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Position Statement
February 12, 2016

CEF Pleased the President’s Budget Invests in Education Despite Constrained Fiscal Environment
Disappointed in Proposed Freeze for Many Key Programs

The Committee for Education Funding (CEF), a coalition of 116 national education associations and institutions from preschool to postgraduate education, is pleased that President Obama’s Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 budget continues to invest in education, despite the very constrained fiscal environment due to the FY 2017 freeze for nondefense discretionary programs.

The budget increases funding for the Department of Education by $1.3 billion. In addition, early learning programs in the Department of Health and Human Services, including Preschool Development grants, Head Start and the Child Care and Development Block Grant, would receive a combined increase of $734 million.

Makese Motley, president of CEF said, “We are deeply disappointed the budget freezes funding for key foundational education programs including IDEA State grants, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Title II Supporting Effective Instruction, Impact Aid, Rural Education, Career and Technical Education State grants, Adult Education State grants, Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity grants, Federal Work Study, TRIO, GEAR UP, and aid to HBCUs, HSIs, and other minority-serving institutions.”

CEF also noted that the Student Support and Academic Enrichment grant created in ESSA is funded above the combined FY 2016 appropriation levels of programs that were consolidated into the grant. However, proposed funding is less than one-third of the $1.65 billion authorized level established in the bipartisan Act, even though the activities under the new block grant are far broader than those funded under the subsumed programs.

CEF is pleased some currently authorized programs received modest increases, including Education for Homeless Children, Promise Neighborhoods, Education Innovation and Research, School Leaders, Magnet Schools, IDEA Preschool and Infants/Families, and Research and Statistics. In addition, the budget proposes $139 billion in new mandatory funding over 10 years for programs such as Preschool for All, Computer Science for All, and America’s College Promise.
At the higher education level, CEF supports expanded eligibility for Pell grants through the proposed Pell for Accelerated Completion, the Pell bonus, and other improvements.


“We are fully supportive of the president’s plan to finally eliminate the harmful sequester caps and cuts in FY 2018 and beyond which make it extremely difficult to provide needed investments in education and related programs,” CEF Executive Director Joel Packer noted.

“CEF looks forward to working with Congress on a bipartisan basis to ensure key education programs receive the increases desperately needed to help ensure all students come to school ready to learn, close achievement gaps, improve overall student achievement, and increase high school graduation, college access, and college completion rates,” said Motley. “When our students succeed, our nation succeeds.”
BACKGROUND

President Obama released his Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 Budget on February 9. It is important to understand the policy and political context in which the budget and appropriations bills will be considered, as well as the overarching policies in the budget.

In the last several years, Congress enacted several rounds of spending cuts, including the FY 2011 Continuing Resolution which cut education and other nondefense discretionary (NDD) spending, and the Budget Control Act (BCA) of 2011 which imposed both defense and NDD spending caps that produced substantial savings and led to the sequester cuts. On March 1, 2013, the FY 2013 sequester cuts took effect. All non-exempt NDD programs were cut by 5 percent across the board, resulting in a $2.2 billion cut to the Department of Education (ED). While most mandatory funded domestic programs are exempt from the sequester, several programs at the Department of Education are not, including Vocational Rehabilitation and Aid to Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-Serving Institutions, and other Minority-Serving Institutions. These programs have been subject to sequester cuts of approximately 7 percent since FY 2013 and will continue to be cut each year through FY 2025. Further, the sequester increases loan origination fees each year for Stafford and PLUS loans.

Student aid programs, including student loans and Pell grants, have also endured multiple programmatic restrictions, eliminations, and limitations, resulting in almost $80 billion in savings. [See page 201 for a more detailed listing of these student aid cuts. Also see page 22 for additional details on education program cuts since 2011.]

According to the president’s FY 2017 budget, excluding savings from reduced debt service, cumulative spending cuts already enacted total $1.915 trillion for FY 2017 through FY 2026. The ongoing sequester caps will add an additional $556 billion in cuts, for a total of $2.471 trillion. Total increased revenues equal $814 billion. Thus, enacted spending cuts are more than three times as large as revenue increases. When the impact of interest savings is added the deficit has been reduced by $4.470 trillion.

While the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (BBA) partially raised the sequester caps for FY 2016 and FY 2017, it failed to fully return the caps to their pre-sequester levels. The BBA also left in place the sequester caps for FY 2018-21. Indeed, the NDD cap for FY 2017 is virtually the same as the FY 2016 cap, effectively freezing NDD spending. Since spending for some programs will go up, such as veterans’ health care which is within the NDD cap, in reality there will be less money available for needed investments in education and other domestic programs than there was in FY 2016.

According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), “Spending for nondefense discretionary programs is projected to drop from 3.3 percent of GDP in 2016 to 2.6 percent in 2026, 1.2 percentage points below the average from 1966 to 2015 and also the lowest share in any year since 1962.”
THE PRESIDENT’S BUDGET AND SEQUESTRATION

Overall the president’s budget adheres to the FY 2017 NDD cap set in the BBA of 2015 and partially replaces caps in FY 2018 through FY 2021 with a balanced mix of other spending cuts and revenue increases. The budget would also fully repeal the across the board sequester cuts on mandatory spending.

Even with these increases, NDD spending under the president’s budget in population- and inflation-adjusted dollars would decline from $625 billion in FY 2017 to $528 billion in FY 2026.

As the budget notes, “...not fully replacing sequestration in 2017 has consequences, including hindering the ability to make needed investments that are critical to building durable economic growth in the future and maintaining America’s edge as the leader in innovation and cutting-edge science.”

Partially because of this flat funding cap for NDD, the budget proposes to shift some funding from discretionary to mandatory (such as for NIH) and also create new mandatory funded programs.

A key issue facing education and other nondefense discretionary spending programs next year is whether or not Congress will once again replace the sequester cuts and ideally fully repeal the harmful sequester caps. Absent such an agreement in 2017, the FY 2018 NDD cap will go down by $12 billion (taking into account NDD funding available through the Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) fund), resulting in a new round of spending cuts.

EDUCATION OVERVIEW

Within a very constrained fiscal situation, education funding is again a priority in the president’s budget. It proposes an increase for ED of $1.3 billion (+1.96 percent) above the FY 2016 level when adjusted for the transfer of Preschool Development Grants from ED to the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). The budget also includes $139.7 billion in new mandatory spending for education, including Preschool for All, America’s College Promise, Computer Science for All, Respect: Best Job In The World, and the College Opportunity And Graduation Bonus.

Here is how various programmatic categories would fare:

- Funding for Preschool Development Grants (now in HHS) would increase by $100 million (+40 percent).
- Programs authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as revised by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), would increase by $495.3 million (+2.1 percent). Including proposed new K-12 programs, funding would increase by $805.3 million (+3.4 percent).
- Funding for special education programs would increase by $90 million (+0.7 percent).
- Career and Technical and Adult Education would increase by $88 million (+5.1 percent).
- Student financial aid programs would be frozen at their FY 2016 level.
- Higher education programs would increase by $207 million (+6.8 percent).
- The Institute of Education Sciences would receive an increase of $75.8 million (+12.3 percent).
- Departmental Management would increase by $156.4 million (+7.3 percent), with $80.1 million of that total for Student Aid Administration and $30.7 million for the Office for Civil Rights.

Over a third of the proposed discretionary increase, $465 million, is for new programs: Stronger Together ($120 million), Next Generation High Schools ($80 million), Computer Science for All Development Grants ($100 million), Teach to Lead ($10 million), HBCU and Minority-Serving Institutions (MSi) Innovation for Completion Fund ($30 million), and Teacher and Principal Pathways ($125 million).
While increases are proposed for some programs, a large number would be frozen, including the following: Comprehensive Literacy Development Grants; Innovative Approaches to Literacy; Migrant, Neglected and Delinquent; HEP/CAMP; Impact Aid Basic Support Payments; Impact Aid Payments for Children with Disabilities; Impact Aid Construction; Education for Native Hawaiians; Alaska Native Education Equity; Training and Advisory Services, Rural Education; Supplemental Education Grants; Full-Service Community Schools; Indian Education Grants to Local Educational Agencies; Indian Education National Activities; American History and Civics Academies; Ready To Learn; Arts in Education; Javits Gifted and Talented Education; IDEA Grants to States, IDEA State Personnel Development Grants, IDEA Personnel Preparation, IDEA Parent Information Centers, IDEA Technology and Media Services, and Special Olympics Education Programs; Vocational Rehabilitation Client Assistance State Grants, Vocational Rehabilitation Training, Vocational Rehabilitation Demonstration and Training programs, and Vocational Rehabilitation Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights; Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults, American Printing House for the Blind, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, and Gallaudet University; Adult Basic and Literacy Education State Grants; Pell Grants discretionary funding; Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants; Federal Work-Study; Strengthening Institutions, Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities, Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions, Strengthening HBCUs, Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions, Strengthening Predominantly Black Institutions, Strengthening Hispanic-Serving Institutions, and Promoting Postbaccalaureate Opportunities for Hispanic Americans; International Education and Foreign Language Studies Domestic Programs; Model Transition Programs for Students with Intellectual Disabilities into Higher Education; Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Career and Technical Institutions; Federal TRIO programs; Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP); Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need; Child Care Access Means Parents in School; Howard University; Regional Educational Laboratories; National Assessment; and Research in Special Education.

See the table on page 25 for the complete list of education programs increased, decreased and frozen.

**Mandatory Funding**

In addition to the proposed discretionary increases and changes, the budget includes significant mandatory funding for education. Under congressional budget rules, any new mandatory funded program must be paid for with either an increase in revenues, a reduction in funding to other mandatory programs, or a combination of the two.

- **Preschool for All ($75 billion over 10 years; $1.3 billion in FY 2017). This would be paid for by increasing the federal tax on tobacco products:**

  “Preschool for All funds would be used to improve outcomes for children by expanding the number and availability of high-quality preschool programs and improving the quality of existing programs. The definition of high-quality preschool, based on nationally recognized standards, includes, at a minimum, the following elements: (1) high-quality staff requirements, including a bachelor’s degree for teachers; (2) professional development for teachers and staff; (3) low staff-child ratios and small class sizes; (4) a full-day program; (5) developmentally appropriate, culturally and linguistically responsive instruction and evidence-based curricula and learning environments that are aligned with the State early learning and development standards; (6) inclusion of children with disabilities to ensure access to and full participation in all opportunities, as well as individual accommodations and supports for children; (7) instructional staff salaries that are comparable to those for K–12 instructional staff; (8) ongoing program evaluation to ensure continuous improvement; (9) onsite comprehensive services for children; and (10) evidence-based health and safety standards.”

  This same proposal was included in the president’s budget each of the three previous years.
RESPECT: Best job in the world ($1 billion in FY 2017. Funds would be available for use over a 5-year period):
This “program would aim to better recognize and support educators in high-need schools that often struggle to attract and retain talent. Providing all students with equal access to effective teachers will continue to be a challenge until we transform the job of working in high-need schools into one in which talented educators of demonstrated effectiveness aspire to work. This proposal would target the core barriers of poor human capital management and unsupportive working environments in under-resourced schools to create significant positive change. The program would award competitive grants of up to $250 million to State educational agencies (SEAs), which in turn would make subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) with schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Eligible LEAs would undertake a needs assessment, including educator as well as community and stakeholder input, aimed at identifying incentives and policies for attracting, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and school leaders and creating more supportive school environments with greater opportunities for students and teachers alike.”

Computer Science For All ($4 billion in mandatory funding over 3 years; $2 billion in FY 2017):
“Computer Science for All grants would be awarded to States in amounts based in part on State shares of funds under Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. To receive a grant, a State must submit a high-quality plan that includes: (1) ensuring that all high schools in the State offer at least one rigorous computer science course by the end of the grant period, which may be part of broader efforts to expand and improve STEM instruction in those schools; (2) ensuring that local educational agencies in the State develop, or adopt, and implement a rigorous curriculum and progression of high-quality instruction and other learning opportunities in preschool through grade 8 that integrate principles of computer science, include instructional practices supported by evidence of effectiveness, and lay the groundwork for academic success in high school; (3) effectively preparing and further developing computer science teachers and support staff; and (4) increasing access for underserved and disadvantaged students to other rigorous and advanced courses and programs, including Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses and dual or concurrent enrollment programs.”

America's College Promise ($60.8 billion over 10 years; $1.26 billion in FY 2017):
“Funds provided under this program would be used to:

- “Eliminate community college tuition and fees for eligible first-time students, regardless of age or whether they are recent high school graduates. Accordingly, low- and moderate-income students would continue to be eligible for Federal student aid (including Pell Grants) that they can use to cover other costs of attending college, such as books, supplies, housing, and transportation. America’s College Promise funds would be awarded before other student aid and scholarship programs. America’s College Promise fund would be a tuition waiver program funded by new Federal and State resources. States’ performance funding formulas must meet minimum criteria set by the Department that will work to ensure no funding gaps between different types of public institutions are developed so that all students have a chance to succeed.

- “Award grants to 4-year HBCUs and other MSIs to waive or reduce tuition and fees for up to 60 credits for Pell-eligible students. The grant amount would be based on a per-student cost of tuition and fees, capped by the national average of tuition and fees at public 4-year institutions, multiplied by the number of eligible students enrolled. The amount per student may not increase by more than 3 percent annually, while tuition and fees during the first year of the grant may not increase at a rate greater than any annual increase at the eligible institution in the previous 5 years.”

A similar proposal was included in the president’s budget last year.
- **College Opportunity and Graduation Bonus Program ($5.7 billion over 10 years; $548 million in FY 2017):** This program would reward colleges that successfully enroll and graduate a significant number of Pell students on time and encourage all institutions to improve their performance. Eligible institutions would receive a grant that will support innovation, interventions, and reforms to further increase college access and success based upon the number of Pell Grant recipients they graduate on time. Annual grants would be equal to the institutions' number of on-time Pell Grant recipient-graduates multiplied by a tiered bonus amount per student. This proposal was included in the FY 2015 and FY 2016 budgets.

