



**Congressional  
Research Service**

Informing the legislative debate since 1914

---

# **FY2025 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)**

May 21, 2026

**Congressional Research Service**

<https://crsreports.congress.gov>

R48953



**R48953**

May 21, 2026

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

**Joe Angert**  
Research Assistant

## **FY2025 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 (P.L. 114-95), is the primary source of federal aid to support elementary and secondary education. The Title I-A program is the largest grant program authorized under the ESEA and was funded at \$18.4 billion for FY2025. 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 determines Title I-A allocations to local educational agencies (LEAs) based on four separate funding formulas: Basic Grants, Concentration Grants, Targeted Grants, and Education Finance Incentive Grants. State grants are the total of the allocations for all LEAs in a state under all four formulas. The four Title I-A formulas have somewhat distinct allocation patterns, providing varying shares of allocated funds to different types of LEAs and states. Thus, for some states, certain formulas are more favorable than others.

This report provides FY2025 state grant amounts under each of the four formulas used to determine Title I-A grants. Overall, California received the largest FY2025 Title I-A grant amount (\$2.3 billion, or 12.47% of total Title I-A grants to states). Vermont received the smallest FY2025 Title I-A grant amount (\$41.6 million, or 0.23% of total Title I-A grants to states).

## Contents

Introduction .....	1
Methodology for Determining Title I-A Grants .....	1
Formula Child Count and Formula Child Rate .....	2
Expenditure Factor .....	2
State Adjustments to LEA Grant Amounts.....	3
FY2025 Title I-A Grants.....	4

## Figures

Figure 1. FY2025 Title I-A State Grants by Amount and Share of Grant Provided Under Each Formula .....	6
--	---

## Tables

Table 1. FY2025 Title I-A State Grants and Percentage Shares of Funds Received Under Each Title I-A Formula Relative to All States .....	8
Table A-1. FY2025 Title I-A State Grants by Amount and Share of State Grant Provided Under Each Formula .....	12

## Appendixes

Appendix. Comparison of FY2025 Title I-A State Grants by Amount and Share of State Grant Provided Under Each Formula.....	12
---	----

## Contacts

Author Information.....	16
-------------------------	----

## Introduction

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), most recently comprehensively amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (P.L. 114-95), is the primary source of federal aid to support elementary and secondary education. Title I-A is the largest program in the ESEA,<sup>1</sup> funded at \$18.4 billion for FY2025. 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 allocations to local educational agencies (LEAs) based on four separate funding formulas: Basic Grants, Concentration Grants, Targeted Grants, and Education Finance Incentive Grants (EFIG). Grants to states are the total of the allocations for all LEAs in the state under all four formulas.<sup>2</sup>

This report provides FY2025 state grant amounts under each of the four formulas used to determine Title I-A grants.<sup>3</sup> For a general overview of the Title I-A formulas, see CRS Report R48890, *Determining Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*. For a more detailed discussion of the Title I-A formulas, see CRS Report R48165, *The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as Amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA): An Analytical Review of the Allocation Formulas*.

## Methodology for Determining Title I-A Grants

Under Title I-A, ED allocates funds to LEAs via state educational agencies (SEAs) and using the four Title I-A formulas.<sup>4</sup> Annual appropriations acts specify portions of each year's Title I-A appropriations to be allocated under each of the formulas. In FY2025, the ED Appropriations Act, 2025,<sup>5</sup> provided \$18.4 billion for the Title I-A program and designated 35.09% (\$6.5 billion) of Title I-A appropriations for the Basic Grant formula, 7.40% (\$1.4 billion) for the Concentration Grant formula, 28.75% (\$5.3 billion) for the Targeted Grant formula, and 28.75% (\$5.3 billion) for the EFIG formula.<sup>6</sup> After reserving funds for the U.S. Census Bureau, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas as required under Title I-A, \$18.2 billion was available for

<sup>1</sup> Title I-A is officially titled “Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies” in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), but it is commonly referred to as Title I-A.

<sup>2</sup> For the purposes of Title I-A, the term *states* includes the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

<sup>3</sup> This report continues a series of annual reports on Title I-A state grants. Similar analyses are available for FY2015–FY2024: CRS Report R48893, *FY2024 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*; CRS Report R48607, *FY2023 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*; CRS Report R47598, *FY2022 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*; CRS Report R47111, *FY2021 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*; CRS Report R47078, *FY2020 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*; CRS Report R46269, *FY2019 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*; CRS Report R45662, *FY2018 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*; CRS Report R44873, *FY2017 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*; CRS Report R44486, *FY2016 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*; and CRS Report R44097, *FY2015 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*.

<sup>4</sup> As the analysis presented in this report is based on unpublished data provided to CRS by the U.S. Department of Education (ED) on November 24, 2025, CRS is unable to present the specific underlying data used to determine Title I-A grants for a given state.

<sup>5</sup> Division D, Title III, of the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2024 (P.L. 118-47).

<sup>6</sup> Individual grant formula appropriations may not add to \$18.4 billion because of rounding.

