



**Congressional  
Research Service**

Informing the legislative debate since 1914

---

# Estimated FY2015 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)

**Rebecca R. Skinner**  
Specialist in Education Policy

July 2, 2015

**Congressional Research Service**

7-5700

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

R44097

## Summary

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was last comprehensively amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB; P.L. 107-110). During the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress, both the House and the Senate have actively worked on reauthorizing the ESEA. The House Education and the Workforce Committee reported the Student Success Act (H.R. 5), which would provide for a comprehensive reauthorization of the ESEA. The bill was subsequently introduced on the House floor but consideration of it was not completed. The Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions (HELP) Committee reported the Every Child Achieves Act of 2015 (ECAA; S. 1177), which would also provide for a comprehensive reauthorization of the ESEA. S. 1177 has not been considered on the Senate floor.

Under both H.R. 5 and S. 1177, the ESEA Title I-A program providing grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) for disadvantaged students would be retained. Under current law, appropriations for the Title I-A program were \$14.4 billion for FY2015, accounting for over 60% of the overall \$23.1 billion appropriated for all ESEA programs. As Title I-A is the largest ESEA program and both the House and the Senate are actively engaged in reauthorizing the ESEA, this report provides estimated FY2015 state grant amounts under each of the four formulas used to determine Title I-A grants to aid in consideration of reauthorizing the Title I-A program.

Overall, California is estimated to receive the largest total Title I-A grant amount (\$1.7 billion) and, as a result, the largest percentage share (11.81%) of Title I-A grants. Wyoming is estimated to receive the smallest total Title I-A grant amount (\$33.1 million) and, as a result, the smallest percentage share (0.23%) of Title I-A grants.

## Contents

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

## Tables

Table 1. Estimated FY2015 Title I-A State Grants and Percentage Share of Funds.....	4
---	---

## Contacts

Author Contact Information.....	7
Acknowledgments.....	7

## Introduction

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was last comprehensively amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB; P.L. 107-110). During the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress, both the House and the Senate have actively worked on reauthorizing the ESEA. The House Education and the Workforce Committee reported the Student Success Act (H.R. 5), which would provide for a comprehensive reauthorization of the ESEA. The bill was subsequently introduced on the House floor but consideration of it was not completed. The Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions (HELP) Committee reported the Every Child Achieves Act of 2015 (ECAA; S. 1177), which would also provide for a comprehensive reauthorization of the ESEA. S. 1177 has not been considered on the Senate floor.<sup>1</sup>

Under both H.R. 5 and S. 1177, the ESEA Title I-A program providing grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) for disadvantaged students would be retained.<sup>2</sup> Under current law, appropriations for the Title I-A program were \$14.4 billion for FY2015, accounting for over 60% of the overall \$23.1 billion appropriated for all ESEA programs. As Title I-A is the largest ESEA program and both the House and the Senate are actively engaged in reauthorizing the ESEA, this report provides estimated FY2015 state grant amounts under each of the four formulas used to determine Title I-A grants to aid in consideration of reauthorizing the Title I-A program.<sup>3</sup>

## Methodology

Under Title I-A, funds are allocated to LEAs via states using four different allocation formulas specified in statute: Basic Grants, Concentration Grants, Targeted Grants, and Education Finance Incentive Grants (EFIG).<sup>4</sup> Annual appropriations bills specify portions of each year's Title I-A appropriation to be allocated to LEAs and states under each of these formulas. In FY2015, an estimated 45% of Title I-A appropriations were allocated through the Basic Grants formula, 9% through the Concentration Grants formula, and 23% through each of the Targeted Grants and EFIG 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, adjusted for state minimum grant provisions.<sup>5</sup> Under EFIG, grants are first calculated for each state overall and then are subsequently suballocated to LEAs within the state using a different

---

<sup>1</sup> For more information about H.R. 5 and S. 1177, see CRS Report R43916, *ESEA Reauthorization Proposals in the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress: Selected Key Issues*, by Rebecca R. Skinner and Jeffrey J. Kuenzi.

<sup>2</sup> For general information about the Title I-A program, see CRS Report RL33960, *The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as Amended by the No Child Left Behind Act: A Primer*, by Rebecca R. Skinner.

<sup>3</sup> This report updates a CRS Congressional Distribution memorandum on Title I-A state grant amounts dated May 26, 2015. Newly available (July 2015) data were used in the updated grant estimates.

