



**Congressional  
Research Service**

Informing the legislative debate since 1914

---

# **FY2019 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)**

**Rebecca R. Skinner**

Specialist in Education Policy

**Clarissa G. Cooper**

Analyst in Education Policy

March 11, 2020

**Congressional Research Service**

7-....

[www.crs.gov](http://www.crs.gov)

R46269



## **FY2019 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)**

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), most recently comprehensively 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 and was funded at \$15.9 billion for FY2019. 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.

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 FY2019 state grant amounts under each of the four formulas used to determine Title I-A grants. Overall, California received the largest FY2019 Title I-A grant amount (\$2.0 billion, or 12.52% of total Title I-A grants). Vermont received the smallest FY2019 Title I-A grant amount (\$36.9 million, or 0.24% of total Title I-A grants).

**R46269**

March 11, 2020

**Rebecca R. Skinner**

Specialist in Education Policy

-redacted-@crs.loc.gov

**Clarissa G. Cooper**

Analyst in Education Policy

-redacted-@crs.loc.gov

For a copy of the full report, please call 7-.... or visit [www.crs.gov](http://www.crs.gov).

## Contents

Introduction .....	1
Methodology .....	1
FY2019 Title I-A Grants.....	2

## Tables

Table 1. FY2019 Title I-A State Grants and Percentage Share of Funds Received Under Each Title I-A Formula, by State.....	3
--	---

## Contacts

Author Contact Information .....	6
----------------------------------	---

## Introduction

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), most recently comprehensively amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA; P.L. 114-95), is the primary source of federal aid to elementary and secondary education. Title I-A is the largest program in the ESEA, funded at \$15.9 billion for FY2019. Title I-A 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).

This report provides FY2019 state grant amounts under each of the four formulas used to determine Title I-A grants.<sup>1</sup> 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*.

## Methodology

Under Title I-A, funds are allocated to LEAs via state educational agencies (SEAs) using the four Title I-A formulas. Annual appropriations acts specify portions of each year's Title I-A appropriation to be allocated to LEAs and states under each of the formulas. In FY2019, about 41% 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 living in families in poverty, by an “expenditure factor” based on state average per pupil expenditures for public elementary and secondary education. In some of the Title I-A formulas, additional factors are multiplied by the formula child count and expenditure factor to determine a maximum grant amount. 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—grants are initially calculated at the LEA level. State grants are the total of allocations for all LEAs in the state, adjusted for state minimum grant provisions. Under EFIG, grants are first calculated for each

---

<sup>1</sup> This report is one in a series of annual reports on Title I-A state grants. For more information about FY2018 Title I-A grants to states, see CRS Report R45662, *FY2018 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*. For more information about FY2017 Title I-A grants to states, see CRS Report R44873, *FY2017 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*. 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)*.

state overall and then are subsequently suballocated to LEAs within the state using a different formula.

FY2019 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.

## FY2019 Title I-A Grants

**Table 1** provides each state's grant amount and percentage share of funds allocated under each of the Title I-A formulas for FY2019. 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 (\$2.0 billion) and, as a result, the largest percentage share (12.52%) of Title I-A grants. Vermont received the smallest total Title I-A grant amount (\$36.9 million) and, as a result, the smallest percentage share (0.24%) 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 larger population of children included in the formula calculations than North Carolina and, therefore, is to receive 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, Alaska, Arizona, California, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, and Wyoming each received a 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.

In states that received a minimum grant under all four formulas (Montana, North Dakota, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming), the shares 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**.