- **Extend the Pell maximum award CPI Increase ($33.324 billion over nine years, starting in FY 2018).**

- **Reform teacher loan forgiveness benefits ($1.679 billion between FY 2021 and FY 2026):** The budget proposes to expand and increase teacher loan forgiveness, starting in 2021. This proposal would simplify existing postsecondary assistance available to teachers, such as TEACH grants and the current teacher loan forgiveness program, by consolidating them into a single, more generous loan forgiveness program, incentivizing more individuals to teach in our neediest schools and encouraging them to stay on the job. “The new program would reward teachers in high-need schools with forgiveness up to $10,000, while those who graduated from effective teacher preparation programs, as determined by States, would be eligible to receive up to $25,000. This new program would also reward job retention by forgiving increasing shares of student loan balances, awarded at 10 percent per year for teachers starting years 2-3, 20 percent for starting years 4-5, and 40 percent for starting year 6.”

- **Reauthorize Secure Rural Schools ($581 million between FY 2017 and FY 2022):** This program is in the Department of Agriculture.

To partially offset these costs, in particular the extension of the Pell maximum award CPI indexing, the budget includes several proposals that result in mandatory savings.

- **Reform student loan Income-Based Repayment plans (Saves $48.864 billion over 10 years):** “The 2017 Budget would reform and streamline PAYE and related repayment plans to ensure that program benefits are better targeted and safeguard the program for the future by protecting against institutional practices that may further increase student indebtedness. The proposal would create a single PAYE plan for loans originated on or after July 1, 2017, similar to the Revised PAYE (REPAYE) plan. This would simplify borrowers’ experience and allow for easier selection of a repayment plan, while reducing program complexity and targeting benefits to ensure program effectiveness.”

- **Reform and expand Perkins loan program (Saves $4.575 billion over 10 years):** “The Budget proposes to modernize and expand the Perkins Loan program into a new Unsubsidized Perkins Loan program which would provide $8.5 billion in loans annually, allocating lending authority among institutions on the basis of the extent to which institutions enroll and graduate higher numbers of Pell-eligible students, and offer affordable and quality education such that graduates can repay their educational debt.”

- **Limit federal revenue to 85 percent of total revenue at for-profit universities (loan effects) (Saves $14 million over 10 years).**
Tax Proposals

(For additional details, see General Explanations of the Administration’s FY 2017 Revenue Proposals.)

On the tax side, the budget proposes several provisions related to higher education:

- **Provide Community College Partnership Tax Credit (Reduces revenues by $2.213 billion over 10 years):** “The proposal would provide businesses with a new tax credit for hiring graduates from community and technical colleges as an incentive to encourage employer engagement and investment in these education and training pathways. The credit would be a component of the general business credit. The proposal would provide $500 million in tax credit authority for each of the five years, 2017 through 2021. The tax credit authority would be allocated annually to states on a per capita basis.”

- **Expand and modify the AOTC and repeal the Lifetime Learning Credit (Reduces revenues by $33.135 billion over 10 years):** “[T]he Administration proposes to replace the Lifetime Learning Credit (LLC) and student loan interest deduction with an expanded AOTC. The expanded AOTC would be available for the first five years of postsecondary education and for five tax years. It would expand eligibility to include less than half-time undergraduate students. The proposal would simplify and increase the refundable portion of the AOTC, and it would index expense limits and the refundable amount for inflation after 2017.”

  However, these changes would negatively impact some students and families who benefit under current law by:
  - Limiting the AOTC to only five years, which could adversely affect low- and middle-income nontraditional undergraduates who on average take 6.6 years to complete their degrees and are now eligible for the LLC without time limit.
  - Eliminating LLC benefits to graduate students after their first year of study and to lifelong learners, many of whom are low-income and need assistance in pursuing additional skill development or the advanced degrees that employers and our economy need.

- **Making Pell Grants excludable from income (Reduces revenues by $17.603 billion over 10 years):** “To further simplify education benefits for low-income students, the proposal would exclude all Pell Grants from gross income and the AOTC calculation, such that taxpayers can claim an AOTC without reducing eligible expenses for claiming the credit by the amount of their Pell Grant.”

- **Repealing the student loan interest deduction and providing exclusion for certain debt relief and scholarships (Increases revenues by $1.596 billion over 10 years):**

  The proposal would:
  - “Repeal the deduction for student loan interest for new students;
  - “Exclude the forgiven or discharged portion of a Federal student loan from gross income in cases where the loan was forgiven or discharged as part of a program administered by the Department of Education;
  - “Conform the tax treatment of loan amounts repaid by IHS to the tax treatment of loan amounts paid by NHSC and certain State programs intended to increase the availability of health care services to underserved populations. The proposal would also conform the tax treatment of IHS Health Professions Scholarships to the tax treatment of NHSC scholarships and Armed Forces Health Professions scholarships; and
  - “Allow the Secretary to disclose identifying information to the Department of Education for the purpose of contacting late-stage delinquent borrowers to inform them about options for avoiding default. The proposal would also allow the Department of Education to re-disclose this information, as under current law for defaulted borrowers, to certain lenders, guarantee agencies, and educational institutions for this purpose.”

It also modifies the reporting of tuition expenses and scholarships on Form 1098-T to require institutions of higher education to report amounts paid, not billed and increases revenues by $353 million over 10 years.
EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Early childhood education is again a major priority for the president. The proposal includes several main components:

- $75 billion in mandatory funding over 10 years for States to expand access to preschool for children in families under 200 percent of the poverty line. (ED)
- A $100 million increase in funding for Preschool Development Grants. (HHS)
  
This program was initially funded in the FY 2014 omnibus under the Race To The Top program. In FY 2015 and FY 2016, funding was shifted to the Fund for the Improvement of Education. The Every Student Succeeds Act revised the program and shifted its administration and funding to HHS.

- $15 billion in mandatory funding over the next 10 years to extend the evidence-based Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) program now funded through September 2017. (HHS)

- $434 million in increased discretionary funding for Head Start and Early Head Start-Childcare Partnerships. (HHS)

An additional $82 billion over 10 years for the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG). For FY 2017 the president proposes to increase mandatory funding for CCDBG to $6.582 billion (from $2.917 billion in FY 2016) and increase discretionary funding to $2.962 billion (from $2.76 billion in FY 2016). (HHS)

In addition, the budget provides an increase of $35 million (+9.5 percent) for IDEA Preschool grants, an average of $535 per child and $46 more per child than in FY 2016. The IDEA Grants for Infants and Families program is slated for an increase of $45 million (+9.8 percent).

In HHS, the budget requests an increase of $434 million (+4.5 percent) for Head Start divided as follows:

- $292 million to allow more Head Start programs to operate at least for a full school day and full school year.
- $142 million for a cost of living increase.

Also in HHS, the proposal includes historic increases for CCDBG. “The budget request includes $82 billion in additional mandatory funding over ten years to ensure that all low- and moderate-income working families (under 200 percent of the Federal Poverty Level) with children age three and below have access to child care assistance that can help them afford high-quality care. By 2026, this investment will provide access to high-quality care for about 1.15 million additional children under the age of four, increasing the total CCDF caseload to a historic high of more than 2.6 million children.” This mandatory expansion was also proposed in the FY 2016 budget.

The budget also provides funding to help States implement the policies required by the new bipartisan child care law, including a $200 million discretionary increase in FY 2017.

Finally, the budget also includes $400 million in FY 2017 and $15 billion in mandatory funding from FY 2018 through FY 2026 to extend and expand the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting program, which is estimated to serve more than 4.6 million at-risk families and provide over 30 million home visits through FY 2026.
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

FY 2017 is the first year of funding for programs authorized by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). In addition to ESSA funding, the budget proposes the following new discretionary funded programs:

- **Teach to Lead ($10 million):** “Funds would support an award to a nonprofit organization that would design and implement a national competition to make one-time, 3-year grants directly to teachers to support the development, implementation, expansion, and dissemination of projects designed to improve student outcomes for all students in high-need schools or that target the educational needs of low-achieving students.”

- **Stronger Together ($120 million):** “The Department would make competitive grants to LEAs or consortia of LEAs that have significant achievement gaps and socioeconomic segregation within or across districts and that propose either to embark on a planning process to study and develop options for addressing socioeconomic isolation in schools or to implement plans that have already been developed and have community support. Educational service agencies or other regional educational authorities serving such LEAs may also apply for grants.”

- **Next Generation High Schools ($80 million):** “Funds would support competitive grants to LEAs in partnership with institutions of higher education and other entities, such as nonprofit and community-based organizations, businesses, and other industry-related organizations. The Department would give priority to projects that: (1) are designed to improve readiness for postsecondary education and careers in STEM fields, particularly for student groups historically underrepresented in those fields; (2) serve areas with limited access to high-quality college and career opportunities such as high-poverty or rural LEAs; or (3) include partnerships with employers that help students attain career-related credentials.”

- **Computer Science for All Development Grants ($100 million):** “The program would promote innovative strategies and replicable models for providing high-quality instruction and other learning opportunities in computer science in preschool through grade 12. Funds would support competitive grants to LEAs, alone, in consortia, or in partnership with their State, or in partnership with institutions of higher education, nonprofit organizations, government agencies, and business or industry-related organizations.”

Several programs are slated for increases:

- **Title I** is increased by $450 million (+3.02 percent). However, the FY 2017 proposed funding level is equal to the combined FY 2016 appropriations for Title I and School Improvement Grants program, which was eliminated by ESSA.

- **State Assessments** is increased by $25 million (+6.61 percent).

- **Impact Aid Facilities Maintenance** is increased by $66.8 million (+1,381.86 percent).

- **Education For Homeless Children And Youths** is increased by $15 million (+21.43 percent).

- **School Safety National Activities** is increased by $15 million (+20 percent).

- **Promise Neighborhoods** is increased by $54.7 million (+74.73 percent).
Special Programs for Indian Children is increased by $30 million (+78.96 percent). The proposed increase is to support a significant expansion of the Native Youth Community Projects (NYCP).

Education Innovation And Research is increased by $80 million (+50 percent) compared to the previous Investing in Innovation (i3) program.

Excellent Educators Grants is increased by $20 million (+8.7 percent) compared to the previous Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) program.

Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED) would be funded at $100 million, an increase of $6 million (+6.39 percent) compared to the amount available for SEED in FY 2016 though the Title II, Part A set-aside.

School Leader Recruitment And Support is increased by $13.6 million (+83.28 percent) compared to the previous School Leadership program.

STEM Master Teacher Corps, a new program created by ESSA, is funded at $10 million.

Charter Schools Grants is increased by $16.83 million (+5.05 percent).

Magnet Schools Assistance Program is increased by $18.35 million (+18.99 percent).

IDEA Preschool Grants, as noted in the early childhood section, would receive an increase of $35 million (+9.5 percent).

IDEA Grants for Infants and Families, also as noted in the early childhood section, would receive an increase of $45 million (+9.81 percent).

Programs slated for decreases include:

School Improvement Grants = -$450 million, -100 percent (eliminated by ESSA).
Impact Aid Payments for Federal Property = -$66.8 million, -100 percent.
Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants = -$99.8 million, -14.94 percent compared to the previous Teacher Quality State Grants program.
Mathematics and Science Partnerships = -$152.7 million, -100 percent (eliminated by ESSA).
21st Century Community Learning Centers = -$166.7 million, -14.29 percent.
Elementary and Secondary School Counseling = -$49.6 million, -100 percent (eliminated by ESSA).
Physical Education Program = -$47 million, -100 percent (eliminated by ESSA).
Advanced Placement = -$28.5 million, -100 percent (eliminated by ESSA).

CAREER, TECHNICAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

Adult Basic and Literacy Education State Grants would be frozen.
Other programs would receive increases:

Career and Technical Education is increased by $75 million (+22.96 percent).
The increase is for a new grant competition for an American Technical Training Fund under a proposed CTE Innovation Fund that “would support the development, operation, and expansion of innovative, evidence-based, tuition-free, short-term or accelerated job training programs in high-demand fields that provide a path to the middle class for low-income individuals.”
Career and Technical Education National programs is increased by $2 million (+26.95 percent). The $2 million increase is to provide technical assistance and evaluation support for projects under the $75 million American Technical Training Fund proposal.

Adult Education National Leadership Activities is increased by $11 million (+80.22 percent). “The proposed $11 million increase would be used to support State-based efforts to improve adult education standards and assessments and to carry out data collection activities, as well as to improve the interoperability of data systems and the accuracy and timeliness of reporting to meet WIOA requirements.”

STUDENT AID AND HIGHER EDUCATION

The budget proposes to fund several new programs (see Mandatory Programs section above for details on new mandatory funded higher education programs), extend the inflation indexing for the Pell grant maximum award, revise the campus allocation formula for the campus-based student aid programs, restructure the Perkins loan program, and revise the Pay As You Earn program.

Almost all student aid and higher education programs would be frozen, including the discretionary funded portion of Pell grants; campus-based aid; programs providing aid to HBCUs, HSIs and other MSIs; International Education and Foreign Language Studies Domestic Programs; Model Transition Programs for Students with Intellectual Disabilities into Higher Education; Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Career and Technical Institutions; TRIO; GEAR UP; Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need; and, Child Care Access Means Parents in School.

The budget proposes to replace the Teacher Quality Partnership program with a new Teacher and Principal Pathways Program funded at $125 million.

It also proposes $30 million for one new discretionary program, the HBCU and MSI Innovation for Completion Fund, which is “designed to support innovative and evidence-based, student-centered strategies and interventions to increase the number of low-income students and students of color completing degree programs at HBCUs and minority-serving institutions.”

First in the World (FITW) is the only program slated for an increase. It would be funded at $100 million. Congress eliminated funding for FITW in FY 2016.

International Education and Foreign Language Studies Overseas Programs is the only program that would be cut (-$4.89 million; -69.3 percent).

Other Policy Proposals

Pell Grants:
The proposal includes several reforms and changes to the Pell Grant program:

- **Pell for Accelerated Completion:** The budget proposes to reinstate year-round Pell Grant eligibility, allowing students the opportunity to earn a third semester of Pell during an academic year if they have already completed a full-time course load of 24 credits. Eligible students will be able to receive up to 150 percent of their regular Pell Grant award, allowing students to complete degrees and enter the workforce or graduate education on time or even faster.

- **On-Track Pell Bonus:** To bolster incentives for on-time completion, the budget proposes to provide an additional $300 Pell bonus award to reward recipients who take 15 credits per semester in an award year. The budget proposes again to strengthen academic progress requirements in the Pell Grant program to encourage students to complete their studies on time.
Second Chance Pell: Access to Pell Grant aid would be reinstated for eligible incarcerated students in federal and State penal institutions.

The budget provides mandatory funding to continue indexing the maximum Pell Grant award to inflation beyond 2017. The automatic inflationary increases provided in the SAFRA Act are scheduled to expire after the 2017-18 award year.