<sup>4</sup> For more information about the Title I-A formulas, see CRS Report RL34721, *Elementary and Secondary Education Act: An Analytical Review of the Allocation Formulas*, by Rebecca R. Skinner.

<sup>5</sup> All four Title I-A formulas include minimum grant provisions that prevent state grants from falling below a certain threshold. Minimum grant provisions vary by Title I-A formula. For more information on the minimum grant provisions in Title I-A, see CRS Report RL34721, *Elementary and Secondary Education Act: An Analytical Review of the Allocation Formulas*, by Rebecca R. Skinner.

formula. Once funds reach LEAs, the amounts allocated under the four formulas are combined and used jointly.

Estimated FY2015 grants were calculated by the U.S. Department of Education (ED) using the most current data available.<sup>6</sup> 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. Final FY2015 Title I-A state grant amounts will be determined by ED by October 1, 2015.

## Estimated Title I-A Grants

**Table 1** provides each state's estimated grant amount and percentage share of funds allocated under each of the Title I-A formulas for FY2015. 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 is estimated to receive the largest total Title I-A grant amount (\$1.7 billion) and, as a result, the largest percentage share (11.81%) of Title I-A grants. Wyoming is estimated to receive the smallest total Title I-A grant amount (\$33.1 million) and, as a result, the smallest percentage share (0.23%) of Title I-A grants.

In general, estimated grant amounts for states vary between formulas due to the different allocation amounts for the formulas. For example, the Basic Grants formula receives a greater share of overall Title I-A appropriations than the Concentration Grants formula, so states generally receive higher estimated grant amounts under the Basic Grants formula than under the Concentration Grants formula. In addition, the percentage share of funds received overall and under each of the four formulas differs by state 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 estimated grant amount and larger share of Title I-A funds.

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, New York and Nevada are estimated to receive a substantially higher percentage share of Targeted Grants than of their overall Title I-A funds, indicating that the Targeted Grants formula is more favorable to them than other Title I-A formulas may be. At the same time, both states are estimated to receive a smaller percentage share of Basic Grants than of their overall Title I-A funds, indicating that the Basic Grants formula is less favorable to them than other Title I-A formulas may be.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> The estimated grant amounts included in this report are based on the data used by ED to determine FY2015 Title I-A grant amounts for the initial allocation of funds on July 1, 2015. It is possible that the underlying data used to determine these grant amounts (e.g., average per pupil expenditure (APPE) data) may change prior to the final calculation of Title I-A grant amounts by ED that will be used to determine grant amounts for the October 1, 2015, allocation of funds.

<sup>7</sup> Both Nevada and New York receive their largest estimated grants under the Basic Grants formula, but this is due to the 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.

In states that receive a minimum grant under all four formulas (the District of Columbia, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Vermont), the shares under the Targeted Grants and EFIG formulas are greater than under Basic or Concentration Grants, due to higher state minimums under these formulas. All states receiving a minimum grant under any of the four Title I-A formulas are denoted in **Table 1**.