FY2025 Title I-A grants to LEAs.<sup>7</sup> Once states allocate funds received from ED to LEAs, the amounts allocated under the four formulas are combined and used jointly by each LEA.

For each formula, grants are calculated using a *formula child count*, a *formula child rate*, and an *expenditure factor*. The FIG formula has two additional factors that are used to calculate grant amounts.<sup>8</sup>

## Formula Child Count and Formula Child Rate

Formula child counts used to determine Title I-A grants for the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico include children ages 5-17 and meet at least one of the following criteria: (1) living in families in poverty, according to estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program;<sup>9</sup> (2) living in institutions for neglected or delinquent children or in foster homes; or (3) living in families with income above the federal poverty level that receive Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) payments.<sup>10</sup> To obtain the percentage of children in an LEA who are formula children (also referred to as the formula child rate), the formula child count is divided by the total number of children ages 5-17 living in the LEA's geographic boundaries. For example, in an LEA with 200 formula children and 1,000 children ages 5-17, the formula child rate would be 20%. The data on the total number of children also are based on SAIPE estimates. In FY2025, children in poor families accounted for 97.11% of the total formula child count, which aligns with the first criterion listed above. Each element of the formula child count and formula child rate factors is updated annually.

In general, LEAs must have a minimum number of formula children, a minimum formula child rate, or both to be eligible to receive a grant under a specific Title I-A formula. Some LEAs may qualify for a grant under one of the formulas, and others may be eligible to receive grants under multiple formulas.

## Expenditure Factor

For LEAs in a given state, the expenditure factor for all four Title I-A formulas is equal to state average per-pupil expenditures (APPE) for public elementary and secondary education,<sup>11</sup> subject

<sup>7</sup> From the appropriation for Basic Grants, \$5 million was reserved for the U.S. Census Bureau to provide the data needed to determine Title I-A grant amounts. The maximum amount that may be reserved for this purpose is specified annually in the ED Appropriations Act. From the remaining funds, a statutorily determined 1.1% was reserved from the appropriations for each of the four formulas for the Bureau of Indian Education and the outlying areas. For the purposes of Title I-A, outlying areas are American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

<sup>8</sup> The two factors are the *equity* and *effort* factors. For more information about these factors, see CRS Report R48165, *The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as Amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA): An Analytical Review of the Allocation Formulas*.

<sup>9</sup> The Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program produces single-year estimates of income and poverty for all U.S. states and counties as well as estimates of school-age children in poverty for over 13,000 local educational agencies (LEAs). SAIPE estimates do not include all LEAs in the United States. For example, SAIPE estimates do not include charter schools that are their own LEAs. State educational agencies (SEAs) make adjustments to the grants calculated by ED to account for LEAs not included in the SAIPE estimates.

<sup>10</sup> For a description of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, see CRS In Focus IF10036, *The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant*.

<sup>11</sup> State average per-pupil expenditures (APPE) are based on (1) the aggregate current expenditures of all LEAs in the state plus any direct expenditures by the state for the operation of those LEAs divided by (2) the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom those LEAs provided free public education. For the purposes of (continued...)

to a minimum and a maximum percentage of the national average further multiplied by 0.40.<sup>12</sup> More specifically, a state's APPE is multiplied by 40% and then subject to a minimum of 80% and a maximum of 120% of 40% of the national APPE—referred to as the *lower bound* and *upper bound*, respectively—for the Basic, Concentration, and Targeted Grant formulas. If a state's APPE multiplied by 40% falls below the lower bound, the state's expenditure factor is raised to the lower bound amount. If a state's APPE multiplied by 40% is above the upper bound, the state's expenditure factor is reduced to the upper bound amount. For EFIG, the minimum and maximum bounds for state APPE relative to 40% of the national APPE are 85% and 115%, respectively.<sup>13</sup>

The following example demonstrates the expenditure calculation for the Basic Grant, Concentration Grant, and Targeted Grant formulas.

Step One: Assume national APPE is \$10,000. Multiplying this amount by 40% equals \$4,000. The lower and upper bounds are established by multiplying \$4,000 by 80% to produce a lower bound of \$3,200 and multiplying \$4,000 by 120% to produce an upper bound of \$4,800.

Step Two: Assume state APPE is \$14,000. Multiplying the amount by 40% equals \$5,600. This amount is compared with the lower and upper bounds established in Step One. As \$5,600 is higher than \$4,800, the state's expenditure factor used in each of the formulas is reduced to the upper bound amount calculated in Step One (i.e., \$4,800).