Iraq and Afghanistan Service Grants would be moved to the Pell Grant program to avoid further award reductions as a result of sequestration and ensure veterans’ children receive a full, non-sequestered aid award.

Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, Federal Work-Study, and Perkins Loans: “The President’s 2017 Budget proposes to reform Federal allocations in the campus-based programs to allocate grants to those institutions that enroll and graduate higher numbers of Pell-eligible students and offer affordable and quality education and training such that graduates can obtain employment and repay their educational debt.”

This proposal has been included in the past several Administration budgets.

Perkins Loans: “The Budget proposes to modernize and expand the Perkins Loan program into a new Unsubsidized Perkins Loan program, which would provide $8.5 billion in loans annually, allocating lending authority among institutions on the basis of the extent to which institutions enroll and graduate higher numbers of Pell-eligible students and offer affordable and quality education such that graduates can repay their educational debt. This reform would replace the current program, which was recently reauthorized through the end of September 2017, and be in effect for the 2017-2018 school year. When fully implemented, the new Perkins loan program would provide eight and a half times the current Perkins loan volume and expand institutional participation by up to an additional 2,900 postsecondary institutions.”

FAFSA Simplification: “The President’s 2017 Budget proposes additional and significant FAFSA simplification by removing questions regarding savings, investments, and net worth, which rarely affect the actual aid award but significantly lengthen the application for some families. Additionally, untaxed income and exclusions from income data that are not reported to the IRS would no longer be collected. To prevent resulting decreases of aid awards, the Budget also proposes adjustments to the Expected Family Contribution for certain categories of applicants.”

Student Loans:

Reform and Streamline Repayment Plan Options: “The 2017 Budget would reform and streamline PAYE and related repayment plans to ensure that program benefits are better targeted and safeguard the program for the future by protecting against institutional practices that may further increase student indebtedness. The proposal would create a single PAYE plan for loans originated on or after July 1, 2017, similar to the Revised PAYE (REPAYE) plan. This would simplify borrowers’ experience and allow for easier selection of a repayment plan, while reducing program complexity and targeting benefits to ensure program effectiveness. Students who borrowed their first loans prior to July 1, 2017, would continue to be able to select among the existing repayment plans for loans borrowed to fund their current course of study, though loans they borrow for future degrees would be under the new terms.”
• **Strengthen and Streamline Teacher Loan Forgiveness:** “The Budget proposes to expand and increase teacher loan forgiveness, providing up to $25,000 in forgiveness for teachers graduating from an effective preparation program who serve in low-income schools, starting in 2021.”

The budget also proposes to include all federal education programs, including Department of Defense Tuition Assistance and Department of Veterans Affairs GI Bill Benefits, in the 90/10 calculation as part of the administration of Title IV federal student aid at proprietary (for-profit) institutions. Additionally, the budget proposes to revert the 90 percent benchmark back to the original 85 percent in the calculation.

---

**RESEARCH/STATISTICS**

Regional Educational Laboratories, National Assessment, and Research in Special Education are frozen.

Other programs are slated for increases:

- **Research, Development, and Dissemination** is increased by $14.27 million (+7.32 percent).
- **Statistics** is increased by $13.36 million (+11.93 percent).
- **Statewide Data Systems** is increased by $46.48 million (+134.57 percent).
- **Special Education Studies and Evaluations** is increased by $2.18 million (+20.17 percent).
Since 2010, federal education programs have been subject to multiple waves of cuts totaling more than $81 billion.

DISCRETIONARY CUTS

On the discretionary side of the budget, funding for programs exclusive of Pell grants was cut by a total of $3.714 billion between FY 2010 and FY 2013, as follows:

- FY 2011 = (-$1.25 billion).
- FY 2012 = (-$101 million).
- FY 2013 = (-$2.362 billion).

Included among those cuts was the elimination of almost 60 education programs (see list below).

While the FY 2014 Consolidated Appropriations Act restored many of the sequester cuts and the FY 2016 Consolidated Appropriations Act provided some increased funding, FY 2016 discretionary funding in the Department of Education, exclusive of Pell grants, is still below the FY 2010 level.

STUDENT AID CUTS

In addition to these discretionary cuts, the Pell Grant program which was exempt from the sequester cuts in FY 2013 and student loans were subject to a series of restrictions and limitations on eligibility and reductions in a variety of benefits. In total, students have lost more than $75 billion from these cuts. (For more details on Pell grant cuts, see the Table on page 201.)

- Elimination of the in-school interest subsidy for graduate student loans;
- Elimination of the interest subsidy for the six-month grace period for undergraduate subsidized Stafford loans;
- Limiting to 150 percent of program length the period an undergraduate can receive a subsidized Stafford loan;
- Elimination of the summer Pell grant;
- Reduction of the number of semesters to 12 for which a student can receive a Pell grant;
- Elimination of ability-to-benefit eligibility (partially restored in the FY 2015 CRomnibus);
- Increased difficulty for some low-income students to automatically qualify for the maximum Pell grant; and,
- Cut in eligibility for the minimum Pell award.

The majority of the “savings” from these limitations was used to fill shortfalls in the Pell grant program needed to maintain the maximum award in FY 2011 and FY 2012.

In addition to these cuts, the 2013 Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act shifted another $715 million over 10 years in interest costs from the federal government to student and parent borrowers.
Finally, the sequester increased loan origination fees on Stafford loans and Parent Plus loans by a cumulative $422 million, as follows:

- The FY 2013 sequester added $82 million in fees to direct loans.
- The FY 2014 sequester added another $122 million in fees.
- The FY 2015 sequester added another $74 million.
- The FY 2016 sequester increased fees by another $75 million.
- The FY 2016 sequester will increase fees by another $69 million.

### OTHER MANDATORY CUTS

The sequester also cut funding for several mandatory programs in the Department of Education by over $1 billion.

- FY 2013 = -$207 million.
- FY 2014 = -$301 million.
- FY 2015 = -$264 million.
- FY 2016 = -$250 million.
- FY 2017 = -$255 million.
- Total = -$1,277 million.

Among the mandatory education programs adversely affected by these cuts are Vocational Rehabilitation State grants, TEACH Grants, and Aid to Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Predominantly Black Institutions, Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions STEM and Articulation programs, Post-Baccalaureate Opportunities for Hispanic Americans, Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities, Native American-Serving Nontribal Institutions, Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions, and Asian American- and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions.

### Education Programs and Earmarks Terminated FY 2011 through FY 2016

<p>| Education Programs and Earmarks Terminated FY 2011 through FY 2016 (in millions) |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (earmarks) | $121.54 |
| 2. Teaching American History | $118.95 |
| 3. Educational Technology State grants | $100.00 |
| 4. Tech Prep Education State grants | $102.92 |
| 5. Fund for Improvement of Education (earmarks) | $88.79 |
| 6. Smaller Learning Communities | $88.00 |
| 7. Even Start | $66.45 |
| 8. Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnerships | $63.85 |
| 9. First in the World | $60.00 |
| 10. High School Graduation Initiative | $43.27 |
| 11. Byrd Honors Scholarships | $42.00 |
| 12. Parental Information and Resource Centers | $39.25 |
| 13. Civics Education | $35.00 |
| 14. Alcohol Abuse Reduction | $32.71 |
| 15. Foreign Language Assistance | $26.87 |
| 16. Voluntary Public School Choice | $25.77 |
| 17. National Writing Project | $25.65 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Reading is Fundamental</td>
<td>$24.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Projects with Industry</td>
<td>$19.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Literacy in School Libraries</td>
<td>$19.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Teach for America</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Workplace and Community Transition for Incarcerated Individuals</td>
<td>$17.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>IDEA Technology and Media Services (earmarks)</td>
<td>$15.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Transition to Teaching</td>
<td>$13.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Recording for the Blind and Dyslexic, Inc.</td>
<td>$13.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Arts in Education (earmarks)</td>
<td>$12.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>National Board for Professional Teaching Standards</td>
<td>$10.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Course Material Rental Program</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners</td>
<td>$8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Javits Fellowships</td>
<td>$8.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Gallaudet University Construction</td>
<td>$7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Demonstrations to Support Postsecondary Institutions in Educating Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>$6.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Mental Health Integration in Schools</td>
<td>$5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Demonstration and Training Projects (earmarks)</td>
<td>$5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Legal Assistance Loan Repayment Program</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>New Leaders for New Schools (earmark)</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Centers of Excellence for Veteran Student Success</td>
<td>$4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Thurgood Marshall Legal Education Opportunities</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>National Center for Information and Technical Support for Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>$2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Recreational Projects</td>
<td>$2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Women's Educational Equity</td>
<td>$2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Teachers for a Competitive Tomorrow</td>
<td>$2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Underground Railroad Program</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Close-Up</td>
<td>$1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI</td>
<td>$1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Institute for International Public Policy</td>
<td>$1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Erma Byrd Scholarships</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Excellence in Economic Education</td>
<td>$1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Services Evaluation</td>
<td>$1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers</td>
<td>$1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Training for Realtime Writers</td>
<td>$1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Foundations for Learning</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Education Facilities Clearinghouse</td>
<td>$0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>B.J. Stupak Olympic Scholarships</td>
<td>$0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Services Program Improvement</td>
<td>$0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Off-Campus Community Service</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Reading Rockets Program (earmark)</td>
<td>$0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $1,343.67
The FY 2017 Education Budget
Discretionary Funded Programs

The president’s FY 2017 budget includes a proposed increase of $1.082 billion (+1.58 percent) for the Department of Education’s discretionary funding. Since funding for Preschool Development Grants is transferred from ED to the Department of Health and Human Services, on a comparable basis, the increase is $1.332 billion (+1.96 percent).

### PROGRAMS INCREASED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies</td>
<td>+$450 million (+3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Aid Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>+$66.8 million (+1,381.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assessments</td>
<td>+$25 million (+6.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for Homeless Children and Youths</td>
<td>+$15 million (+21.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Centers</td>
<td>+$4 million (+7.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants¹</td>
<td>+$500 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Safety National Activities</td>
<td>+$15 million (+20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promise Neighborhoods</td>
<td>+$54.7 million (+74.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programs for Indian Children</td>
<td>+$30 million (+79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Education National Activities</td>
<td>+$1 million (+17.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Innovation and Research</td>
<td>+$60 million (+50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and School Leader Incentive Grants</td>
<td>+$20 million (+8.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED)²</td>
<td>+$100 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Leader Recruitment and Support</td>
<td>+$13.6 million (+83.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM Master Teacher Corps</td>
<td>+$10 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Schools Grants</td>
<td>+$16.8 million (+5.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnet Schools Assistance</td>
<td>+$18.4 million (+19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Acquisition</td>
<td>+$63 million (+8.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA Preschool Grants</td>
<td>+$35 million (+9.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA Grants for Infants and Families</td>
<td>+$45 million (+9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA Technical Assistance and Dissemination</td>
<td>+$10 million (+22.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Supported Employment State Grants</td>
<td>+$3 million (+10.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Independent Living Services for Older Blind Individuals</td>
<td>+$2 million (+6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career and Technical Education State Grants</td>
<td>+$75 million (+23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career and Technical Education National Programs</td>
<td>+$2 million (+27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education National Leadership Activities</td>
<td>+$11 million (+80.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First in the World</td>
<td>+$100 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, and Dissemination</td>
<td>+$14.3 million (+7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>+$13.4 million (+11.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems</td>
<td>+$46.5 million (+134.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Studies and Evaluations</td>
<td>+$2.2 million (+20.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration</td>
<td>+$42.8 million (+9.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid Administration</td>
<td>+$80.1 million (+5.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office for Civil Rights</td>
<td>+$30.7 million (+28.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Inspector General</td>
<td>+$2.7 million (+4.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROPOSED NEW PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teach to Lead</td>
<td>$10 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger Together</td>
<td>$120 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Generation High Schools</td>
<td>$80 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science for All Development Grants</td>
<td>$100 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBCU and Minority-Serving Institutions (MSI) Innovation for Completion Fund</td>
<td>$30 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and Principal Pathways</td>
<td>$125 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROGRAMS DECREASED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Improvement Grants</td>
<td>-$450 million</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Aid Payments for Federal Property</td>
<td>-$66.8 million</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants</td>
<td>-$99.8 million</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and Science Partnerships</td>
<td>-$152.7 million</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Century Community Learning Centers</td>
<td>-$168.7 million</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary and Secondary School Counseling</td>
<td>-$49.6 million</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education Program</td>
<td>-$47 million</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Placement</td>
<td>-$28.5 million</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Cognitive Skills Initiative</td>
<td>-$3 million</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Education and Foreign Language Studies Overseas Programs</td>
<td>-$4.9 million</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Quality Partnerships</td>
<td>-$43.1 million</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Assessment Governing Board</td>
<td>-$0.5 million</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROGRAMS FROZEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Literacy Development Grants</td>
<td>$190 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Approaches to Literacy</td>
<td>$27 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I Migrant</td>
<td>$374.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I Neglected and Delinquent</td>
<td>$47.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEP/CAMP</td>
<td>$44.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Aid Basic Support Payments</td>
<td>$1,168.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Aid Payments for Children with Disabilities</td>
<td>$48.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Aid Construction</td>
<td>$48.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian Education</td>
<td>$33.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Native Education</td>
<td>$32.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Advisory Services</td>
<td>$6.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Education</td>
<td>$175.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Education Grants</td>
<td>$16.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-service Community Schools</td>
<td>$10 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Education Grants to LEAs</td>
<td>$100.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Education National Activities</td>
<td>$6.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American History and Civics Academies</td>
<td>$1.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready to Learn Programming</td>
<td>$25.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts in Education</td>
<td>$27 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javits Gifted and Talented Education</td>
<td>$12 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA Grants to States</td>
<td>$11,912.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA State Personnel Development</td>
<td>$41.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA Personnel Preparation</td>
<td>$83.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA Parent Information Centers</td>
<td>$27.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA Educational Technology, Media, and Materials</td>
<td>$30 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Olympics Education Programs</td>
<td>$101 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Client Assistance State Grants</td>
<td>$13 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Training</td>
<td>$30.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Demonstration and Training Programs</td>
<td>$5.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights</td>
<td>$177 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults</td>
<td>$10.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Printing House for the Blind</td>
<td>$25.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Technical Institute for the Deaf</td>
<td>$70 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallaudet University</td>
<td>$121.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Basic and Literacy Education State Grants</td>
<td>$582 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Pell Grants Discretionary</td>
<td>$22,475.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Supplement Educational Opportunity Grants</td>
<td>$733.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Work-Study</td>
<td>$989.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Institutions</td>
<td>$86.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities</td>
<td>$27.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions</td>
<td>$13.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening HBCUs</td>
<td>$244.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions</td>
<td>$63.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Predominantly Black Institutions</td>
<td>$9.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Asian American- and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions</td>
<td>$3.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Science and Engineering Improvement</td>
<td>$9.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions</td>
<td>$107.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Post-Baccalaureate Opportunities for Hispanic Americans</td>
<td>$9.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Education and Foreign Language Studies Domestic Programs</td>
<td>$65.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Transition Programs for Students with Intellectual Disabilities into Higher Education</td>
<td>$11.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Career and Technical Institutions</td>
<td>$8.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal TRIO Programs</td>
<td>$900 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP)</td>
<td>$322.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need</td>
<td>$29.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Access Means Parents in School</td>
<td>$15.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard University</td>
<td>$221.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Educational Laboratories</td>
<td>$54.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Assessment</td>
<td>$149 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research in Special Education</td>
<td>$54 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Endnotes