**Table I. FY2019 Title I-A State Grants and Percentage Share of Funds Received Under Each Title I-A Formula, by State**

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%	3,974,840	100.00%	3,974,840	100.00%	15,680,399	100.00%
Alabama	103,864	1.63%	24,044	1.78%	62,475	1.57%	66,936	1.68%	257,319	1.64%
Alaska	17,744*	0.28%	2,515	0.19%	12,706*	0.32%	12,645*	0.32%	45,609	0.29%
Arizona	138,761	2.17%	29,999	2.23%	87,212	2.19%	83,156	2.09%	339,128	2.16%
Arkansas	64,479	1.01%	14,683	1.09%	35,069	0.88%	42,899	1.08%	157,131	1.00%
California	804,065	12.60%	171,827	12.75%	520,439	13.09%	467,182	11.75%	1,963,512	12.52%
Colorado	62,596	0.98%	11,053	0.82%	34,475	0.87%	37,773	0.95%	145,897	0.93%
Connecticut	58,630	0.92%	9,024	0.67%	27,193	0.68%	36,288	0.91%	131,135	0.84%
Delaware	19,841	0.31%	4,449	0.33%	13,912*	0.35%	13,912*	0.35%	52,114	0.33%
District of Columbia	17,744*	0.28%	4,244	0.31%	13,719	0.35%	13,377*	0.34%	49,085	0.31%
Florida	333,611	5.23%	80,329	5.96%	262,282	6.60%	221,891	5.58%	898,113	5.73%
Georgia	213,563	3.35%	49,595	3.68%	138,881	3.49%	136,121	3.42%	538,160	3.43%
Hawaii	19,126	0.30%	4,279	0.32%	13,912*	0.35%	13,912*	0.35%	51,230	0.33%
Idaho	24,955	0.39%	4,914	0.36%	13,912*	0.35%	14,449	0.36%	58,230	0.37%
Illinois	285,561	4.47%	56,974	4.23%	173,653	4.37%	155,208	3.90%	671,396	4.28%
Indiana	109,708	1.72%	22,453	1.67%	56,472	1.42%	68,528	1.72%	257,161	1.64%
Iowa	39,837	0.62%	6,248	0.46%	16,662	0.42%	25,209	0.63%	87,956	0.56%
Kansas	44,609	0.70%	8,097	0.60%	21,624	0.54%	26,624	0.67%	100,955	0.64%
Kentucky	93,773	1.47%	21,902	1.63%	55,857	1.41%	60,135	1.51%	231,667	1.48%

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	134,729	2.11%	32,310	2.40%	89,001	2.24%	85,653	2.15%	341,692	2.18%
Maine	21,387	0.34%	4,125	0.31%	13,912*	0.35%	13,912*	0.35%	53,336	0.34%
Maryland	95,439	1.50%	19,118	1.42%	64,970	1.63%	62,583	1.57%	242,109	1.54%
Massachusetts	111,009	1.74%	19,450	1.44%	55,827	1.40%	66,680	1.68%	252,965	1.61%
Michigan	194,556	3.05%	39,649	2.94%	112,044	2.82%	123,641	3.11%	469,889	3.00%
Minnesota	75,346	1.18%	10,561	0.78%	35,305	0.89%	45,769	1.15%	166,981	1.06%
Mississippi	81,878	1.28%	19,053	1.41%	51,462	1.29%	53,059	1.33%	205,452	1.31%
Missouri	107,415	1.68%	22,444	1.67%	54,804	1.38%	64,099	1.61%	248,761	1.59%
Montana	17,744*	0.28%	3,378*	0.25%	13,912*	0.35%	13,912*	0.35%	48,946	0.31%
Nebraska	33,142	0.52%	5,913	0.44%	17,103	0.43%	21,175	0.53%	77,333	0.49%
Nevada	49,603	0.78%	11,864	0.88%	43,122	1.08%	31,795	0.80%	136,383	0.87%
New Hampshire	17,671*	0.28%	2,437*	0.18%	12,033*	0.30%	12,474*	0.31%	44,616	0.28%
New Jersey	160,980	2.52%	27,725	2.06%	78,781	1.98%	98,646	2.48%	366,132	2.33%
New Mexico	50,814	0.80%	11,999	0.89%	33,386	0.84%	33,546	0.84%	129,745	0.83%
New York	476,838	7.47%	102,788	7.63%	352,068	8.86%	287,804	7.24%	1,219,497	7.78%
North Carolina	185,278	2.90%	43,670	3.24%	117,447	2.95%	119,804	3.01%	466,200	2.97%
North Dakota	15,320*	0.24%	2,141*	0.16%	10,999*	0.28%	11,007*	0.28%	39,467	0.25%
Ohio	243,058	3.81%	49,125	3.65%	135,961	3.42%	153,002	3.85%	581,146	3.71%
Oklahoma	79,498	1.25%	17,096	1.27%	44,498	1.12%	49,570	1.25%	190,662	1.22%
Oregon	62,849	0.98%	12,866	0.95%	30,814	0.78%	38,655	0.97%	145,184	0.93%
Pennsylvania	268,869	4.21%	51,502	3.82%	155,043	3.90%	154,748	3.89%	630,162	4.02%