## State Adjustments to LEA Grant Amounts

After calculating LEA grant amounts, ED provides these amounts to each state. States need to make adjustments to these LEA grant amounts to account for LEAs for which ED is unable to estimate Title I-A grant amounts, such as charter schools that operate as independent LEAs or newly formed LEAs.<sup>14</sup> In addition, each state must reserve Title I-A funds for school

---

determining state APPE, current expenditures include expenditures to provide a free public education, including expenditures for administration, instruction, attendance and health services, pupil transportation services, plant operations and maintenance, fixed charges, and net expenditures to cover deficits for food services and student body activities. Current expenditures do not include expenditures from community services, capital outlay, debt service, or any expenditures made from funds received under ESEA, Title I (§8101). In addition, according to a report on the Title I-A formulas published by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) under ED, to refine the state APPE calculation “to reflect only the state and local education costs, several federal revenue items from the current expenditure numerator are removed before calculating state APPE.” In addition to removing federal revenues from Title I, other federal revenue items that are large enough to have a “substantive effect on current expenditures” are removed. For example, revenue from the National School Lunch Program administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture is removed from the numerator. For more information, see ED, NCES, *Study of the Title I, Part A Grant Program Mathematical Formulas*, May 2019, p. 17, <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2019/2019016.pdf> (hereinafter ED, NCES, *Study of the Title I-A Formulas*).

<sup>12</sup> The state APPE is multiplied by 40% because “Title I is intended to be a supplemental program; thus, districts are authorized to receive 40 additional cents for each [state per pupil expenditure] dollar to spend on education services provided to disadvantaged students” (ED, NCES, *Study of the Title I-A Formulas*, p. 1).

<sup>13</sup> In practice, the bounds on the expenditure factor for the Basic Grant, Concentration Grant, and Targeted Grant formulas are expressed as 80% and 120%. In law, the bounds are expressed as 32% and 48% of 100% of the national APPE (ESEA, §1124(a)(1)(B)). Similarly, in practice, the bounds on the expenditure factor for the Education Finance Incentive Grants (EFIG) formula are expressed as 85% and 115%. In law, the bounds are expressed as 34% and 46% of 100% of the national APPE (ESEA, §1125A(b)(1)(A)(i)).

<sup>14</sup> For example, during the 2021-2022 school year, there were 4,149 independent charter districts in the United States (ED, NCES, “Table 214.30. Number of public elementary and secondary education agencies, by type of agency and state or jurisdiction: School years 2020-21 and 2021-22,” *Digest of Education Statistics*, 2022, <https://nces.ed.gov/> (continued...))

improvement and may reserve Title I-A funds for administration and direct student services. Thus, the LEA grant amounts calculated by ED will likely be higher than what an LEA will actually receive after state adjustments and reservations are made.

## FY2025 Title I-A Grants

**Figure 1** depicts the composition of each state's Title I-A grant based on the share of total state funds received under each of the formulas. The figure also provides the amount of funding each state received under each of the formulas. The data in **Figure 1** also are presented in **Table A-1**. State grant amounts also can be examined based on each state's share of the amount of funds available overall and under each of the formulas relative to other states. **Table 1** provides each state's grant amount and relative percentage share of funds allocated under each of the Title I-A formulas for FY2025. The latter was determined for each state by dividing the state's grant amount under that formula by the total amount of funding allocated to states for a given Title I-A formula. **Table 1** also shows total Title I-A grants, calculated by summing the state-level grant for each of the four formulas, along with each state's relative percentage shares of total Title I-A grants.

In general, grant amounts for states vary across the Title I-A formulas because of the different allocation amounts for the formulas provided through the appropriations process and the characteristics of the formulas themselves. For example, with respect to appropriations for each of the formulas, the Basic Grant formula receives a greater share of overall Title I-A appropriations than the Concentration Grant formula, so states receive higher grant amounts and a greater share of their total Title I-A funds under the Basic Grant formula than under the Concentration Grant formula (**Figure 1**). With respect to formula characteristics,<sup>15</sup> the amount of funding received under each formula is related in part to an LEA's, and by extension a state's, number or percentage of formula children. For example, while Nevada and Arizona had similar percentages of formula children and identical expenditure factors in FY2025, Arizona had a larger population of children included in the formula calculations than Nevada and therefore received a higher grant amount and larger share of Title I-A funds in FY2025 (**Table 1**).

States might have similar numbers of formula children but different expenditure factors, which would contribute to a lower Title I-A grant amount for the state with the lower expenditure factor. For example, Washington and Oklahoma had similar numbers of formula children in FY2025, but Washington had a higher expenditure factor. This difference contributed to Washington receiving a higher Title I-A grant and a larger share of Title I-A funds than Oklahoma (**Table 1**).

Different Title I-A formulas have different eligibility requirements for LEAs to receive a grant (e.g., minimum number of formula children, minimum formula child rate). This difference affects which LEAs receive funds under a particular Title I-A grant formula, thereby affecting the total amount of funding received by a state under a specific Title I-A formula. In addition, the Targeted Grant and EFIG formulas use weighted formula child counts in determining LEA grant amounts.<sup>16</sup> These differences can affect total state grant amounts.

---

programs/digest/d22/tables/dt22\_214.30.asp). Independent charter districts are not included in the SAIPE dataset used by ED to calculate Title I-A grants, so ED is unable to calculate grant amounts for these LEAs.

<sup>15</sup> For more information about the characteristics of the Title I-A formulas and how they affect grant amounts, see CRS Report R45141, *Analysis of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I-A Allocation Formulas: Factors, Design Elements, and Allocation Patterns*.