1 Created in the Every Student Succeeds Act
2 Created in the Every Student Succeeds Act
3 Created in the Every Student Succeeds Act
4 Repealed by the Every Student Succeeds Act
5 Repealed by the Every Student Succeeds Act
6 Repealed by the Every Student Succeeds Act
7 Repealed by the Every Student Succeeds Act
8 Repealed by the Every Student Succeeds Act
9 Repealed by the Every Student Succeeds Act
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## Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increases in <strong>BOLD</strong>, Cuts in <strong>RED</strong></td>
<td>Increases in <strong>BOLD</strong>, Cuts in <strong>RED</strong></td>
<td>Increases in <strong>BOLD</strong>, Cuts in <strong>RED</strong></td>
<td>Increases in <strong>BOLD</strong>, Cuts in <strong>RED</strong></td>
<td>Increases in <strong>BOLD</strong>, Cuts in <strong>RED</strong></td>
<td>Increases in <strong>BOLD</strong>, Cuts in <strong>RED</strong></td>
<td>Increases in <strong>BOLD</strong>, Cuts in <strong>RED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title I Grants to LEAs</strong></td>
<td>14,516,457</td>
<td>13,760,219</td>
<td>14,384,802</td>
<td>14,409,802</td>
<td>14,909,802*</td>
<td>15,359,802*</td>
<td>+450,000 (+3.02%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Improvement Grants</strong></td>
<td>533,552</td>
<td>505,756</td>
<td>505,756*</td>
<td>505,756*</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-450,000 (-100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Striving readers/ LEARN</strong></td>
<td>159,698</td>
<td>151,378</td>
<td>158,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovative Approaches to Literacy</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,000*</td>
<td>27,000*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Migrant</strong></td>
<td>393,236</td>
<td>372,751</td>
<td>374,751</td>
<td>374,751</td>
<td>374,751</td>
<td>374,751</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neglected and Delinquent</strong></td>
<td>50,231</td>
<td>47,614</td>
<td>47,614</td>
<td>47,614</td>
<td>47,614</td>
<td>47,614</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title I Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>3,194</td>
<td>3,028</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Equivalency Program/College Assistant Migrant Program</strong></td>
<td>36,526</td>
<td>34,623</td>
<td>34,623</td>
<td>34,623</td>
<td>37,474</td>
<td>44,623</td>
<td>44,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Graduation Initiative</strong></td>
<td>48,809</td>
<td>46,267</td>
<td>46,267</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Aid Basic Support Payments</strong></td>
<td>1,153,540</td>
<td>1,093,203</td>
<td>1,151,233</td>
<td>1,151,233</td>
<td>1,168,233</td>
<td>1,168,233</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Aid Payments for Children with Disabilities</strong></td>
<td>48,413</td>
<td>45,881</td>
<td>48,316</td>
<td>48,316</td>
<td>48,316</td>
<td>48,316</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Aid Facilities Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>4,845</td>
<td>4,591</td>
<td>4,835</td>
<td>4,835</td>
<td>4,835</td>
<td>71,648</td>
<td>(+1,381.86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Aid Construction</strong></td>
<td>17,441</td>
<td>16,529</td>
<td>17,406</td>
<td>17,406</td>
<td>17,406</td>
<td>17,406</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Aid Payments for Federal Property</strong></td>
<td>66,947</td>
<td>63,445</td>
<td>66,813</td>
<td>66,813</td>
<td>66,813</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-66,813 (-100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Quality State Grants/ Supporting Effective Instruction</strong></td>
<td>2,466,567**</td>
<td>2,337,830**</td>
<td>2,349,830**</td>
<td>2,349,830**</td>
<td>2,349,830**</td>
<td>2,250,000**</td>
<td>-99,830 (-4.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting Effective Educator Development</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000**</td>
<td>+6,007 (+6.39%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(in thousands of dollars)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FY 2012 P.L. 112-77</th>
<th>FY 2013 P.L. 113-6 Increases in <strong>BOLD</strong>, Cuts in <strong>RED</strong></th>
<th>FY 2014 P.L. 113-76 Increases in <strong>BOLD</strong>, Cuts in <strong>RED</strong></th>
<th>FY 2015 P.L. 113-235 Increases in <strong>BOLD</strong>, Cuts in <strong>RED</strong></th>
<th>FY 2016 P.L. 113-113 Increases in <strong>BOLD</strong>, Cuts in <strong>RED</strong></th>
<th>President’s FY 2017 Budget Increases in <strong>BOLD</strong>, Cuts in <strong>RED</strong></th>
<th>President V. FY 2016 Increases in <strong>BOLD</strong>, Cuts in <strong>RED</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and Science Partnerships</td>
<td>149,716</td>
<td>141,902</td>
<td>149,717</td>
<td>152,717</td>
<td>152,717</td>
<td>0**</td>
<td>-152,717**(-100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Century Community Learning Centers</td>
<td>1,151,673</td>
<td>1,091,564</td>
<td>1,149,370</td>
<td>1,151,673</td>
<td>1,166,673**</td>
<td>1,000,000**</td>
<td>-166,673**(-14.29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assessments</td>
<td>389,214</td>
<td>368,900</td>
<td>378,000</td>
<td>378,000</td>
<td>378,000</td>
<td>403,000**</td>
<td>+25,000**(+6.61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for Homeless Children and Youths</td>
<td>65,173</td>
<td>61,771</td>
<td>65,042</td>
<td>65,042</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>+15,000**(+21.43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for Native Hawaiians</td>
<td>34,181</td>
<td>32,397</td>
<td>32,397</td>
<td>32,397</td>
<td>32,453</td>
<td>32,453</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Native Education Equity</td>
<td>33,185</td>
<td>31,453</td>
<td>31,453</td>
<td>31,453</td>
<td>31,453</td>
<td>31,453</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Advisory Services</td>
<td>6,962</td>
<td>6,598</td>
<td>6,598</td>
<td>6,575</td>
<td>6,575</td>
<td>6,575</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Education</td>
<td>179,933</td>
<td>169,840</td>
<td>169,840</td>
<td>169,840</td>
<td>175,840</td>
<td>175,840</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Education Grants</td>
<td>17,619</td>
<td>16,699</td>
<td>16,699</td>
<td>16,699</td>
<td>16,699</td>
<td>16,699</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Centers</td>
<td>51,113</td>
<td>48,445</td>
<td>48,445</td>
<td>48,445</td>
<td>51,445**</td>
<td>55,445</td>
<td>+4,000**(+7.78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500,000**</td>
<td>+500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs/ School Safety National Activities includes:</td>
<td>64,877</td>
<td>61,484**</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>75,000**</td>
<td>90,000**</td>
<td>+15,000**(+20.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*School Climate Transformation Grants – non-add</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46,848</td>
<td>46,695</td>
<td>47,058</td>
<td>46,461</td>
<td>-597**(-1.27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Project Prevent – non-add</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,597</td>
<td>14,625</td>
<td>15,074</td>
<td>24,521</td>
<td>+9,447**(+62.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Project SERV – non-add</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,843</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>2,592</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>+408**(+15.74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*School Safety and Preparedness Activities – non-add</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>15,627</td>
<td>2,505</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>12,392</td>
<td>+10,142**(+4,507.56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Safe and Supportive Schools – non-add</td>
<td>47,056</td>
<td>48,610</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Safe Schools/ Healthy Students Initiative – non-add</td>
<td>16,439</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*National Activities – non-add</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,628</td>
<td>3,504</td>
<td>3,025</td>
<td>3,625</td>
<td>+600**(+19.83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>FY 2012 P.L. 112-77</td>
<td>FY 2013 P.L. 113-6 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>FY 2014 P.L. 113-76 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>FY 2015 P.L. 113-235 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>FY 2016 P.L. 114-113 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>President’s FY 2017 Budget Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>President V. FY 2016 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Unrest Response – non-add</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000&lt;sup&gt;34&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5,000 (-100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary and Secondary School Counseling</td>
<td>52,296</td>
<td>49,561</td>
<td>49,561</td>
<td>52,509&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>49,561</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-49,561 (-100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol M. White Physical Education Program</td>
<td>78,693</td>
<td>74,577</td>
<td>74,577</td>
<td>44,052&lt;sup&gt;29&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-47,000 (-100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promise Neighborhoods</td>
<td>59,887</td>
<td>56,754</td>
<td>56,754</td>
<td>52,296</td>
<td>73,254</td>
<td>128,000&lt;sup&gt;31&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+56,746 (+74.73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Service Community Schools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000&lt;sup&gt;34&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10,000&lt;sup&gt;31&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Education total</td>
<td>130,779</td>
<td>123,939</td>
<td>123,939</td>
<td>123,939</td>
<td>143,939</td>
<td>174,939</td>
<td>+31,000 (+21.54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race to the Top</td>
<td>548,960</td>
<td>520,247</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;34&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing in Innovation/</td>
<td>149,417</td>
<td>141,602</td>
<td>141,602</td>
<td>120,000&lt;sup&gt;35&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>180,000&lt;sup&gt;31&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+60,000 (+50.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Innovation</td>
<td>299,433</td>
<td>283,771</td>
<td>288,771</td>
<td>230,000&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>250,000&lt;sup&gt;31&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+20,000 (+8.70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Incentive Fund Grants/</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,815&lt;sup&gt;35&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,815&lt;sup&gt;35&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and School Leader Incentive Program</td>
<td>29,107</td>
<td>27,584</td>
<td>25,763</td>
<td>16,368</td>
<td>16,368</td>
<td>30,000&lt;sup&gt;34&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+13,632 (+83.28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American History and Civics Academies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>+125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and Principal Pathways (proposed</td>
<td>26,054</td>
<td>24,691</td>
<td>13,762</td>
<td>13,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new program)</td>
<td>29,107</td>
<td>27,584</td>
<td>25,763</td>
<td>16,368</td>
<td>30,000&lt;sup&gt;34&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+13,632 (+83.28%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Leadership/</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000&lt;sup&gt;34&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Leader Recruitment and</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000&lt;sup&gt;34&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>254,836&lt;sup&gt;24&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>241,507</td>
<td>248,172</td>
<td>253,172&lt;sup&gt;24&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>333,172</td>
<td>350,172&lt;sup&gt;24&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+16,828 (+5.05%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM Master Teacher Corps</td>
<td>96,705</td>
<td>91,647</td>
<td>91,647</td>
<td>91,647</td>
<td>96,647</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>+18,353 (+18.99%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach to Lead Grants (proposed new program)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120,000&lt;sup&gt;34&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+120,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Schools Grants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80,000&lt;sup&gt;34&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>FY 2012 P.L. 112-77</td>
<td>FY 2013 P.L. 113-6* Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>FY 2014 P.L. 113-76 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>FY 2015 P.L. 113-113 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>FY 2016 P.L. 114-113 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>President’s FY 2017 Budget Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>President V. FY 2016 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science for All Development Grants (proposed new program)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000*</td>
<td>+100,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready to Learn Television</td>
<td>27,194</td>
<td>25,771</td>
<td>25,741</td>
<td>25,741</td>
<td>25,741</td>
<td>25,741</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Placement</td>
<td>30,055*</td>
<td>28,890*</td>
<td>28,483</td>
<td>28,483</td>
<td>28,483</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>-28,483 (-100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund for the Improvement in Education total includes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Literacy initiative – non-add</td>
<td>28,600</td>
<td>27,567</td>
<td>26,528</td>
<td>24,786</td>
<td>53,815</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>-53,815 (-100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Full Service Community Schools – non-add</td>
<td>10,094</td>
<td>5,344</td>
<td>10,649</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>12,000*</td>
<td>12,000*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data Quality Initiative</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Javits Gifted and Talented - non-add</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,027</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>12,000*</td>
<td>12,000*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-Cognitive Initiative - non-add</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>-3,000 (-100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Education Facilities Clearinghouse- non-add</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts in Education</td>
<td>24,953</td>
<td>23,648</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>27,000*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Acquisition</td>
<td>732,144</td>
<td>693,848</td>
<td>723,400</td>
<td>737,400</td>
<td>737,400</td>
<td>800,000*</td>
<td>+62,600 (+8.54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA State Grants</td>
<td>11,577,855</td>
<td>10,974,866*</td>
<td>11,472,848</td>
<td>11,497,848*</td>
<td>11,912,848</td>
<td>11,912,848*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA Preschool Grants</td>
<td>372,646</td>
<td>353,238</td>
<td>353,238</td>
<td>353,238</td>
<td>368,238</td>
<td>403,238</td>
<td>+35,000 (+9.50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA Grants for Infants and Families</td>
<td>442,710</td>
<td>419,653</td>
<td>438,498</td>
<td>438,556</td>
<td>458,556</td>
<td>503,556*</td>
<td>+45,000 (+9.81%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA State Personnel Development</td>
<td>43,917</td>
<td>41,630</td>
<td>41,630</td>
<td>41,630</td>
<td>41,630</td>
<td>41,630</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA Technical Assistance and Dissemination</td>
<td>46,781*</td>
<td>44,345*</td>
<td>44,345*</td>
<td>44,345*</td>
<td>44,345*</td>
<td>54,345*</td>
<td>+10,000 (+22.55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA Personnel Preparation</td>
<td>88,299</td>
<td>83,700</td>
<td>83,700</td>
<td>83,700</td>
<td>83,700</td>
<td>83,700</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA Parent Information Centers</td>
<td>28,917</td>
<td>27,404</td>
<td>27,411</td>
<td>27,411</td>
<td>27,411</td>
<td>27,411</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA Technology and Media Services</td>
<td>29,588</td>
<td>28,047</td>
<td>28,047</td>
<td>28,047</td>
<td>30,047</td>
<td>30,047</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Olympics Education Programs</td>
<td>8,000*</td>
<td>8,000*</td>
<td>7,583*</td>
<td>7,583*</td>
<td>10,083*</td>
<td>10,083</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>FY 2012 P.L. 112-77</td>
<td>FY 2013 P.L. 113-6 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>FY 2014 P.L. 113-76 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>FY 2015 P.L. 113-235 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>FY 2016 P.L. 114-113 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>President’s FY 2017 Budget Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>President V. FY 2016 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Client Assistance State Grants</td>
<td>12,240</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Training</td>
<td>35,515</td>
<td>33,657</td>
<td>33,657</td>
<td>30,188</td>
<td>30,188</td>
<td>30,188</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Demonstration and Training Programs</td>
<td>5,325</td>
<td>5,046</td>
<td>5,796</td>
<td>5,796</td>
<td>5,796</td>
<td>5,796</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights</td>
<td>18,031</td>
<td>17,088</td>
<td>17,650</td>
<td>17,650</td>
<td>17,650</td>
<td>17,650</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Supported Employment State Grants</td>
<td>29,068</td>
<td>27,548</td>
<td>27,548</td>
<td>27,548</td>
<td>27,548</td>
<td>30,548</td>
<td>+3,000 (+10.89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Independent Living Services for Older Blind Individuals</td>
<td>34,018</td>
<td>32,239</td>
<td>33,317</td>
<td>33,317</td>
<td>33,317</td>
<td>35,317</td>
<td>+2,000 (+6.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults</td>
<td>9,145</td>
<td>8,667</td>
<td>9,127</td>
<td>9,127</td>
<td>10,336</td>
<td>10,336</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Printing House for the Blind</td>
<td>24,505</td>
<td>23,223</td>
<td>24,456</td>
<td>24,931</td>
<td>25,431</td>
<td>25,431</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Technical Institute for the Deaf</td>
<td>65,422</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>66,291</td>
<td>67,016</td>
<td>70,016</td>
<td>70,016</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallaudet University</td>
<td>125,516</td>
<td>118,951</td>
<td>119,000</td>
<td>120,275</td>
<td>121,275</td>
<td>121,275</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career and Technical Education State Grants</td>
<td>1,123,030</td>
<td>1,064,446</td>
<td>1,117,598</td>
<td>1,117,598</td>
<td>1,117,598</td>
<td>1,192,598</td>
<td>+75,000 (+6.71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTE National Programs</td>
<td>7,829</td>
<td>7,421</td>
<td>7,421</td>
<td>7,421</td>
<td>7,421</td>
<td>9,421</td>
<td>+2,000 (+26.95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Basic and Literacy Education State Grants</td>
<td>594,993</td>
<td>563,955</td>
<td>563,955</td>
<td>568,955</td>
<td>581,955</td>
<td>581,955</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education National Leadership</td>
<td>11,302</td>
<td>10,712</td>
<td>13,712</td>
<td>13,712</td>
<td>13,712</td>
<td>24,712</td>
<td>+11,000 (+80.22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell grants discretionary</td>
<td>22,824,000</td>
<td>22,778,352</td>
<td>22,778,352</td>
<td>22,475,352</td>
<td>22,475,352</td>
<td>22,475,352</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell grant maximum award (in whole dollars)</td>
<td>5,550</td>
<td>5,645</td>
<td>5,730</td>
<td>5,775</td>
<td>5,815</td>
<td>5,935</td>
<td>+120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>FY 2012 P.L. 112-77</td>
<td>FY 2013 P.L. 113-6* Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>FY 2014 P.L. 113-76 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>FY 2015 P.L. 113-235 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>FY 2016 P.L. 114-113 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>President’s FY 2017 Budget Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>President V. FY 2016 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants</td>
<td>733,599</td>
<td>696,175</td>
<td>733,130</td>
<td>733,130</td>
<td>733,130</td>
<td>733,130</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Work-study</td>
<td>976,682</td>
<td>925,595</td>
<td>974,728</td>
<td>989,728</td>
<td>989,728</td>
<td>989,728</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid Administration</td>
<td>1,043,387</td>
<td>978,924</td>
<td>1,166,000*</td>
<td>1,396,924</td>
<td>1,551,854</td>
<td>1,631,990</td>
<td>+80,136 (+5.16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</strong></td>
<td><strong>Higher Education Policy Provisions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Title III/Title V Institutional Endowment Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Institutions</td>
<td>80,623</td>
<td>76,406</td>
<td>79,139</td>
<td>80,462</td>
<td>86,534</td>
<td>86,534</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities</td>
<td>25,713</td>
<td>24,368</td>
<td>25,239</td>
<td>25,662</td>
<td>27,599</td>
<td>27,599</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions</td>
<td>12,859</td>
<td>12,386</td>
<td>12,622</td>
<td>12,833</td>
<td>13,802</td>
<td>13,802</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening HBCUs</td>
<td>227,980</td>
<td>216,056</td>
<td>223,783</td>
<td>227,524</td>
<td>244,694</td>
<td>244,694</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions</td>
<td>58,958</td>
<td>55,874</td>
<td>57,872</td>
<td>58,840</td>
<td>63,281</td>
<td>63,281</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Predominately Black Institutions</td>
<td>9,262</td>
<td>8,778</td>
<td>9,092</td>
<td>9,244</td>
<td>9,942</td>
<td>9,942</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions</td>
<td>3,119</td>
<td>2,956</td>
<td>3,062</td>
<td>3,113</td>
<td>3,348</td>
<td>3,348</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Native American-Serving Nontribal Institutions</td>
<td>3,119</td>
<td>2,956</td>
<td>3,062</td>
<td>3,113</td>
<td>3,348</td>
<td>3,348</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Science and Engineering Improvement</td>
<td>9,466</td>
<td>8,971</td>
<td>8,971</td>
<td>8,971</td>
<td>9,648</td>
<td>9,648</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Hispanic-serving Institutions</td>
<td>100,432</td>
<td>95,179</td>
<td>98,583</td>
<td>100,231</td>
<td>107,795</td>
<td>107,795</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Post Baccalaureate Opportunities for Hispanic Americans</td>
<td>9,011</td>
<td>8,540</td>
<td>8,845</td>
<td>8,992</td>
<td>9,671</td>
<td>9,671</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>FY 2012 P.L. 112-77 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>FY 2013 P.L. 113-6 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>FY 2014 P.L. 113-76 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>FY 2015 P.L. 113-235 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>FY 2016 P.L. 114-113 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>President’s FY 2017 Budget Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
<td>President V. FY 2016 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBCU and Minority-Serving Institutions Innovation for Completion Fund (proposed new program)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>+30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Education and Foreign Language Studies total</td>
<td>74,037</td>
<td>70,164</td>
<td>72,164</td>
<td>72,164</td>
<td>72,164</td>
<td>62,271+</td>
<td>-4,893 (-6.78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) includes:</td>
<td>3,494</td>
<td>3,311</td>
<td>79,400</td>
<td>67,775</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>+100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training for Realtime Writers – non-add</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U.S./European Community Program – non-add</td>
<td>2,116</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U.S./Brazilian Program – non-add</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Center for the Study of Distance Education – non-add</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Center for Best Practices to Support Single Parent Students – non-add</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Analysis of Federal Regulations and Reporting Requirements on IHEs – non-add</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• First in the World – non-add</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75,000+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000*</td>
<td>+100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Centers of Excellence for Veteran Student Success – non-add</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Center for Information and Technical Support for Students with Disabilities – non-add</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,475</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>FY 2012 P.L. 112-77</td>
<td>FY 2013 P.L. 113-61 Increase in BOLD</td>
<td>FY 2014 P.L. 113-76 Increase in BOLD</td>
<td>FY 2015 P.L. 113-235 Increase in BOLD</td>
<td>FY 2016 P.L. 114-113 Increase in BOLD</td>
<td>President’s FY 2017 Budget Increase in BOLD</td>
<td>President V. FY 2016 Increase in BOLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for Students with Intellectual Disabilities</td>
<td>10,957</td>
<td>10,384</td>
<td>10,384</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Career and Technical Institutions</td>
<td>8,146</td>
<td>8,131</td>
<td>7,705</td>
<td>7,705</td>
<td>8,286</td>
<td>8,286</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal TRIO Programs</td>
<td>839,932</td>
<td>795,998</td>
<td>838,252</td>
<td>839,752</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP)</td>
<td>302,244</td>
<td>286,435</td>
<td>301,639</td>
<td>301,639</td>
<td>322,754</td>
<td>322,754</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need</td>
<td>30,909</td>
<td>29,293</td>
<td>29,293</td>
<td>29,293</td>
<td>29,293</td>
<td>29,293</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Access Means Parents in School</td>
<td>15,970</td>
<td>15,134</td>
<td>15,134</td>
<td>15,134</td>
<td>15,134</td>
<td>15,134</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and Principal Pathways (proposed new program)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Quality Partnership</td>
<td>42,833</td>
<td>40,592</td>
<td>40,592</td>
<td>40,592</td>
<td>43,092</td>
<td>43,092</td>
<td>0 (−100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRA Data/HEA Program Evaluation</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard University</td>
<td>234,064</td>
<td>221,821</td>
<td>221,821</td>
<td>221,821</td>
<td>222,821</td>
<td>222,821</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Housing and Academic Facilities Loans Program</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historically Black College and University Capital Financing Program</td>
<td>20,502</td>
<td>19,430</td>
<td>19,430</td>
<td>19,430</td>
<td>20,484</td>
<td>20,499</td>
<td>+15 (+0.07%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, and Dissemination</td>
<td>189,787</td>
<td>179,860</td>
<td>179,860</td>
<td>179,860</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>209,273</td>
<td>+14,273 (+7.32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>108,748</td>
<td>103,060</td>
<td>103,060</td>
<td>103,060</td>
<td>112,000</td>
<td>125,360</td>
<td>+13,360 (+11.93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Educational Laboratories</td>
<td>57,426</td>
<td>54,423</td>
<td>54,423</td>
<td>54,423</td>
<td>54,423</td>
<td>54,423</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Assessment (NAEP)</td>
<td>129,616</td>
<td>122,836</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>129,000</td>
<td>149,000</td>
<td>149,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Assessment Governing Board</td>
<td>8,690</td>
<td>8,235</td>
<td>8,235</td>
<td>8,235</td>
<td>8,235</td>
<td>7,745</td>
<td>−490 (−5.95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research in Special Education</td>
<td>49,905</td>
<td>47,295</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Data Systems</td>
<td>38,077</td>
<td>36,085</td>
<td>34,539</td>
<td>34,539</td>
<td>34,539</td>
<td>81,017</td>
<td>+46,478 (+134.57%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## COMMITTEE FOR EDUCATION FUNDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FY 2012 P.L. 112-77</th>
<th>FY 2013 P.L. 113-6 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</th>
<th>FY 2014 P.L. 113-76 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</th>
<th>FY 2015 P.L. 113-235 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</th>
<th>FY 2016 P.L. 114-113 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</th>
<th>President’s FY 2017 Budget Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</th>
<th>President V. FY 2016 Increases in BOLD, Cuts in RED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Studies and Evaluations</td>
<td>11,415</td>
<td>10,818</td>
<td>10,818</td>
<td>10,818</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>+2,182 (+20.17%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Expenses</td>
<td>446,259</td>
<td>430,605</td>
<td>422,917</td>
<td>411,000</td>
<td>431,000</td>
<td>450,342</td>
<td>+19,342 (+4.49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Modernization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>24,485</td>
<td>+23,485 (+2,348.50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office for Civil Rights</td>
<td>102,624</td>
<td>98,356</td>
<td>98,356</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>107,000</td>
<td>137,708</td>
<td>+30,708 (+28.70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Inspector General</td>
<td>59,820</td>
<td>56,691</td>
<td>57,791</td>
<td>57,791</td>
<td>59,256</td>
<td>61,941</td>
<td>+2,685 (+4.53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education Discretionary Appropriations total</td>
<td>68,112,289</td>
<td>65,704,706</td>
<td>67,301,715</td>
<td>67,135,576</td>
<td>68,306,763</td>
<td>69,388,269</td>
<td>+1,081,506 (+1.58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education Discretionary Appropriations total (excluding Pell Grants)</td>
<td>45,288,289</td>
<td>42,926,354</td>
<td>44,523,413</td>
<td>44,660,224</td>
<td>45,831,411</td>
<td>46,912,917</td>
<td>+1,081,506 (+2.36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start (in HHS)</td>
<td>7,968,544</td>
<td>7,573,095</td>
<td>8,598,095</td>
<td>8,598,095</td>
<td>9,168,095</td>
<td>9,601,724</td>
<td>433,629 (+4.73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care and Development Block Grant (in HHS)</td>
<td>2,278,313</td>
<td>2,205,558</td>
<td>2,358,246</td>
<td>2,435,000</td>
<td>2,761,000</td>
<td>2,961,672</td>
<td>+200,672 (+7.27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Development Grants (now in HHS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>+100,000 (+40.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Services Technology Act State Grants</td>
<td>156,365</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>154,848</td>
<td>154,848</td>
<td>155,789</td>
<td>158,848</td>
<td>-941 (-0.60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Services Technology Act total</td>
<td>184,704</td>
<td>175,044</td>
<td>180,909</td>
<td>180,909</td>
<td>182,944</td>
<td>182,429</td>
<td>-515 (-0.28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Services Act</td>
<td>29,449</td>
<td>27,909</td>
<td>28,724</td>
<td>28,724</td>
<td>29,862</td>
<td>30,244</td>
<td>+382 (+1.28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Museum and Library Services (total)</td>
<td>231,954</td>
<td>219,821</td>
<td>226,860</td>
<td>227,860</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### END NOTES