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	156,905	2.46%	38,406	2.85%	100,791	2.54%	109,726	2.76%	405,828	2.59%
Rhode Island	22,545	0.35%	4,066	0.30%	13,912*	0.35%	14,239	0.36%	54,762	0.35%
South Carolina	102,342	1.60%	23,931	1.78%	62,301	1.57%	66,800	1.68%	255,374	1.63%
South Dakota	17,744*	0.28%	3,378*	0.25%	13,912*	0.35%	13,912*	0.35%	48,946	0.31%
Tennessee	124,114	1.94%	28,852	2.14%	77,216	1.94%	78,616	1.98%	308,799	1.97%
Texas	596,089	9.34%	134,111	9.95%	394,632	9.93%	387,465	9.75%	1,512,298	9.64%
Utah	35,056	0.55%	5,491	0.41%	19,134	0.48%	21,939	0.55%	81,619	0.52%
Vermont	14,170*	0.22%	2,239*	0.17%	10,256*	0.26%	10,254*	0.26%	36,920	0.24%
Virginia	121,094	1.90%	23,200	1.72%	66,497	1.67%	68,375	1.72%	279,166	1.78%
Washington	112,333	1.76%	20,815	1.54%	54,593	1.37%	69,021	1.74%	256,762	1.64%
West Virginia	41,896	0.66%	9,707	0.72%	21,653	0.54%	28,053	0.71%	101,309	0.65%
Wisconsin	88,231	1.38%	15,241	1.13%	46,196	1.16%	57,895	1.46%	207,563	1.32%
Wyoming	14,991*	0.23%	2,033*	0.15%	10,803*	0.27%	10,768*	0.27%	38,596	0.25%

**Source:** Table prepared by CRS based on unpublished data provided by the U.S. Department of Education (ED), Budget Service. FY2019 Title I-A grant amounts were calculated by ED using the most current data available. Percentage shares of FY2019 allocation amounts were calculated by CRS.

**Notes:** Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Percentages were 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. For the purposes of Title I-A, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico are considered states.

\* Denotes that a state received a minimum state grant under a particular Title I-A formula.

## **Author Contact Information**

Rebecca R. Skinner  
Specialist in Education Policy  
redacted@crs.loc.gov, 7-....

Clarissa G. Cooper  
Analyst in Education Policy  
redacted@crs.loc.gov, 7-....

# EveryCRSReport.com

The Congressional Research Service (CRS) is a federal legislative branch agency, housed inside the Library of Congress, charged with providing the United States Congress non-partisan advice on issues that may come before Congress.

EveryCRSReport.com republishes CRS reports that are available to all Congressional staff. The reports are not classified, and Members of Congress routinely make individual reports available to the public.

Prior to our republication, we redacted phone numbers and email addresses of analysts who produced the reports. We also added this page to the report. We have not intentionally made any other changes to any report published on EveryCRSReport.com.

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 permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.

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' institutional role.

EveryCRSReport.com is not a government website and is not affiliated with CRS. We do not claim copyright on any CRS report we have republished.