<sup>16</sup> Under the Targeted Grant and EFIG formulas, weights are applied to formula child counts on the basis of (1) each (continued...)

Overall, California received the largest total Title I-A grant amount (\$2.3 billion) and, as a result, the largest percentage share (12.47%) of Title I-A grants. Vermont received the smallest total Title I-A grant amount (\$41.6 million) and, as a result, the smallest percentage share (0.23%) of Title I-A grants (**Table 1**).

Within a state, the relative percentage share of funds received from each formula may vary by formula, as certain formulas are more favorable to states with certain characteristics. For example, in addition to the formula features discussed above, the EFIG formula is generally more favorable to states with comparatively equal levels of spending per pupil among their LEAs.<sup>17</sup> If a state's share of a given Title I-A formula exceeds its share of overall Title I-A funds, this is an indication that this particular formula was 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 the fiscal year being examined. For example, in FY2025, Florida received a higher percentage share of Concentration Grants and Targeted Grants than its overall share of Title I-A funds, indicating that the Concentration Grant and Targeted Grant formulas were more favorable to Florida than the Basic Grant or EFIG formulas. Utah, in contrast, received a higher percentage share of Basic Grants and EFIG than its overall share of Title I-A funds in FY2025, indicating that the Basic Grant and EFIG formulas are more favorable to Utah than the Concentration Grant or Targeted Grant formulas (**Table 1**).

Another factor affecting state grant amounts is the state minimum grant provision included in each of the four Title I-A formulas. The minimum grant provisions applicable to each of the Title I-A formulas provide states with different minimum shares of the funds allocated under the respective formulas. The highest minimum state grant shares are provided under Targeted Grants and EFIG, and lower minimum state grant shares are provided under Basic Grants and Concentration Grants. This is evident in the shares of each Title I-A formula grant provided to the six states that received a minimum grant under all four formulas in FY2025 (Alaska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming).<sup>18</sup> Each of these states received a higher share of the total available funds under the Targeted Grant and EFIG formulas than under the Basic Grant or Concentration Grant formulas. As a state may receive a state minimum grant amount under any or all of the formulas, **Table 1** indicates which states received a minimum grant under each of the Title I-A formulas.

---


LEA's formula child rate (commonly referred to as *percentage weighting*) and (2) each LEA's number of formula children (commonly referred to as *number weighting*). Both percentage weighting and number weighting produce a weighted formula child count. The higher of the two weighted formula child counts for a given LEA is used in the formula for determining grants. For more information about the Title I-A formulas, see CRS Report R48165, *The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as Amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA): An Analytical Review of the Allocation Formulas*.

<sup>17</sup> This is due to the equity factor used in the EFIG formula. For more information about this factor, see CRS Report R48165, *The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as Amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA): An Analytical Review of the Allocation Formulas*.

<sup>18</sup> Each of the minimum grant provisions included in the four Title I-A formulas have multiple minimum grant calculation formulas. By law, the calculation option that produces the lowest grant is chosen for each state, resulting in states benefiting from the minimum state grant provisions receiving different shares of the same Title I-A formula appropriation.

**Figure I. FY2025 Title I-A State Grants by Amount and Share of Grant Provided Under Each Formula**

Figure is interactive in HTML report version



**Source:** Figure prepared by CRS based on unpublished data provided by the U.S. Department of Education (ED), Budget Service. FY2025 Title I-A grant amounts were calculated by ED using the most current data available. CRS calculated the percentage shares of state grant FY2025 allocation amounts from each formula.

**Notes:** EFIG = Education Finance Incentive Grants. The percentages represented by the bars for each state show the share of a state's total Title I-A funding being provided under each of the four Title I-A formulas. Thus, across states, the same percentage of funds being provided by a particular Title I-A formula may not correspond to an identical dollar amount of funds being provided by that formula to the relevant states. Details may not add to totals because of rounding. Percentages were calculated based on unrounded numbers. Amounts shown in the figure reflect only Title I-A funds provided to states. These amounts are determined after funds have been reserved from the total Title I-A appropriation (\$18.4 billion) 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. See Table A-1 for further details on amounts and shares of state grants provided under each formula.

**Table I. FY2025 Title I-A State Grants and Percentage Shares of Funds Received Under Each Title I-A Formula Relative to All States**