1. The final FY 2013 levels reflect an across the board cut (ATB) of 0.2 percent from the levels set in the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act. These levels were then reduced by the 5 percent sequester cuts applicable to all nondefense discretionary programs. The sequester cuts were based on the OMB ordered cut of 5 percent from the March 27 CR levels, which included a 0.612 percent across the board increase. However, for four programs with advanced appropriations (Title I, ESEA Title II, IDEA State Grants and Career/Technical Education State Grants), the 5 percent cut was applied to the advanced appropriations provided in the FY 2012 omnibus for FY 2013 (which did not include the 0.612 percent ATB increase) and to the FY 2013 annual appropriation level provided in the CR which included the ATB increase. All of the
The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) repealed the School Improvement Grants (SIG) program, but increased the State set-aside for school improvement under Title I from 4 percent to 7 percent. The budget request is equal to the combined FY 2016 appropriation for Title I and SIG. The request also includes appropriations language allocating 50 percent of funds above the authorized funding level, or $173.7 million, to States for school improvement activities. In addition, “the Administration proposes to eliminate the LEA-level hold-harmless provision in section 1003(h) of the ESEA. Although this provision is not in effect for FY 2017, the Administration believes it should be repealed to ensure States are able to reserve sufficient school improvement funding under section 1003(a) in FY 2018 and beyond.” Due to the elimination of the hold-harmless, LEAs in the aggregate are projected to receive $200 less than they received in FY 2016 in initial Title I allocations.