**Table I. Estimated FY2015 Title I-A State Grants and Percentage Share of Funds**

Dollars in thousands

State	Basic Grants		Concentration Grants		Targeted Grants		EFIG		Total Title I-A Grants	
	Estimated Grant	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Estimated Grant	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Estimated Grant	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Estimated Grant	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Estimated Grant	Percentage Share of Total Allocation
Total, U.S.	\$6,390,863	100.00%	\$1,348,678	100.00%	\$3,261,110	100.00%	\$3,261,110	100.00%	\$14,261,760	100.00%
Alabama	\$98,996	1.55%	\$22,270	1.65%	\$48,645	1.49%	\$51,765	1.59%	\$221,675	1.55%
Alaska <sup>a</sup>	\$16,123	0.25%	\$2,378	0.18%	\$9,424	0.29%	\$9,410	0.29%	\$37,335	0.26%
Arizona	\$145,033	2.27%	\$31,446	2.33%	\$77,003	2.36%	\$69,340	2.13%	\$322,822	2.26%
Arkansas	\$69,417	1.09%	\$15,776	1.17%	\$32,545	1.00%	\$36,713	1.13%	\$154,451	1.08%
California	\$755,016	11.81%	\$162,811	12.07%	\$405,687	12.44%	\$361,463	11.08%	\$1,684,977	11.81%
Colorado	\$69,641	1.09%	\$12,377	0.92%	\$32,715	1.00%	\$35,353	1.08%	\$150,086	1.05%
Connecticut	\$56,605	0.89%	\$8,734	0.65%	\$21,498	0.66%	\$29,159	0.89%	\$115,996	0.81%
Delaware <sup>b</sup>	\$17,879	0.28%	\$4,291	0.32%	\$11,107	0.34%	\$11,072	0.34%	\$44,349	0.31%
District of Columbia <sup>a</sup>	\$17,744	0.28%	\$3,994	0.30%	\$10,557	0.32%	\$10,525	0.32%	\$42,820	0.30%
Florida	\$321,382	5.03%	\$75,272	5.58%	\$201,580	6.18%	\$177,092	5.43%	\$775,326	5.44%
Georgia	\$217,886	3.41%	\$50,042	3.71%	\$116,842	3.58%	\$114,479	3.51%	\$499,248	3.50%
Hawaii <sup>c</sup>	\$19,468	0.30%	\$4,583	0.34%	\$11,414	0.35%	\$11,579	0.36%	\$47,045	0.33%
Idaho <sup>c</sup>	\$27,270	0.43%	\$5,860	0.43%	\$11,414	0.35%	\$12,760	0.39%	\$57,304	0.40%
Illinois	\$305,084	4.77%	\$60,434	4.48%	\$155,157	4.76%	\$143,115	4.39%	\$663,791	4.65%
Indiana	\$120,256	1.88%	\$24,896	1.85%	\$51,379	1.58%	\$61,905	1.90%	\$258,436	1.81%
Iowa	\$44,784	0.70%	\$7,733	0.57%	\$15,857	0.49%	\$22,885	0.70%	\$91,259	0.64%
Kansas	\$49,554	0.78%	\$9,385	0.70%	\$20,498	0.63%	\$24,689	0.76%	\$104,127	0.73%
Kentucky	\$94,551	1.48%	\$21,506	1.59%	\$45,841	1.41%	\$49,978	1.53%	\$211,876	1.49%

State	Basic Grants		Concentration Grants		Targeted Grants		EFIG		Total Title I-A Grants	
	Estimated Grant	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Estimated Grant	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Estimated Grant	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Estimated Grant	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Estimated Grant	Percentage Share of Total Allocation
Louisiana	\$125,066	1.96%	\$29,737	2.20%	\$65,250	2.00%	\$64,758	1.99%	\$284,811	2.00%
Maine <sup>b</sup>	\$22,793	0.36%	\$4,466	0.33%	\$11,414	0.35%	\$11,414	0.35%	\$50,087	0.35%
Maryland	\$86,084	1.35%	\$16,802	1.25%	\$46,200	1.42%	\$46,759	1.43%	\$195,845	1.37%
Massachusetts	\$111,652	1.75%	\$18,953	1.41%	\$46,015	1.41%	\$55,115	1.69%	\$231,735	1.62%
Michigan	\$225,482	3.53%	\$46,817	3.47%	\$113,388	3.48%	\$113,055	3.47%	\$498,742	3.50%
Minnesota	\$73,962	1.16%	\$10,299	0.76%	\$28,311	0.87%	\$36,076	1.11%	\$148,649	1.04%
Mississippi	\$83,666	1.31%	\$19,716	1.46%	\$44,455	1.36%	\$42,817	1.31%	\$190,654	1.34%
Missouri	\$112,743	1.76%	\$23,714	1.76%	\$49,425	1.52%	\$54,936	1.68%	\$240,817	1.69%
Montana <sup>b</sup>	\$18,503	0.29%	\$4,142	0.31%	\$11,414	0.35%	\$11,414	0.35%	\$45,473	0.32%
Nebraska	\$32,355	0.51%	\$6,197	0.46%	\$13,474	0.41%	\$16,845	0.52%	\$68,871	0.48%
Nevada	\$47,954	0.75%	\$11,105	0.82%	\$32,640	1.00%	\$24,991	0.77%	\$116,689	0.82%
New Hampshire <sup>a</sup>	\$17,187	0.27%	\$2,994	0.22%	\$9,571	0.29%	\$9,975	0.31%	\$39,727	0.28%
New Jersey	\$159,161	2.49%	\$25,958	1.92%	\$64,605	1.98%	\$80,536	2.47%	\$330,260	2.32%
New Mexico	\$50,206	0.79%	\$11,632	0.86%	\$26,888	0.82%	\$27,480	0.84%	\$116,205	0.81%
New York	\$477,354	7.47%	\$102,018	7.56%	\$286,390	8.78%	\$238,384	7.31%	\$1,104,146	7.74%
North Carolina	\$182,646	2.86%	\$42,421	3.15%	\$94,031	2.88%	\$97,889	3.00%	\$416,987	2.92%
North Dakota <sup>d</sup>	\$14,385	0.23%	\$2,037	0.15%	\$8,519	0.26%	\$8,546	0.26%	\$33,486	0.23%
Ohio	\$256,854	4.02%	\$52,379	3.88%	\$117,370	3.60%	\$131,811	4.04%	\$558,414	3.92%
Oklahoma	\$71,467	1.12%	\$15,343	1.14%	\$32,202	0.99%	\$37,241	1.14%	\$156,253	1.10%
Oregon	\$64,950	1.02%	\$14,397	1.07%	\$27,789	0.85%	\$33,572	1.03%	\$140,708	0.99%
Pennsylvania	\$253,155	3.96%	\$48,003	3.56%	\$117,500	3.60%	\$125,361	3.84%	\$544,019	3.81%



