either program, based on the number, quality, and promise of applications received.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2020	\$45,623
2021	46,123
2022	48,123
2023	52,123
2024 Annualized CR	52,123

FY 2025 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2025, the Administration requests \$52.1 million for Special Programs for Migrant Students, level with a fiscal year 2024 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2023 appropriation. The request would continue support for programs that have demonstrated success in helping migratory youth, who are particularly at risk for low educational, employment, and earnings outcomes, in obtaining a high school equivalency certificate or helping first-year undergraduate migrant students successfully complete their first year of postsecondary education.

HEP and CAMP programs focus on finding and assisting migrant youth who have not been able to complete high school or go on to postsecondary education due to limited or inconsistent educational opportunity. Projects emphasize services to out-of-school-youth and other eligible individuals by conducting extensive outreach in locations where these youth live and work (e.g., farms, production facilities, and labor camps) and providing services at locations and times that meet the needs of an out-of-school, working population. Program performance data show that the programs' academic and support services are successful at helping participants attain their high school equivalency credentials or complete their first academic year in a postsecondary program. Program outcomes compare favorably with outcomes for the general population. For example, approximately 96 percent of CAMP participants who completed their first academic year in a postsecondary program continued their postsecondary education. In contrast, NCES data show that the retention rate of first-time, full-time degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates at 4-year institutions was 82 percent from 2019 to 2020, and 61 percent at 2-year institutions during the same period.¹

Data from a 2021 U.S. Department of Labor research report (Findings from the National Agricultural Workers Survey 2017-18: A Demographic and Employment Profile of United States Farmworkers)² show that a significant proportion of farmworkers tend to be young, under-educated, unlikely to be proficient in English, and from low-income backgrounds. In 2019-2020,

¹ National Center for Education Statistics. (2022). Undergraduate Retention and Graduation Rates. Condition of Education. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. Retrieved December 7, 2023, from <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/ctr>.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

individuals aged 14-19 constituted five percent of farmworkers, and one-third of farmworkers overall were younger than 35; average educational attainment was 9th grade; only 32 percent of respondents said they could speak English well; and 20 percent of farmworkers had family incomes below the poverty level.

HEP and CAMP provide participants with assistance that can enable them to improve their earnings potential dramatically. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics “Occupational Outlook Handbook,”¹ the median annual wage for agricultural workers in 2022 was \$33,290, 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 2021 the median earnings for full-time, year-round workers aged 25-34 were \$39,700 for a person with a high school diploma or equivalent; \$45,000 for a person with an associate’s degree; and \$61,600 for a person with a bachelor’s degree.² Furthermore, the “Occupational Outlook Handbook” indicates that periods of unemployment between jobs can cause stress for migrant and seasonal farmworkers, and agricultural work can be dangerous due to risk of exposure to pesticides or working with farm machinery that can cause serious injuries. Agricultural workers frequently leave the occupation due to the intense physical nature of the work, but because of the barriers to attain a quality education, they are likely to need support to pursue educational opportunities that would allow them and their families to obtain other jobs.

The Administration is also requesting appropriations language that would allow the Department to override the distribution of funds between the HEP and CAMP programs required by the statute. This change would allow the Department to better leverage funds across multiple programs and provide more flexibility to make grant awards to the strongest applications.

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 December 4, 2023).

² National Center for Education Statistics. (2023). Annual Earnings by Educational Attainment. Condition of Education. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. Retrieved December 7, 2023, from <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cba>.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

Output Measures ¹	2023	2024	2025
Outreach, technical assistance, and professional development	\$260	\$261	\$261
HEP:			
Number of students served	3,924	4,215	4,069
Funding for new awards	\$1,715	\$9,367	\$5,302
Number of new awards	4	20	12
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$58	\$60
Average new award	\$429	\$468	\$442
Funding for continuation awards	\$22,969	\$16,376	\$20,439
Number of continuation awards	50	38	44
Average continuation award	\$459	\$431	\$465
Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars)	\$6,290	\$6,121	\$6,341
CAMP:			
Number of students served	2,160	2,124	2,016
Funding for new awards	\$1,846	\$4,783	\$5,876
Number of new awards	4	11	13
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$58	\$60
Average new award	\$462	\$435	\$452
Funding for continuation awards	\$25,072	\$20,959	\$19,864
Number of continuation awards	56	48	43
Average continuation award	\$448	\$437	\$462
Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars)	\$12,462	\$12,147	\$12,798

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.

¹ Totals include funding for higher education evaluation.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

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

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2020	69.0%	62.0%
2021	69.0	65.2
2022	69.0	68.3
2023	69.0	
2024	69.0	
2025	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. Grantees indicated that challenges caused by the COVID-19 pandemic continued during the 2021-22 reporting period, including adjustments in instructional mode such as limited or no in-person instruction; recruiting and retaining staff; and student outreach, recruitment, and engagement. Data collected for fiscal year 2023 will be available in late 2024.

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, employment, or the military.

Year	Target	Actual
2020	80.0%	75.1%
2021	80.0	84.5
2022	80.0	83.5
2023	80.0	
2024	80.0	
2025	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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

project periods. Grantees indicated that disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic disruptions continued during 2021, including limited opportunities for participants to take high school equivalency tests because of lack of open test sites and prolonged wait times. Data collected for fiscal year 2023 will be available in late 2024.