The bill includes new language under the School Improvement Grants (SIG) program that allows funds to be used to implement a research-proven, whole school reform model; enables States, with the approval of the Secretary of Education, to establish an alternative State-determined school improvement strategy that may be used by LEAs; and provides flexibility to LEAs eligible to receive services under the Rural Education Achievement program.

“The Department shall ensure that any Final Requirements for the SIG program strictly adhere to bill language which stipulates that LEAs may implement an alternative State-determined school improvement strategy that has been established by a State educational agency (SEA) with the approval of the Secretary.”

10 Up to 1.5 percent shall be set aside for a national competitive grant program for educator professional development (SEED).
11 Up to 1.5 percent shall be set aside for a national competitive grant program for educator professional development (SEED).
12 “Up to 2 percent of the funds for subpart 1 of part A of title II of the ESEA shall be reserved by the Secretary for competitive awards for teacher or principal recruitment and training or professional enhancement activities to national not-for-profit organizations, of which up to 10 percent may be used for related research, dissemination, evaluation, technical assistance, and outreach activities.”
13 “Up to 2.3 percent of the funds shall be used for competitive awards for teacher or principal recruitment and training or professional enhancement activities, including for civic education instruction, to national not-for-profit organizations.”
14 Increases the set-aside within this program for the Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED) program from 2.3 percent to 4 percent which equals $93.993 million.
15 ESSA renamed Improving Teacher Quality State Grants as Supporting Effective Instruction (SEI) State Grants. ESSA also authorized Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED) as a separate program rather than a set-aside within the formula grant program. The decrease of $99.83 million from the FY 2016 amount primarily reflects the separate FY 2017 request of $100 million for the SEED program.
16 ESSA authorized Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED) as a separate program rather than a set-aside within the Teacher Quality State Grants program.
17 ESSA eliminated this program.
18 “None of the funds shall be used to allow 21st Century Community Learning Centers initiative funding for expanded learning time unless these activities provide enrichment and engaging academic activities for students at least 300 additional program hours before, during, or after the traditional school day and supplements but does not supplant school day requirements.”
The FY 2017 budget proposes to fund this program at its ESSA authorized level.

The FY 2017 request includes $369.1 million, the “trigger amount” for Grants for State Assessments and the Assessment System Audit formula programs, and $33.9 million for awards under the Competitive Grants for State Assessment program. The request includes $18.2 million for the new Assessment System Audit program.

“The agreement includes $1,500,000 to establish a new comprehensive center on students at risk of not attaining full literacy skills due to a disability, in accordance with section 2244 of the ESEA, as reauthorized by the ESSA.”

“The request includes appropriations language to give States the option to override the statute's formula-based local allocation requirements, which at the proposed funding level would result in allocations for the vast majority of LEAs that are too small to support meaningful uses of funds. The Administration estimates that, at the $500 million funding level proposed for fiscal year 2017, at least 80 percent of LEAs would receive a formula allocation that is less than the $30,000 award that triggers a needs assessment. Further, 75 percent of these LEAs (or, at least 60 percent of all LEAs) would receive awards at or below the minimum $10,000 allocation, including all LEAs in the States of Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Vermont. To ensure that subgrants are of sufficient size to support meaningful program activities in response to locally identified needs, the Administration requests appropriations language allowing States to make competitive rather than formula-based subgrants to LEAs or consortia of LEAs in a minimum amount of $50,000 per year for up to 3 years. In addition, the Administration proposes to permit States to give priority to one or more of the authorized categories of activities (i.e., well-rounded education, school conditions, and use of technology) or to specific authorized activities within each category.”

Three million dollars in funds available under the Department of Education Safe Schools and Citizenship account is to be used to assist educational institutions impacted by school violence.

The bill and report do not provide additional details on the breakdown of the SDFSC funds.

ESSA replaced the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs with the School Safety National Activities Program.

“For competitive grants to eligible entities, including community-based organizations, Local Educational Agencies, and partnerships thereof, in communities that have experienced significant episodes of civil unrest. This funding is to support establishing school-based programs in such communities to address, including through counseling services, the comprehensive educational, behavioral, and mental health needs of youth who have experienced significant trauma related to recent events in their communities.”

“Reflects a one-time reprogramming in FY 2015 of $2,948 from the Physical Education program to Elementary and Secondary School Counseling.”

ESSA repealed this program.

“Reflects a one-time reprogramming in FY 2015 of $2,948 from the Physical Education program to Elementary and Secondary School Counseling.”

ESSA repealed this program.

FY 2017 funds would support an estimated 15 new grants as well as five continuation awards for the 2016 cohort of implementation grantees.

Funds were previously provided under the Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE).

“The Full-Service Community Schools program, which previously operated under the broad authority of the Fund for the Improvement of Education, is authorized under Title IV, Part F of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as reauthorized by ESSA. All requested funds would be used to pay continuation costs for prior-year grantees.”

Funds were provided for Preschool Development grants. The funding is displayed under that program.

“The Department is directed to establish an absolute priority in the investing in innovation notice inviting applications for funds available in this act for the implementation of comprehensive high school reform strategies that will increase the number and percentage of students who graduate from high school and enroll in postsecondary education without the need for remediation and with the ability to think critically, solve complex problems, evaluate arguments on the basis of evidence, and communicate effectively. This competition should target schools where not less than 40 percent of the students to be served will be from low-income families as calculated under section 1113 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.”

ESSA authorized the Education Innovation and Research (EIR) program, which is similar to the i3 program. ED may reserve up to $30 million for ARPA-ED.

Transferred under FIE.

“The Teacher and School Leader Incentive Grants program (TSLIG) was authorized by ESSA as the successor to the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF). Fiscal year 2017 funds would support an estimated $193 million in new competitive grant awards.”

Funds were provided under FIE.

Funds would be used to continue awards initially made in FY 2016 under the program as authorized by ESSA.

The School Leader Recruitment and Support grants program is the successor to the School Leadership program.
Newly authorized by ESSA.

“Funds would support one award to a nonprofit organization that, in turn, would design and implement a national competition to make one-time, 3-year grants to individual teachers, teams of teachers, or teachers and school leaders to develop and implement projects to improve student achievement outcomes.”

Reflects a reprogramming in fiscal year 2012 of $200,000 from Charter Schools Grants to Advanced Placement.

“The bill allows up to $11,000,000 for State Facilities incentives, not less than $13,000,000 for the Credit Enhancement for Charter Schools Facilities program, and not less than $11,000,000 for national activities designed to support local, State, and national efforts to increase the number of high-quality charter schools. In addition, the Secretary shall reserve up to $75,000,000 for awards to charter management organizations and other entities for the replication and expansion of successful charter school models that have a track record of success.”

Funds would be allocated as follows: up to $100 million for Replication and Expansion grants, not less than $16 million for Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities grants, up to $10 million for State Facilities Incentive grants, not less than $16 million for national activities

“The proposed Stronger Together Grants program would support voluntary community efforts to develop and implement comprehensive strategies to address the effects of concentrated poverty by increasing school socioeconomic diversity in preschool through grade 12. The request would support new planning grants and new implementation grants to help eligible applicants improve socioeconomic integration in approximately 500 schools within and across school districts.”

“The proposed Next Generation High Schools program would promote the whole school redesign of the high school experience through competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) and their partners.”

“The proposed Computer Science for All Development Grants program would promote innovative strategies to provide high-quality instruction and other learning opportunities in computer science (including computer programming and related skills such as computational thinking) in preschool through grade 12. Funds would support the first year of approximately 25 5-year awards to LEAs that together with their partners are primed to develop and implement computer science instructional plans that can serve as models for similar efforts across the Nation.”

“Reflects a reprogramming in fiscal year 2012 of $2,906 million from Magnet Schools Assistance and $200 thousand from Charter Schools Grants to Advanced Placement.”

“Reflects a reprogramming in fiscal year 2013 of $407,000 from the Fund for the Improvement of Education: Programs of National Significance.”
“The bill includes new language clarifying that the level of effort under Part B that a LEA must meet in the year after it fails to maintain its fiscal effort is the level that it should have met in the prior year. This language clarifies congressional intent and is consistent with the Office of Special Education Program’s April 4, 2012, informal guidance letter on this issue. The bill also includes new language clarifying that funds reserved under section 611(c) of the IDEA may be used to help improve State capacity to meet data collection requirements under IDEA and improve data collection, quality and use under the act.”

“The bill continues language clarifying provisions of the IDEA. The first provision clarifies that penalties for violating the State maintenance of effort [MOE] under part B of the IDEA shall be reallocated to States by formula to those States that did not violate those requirements. The language further clarifies that both the reduced State allocations due to penalties paid and increased amounts under the reallocation shall not be considered in the current or future years for allocations under the statutory formula. The bill also includes language clarifying that the level of effort under part B that an LEA must meet in the year after it fails to maintain its fiscal effort is the level that it should have met. Finally, the bill includes language clarifying that funds reserved under section 611(c) of the IDEA may be used to enhance State capacity to meet data collection requirements under the IDEA and improve data collection, quality, and use under the act. These provisions are included in the administration’s budget request and the fiscal year 2014 appropriations act.”

“The bill includes new language allowing the Department to apply penalties for violations of MOE over a maximum of 5 years. It also includes new language allowing the Secretary to recover non-Federal funds or reduce IDEA section 611 funds for the Local Educational Agency (LEA) MOE requirement.”

“The Administration is proposing to continue appropriations language provided in previous years regarding State Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirements, the technical assistance set-aside under section 616(i) of the IDEA, and the allocation provided to the Bureau of Indian Education. However, the Administration is no longer requesting language for the Local Educational Agency (LEA) MOE requirement.”

“Because the requested level is above the statutory $460.0 million trigger, the Administration would be able to make State Incentive Grants to States under section 643(e) of the IDEA to promote and facilitate the implementation of policies allowing parents of children with disabilities to choose the continuation of early intervention services for their children until they are eligible to enter elementary school. The Administration is requesting a $15 million set-aside within the Part C program to make competitive grants to public and private entities for model demonstration projects.”

Excludes funds for Special Olympics Education programs, shown separately below.

Excludes funds for Special Olympics Education programs, shown separately below.

Excludes funds for Special Olympics Education programs, shown separately below.

The request would provide $10 million for grants to substantially increase the Administration’s investment in model demonstration projects that build the evidence base for promising practices in critical areas, such as interventions for students with autism who require intensive services and support.

Funds for Special Olympics Education programs were included in Technical Assistance and Dissemination.

Funds for Special Olympics Education programs were included in Technical Assistance and Dissemination.

Funds for Special Olympics Education programs were included in Technical Assistance and Dissemination.

Funds for Special Olympics Education programs were included in Technical Assistance and Dissemination.

Funds for Special Olympics Education programs were included in Technical Assistance and Dissemination.

Funds for Special Olympics Education programs were included in Technical Assistance and Dissemination.

“The request would provide $1.1 billion for the State formula program and an additional $75 million for a grant competition for an American Technical Training Fund (ATTF). The $75 million request for the ATTF (funded through the CTE Innovation Fund proposed as part of the Administration’s reauthorization plan) would provide competitive grants to support the development, operation, and expansion of innovative, evidence-based, short-term, or accelerated education and job training programs that enable youth and adults, particularly from low-income families, to enter and complete career pathways that lead to jobs in in-demand industries and occupations.”

“The Department would reserve $2 million from the request to provide technical assistance and evaluation support for projects under the $75 million American Technical Training Fund proposal.”

“The request includes $5.0 million to provide technical assistance to help States meet the WIOA requirement to align adult education content standards with the challenging State-determined academic standards for K-12 education required by Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Administration also is seeking $6.0 million to help meet WIOA data requirements.”

The Pell grant program is exempt from the across the board sequester cut but was subject to the 0.2% ATB cut.
80 The bill includes a new provision reinstating financial aid eligibility for students without high school diplomas enrolled in career pathway programs at community colleges.

81 The Department of Education projects this discretionary funding level will result in an FY 2015 surplus of $2.978 billion which will be carried over into FY 2016.

82 The budget proposes new student supports and incentives for eligible Pell Grant recipients to encourage on-time or accelerated completion, which would be paid out of the current discretionary surplus and part of the available mandatory funding:
   o "Pell for Accelerated Completion would reinstate year-round Pell Grant eligibility for recipients who have completed 24 credit hours in an academic year, exhausted their eligibility for the award year, and wish to enroll in additional coursework.”
   o "On-Track Pell Bonus would provide a $300 Pell bonus award to recipients who take 15 credit hours per semester in an academic year, effectively increasing their Pell maximum award to $6,235 for award year 2017-18.”
   o "Second Chance Pell would restate access to Pell Grant aid for eligible incarcerated students in Federal and State penal institutions who are eligible for release, with the goal of helping them get jobs, support their families, and create safer communities.”

83 The bill supports a maximum discretionary award of $4,860. Combined with mandatory funds, the maximum grant will be $5,730, an increase of $85.

84 The appropriation supports a maximum discretionary award of $4,860. Combined with mandatory funds, the maximum grant will be $5,775, an increase of $45.

85 The maximum award increases through an inflation formula funded through mandatory funding provided in SAFRA.

86 The maximum award increases through an inflation formula funded through mandatory funding provided in SAFRA.

87 "The Budget proposes to reform Federal SEOG allocations to target those institutions that enroll and graduate higher numbers of Pell-eligible students, and offer affordable and quality education and training such that graduates can obtain employment and repay their educational debt.”