dollars in thousands

State	Basic Grants		Concentration Grants		Targeted Grants		EFIG		Total Title I-A Grants	
	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Amount Available for State Grants	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Amount Available for State Grants	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Amount Available for State Grants	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Amount Available for State Grants	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Amount Available for State Grants
<b>Total, All States</b>	\$6,383,403	100%	\$1,347,316	100%	\$5,234,332	100%	\$5,234,332	100%	\$18,199,382	100%
Alabama	\$104,629	1.64%	\$25,868	1.92%	\$82,888	1.58%	\$88,972	1.70%	\$302,357	1.66%
Alaska	\$17,472 <sup>a</sup>	0.27%	\$2,406 <sup>a</sup>	0.18%	\$16,334 <sup>a</sup>	0.31%	\$16,213 <sup>a</sup>	0.31%	\$52,426	0.29%
Arizona	\$114,829	1.80%	\$23,299	1.73%	\$87,524	1.67%	\$92,535	1.77%	\$318,188	1.75%
Arkansas	\$62,901	0.99%	\$14,746	1.09%	\$44,257	0.85%	\$52,464	1.00%	\$174,368	0.96%
California	\$811,800	12.72%	\$160,531	11.91%	\$671,291	12.82%	\$625,756	11.95%	\$2,269,377	12.47%
Colorado	\$67,456	1.06%	\$9,549	0.71%	\$47,963	0.92%	\$52,595	1.00%	\$177,564	0.98%
Connecticut	\$62,733	0.98%	\$11,308	0.84%	\$39,551	0.76%	\$52,376	1.00%	\$165,967	0.91%
Delaware	\$20,785	0.33%	\$3,517	0.26%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$60,942	0.33%
District of Columbia	\$17,744 <sup>a</sup>	0.28%	\$4,283	0.32%	\$17,304 <sup>a</sup>	0.33%	\$17,155 <sup>a</sup>	0.33%	\$56,486	0.31%
Florida	\$308,731	4.84%	\$79,026	5.87%	\$321,674	6.15%	\$264,019	5.04%	\$973,451	5.35%
Georgia	\$222,932	3.49%	\$54,605	4.05%	\$191,950	3.67%	\$180,864	3.46%	\$650,352	3.57%
Hawaii	\$22,388	0.35%	\$5,028	0.37%	\$20,594	0.39%	\$21,029	0.40%	\$69,039	0.38%
Idaho	\$23,152	0.36%	\$2,576 <sup>a</sup>	0.19%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$62,368	0.34%
Illinois	\$275,156	4.31%	\$55,078	4.09%	\$220,522	4.21%	\$206,466	3.94%	\$757,221	4.16%
Indiana	\$104,363	1.63%	\$19,757	1.47%	\$69,976	1.34%	\$85,461	1.63%	\$279,557	1.54%

State	Basic Grants		Concentration Grants		Targeted Grants		EFIG		Total Title I-A Grants	
	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Amount Available for State Grants	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Amount Available for State Grants	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Amount Available for State Grants	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Amount Available for State Grants	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Amount Available for State Grants
Iowa	\$43,718	0.68%	\$6,682	0.50%	\$25,402	0.49%	\$36,466	0.70%	\$112,268	0.62%
Kansas	\$44,818	0.70%	\$8,202	0.61%	\$29,309	0.56%	\$35,271	0.67%	\$117,600	0.65%
Kentucky	\$106,267	1.66%	\$25,754	1.91%	\$83,571	1.60%	\$91,651	1.75%	\$307,243	1.69%
Louisiana	\$131,191	2.06%	\$34,192	2.54%	\$116,544	2.23%	\$110,738	2.12%	\$392,665	2.16%
Maine	\$21,438	0.34%	\$3,668	0.27%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$61,747	0.34%
Maryland	\$99,122	1.55%	\$21,815	1.62%	\$92,878	1.77%	\$82,691	1.58%	\$296,506	1.63%
Massachusetts	\$114,888	1.80%	\$20,300	1.51%	\$76,657	1.46%	\$90,759	1.73%	\$302,606	1.66%
Michigan	\$205,284	3.22%	\$42,458	3.15%	\$156,997	3.00%	\$178,346	3.41%	\$583,085	3.20%
Minnesota	\$73,754	1.16%	\$8,465	0.63%	\$45,033	0.86%	\$56,281	1.08%	\$183,533	1.01%
Mississippi	\$78,958	1.24%	\$19,411	1.44%	\$66,132	1.26%	\$64,476	1.23%	\$228,977	1.26%
Missouri	\$95,714	1.50%	\$19,425	1.44%	\$62,869	1.20%	\$69,620	1.33%	\$247,628	1.36%
Montana	\$17,744 <sup>a</sup>	0.28%	\$2,915	0.22%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$57,300	0.31%
Nebraska	\$30,564	0.48%	\$5,150	0.38%	\$21,096	0.40%	\$21,702	0.41%	\$78,513	0.43%
Nevada	\$47,455	0.74%	\$12,148	0.90%	\$54,611	1.04%	\$41,887	0.80%	\$156,101	0.86%
New Hampshire	\$17,331 <sup>a</sup>	0.27%	\$2,025 <sup>a</sup>	0.15%	\$15,283 <sup>a</sup>	0.29%	\$16,185 <sup>a</sup>	0.31%	\$50,823	0.28%
New Jersey	\$170,057	2.66%	\$31,169	2.31%	\$115,098	2.20%	\$139,936	2.67%	\$456,260	2.51%
New Mexico	\$51,581	0.81%	\$13,343	0.99%	\$43,770	0.84%	\$44,845	0.86%	\$153,539	0.84%
New York	\$487,224	7.63%	\$111,818	8.30%	\$487,285	9.31%	\$395,461	7.56%	\$1,481,788	8.14%
North Carolina	\$180,719	2.83%	\$44,218	3.28%	\$153,150	2.93%	\$155,924	2.98%	\$534,011	2.93%

