Congressional Research Service
Informing the legislative debate since 1914

FY2017 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)

Updated November 19, 2018

Congressional Research Service
https://crsreports.congress.gov
R44873

CRS REPORT
Prepared for Members and
Committees of Congress

Summary

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA; P.L. 114-95), is the primary source of federal aid to K-12 education. The Title I-A program is the largest grant program authorized under the ESEA. It is designed to provide supplementary educational and related services to low-achieving and other students attending elementary and secondary schools with relatively high concentrations of students from low-income families. Title I-A was funded at $15.5 billion for FY2017.

Under current law, the U.S. Department of Education (ED) determines Title I-A grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) based on four separate funding formulas: Basic Grants, Concentration Grants, Targeted Grants, and Education Finance Incentive Grants (EFIG). The four Title I-A formulas have somewhat distinct allocation patterns, providing varying shares of allocated funds to different types of states. Thus, for some states, certain formulas are more favorable than others.

This report provides FY2017 state grant amounts under each of the four formulas used to determine Title I-A grants. Overall, California received the largest FY2017 Title I-A grant amount ($1.8 billion, or 12.00% of total Title I-A grants). Vermont received the smallest FY2017 Title I-A grant amount ($35.3 million, or 0.23% of total Title I-A grants).

Contents

Introduction 1
FY2017 Title I-A Grants 2

Tables

Table 1. FY2017 Title I-A State Grants and Percentage Share of Funds, by Funding Formula 4

Contacts

Author Information 7

Introduction

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) is the primary source of federal aid to elementary and secondary education. Title I-A is the largest program in the ESEA, funded at $15.5 billion for FY2017. The program is designed to provide supplementary educational and related services to low-achieving and other students attending elementary and secondary schools with relatively high concentrations of students from low-income families. The U.S. Department of Education (ED) determines Title I-A grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) based on four separate funding formulas: Basic Grants, Concentration Grants, Targeted Grants, and Education Finance Incentive Grants (EFIG).

The ESEA was comprehensively reauthorized by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA; P.L. 114-95) on December 10, 2015.[1] The ESSA made few changes to the Title I-A formulas. These changes took effect in FY2017.[2]

This report provides FY2017 state grant amounts under each of the four formulas used to determine Title I-A grants.[3] For a general overview of the Title I-A formulas, see CRS Report R44164, *ESEA Title I-A Formulas: In Brief*. For a more detailed discussion of the Title I-A formulas, see CRS Report R44461, *Allocation of Funds Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act*.

Under Title I-A, funds are allocated to LEAs via state educational agencies (SEAs) using the four Title I-A formulas. Annual appropriations bills specify portions of each year's Title I-A appropriation to be allocated to LEAs and states under each of the formulas. In FY2017, about 42% of Title I-A appropriations were allocated through the Basic Grants formula, 9% through the Concentration Grants formula, and 25% each through the Targeted Grants and EFIG formulas. Once funds reach LEAs, the amounts allocated under the four formulas are combined and used jointly.

For each formula, a maximum grant is calculated by multiplying a *formula child count*, consisting primarily of estimated numbers of school-age children in poor families, by an *expenditure factor* based on state average per-pupil expenditures for public elementary and secondary education. In some formulas, additional factors are multiplied by the formula child count and expenditure factor. These maximum grants are then reduced to equal the level of available appropriations for each formula, taking into account a variety of state and LEA minimum grant provisions. In general, LEAs must have a minimum number of formula children and/or a minimum formula child rate to be eligible to receive a grant under a specific Title I-A formula. Some LEAs may qualify for a grant under only one formula, while other LEAs may be eligible to receive grants under multiple formulas.

Under three of the formulas—Basic, Concentration, and Targeted Grants—funds are initially calculated at the LEA level. State grants are the total of allocations for all LEAs in the state,

[1] For more information on the ESSA, see CRS Report R44297, *Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act: Highlights of the Every Student Succeeds Act*.

[2] While the ESSA included provisions for changes to the Title I-A formula grant allocation process to take effect on July 1, 2016, the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2016 (P.L. 114-113) changed the effective date of these provisions to July 1, 2017.