88 "The 2017 Budget proposes to reform Federal Work-Study allocations to target those institutions that enroll and graduate higher numbers of Pell-eligible students, and offer affordable and quality education and training such that graduates can obtain employment and repay their educational debt.”

89 "This agreement provides sufficient funding to continue the servicing of student loans by NFPs. The Secretary shall continue to comply with the terms of the Department’s existing contracts with NFP servicers or teams of NFP servicers to service student loans through fiscal year 2014.”

90 "The agreement includes bill language extending authorization of the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity through 2016.”

91 "An institution of higher education that maintains an endowment fund supported with funds appropriated for title III or V of the HEA for fiscal year 2016 may use the income from that fund to award scholarships to students, subject to the limitation in section 331(c)(3)(B)(i) of the HEA. The use of such income for such purposes, prior to the enactment of this Act, shall be considered to have been an allowable use of that income, subject to that limitation.”

92 The proposed cut is to the Overseas Programs.

93 "$20 million shall be used for minority-serving institutions.”

94 "$16 million shall be used for minority-serving institutions.”

95 The Department plans to set aside a portion of the requested funding in FY 2017, up to 30 percent, or $30 million, for awards to HBCUs and MSIs.

96 The agreement provides funding for a new competition for the Talent Search and Educational Opportunity Centers programs as well as an increase in funding for existing grantees.

97 "The Administration seeks to use up to $20 million of the requested funding to develop a TRIO Demonstration Initiative, in consultation with the TRIO community, that would give TRIO grantees, or consortia of grantees, the opportunity to compete for increased funding to: 1) implement additional evidence-based college access and success strategies and serve additional students, and 2) participate in evaluations of such strategies to contribute to the growing body of evidence about the effectiveness of particular student support activities.”

98 The Department would use approximately $54 million to conduct competitions for new State and Partnership awards.

99 Allows continuation awards for Javits Fellowship recipients under the Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need program. Congress consolidated the two programs last year. This language allows 100 Javits recipients to receive their last year of funding.

100 The agreement continues language allowing funds awarded under the Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need program to be used to fund continuation costs for the Javits Fellowship program.

101 All of the program funds would be used to cover the continuation costs of awards made under the program in FY 2015 and FY 2016.
All of the funds requested for the CCAMPIS program in FY 2017 would support continuation awards.

$90 million is for the Teacher Pathways program and $35 million is for the Principal Pathways program, an overall increase of $81.9 million above the FY 2016 level for the Teacher Quality Partnerships program. Not less than 5 percent of the program funds would be awarded to HBCUs and MSIs.

The budget proposes to replace TQP with the proposed Teacher and Principal Pathways program.

The requested funds would allow IES to make approximately $52.3 million in new research awards (an increase of $14.2 million from 2016) and provide an increase of $2 million to make enhancements to dissemination activities.

“Funds may be used to link Statewide elementary and secondary data systems with early childhood, postsecondary, and workforce data systems, or to further develop such systems. Up to $6,000,000 may be used for awards to public or private organizations or agencies to support activities to improve data coordination, quality, and use at the local, State, and national levels.”

Approximately $28.3 million would support continuation costs of grants awarded in 2015, approximately $34.7 million would support a new competition, and the remainder would fund for national activities.

ESSA transferred the administration and funding of Preschool Development Grants (PDG) from ED to HHS. The budget includes a proposed $100 million for PDG within HHS.

Within the total for Head Start, $500 million is for expanding Early Head Start (EHS), including EHS-Child Care Partnerships.

Within the total for Head Start, $500 million is for expanding Early Head Start (EHS), including EHS-Child Care Partnerships.

FY 2016 Head Start funding includes $635 million to continue supporting the EHS-CC Partnerships and $294 million to lengthen the Head Start day and year.

This increase includes $292 million in supplemental funds to ensure that more Head Start children will receive services for a full school day and a full school year. It also includes $141.63 million for a cost of living adjustment for the base program and the Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership grantees. FY 2017 request will maintain the estimated enrollment for FY 2016.

An additional $2.917 billion is available in mandatory funds for the Child Care and Development Fund.

An additional $2.917 billion is available in mandatory funds for the Child Care and Development Fund.

An additional $2.917 billion is available in mandatory funds for the Child Care and Development Fund.

An additional $2.917 billion is available in mandatory funds for the Child Care and Development Fund.

The budget proposes an additional $6.582 billion in mandatory funds for the Child Care and Development Fund.

In FY 2014 funding for Preschool Development Grants was provided under Race to The Top. Funds may be used for competitive awards to States to develop, enhance, or expand high quality preschool programs and early childhood education programs for children from low- and moderate-income families, including children with disabilities.

Preschool development grants was funded under the Fund for Improvement of Education (FIE).

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) transferred the administration and funding for Preschool Development grants from ED to HHS.
Budget Charts & Graphs

The Need to Invest in Education
High School Graduation Rate at Record High

PROGRESS: RESULTS FOR STUDENTS
MORE HISPANIC AND AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS GRADUATING

High School Graduation Rates:
School Years 2002-03 through 2011-12


SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (CCD), “NCES Common Core of Data State Dropout and Graduation Rate Data file,” School Year 2011-12, Preliminary Version 1a; School Year 2010-11, Provisional 1a; School Year 2009-10, 1a; School Year 2008-09, 1a; School Year 2007-08, 1b., http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/tables/AFGR0812.asp
PROGRESS: RESULTS FOR STUDENTS
DROPOUT RATES DECREASING

Dropout Rate: 2000–12

**College Enrollments Gaps Narrowing**
Immediate Entry into College by Race and Ethnicity, 2000-12

(Share of recent high school completers enrolled in college the following October)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** White, Black and Asian include the Hispanic portion of those groups. Due to the small sample size for Hispanics, blacks and Asians, a 3-year moving average is used. The 3-year moving average uses the year indicated, the year immediately preceding and the year immediately following. For 2011 a 2-year moving average is used.


PEW RESEARCH CENTER
Rising K-12 Enrollments
Public School Enrollment (in thousands)

SOURCE: CEF based on NCES Digest of Education Statistics, Table 203.10

Rising Higher Education Enrollments
Enrollment in Degree-Granting Institutions (in thousands)

SOURCE: CEF based on NCES Digest of Education Statistics, Table 303.10
Postsecondary Enrollment Rates of All 18- to 24-Year Olds by Race/Ethnicity
1974 to 2011

SOURCES: National Center for Education Statistics, 2013a, Tables 235 and 239; calculations by the authors.
More Hispanic Students
Hispanic Share of Pre-K through 12th Grade Public School Enrollment and 18- to 24-Year Old College Enrollment, 1972-2011

Notes: "Pre-K through 12th grade public school enrollment, ages 3 and older" shows the Hispanic share of enrollment in public schools from pre-K through 12th grade. Public school enrollment figures for 1980 are not available. "College enrollment, ages 18-24" shows Hispanic share among college students ages 18 to 24.

Source: Pew Hispanic Center analysis of the October Current Population Survey (CPS)
More Children in Poverty

Table 1: Percentage change of children living in low-income and poor families, 2007–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Percent change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low income</td>
<td>28,236,002</td>
<td>31,820,739</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>12,867,473</td>
<td>15,770,127</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Children living in low-income and poor families, 2007–2013

© National Center for Children in Poverty (www.nccpc.org)
Basic Facts about Low-Income Children: Children under 18 Years, 2013
Nationally, 23 percent of children (16.4 million) lived in families with incomes below the poverty line; 32.8 million lived below 200 percent of the poverty line.

**CHILDREN IN POVERTY: 2012**

- **45%** live below 200% of poverty
- **23%** live below the poverty line

**SOURCE** U.S. Census Bureau, 2012 American Community Survey.
Majority of Public School Children are Low-Income
Percent of Low-Income Students in US Public Schools, 2013

Southern Education Foundation (southerneducation.org)
DATA SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data
More Students in High-Poverty Schools
Percentage distribution of public school students, by school poverty level: School years 1999-2000 and 2011-12

Educational Attainment Gaps Persist
Percentage distribution of highest level of educational attainment of spring 2002 high school sophomores in 2012, by socioeconomic status (SES)

Fewer Local Education Employees

SOURCE: CEF based on BLS seasonally adjusted employment data.
Per Student Public Education Spending Flat Since 2010

State Funding for Preschool Less than in 2002

K-12 Spending Flat as Share of GDP

Public School Teacher Salaries Are Flat
Average Public School Teacher’s Salary in Constant 2012-13 Dollars

SOURCE: NCES; Digest of Education Statistics: Table 106.10

SOURCE: NCES; 2012 Digest of Education Statistics
Public Schools in Urgent Need of Repair

$197 billion needed for public school repairs/renovations
$4.5 million needed per school

SOURCE: NCES: Condition of America’s Public School Facilities: 2012 –13

Annual Percentage Change in State Higher Education Appropriations

State Support for Higher Education Below Pre-recession Levels

Public FTE Enrollment and Educational Appropriations per FTE

U.S. Fiscal 1989-2014
Annual Percentage Change in Inflation-Adjusted Per-Student State Funding for Higher Education and in Tuition and Fees at Public Institutions, 1984-85 to 2014-2015

Total and Per-Student State Funding for Higher Education in 2014 Dollars, and Public FTE Enrollment, 1984-85 to 2014-15

SOURCE: The College Board, Trends in College Pricing 2015, Figure 16A

ICE: The College Board, Trends in College Pricing 2015, Figure 16B
By 2020, 65 Percent of All Jobs will Require Postsecondary Education and Training, up from 28 percent in 1973
Unemployment Linked to Educational Attainment
January 2016 Unemployment Rate

SOURCE: CEF based on BLS data

Unemployment Rates among Individuals Ages 25 and Older, by Education Level, 1992–2012

Earnings Based on Learning
Median Lifetime Earnings by Highest Educational Attainment, 2009 Dollars

SOURCE: Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce; The College Payoff
https://cew.georgetown.edu/report/the-college-payoff/
Median Usual Weekly Earnings of Full-time Wage and Salary Workers Age 25 and Older by Educational Attainment, 2014 Annual Averages

Expected Full-Time Lifetime Earnings Relative to High School Graduates, by Education Level

SOURCES: U.S. Census Bureau, 2012, Table PINC-03; calculations by the authors.
Estimated Cumulative Full-Time Earnings (in 2011 Dollars) Net of Loan Repayment for Tuition and Fees, by Education Level

**Sources:** U.S. Census Bureau, 2012, Table PINC-03; Baum and Ma, 2012; calculations by the authors.
The Economic Consequences of Improving US Educational Outcomes Over the Next 35 and 60 Years
Changes in Economic Growth Due to Rising Educational Achievement under Three Scenarios, 2015-50 and 2015-75

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Scenario 1:</th>
<th>Scenario 2:</th>
<th>Scenario 3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matching OECD average PISA score</td>
<td>Matching Canadian PISA score</td>
<td>Matching top quartile U.S. PISA score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in GDP in 2050 in %</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in GDP in 2050</td>
<td>$678 billion</td>
<td>$2.7 trillion</td>
<td>$4.0 trillion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative increase of present value GDP growth* 2015-2050</td>
<td>$2.5 trillion</td>
<td>$10.0 trillion</td>
<td>$14.7 trillion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in GDP in 2075 in %</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in GDP in 2075</td>
<td>$4.1 trillion</td>
<td>$17.3 trillion</td>
<td>$26.7 trillion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative increase of present value GDP growth* 2015-2075</td>
<td>$14.0 trillion</td>
<td>$57.4 trillion</td>
<td>$86.5 trillion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* present value GDP growth is the current dollar value of future increases in GDP and allows for comparisons with GDP today.

Source: OECD (2014), “PISA 2012 Results: What Students Know and Can Do – Student Performance in Mathematics, Reading and Science” (2014 Volume I. Revised edition.) http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264201188-en Calculations by the Washington Center for Equitable Growth based on 0.09 0.37, and 0.54 standard deviation improvements in PISA scores (see methodology for details).
Lack of Financial Support Cited as Biggest Problem Facing Public Schools

The Biggest Problem

What do you think are the biggest problems that the public schools of your community must deal with?

(Telephone)
2015 National totals

Percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.

23% Lack of financial support
7% Standards/quality of education
6% Lack of discipline/more control of behaviors
5% Overcrowded schools
3% Testing/regulations
2% Parents/lack of support/lack of interest
The Public Opposes Education Cuts
Would you Approve or Disapprove Reducing Federal Funding for Education as a Way to Reduce the Size of the National Debt?


Two-Thirds Want to Protect Education from Sequester Cuts

The President’s Priorities

The chart illustrates the preferences of the American public regarding budget priorities. The chart shows the percentage of respondents who consider certain educational initiatives as very important, somewhat important, not too important, not at all important, or who don’t know/refuse to answer.

1. **Making college affordable**
   - Very important: 76%
   - Somewhat important: 17%
   - Not too important: 5%
   - Not at all important: 2%
   - Don’t know/refuse: 2%

2. **Investing in early childhood**
   - Very important: 61%
   - Somewhat important: 23%
   - Not too important: 10%
   - Not at all important: 6%
   - Don’t know/refuse: 2%

3. **Redesigning high schools**
   - Very important: 42%
   - Somewhat important: 39%
   - Not too important: 15%
   - Not at all important: 3%
   - Don’t know/refuse: 2%
FY 2016 Outlays

SOURCE: CEF based on CBO and OMB data

FY 2016 Department of Education Discretionary Funding

SOURCE: CEF based on Education Department data.
Labor-HHS Education Bill shortchanged in FY 2016 Allocations

If the LHHSED bill had gotten its same share of the NDD increase as its share of overall NDD $, it would have received an increase of $10.5 billion. The FY 2016 allocation was only increased by $5.4 billion.
From FY 2014-16, ED’s budget included $250 million for Preschool Development Grants (PDG). The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) authorized a new PDG program, but transferred its administration and funding from ED to HHS. The FY 2014-16 levels shown include $250 million for PDG, while the FY 2017 ED budget does not include the PDG funding.
From FY 2014-16, ED’s budget included $250 million for Preschool Development Grants (PDG). The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) authorized a new PDG program, but transferred its administration and funding from ED to HHS. The FY 2014-16 levels shown include $250 million for PDG, while the FY 2017 ED budget does not include the PDG funding.
Sources: Budget request and appropriations data from the U.S. Department of Education Budget Service. NEA calculated the baseline using data from the U.S. Department of Education Budget Service and Projections of Education Statistics to 2022, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. For more information, contact Tom Zembar at 202.822.7109 or TZembar@nea.org.