State	Basic Grants		Concentration Grants		Targeted Grants		EFIG		Total Title I-A Grants	
	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Amount Available for State Grants	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Amount Available for State Grants	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Amount Available for State Grants	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Amount Available for State Grants	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Amount Available for State Grants
North Dakota	\$16,029 <sup>a</sup>	0.25%	\$2,001 <sup>a</sup>	0.15%	\$15,071 <sup>a</sup>	0.29%	\$15,088 <sup>a</sup>	0.29%	\$48,188	0.26%
Ohio	\$233,948	3.66%	\$48,197	3.58%	\$173,116	3.31%	\$195,248	3.73%	\$650,509	3.57%
Oklahoma	\$86,696	1.36%	\$19,572	1.45%	\$64,920	1.24%	\$70,852	1.35%	\$242,039	1.33%
Oregon	\$67,194	1.05%	\$10,353	0.77%	\$42,461	0.81%	\$56,929	1.09%	\$176,937	0.97%
Pennsylvania	\$269,859	4.23%	\$52,586	3.90%	\$203,334	3.88%	\$217,149	4.15%	\$742,928	4.08%
Puerto Rico	\$137,736	2.16%	\$35,812	2.66%	\$117,736	2.25%	\$120,358	2.30%	\$411,642	2.26%
Rhode Island	\$19,563	0.31%	\$3,378 <sup>a</sup>	0.25%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$59,581	0.33%
South Carolina	\$95,958	1.50%	\$23,208	1.72%	\$77,336	1.48%	\$81,570	1.56%	\$278,073	1.53%
South Dakota	\$17,744 <sup>a</sup>	0.28%	\$3,362 <sup>a</sup>	0.25%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$57,746	0.32%
Tennessee	\$131,296	2.06%	\$30,602	2.27%	\$108,735	2.08%	\$107,349	2.05%	\$377,981	2.08%
Texas	\$616,041	9.65%	\$142,646	10.59%	\$536,062	10.24%	\$513,858	9.82%	\$1,808,606	9.94%
Utah	\$37,251	0.58%	\$4,031	0.30%	\$27,819	0.53%	\$31,035	0.59%	\$100,135	0.55%
Vermont	\$13,650 <sup>a</sup>	0.21%	\$2,016 <sup>a</sup>	0.15%	\$12,873 <sup>a</sup>	0.25%	\$13,075 <sup>a</sup>	0.25%	\$41,614	0.23%
Virginia	\$129,999	2.04%	\$24,437	1.81%	\$95,073	1.82%	\$99,080	1.89%	\$348,590	1.92%
Washington	\$121,426	1.90%	\$16,048	1.19%	\$75,269	1.44%	\$102,296	1.95%	\$315,039	1.73%
West Virginia	\$38,190	0.60%	\$8,962	0.67%	\$26,703	0.51%	\$31,119	0.59%	\$104,974	0.58%
Wisconsin	\$80,656	1.26%	\$13,449	1.00%	\$55,921	1.07%	\$66,858	1.28%	\$216,884	1.19%
Wyoming	\$15,267 <sup>a</sup>	0.24%	\$1,919 <sup>a</sup>	0.14%	\$14,467 <sup>a</sup>	0.28%	\$14,405 <sup>a</sup>	0.28%	\$46,058	0.25%

**Source:** Table prepared by CRS using unpublished data provided by the U.S. Department of Education (ED), Budget Service. FY2025 Title I-A grant amounts were calculated by ED using the most current data available. CRS calculated the percentage shares of FY2025 allocation amounts.

**Notes:** EFIG = Education Finance Incentive Grants. Details may not add to totals because of rounding. Percentages were calculated based on unrounded numbers. Amounts shown in the table reflect only Title I-A funds provided to states. These amounts are determined after funds have been reserved from the total Title I-A appropriation (\$18.4 billion) 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.

- a. The state received a minimum state grant under this Title I-A formula. Each of the minimum grant provisions included in the four Title I-A formulas have multiple minimum grant calculation formulas. By law, the calculation option that produces the lowest grant is chosen for each state. As a result, states that benefit from the minimum state grant provisions may receive different shares of the same Title I-A formula appropriation.