[3] This version of this report updates an earlier version, replacing estimated grant amounts with actual grant amounts. For more information about FY2016 Title I-A grants to states, see CRS Report R44486, *FY2016 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*. For more information about FY2015 Title I-A grants to states, see CRS Report R44097, *FY2015 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*.

adjusted for state minimum grant provisions. Under EFIG, grants are first calculated for each state overall and then are subsequently suballocated to LEAs within the state using a different formula.

FY2017 grants included in this report were calculated by ED. The percentage share of funds allocated under each of the Title I-A formulas was calculated by CRS for each state by dividing the total grant received by the total amount allocated under each respective formula.

FY2017 Title I-A Grants

Table 1 provides each state's grant amount[4] and percentage share of funds allocated under each of the Title I-A formulas for FY2017.[5] Total Title I-A grants, calculated by summing the state level grant for each of the four formulas, are also shown in **Table 1.**

Overall, California received the largest total Title I-A grant amount ($1.8 billion) and, as a result, the largest percentage share (12.00%) of Title I-A grants. Vermont received the smallest total Title I-A grant amount ($35.3 million) and, as a result, the smallest percentage share (0.23%) of Title I-A grants.

In general, grant amounts for states vary among formulas due to the different allocation amounts for the formulas. For example, the Basic Grant formula receives a greater share of overall Title I-A appropriations than the Concentration Grant formula, so states generally receive higher grant amounts under the Basic Grant formula than under the Concentration Grant formula.

Among states, Title I-A grant amounts and the percentage shares of funds vary due to the different characteristics of each state. For example, Texas has a much larger population of children included in the formula calculations than North Carolina and, therefore, receives a higher grant amount and larger share of Title I-A funds.

Within a state, the percentage share of funds allocated may vary by formula, as certain formulas are more favorable to certain types of states (e.g., EFIG is generally more favorable to states with comparatively equal levels of spending per pupil among their LEAs). If a state's share of a given Title I-A formula exceeds its share of overall Title I-A funds, this is generally an indication that this particular formula is more favorable to the state than formulas for which the state's share of funds is below its overall share of Title I-A funds. For example, Florida and New York received a substantially higher percentage share of Targeted Grants than of overall Title I-A funds, indicating that the Targeted Grant formula is more favorable to them than other Title I-A formulas may be. At the same time, both states received a smaller percentage share of Basic Grants than of overall Title I-A funds, indicating that the Basic Grant formula is less favorable to them than other Title I-A formulas may be.[6]

---

[4] For the purposes of the Title I-A program, Puerto Rico is considered a state.

[5] The Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) and the Outlying Areas receive 0.7% and 0.4%, respectively, of overall Title I-A appropriations, less a reservation of funds for the U.S. Census Bureau. Of the funds allocated to the Outlying Areas, $1 million is taken off the top for a grant to Palau and the remaining funds are allocated to each of the Outlying Areas based on poverty levels. If appropriations for Title I-A for FY2017 or a subsequent fiscal year are insufficient to provide a total amount of funds to make grants to states that is at least as much as the total amount of funds available to make grants to states in FY2016, the reservation of funds for the BIE and Outlying Areas will be implemented as required by law prior to the enactment of the ESSA. In FY2017, this appropriations threshold was met, and the BIE received $108.1 million, American Samoa $18.9 million, Guam $20.5 million, the Northern Mariana Islands $11.5 million, and the Virgin Islands $9.9 million.

[6] Both Florida and New York received their largest grant amounts under the Basic Grants formula, but this is due to the

In the four states (North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming) that receive a minimum grant under all four formulas, the shares received under the Targeted Grant and EFIG formulas are greater than under the Basic Grant or Concentration Grant formulas, due to higher state minimums under these formulas. If a state received the minimum grant under a given Title I-A formula, the grant amount is denoted with an asterisk (*) in **Table 1.**

larger appropriation provided for Basic Grants. An examination of the percentage share each state receives under each of the four formulas provides an indication of which formulas are most beneficial to a particular state. In general, a state would receive a larger overall Title I-A grant if a greater percentage of the Title I-A appropriation was provided to the formula(s) under which the state benefits the most.