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

Objective: *All CAMP students will complete their first academic year at a postsecondary institution in good standing.*

Measure: The percentage of CAMP participants completing the first year of their postsecondary program.

Year	Target	Actual
2020	86.0%	85.8%
2021	86.0	70.8
2022	86.0	73.1
2023	86.0	
2024	86.0	
2025	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. Grantees indicated that challenges caused by the COVID-19 pandemic continued during the 2021-22 reporting period, such as lost instructional time in high school that impacted performance in higher education; student mental health challenges; changes to course delivery, including limited or no in-person instruction; and challenges with recruitment of both staff and students. The lack of staff also led to reduced advisory and other support services. Data collected for fiscal year 2023 will be available in late 2024.

Objective: *A majority of CAMP students who successfully complete their first academic year of college will continue in postsecondary education.*

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

Measure: The percentage of CAMP participants who, after completing the first academic year of college, continue their postsecondary education.

Year	Target	Actual
2020	92.0%	96.1%
2021	92.0	96.4
2022	92.0	95.6
2023	92.0	
2024	92.0	
2025	92.0	

Additional information: The source of data is grantee performance reports. Data for this measure are based on actual placement after completion of the first year of college. Data collected for fiscal year 2023 will be available in late 2024.

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 completing their first year of postsecondary education and then continuing their postsecondary education.

HEP Efficiency Measures

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 continued to be affected by the lingering effects of the pandemic during the 2021-2022 reporting period. The Department plans to re-set targets in 2024, taking into account updated costs and inflation rates. Data collected for fiscal year 2023 will be available in late 2024 and will be included in the fiscal year 2026 Congressional Justification.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

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

Year	Target Cost Per Commuter Participant	Actual Cost Per Commuter Participant
2020	\$10,232	\$12,458
2021	10,334	12,104
2022	10,438	11,437
2023	10,541	
2024	10,647	
2025	10,753	

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

Year	Target Cost Per Residential Participant	Actual Cost Per Residential Participant
2020	\$19,924	\$19,168
2021	20,123	10,733
2022	20,324	13,733
2023	20,527	
2024	20,732	
2025	20,939	

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
2020	\$16,127	\$28,120
2021	16,289	29,688
2022	16,451	13,374
2023	16,616	
2024	16,782	
2025	16,950	

CAMP Efficiency Measures

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 continued to be affected by the lingering effects of the pandemic

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

during the 2021-2022 reporting period. The Department plans to re-set targets in 2024, taking into account updated costs and inflation rates. Data collected for fiscal year 2023 will be available in late 2024.

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
2020	\$15,688	\$11,393
2021	15,939	11,044
2022	16,194	16,105
2023	16,453	
2024	16,716	
2025	16,984	

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
2020	\$25,141	\$13,804
2021	25,543	20,837
2022	25,952	16,548
2023	26,367	
2024	26,789	
2025	27,218	

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
2020	\$19,118	\$15,850
2021	19,424	17,550
2022	19,735	17,215
2023	20,051	
2024	20,372	
2025	20,698	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Account Summary Table

Select here for the online version.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2025 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET
(in thousands of dollars)

	Cat Code	2023 Appropriation	2024 Annualized CR	2025 Request	FY 2025 Request Compared to FY 2024 Annualized CR: Amount	FY 2025 Request Compared to FY 2024 Annualized CR: 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	925,000	925,000	1,025,000	100,000	10.81%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	4,357,550	4,357,550	4,357,550	0	0.00%
Subtotal		5,282,550	5,282,550	5,382,550	100,000	1.89%
(d) Education finance incentive grants (section 1125A)						
Annual appropriation	D	925,000	925,000	1,025,000	100,000	10.81%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	4,357,550	4,357,550	4,357,550	0	0.00%
Subtotal		5,282,550	5,282,550	5,382,550	100,000	1.89%
Subtotal, Grants to LEAs		18,386,802	18,386,802	18,586,802	200,000	1.09%
Discretionary	D	18,386,802	18,386,802	18,586,802	200,000	1.09%
Current		7,545,625	7,545,625	7,745,625	200,000	2.65%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year		10,841,177	10,841,177	10,841,177	0	0.00%
2 Comprehensive literacy state development grants (ESEA II-B-2, section 2222)	D	194,000	194,000	194,000	0	0.00%
3 Innovative approaches to literacy (ESEA II-B-2, section 2226)	D	30,000	30,000	30,000	0	0.00%
4 State agency programs:						
(a) Migrant (ESEA I-C)	D	375,626	375,626	375,626	0	0.00%
(b) Neglected, delinquent and at-risk children and youth (ESEA I-D)	D	49,239	49,239	49,239	0	0.00%
Subtotal, State agency programs		424,865	424,865	424,865	0	0.00%
5 Special programs for migrant students (HEA IV-A-5)	D	52,123	52,123	52,123	0	0.00%
Total, Appropriation		19,087,790	19,087,790	19,287,790	200,000	1.05%
Discretionary	D	19,087,790	19,087,790	19,287,790	200,000	1.05%
Current		8,246,613	8,246,613	8,446,613	200,000	2.43%
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.