# Appendix. Comparison of FY2025 Title I-A State Grants by Amount and Share of State Grant Provided Under Each Formula

**Table A-1. FY2025 Title I-A State Grants by Amount and Share of State Grant Provided Under Each Formula**

dollars in thousands

State	Basic Grants		Concentration Grants		Targeted Grants		EFIG		Total Title I-A Grants	
	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total State Grant	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total State Grant	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total State Grant	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total State Grant	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total State Grant
<b>Total, All States</b>	\$6,383,403	35.07%	\$1,347,316	7.40%	\$5,234,332	28.76%	\$5,234,332	28.76%	\$18,199,382	100.00%
Alabama	\$104,629	34.60%	\$25,868	8.56%	\$82,888	27.41%	\$88,972	29.43%	\$302,357	100.00%
Alaska	\$17,472 <sup>a</sup>	33.33%	\$2,406 <sup>a</sup>	4.59%	\$16,334 <sup>a</sup>	31.16%	\$16,213 <sup>a</sup>	30.93%	\$52,426	100.00%
Arizona	\$114,829	36.09%	\$23,299	7.32%	\$87,524	27.51%	\$92,535	29.08%	\$318,188	100.00%
Arkansas	\$62,901	36.07%	\$14,746	8.46%	\$44,257	25.38%	\$52,464	30.09%	\$174,368	100.00%
California	\$811,800	35.77%	\$160,531	7.07%	\$671,291	29.58%	\$625,756	27.57%	\$2,269,377	100.00%
Colorado	\$67,456	37.99%	\$9,549	5.38%	\$47,963	27.01%	\$52,595	29.62%	\$177,564	100.00%
Connecticut	\$62,733	37.80%	\$11,308	6.81%	\$39,551	23.83%	\$52,376	31.56%	\$165,967	100.00%
Delaware	\$20,785	34.11%	\$3,517	5.77%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	30.06%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	30.06%	\$60,942	100.00%
District of Columbia	\$17,744 <sup>a</sup>	31.41%	\$4,283	7.58%	\$17,304 <sup>a</sup>	30.63%	\$17,155 <sup>a</sup>	30.37%	\$56,486	100.00%
Florida	\$308,731	31.72%	\$79,026	8.12%	\$321,674	33.04%	\$264,019	27.12%	\$973,451	100.00%
Georgia	\$222,932	34.28%	\$54,605	8.40%	\$191,950	29.51%	\$180,864	27.81%	\$650,352	100.00%
Hawaii	\$22,388	32.43%	\$5,028	7.28%	\$20,594	29.83%	\$21,029	30.46%	\$69,039	100.00%
Idaho	\$23,152	37.12%	\$2,576 <sup>a</sup>	4.13%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	29.37%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	29.37%	\$62,368	100.00%
Illinois	\$275,156	36.34%	\$55,078	7.27%	\$220,522	29.12%	\$206,466	27.27%	\$757,221	100.00%

State	Basic Grants		Concentration Grants		Targeted Grants		EFIG		Total Title I-A Grants	
	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total State Grant	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total State Grant	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total State Grant	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total State Grant	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total State Grant
Indiana	\$104,363	37.33%	\$19,757	7.07%	\$69,976	25.03%	\$85,461	30.57%	\$279,557	100.00%
Iowa	\$43,718	38.94%	\$6,682	5.95%	\$25,402	22.63%	\$36,466	32.48%	\$112,268	100.00%
Kansas	\$44,818	38.11%	\$8,202	6.97%	\$29,309	24.92%	\$35,271	29.99%	\$117,600	100.00%
Kentucky	\$106,267	34.59%	\$25,754	8.38%	\$83,571	27.20%	\$91,651	29.83%	\$307,243	100.00%
Louisiana	\$131,191	33.41%	\$34,192	8.71%	\$116,544	29.68%	\$110,738	28.20%	\$392,665	100.00%
Maine	\$21,438	34.72%	\$3,668	5.94%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	29.67%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	29.67%	\$61,747	100.00%
Maryland	\$99,122	33.43%	\$21,815	7.36%	\$92,878	31.32%	\$82,691	27.89%	\$296,506	100.00%
Massachusetts	\$114,888	37.97%	\$20,300	6.71%	\$76,657	25.33%	\$90,759	29.99%	\$302,606	100.00%
Michigan	\$205,284	35.21%	\$42,458	7.28%	\$156,997	26.93%	\$178,346	30.59%	\$583,085	100.00%
Minnesota	\$73,754	40.19%	\$8,465	4.61%	\$45,033	24.54%	\$56,281	30.67%	\$183,533	100.00%
Mississippi	\$78,958	34.48%	\$19,411	8.48%	\$66,132	28.88%	\$64,476	28.16%	\$228,977	100.00%
Missouri	\$95,714	38.65%	\$19,425	7.84%	\$62,869	25.39%	\$69,620	28.11%	\$247,628	100.00%
Montana	\$17,744 <sup>a</sup>	30.97%	\$2,915	5.09%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	31.97%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	31.97%	\$57,300	100.00%
Nebraska	\$30,564	38.93%	\$5,150	6.56%	\$21,096	26.87%	\$21,702	27.64%	\$78,513	100.00%
Nevada	\$47,455	30.40%	\$12,148	7.78%	\$54,611	34.98%	\$41,887	26.83%	\$156,101	100.00%
New Hampshire	\$17,331 <sup>a</sup>	34.10%	\$2,025 <sup>a</sup>	3.98%	\$15,283 <sup>a</sup>	30.07%	\$16,185 <sup>a</sup>	31.85%	\$50,823	100.00%
New Jersey	\$170,057	37.27%	\$31,169	6.83%	\$115,098	25.23%	\$139,936	30.67%	\$456,260	100.00%
New Mexico	\$51,581	33.59%	\$13,343	8.69%	\$43,770	28.51%	\$44,845	29.21%	\$153,539	100.00%
New York	\$487,224	32.88%	\$111,818	7.55%	\$487,285	32.88%	\$395,461	26.69%	\$1,481,788	100.00%
North Carolina	\$180,719	33.84%	\$44,218	8.28%	\$153,150	28.68%	\$155,924	29.20%	\$534,011	100.00%
North Dakota	\$16,029 <sup>a</sup>	33.26%	\$2,001 <sup>a</sup>	4.15%	\$15,071 <sup>a</sup>	31.28%	\$15,088 <sup>a</sup>	31.31%	\$48,188	100.00%