Table 1. FY2017 Title I-A State Grants and Percentage Share of Funds, by Funding Formula

Dollars in thousands

State	Basic Grants		Concentration Grants		Targeted Grants		EFIG		Total Title I-A Grants	
	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation
Total, United States	$6,383,403	100.00%	$1,347,316	100.00%	$3,777,040	100.00%	$3,777,040	100.00%	$15,284,799	100.00%
Alabama	103,331	1.62%	23,571	1.75%	59,166	1.57%	64,672	1.71%	250,740	1.64%
Alaska	17,106*	0.27%	2,745	0.20%	11,514*	0.30%	11,488*	0.30%	42,853	0.28%
Arizona	145,520	2.28%	31,663	2.35%	88,056	2.33%	84,221	2.23%	349,461	2.29%
Arkansas	68,933	1.08%	15,679	1.16%	36,250	0.96%	42,277	1.12%	163,139	1.07%
California	767,150	12.02%	165,625	12.29%	476,730	12.62%	424,350	11.23%	1,833,855	12.00%
Colorado	66,541	1.04%	11,859	0.88%	35,597	0.94%	38,237	1.01%	152,235	1.00%
Connecticut	58,941	0.92%	9,211	0.68%	26,586	0.70%	34,986	0.93%	129,724	0.85%
Delaware	19,750	0.31%	4,698	0.35%	13,220*	0.35%	13,220*	0.35%	50,887	0.33%
District of Columbia	17,744*	0.28%	4,118	0.31%	12,877	0.34%	12,659*	0.34%	47,398	0.31%
Florida	327,854	5.14%	77,313	5.74%	243,813	6.46%	207,998	5.51%	856,978	5.61%
Georgia	219,086	3.43%	50,503	3.75%	137,192	3.63%	133,145	3.53%	539,926	3.53%
Hawaii	20,926	0.33%	4,828	0.36%	13,465	0.36%	14,522	0.38%	53,740	0.35%
Idaho	25,886	0.41%	5,579	0.41%	13,220*	0.35%	13,886	0.37%	58,571	0.38%
Illinois	293,028	4.59%	57,926	4.30%	171,879	4.55%	155,592	4.12%	678,426	4.44%
Indiana	115,569	1.81%	23,859	1.77%	57,362	1.52%	68,779	1.82%	265,568	1.74%
Iowa	44,617	0.70%	7,378	0.55%	18,130	0.48%	27,235	0.72%	97,360	0.64%
Kansas	48,567	0.76%	9,103	0.68%	22,806	0.60%	27,267	0.72%	107,743	0.70%
Kentucky	95,480	1.50%	21,972	1.63%	54,232	1.44%	59,704	1.58%	231,388	1.51%