State	Basic Grants		Concentration Grants		Targeted Grants		EFIG		Total Title I-A Grants	
	Estimated Grant	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Estimated Grant	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Estimated Grant	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Estimated Grant	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Estimated Grant	Percentage Share of Total Allocation
Puerto Rico	\$184,398	2.89%	\$46,822	3.47%	\$95,001	2.91%	\$92,247	2.83%	\$418,467	2.93%
Rhode Island <sup>c</sup>	\$22,221	0.35%	\$4,240	0.31%	\$11,414	0.35%	\$11,460	0.35%	\$49,334	0.35%
South Carolina	\$99,873	1.56%	\$23,338	1.73%	\$49,155	1.51%	\$53,451	1.64%	\$225,816	1.58%
South Dakota <sup>d</sup>	\$17,744	0.28%	\$3,327	0.25%	\$11,199	0.34%	\$11,200	0.34%	\$43,470	0.30%
Tennessee	\$124,511	1.95%	\$28,378	2.10%	\$64,411	1.98%	\$66,334	2.03%	\$283,633	1.99%
Texas	\$576,925	9.03%	\$128,428	9.52%	\$313,786	9.62%	\$301,296	9.24%	\$1,320,435	9.26%
Utah	\$40,396	0.63%	\$7,003	0.52%	\$18,716	0.57%	\$21,070	0.65%	\$87,185	0.61%
Vermont <sup>d</sup>	\$14,036	0.22%	\$2,450	0.18%	\$8,307	0.25%	\$8,403	0.26%	\$33,196	0.23%
Virginia	\$117,010	1.83%	\$21,982	1.63%	\$50,679	1.55%	\$53,963	1.65%	\$243,634	1.71%
Washington	\$108,628	1.70%	\$21,315	1.58%	\$45,365	1.39%	\$54,989	1.69%	\$230,297	1.61%
West Virginia	\$40,617	0.64%	\$9,176	0.68%	\$16,796	0.52%	\$22,620	0.69%	\$89,209	0.63%
Wisconsin	\$96,036	1.50%	\$17,210	1.28%	\$41,858	1.28%	\$53,417	1.64%	\$208,522	1.46%
Wyoming <sup>a</sup>	\$14,154	0.22%	\$2,092	0.16%	\$8,410	0.26%	\$8,403	0.26%	\$33,060	0.23%

**Source:** Table prepared by CRS, July 2, 2015, based on unpublished data provided by the U.S. Department of Education (ED), Budget Service. Estimated FY2015 Title I-A grant amounts were calculated by ED. Estimated percentage shares of FY2015 allocation amounts were calculated by CRS.

**Notes:** Details may not add to totals due to rounding.

- a. State receives a minimum grant under the Basic Grants, Targeted Grants, and EFIG formulas.
- b. State receives a minimum grant under the Targeted Grants and EFIG formulas.
- c. State receives a minimum grant under the Targeted Grants formula.
- d. State receives a minimum grant under all four formulas.

**Notice:** These are estimated grants only. These estimates are provided solely to assist in comparisons of the relative impact of alternative formulas and funding levels in the legislative process. They are not intended to predict specific amounts states will receive. In addition to other limitations, data needed to calculate final grants may not yet be available.

## **Author Contact Information**

Rebecca R. Skinner  
Specialist in Education Policy  
rskinner@crs.loc.gov, 7-6600

## **Acknowledgments**

Leah Rosenstiel and Elizabeth Crowe, Research Assistants at CRS, also contributed to this report.