State	Basic Grants		Concentration Grants		Targeted Grants		EFIG		Total Title I-A Grants	
	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total State Grant	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total State Grant	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total State Grant	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total State Grant	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total State Grant
Ohio	\$233,948	35.96%	\$48,197	7.41%	\$173,116	26.61%	\$195,248	30.01%	\$650,509	100.00%
Oklahoma	\$86,696	35.82%	\$19,572	8.09%	\$64,920	26.82%	\$70,852	29.27%	\$242,039	100.00%
Oregon	\$67,194	37.98%	\$10,353	5.85%	\$42,461	24.00%	\$56,929	32.17%	\$176,937	100.00%
Pennsylvania	\$269,859	36.32%	\$52,586	7.08%	\$203,334	27.37%	\$217,149	29.23%	\$742,928	100.00%
Puerto Rico	\$137,736	33.46%	\$35,812	8.70%	\$117,736	28.60%	\$120,358	29.24%	\$411,642	100.00%
Rhode Island	\$19,563	32.83%	\$3,378 <sup>a</sup>	5.67%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	30.75%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	30.75%	\$59,581	100.00%
South Carolina	\$95,958	34.51%	\$23,208	8.35%	\$77,336	27.81%	\$81,570	29.33%	\$278,073	100.00%
South Dakota	\$17,744 <sup>a</sup>	30.73%	\$3,362 <sup>a</sup>	5.82%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	31.73%	\$18,320 <sup>a</sup>	31.73%	\$57,746	100.00%
Tennessee	\$131,296	34.74%	\$30,602	8.10%	\$108,735	28.77%	\$107,349	28.40%	\$377,981	100.00%
Texas	\$616,041	34.06%	\$142,646	7.89%	\$536,062	29.64%	\$513,858	28.41%	\$1,808,606	100.00%
Utah	\$37,251	37.20%	\$4,031	4.03%	\$27,819	27.78%	\$31,035	30.99%	\$100,135	100.00%
Vermont	\$13,650 <sup>a</sup>	32.80%	\$2,016 <sup>a</sup>	4.85%	\$12,873 <sup>a</sup>	30.93%	\$13,075 <sup>a</sup>	31.42%	\$41,614	100.00%
Virginia	\$129,999	37.29%	\$24,437	7.01%	\$95,073	27.27%	\$99,080	28.42%	\$348,590	100.00%
Washington	\$121,426	38.54%	\$16,048	5.09%	\$75,269	23.89%	\$102,296	32.47%	\$315,039	100.00%
West Virginia	\$38,190	36.38%	\$8,962	8.54%	\$26,703	25.44%	\$31,119	29.64%	\$104,974	100.00%
Wisconsin	\$80,656	37.19%	\$13,449	6.20%	\$55,921	25.78%	\$66,858	30.83%	\$216,884	100.00%
Wyoming	\$15,267 <sup>a</sup>	33.15%	\$1,919 <sup>a</sup>	4.17%	\$14,467 <sup>a</sup>	31.41%	\$14,405 <sup>a</sup>	31.28%	\$46,058	100.00%

**Source:** Table prepared by CRS based on unpublished data provided by the U.S. Department of Education (ED), Budget Service. FY2025 Title I-A grant amounts were calculated by ED using the most current data available. CRS calculated percentage shares of FY2025 allocation amounts.

**Notes:** EFIG = Education Finance Incentive Grants. Details may not add to totals because of rounding. Percentages were calculated based on unrounded numbers. Amounts shown in the table reflect only Title I-A funds provided to states. These amounts are determined after funds have been reserved from the total Title I-A appropriation (\$18.4 billion) 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.

- a. The state received a minimum state grant under this Title I-A formula. Each of the minimum grant provisions included in the four Title I-A formulas have multiple minimum grant calculation formulas. By law, the calculation option that produces the lowest grant is chosen for each state. As a result, states that benefit from the minimum state grant provisions may receive different shares of the same Title I-A formula appropriation.

## Author Information

Rebecca R. Skinner  
Specialist in Education Policy

Joe Angert  
Research Assistant

## Acknowledgments

Isobel Sorenson, former CRS Research Assistant, 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.