State	Basic Grants		Concentration Grants		Targeted Grants		EFIG		Total Title I-A Grants	
	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation
Louisiana	129,167	2.02%	30,972	2.30%	77,990	2.06%	78,262	2.07%	316,392	2.07%
Maine	22,998	0.36%	4,563	0.34%	13,220*	0.35%	13,220*	0.35%	54,000	0.35%
Maryland	93,423	1.46%	18,369	1.36%	60,461	1.60%	58,529	1.55%	230,782	1.51%
Massachusetts	109,661	1.72%	19,092	1.42%	52,904	1.40%	62,712	1.66%	244,368	1.60%
Michigan	213,226	3.34%	44,147	3.28%	118,457	3.14%	129,612	3.43%	505,442	3.31%
Minnesota	75,753	1.19%	10,670	0.79%	33,996	0.90%	43,238	1.14%	163,656	1.07%
Mississippi	81,652	1.28%	19,123	1.42%	48,542	1.29%	50,848	1.35%	200,166	1.31%
Missouri	110,493	1.73%	23,066	1.71%	54,706	1.45%	63,386	1.68%	251,651	1.65%
Montana	17,744*	0.28%	3,693	0.27%	13,220*	0.35%	13,220*	0.35%	47,877	0.31%
Nebraska	32,938	0.52%	6,188	0.46%	16,610	0.44%	19,453	0.52%	75,189	0.49%
Nevada	49,206	0.77%	11,468	0.85%	40,040	1.06%	29,769	0.79%	130,483	0.85%
New Hampshire	17,465*	0.27%	2,657	0.20%	11,347*	0.30%	11,728*	0.31%	43,198	0.28%
New Jersey	163,123	2.56%	27,713	2.06%	77,970	2.06%	95,984	2.54%	364,789	2.39%
New Mexico	48,217	0.76%	11,264	0.84%	29,561	0.78%	30,622	0.81%	119,665	0.78%
New York	484,962	7.60%	102,964	7.64%	341,911	9.05%	278,163	7.36%	1,208,000	7.90%
North Carolina	184,190	2.89%	43,018	3.19%	110,654	2.93%	113,105	2.99%	450,967	2.95%
North Dakota	14,735*	0.23%	2,042*	0.15%	10,101*	0.27%	10,108*	0.27%	36,986	0.24%
Ohio	241,679	3.79%	49,199	3.65%	125,588	3.33%	140,083	3.71%	556,549	3.64%
Oklahoma	72,528	1.14%	15,477	1.15%	37,590	1.00%	43,515	1.15%	169,110	1.11%
Oregon	66,426	1.04%	14,272	1.06%	32,204	0.85%	39,484	1.05%	152,387	1.00%
Pennsylvania	269,685	4.22%	51,500	3.82%	149,640	3.96%	150,614	3.99%	621,439	4.07%

State	Basic Grants		Concentration Grants		Targeted Grants		EFIG		Total Title I-A Grants	
	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation
Puerto Rico	166,420	2.61%	42,256	3.14%	94,463	2.50%	105,121	2.78%	408,260	2.67%
Rhode Island	22,526	0.35%	4,135	0.31%	13,220*	0.35%	13,370	0.35%	53,251	0.35%
South Carolina	100,838	1.58%	23,501	1.74%	57,836	1.53%	61,138	1.62%	243,314	1.59%
South Dakota	17,744*	0.28%	3,179*	0.24%	12,992*	0.34%	13,020*	0.34%	46,934	0.31%
Tennessee	126,222	1.98%	29,058	2.16%	75,751	2.01%	75,730	2.01%	306,762	2.01%
Texas	577,591	9.05%	128,319	9.52%	363,688	9.63%	352,211	9.33%	1,421,810	9.30%
Utah	38,226	0.60%	6,456	0.48%	20,096	0.53%	22,375	0.59%	87,154	0.57%
Vermont	13,904*	0.22%	2,265*	0.17%	9,574*	0.25%	9,587*	0.25%	35,330	0.23%
Virginia	115,804	1.81%	21,836	1.62%	59,395	1.57%	62,152	1.65%	259,186	1.70%
Washington	102,484	1.61%	19,839	1.47%	46,831	1.24%	59,408	1.57%	228,563	1.50%
West Virginia	40,950	0.64%	9,318	0.69%	19,805	0.52%	26,511	0.70%	96,585	0.63%
Wisconsin	91,227	1.43%	16,173	1.20%	44,813	1.19%	56,776	1.50%	208,988	1.37%
Wyoming	14,167*	0.22%	1,892*	0.14%	9,769*	0.26%	9,748*	0.26%	35,576	0.23%

Source: Table prepared by CRS based on unpublished data provided by the U.S. Department of Education (ED), Budget Service. Title I-A grant amounts were calculated by ED. Percentage shares of FY2017 allocation amounts were calculated by CRS.

Notes: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Percentages calculated based on unrounded numbers. Amounts shown in the table only reflect Title I-A funds provided to states. These amounts are determined after funds have been reserved from the total Title I-A appropriation for the Census Bureau, Bureau of Indian Education, and Outlying Areas. An asterisk (*) denotes minimum grants.

*: State received a minimum grant.

Author Information

Rebecca R. Skinner
Specialist in Education Policy

Clarissa G. Cooper
Analyst in Education Policy

Acknowledgments

Leah Rosenstiel, former CRS Analyst in Education Policy, also contributed to this report.

Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.