** Baseline: represents the actual appropriation for fiscal year 2010 adjusted each year thereafter for inflation and enrollment

**Adjusted for comparability.

***FY 2010 represents the year prior to the start of concerted efforts to restrain nondefense discretionary spending, including the enforcement of spending caps and sequestration under the Budget Control Act.

Education Policy & Practice Department
CENTER FOR GREAT PUBLIC SCHOOLS

**

**基线：代表了实际的2010财年拨款，之后每年均根据通货膨胀和入学人数调整。

**调整可比性。

***2010年代表了开始实施非国防拨款减少开始的努力的那一年，包括预算控制法案下的支出限额和削减。
U.S. Department of Education
Budget Request, FY2017

**Total Discretionary Funding**

[excluding Federal Pell Grants]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget Request</td>
<td>$46.9</td>
<td>+$1.3</td>
<td>+2.9%</td>
<td>-$8.4</td>
<td>-15.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Baseline: represents the actual appropriation for fiscal year 2010 adjusted each year thereafter for inflation and enrollment.
**Adjusted for comparability.
***FY 2010 represents the year prior to the start of concerted efforts to restrain nondefense discretionary spending, including the enforcement of spending caps and sequestration under the Budget Control Act.

Sources: Budget request and appropriations data from the U.S. Department of Education Budget Service. NEA calculated the baseline using data from the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. For more information, contact Tom Zembar at 202.822.7109 or TZembar@nea.org.

**What is discretionary funding?**
Discretionary funding is subject to the annual appropriations process. Congress must provide the funding each year by program.

**Why exclude Federal Pell Grants from the discretionary total?**
Because Federal Pell Grants represent about 33 percent of total Education Department (ED) discretionary funding, the program can have an out-sized impact on changes in overall funding. Excluding it provides a different view of changes in funding for all other ED programs.

**Why is the budget request compared to a baseline?**
Including a baseline in a funding chart indicates whether or not current or proposed funding is above, below, or just at the level necessary to keep pace with changes in inflation and enrollment.

**Education Policy & Practice Department**
CENTER FOR GREAT PUBLIC SCHOOLS

---

Great Public Schools for Every Student
Department of Education Outlays as Percentage of Total Federal Outlays

![Graph showing Department of Education Outlays as Percentage of Total Federal Outlays.]

**SOURCE:** CEF based on FY 2017 Budget Historical Tables: [http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/Historicals](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/Historicals)
Department of Education Funding
Discretionary Budget Authority in Billions

FY 2009 Includes ARRA

SOURCE: CEF based on FY 2016 Budget Historical Tables:
http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/Historicals
FY 2013 Impact of Sequestration
In millions

SOURCE: CEF calculations based on Department of Education budget tables.
Education Department Funding
In billions

SOURCE: CEF calculations based on Department of Education budget tables.
Proposed Mandatory Spending
In billions (FY 2017 to FY 2026)

# Proposed Mandatory Savings

In billions (FY 2017 to FY 2026)

| Source: Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2017, Summary Tables, Table S-9; [https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2017/assets/tables.pdf](https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2017/assets/tables.pdf) |
|---|---|
| Reform Income-Based Repayment Plans | Reform and expand Perkins Loans | Change 90/10 Rule |
| $(18.9)$ | $(4.6)$ | $(0.1)$ |
**Proposed Tax Changes**

Negative Amounts Increase the Deficit; Positive Amounts Reduce the Deficit (in billions FY 2017-26)

![Bar chart showing proposed tax changes with values: (-$33.1), (-$17.6), (-$2.2), $1.6, $0.4)](chart)

**SOURCE:** Table of Revenue Estimates from the Administration’s Fiscal Year 2017 Revenue Proposals

**NDD Spending Caps**

In Billions

![Bar chart showing NDD spending caps with values: $492, $493, $530, $518, $504, $519, $526 total, $527 total)](chart)
NDD Cap Levels
Budget Authority in Billions

There is an additional $8 billion in nondefense OCO funds in FY 2016 and FY 2017 provided by the BBA of 2015.

SOURCE: CEF Calculations based on CBO and OMB data. Sequester caps are only in law through FY 2021. FY 2022-25 levels shown increase those caps for projected inflation.
Sequestration Still Constraining NDD

Note: The BCA is the 2011 Budget Control Act and the caps are the annual limits on non-defense appropriations. BBA 2015 refers to the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015.

Source: CBPP analysis of data from the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget
Non-Defense Discretionary Spending Falling to Historic Lows

Spending as Percentage of Gross Domestic Product

Note: Data available only back to 1962. Sequestration refers to budget cuts required under the 2011 Budget Control Act, and includes modifications made in the Bipartisan Budget Acts of 2013 and 2015.

Source: CBPP based on Office of Management and Budget and Congressional Budget Office data.
Cumulative Deficit Reduction FY 2017-2026
Spending Cuts are Three Times Revenue Increases (in billions)

SOURCE: CEF Calculations based on President’s FY 2017 Budget, Summary Tables, Table S–3.
Part 1.
The Foundation for Success
Early Childhood, Elementary and Secondary Education
The Administration’s FY 2017 budget request largely reflects the bipartisan reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), enacted as the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA).

The president’s budget proposes significant increases for the early education, elementary and secondary education programs listed below. However, due to the elimination of funding for programs repealed by ESSA (School Improvement Grants, Math and Science Partnerships, Elementary and Secondary School Counseling, Physical Education Program, and Advanced Placement) and proposed cuts to Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants and 21st Century Community Learning Centers, the overall increase for ESEA programs as revised by ESSA is only $495.3 million (+2.1 percent). When the programs newly proposed by the Administration are included, the increase is $805.3 million (+3.4 percent).

- **Early Education:** The Administration’s request includes $1.3 billion in mandatory funding to launch a 10-year investment in Preschool for All. This federal-State partnership would enable States to provide access to high quality preschool for all four year olds from low- and moderate-income families, complementing the $250 million Preschool Development Grants (PDG) transferred to the Department of Health and Human Services under the ESSA. The budget proposes a $100 million increase for PDG.

- **Title I:** The budget proposes an increase of $450 million (+3 percent) for these key grants to local school districts. Title I grants provide supplemental education funding for local programs that provide academic support to help students in high poverty areas meet rigorous State standards. However, since funding for the School Improvement Grant (SIG) program is eliminated (authorization repealed under ESSA), the FY 2017 Title I funding level equals the combined FY 2016 Title I and SIG appropriations.

- **Students with Disabilities:** Although the Administration’s budget freezes funding for the largest program within the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA), grants to States for children in K-12, it does provide a combined increase of $90 million for the preschool and infants and toddlers programs as well as for technical assistance and dissemination.

- **Promise Neighborhoods:** The request provides an increase of nearly $55 million to support up to 15 new awards for communities to implement comprehensive, neighborhood-based plans for meeting the cradle to career educational, health, and social service needs of children in high-poverty communities.

- **State Assessments:** An increase of $25 million is proposed to support the pressing needs States have identified for developing, streamlining, and implementing next generation assessment systems. This investment is critical as States move to implement the newly authorized ESSA.

- **Education Innovation and Research Program:** A proposed increase of $60 million, or 50 percent, for the successor to the Investing in Innovation (i3) program would expand support for evidence-based initiatives and complements the Administration’s investment in the Institute of Education Sciences to expand and scale up effective interventions.

- **English Language Acquisition State Grants:** The $63 million increase would support State and local efforts to ensure English Learners meet challenging academic standards.
Magnet Schools Assistance Program: The budget would increase funding for magnet schools by approximately $18 million for a total of $115 million. This additional support will expand access to STEM, Visual and Performing Arts, International Baccalaureate, and many other public theme-based magnet programs.

Charter Schools Program: To increase the number of high quality charter schools, evaluate their impact on student achievement, and support efforts to strengthen the charter school authorizing process, the budget provides $350 million to the Charter Schools Program, an increase of $17 million.

Comprehensive Centers: The president’s budget will increase funding for Comprehensive Centers by $4 million in FY 2017 to help provide technical assistance to States as they adapt to their expanded roles and responsibilities under the new Every Student Succeeds Act framework for accountability and school improvement.

The request includes several proposed programs that are new, consolidated, or mandatory:

- **Student Support and Academic Enrichment:** ESSA consolidated the functions under several small discretionary grants (Elementary and Secondary School Counseling, Physical Education, Advanced Placement, and Math and Science Partnerships) into one flexible block fund that allows local school districts to use funds to improve student outcomes through a wide range of activities supporting a well-rounded education, safe and healthy students, and expanded use of educational technology. Although this block grant was authorized at $1.65 billion in Title IV, Part A of ESSA, the president’s proposed budget for FY 2017 is $500 million.

- **Comprehensive Literacy Development Grants:** As authorized by ESSA in the LEARN Act, this program is a successor to the Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy program. The $190 million request would allow for competitive awards to States to support the implementation of comprehensive State literacy plans that fund evidence-based pre-literacy and literacy interventions in high need schools.

- **Preparing and Supporting Effective Educators:** The Administration has proposed several programs to help prepare educators and improve efficacy. New programs include the mandatory $1 billion RESPECT: Best Job in the World and the Supporting Effective Educator Development program funded at $100 million, as well as the Teach to Lead and STEM Master Teacher Corps programs funded at $10 million each. Additionally, the president has proposed a $20 million increase to the Teacher and School Leader Incentive Grants and a $13.6 million increase to the School Leader Recruitment and Support program.

- **Next Generation High Schools:** Building on the White House Summit on Next Generation High Schools, the Administration is requesting $80 million to promote high school transformation in order to provide students with learning experiences that will prepare them to transition to postsecondary education and careers. Funds would be used to make competitive awards to local school districts in partnerships with higher education and community-based organizations, businesses, and other industry-related organizations.

- **Computer Science for All:** The president’s Computer Science for All includes a mandatory component funded at $2 billion in FY 2017, with a total of $4 billion over three years, that would allow States to expand student access to quality coursework in computer science, science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM). The additional $100 million in discretionary funds would provide funds to local school districts, consortia, or States to expand innovative programs related to STEM and Computer Science instruction.

- **Stronger Together:** The proposed $120 million for the Stronger Together program would allow the Department to make competitive grants to local school districts or consortia of districts that have significant achievement gaps and socioeconomic segregation in order to develop or implement plans for integration with community support.
Programs Authorized in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)
Public Law 114-95
Updated February 17, 2016

ALL PROGRAMS ARE AUTHORIZED FROM FY 2017 THROUGH FY 2020
(ALL NUMBERS IN THOUSANDS)

NOTE: The bill states it is the sense of Congress that authorized funding levels should be adjusted based on future revised limits to the Budget Control Act’s nondefense discretionary spending caps.

Total FY 2015 appropriation for ESEA programs = $23,304,953
(Includes McKinney-Vento Homeless Education and Investing in Innovation)

Total FY 2016 appropriation for ESEA programs = $23,944,060 (+$639,107 over FY 2015 appropriation, +2.7%)
(Includes McKinney-Vento Homeless Education and Investing in Innovation)

Total FY 2017 budget request for ESSA programs = $24,089,355 (+$495,295 over FY 2016 appropriation, +2.1%)
[Includes McKinney-Vento Homeless Education and Preschool Development Grants (now in HHS), but excludes proposed new K-12 programs: Teach to Lead, Stronger Together, Next Generation High Schools, and Computer Science for All Development Grants]

Total FY 2017 budget request for ESSA programs = $24,399,355 (+$805,295 over FY 2016 appropriation, +3.4%)
[Includes McKinney-Vento Homeless Education and Preschool Development Grants (now in HHS) and proposed new K-12 programs: Teach to Lead, Stronger Together, Next Generation High Schools, and Computer Science for All Development Grants]

Total authorized ESSA levels
[Includes McKinney-Vento Homeless Education and Preschool Development Grants (now in HHS)]:
- FY 2017 = $24,540,409 (+$596,349 over FY 2016 appropriation, +2.5%)
- FY 2018 = $25,053,614 (+$513,205 over FY 2017 authorization, +2.1%)
- FY 2019 = $25,566,819 (+$513,205 over FY 2018 authorization, +2.0%)
- FY 2020 = $26,080,025 (+$513,206 over FY 2019 authorization, +2.0%)

(Bold blue Italic denotes where the FY 2017 budget request is above the FY 2017 authorized level)

TITLE I: IMPROVING THE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF THE DISADVANTAGED

- Part A: IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES
  FY 2016 Appropriation: $14,909,802; FY 2016 Appropriation for School Improvement grants: $450,000
  (combined appropriation: $15,359,802)
  FY 2017 Budget: $15,359,802

AUTHORIZED LEVELS:
- FY 2017: $15,012,318
- FY 2018: $15,457,459
- FY 2019: $15,897,371
- FY 2020: $16,182,345

NOTE: School Improvement Grants eliminated as a separate program, but the NCLB 4% set-aside by States from the Title I allocation for school improvement is increased to 7%.
PART B: STATE ASSESSMENT GRANTS
FY 2016 Appropriation: $378,000
FY 2017 Budget: $403,000
AUTHORIZED LEVELS: $378,000 for each year, FY 2017 through FY 2020

PART C: EDUCATION OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN
FY 2016 Appropriation: $374,751
FY 2017 Budget: $374,751
AUTHORIZED LEVELS: $374,751 for each year, FY 2017 through FY 2020

PART D: PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT-RISK
FY 2016 Appropriation: $47,614
FY 2017 Budget: $47,614
AUTHORIZED LEVELS: $47,614 for each year, FY 2017 through FY 2020

PART E: FLEXIBILITY FOR EQUITABLE PER PUPIL FUNDING

PART F: GENERAL PROVISIONS
FY 2016 Appropriation for evaluation: $0
FY 2017 Budget for evaluation: $0
AUTHORIZED LEVELS: $710 for each year, FY 2017 through FY 2020 (funding is for activities under Section 8601, Evaluation)

TITLE II: PREPARING, TRAINING, AND RECRUITING HIGH-QUALITY TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, AND OTHER SCHOOL LEADERS

PART A: SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION
FY 2016 Appropriation for predecessor Teacher Quality State Grants: $2,349,830
FY 2017 Budget: $2,250,000
AUTHORIZED LEVELS: $2,295,830 for each year, FY 2017 through FY 2020

PART B: NATIONAL ACTIVITIES
FY 2016 Appropriation: N/A
FY 2017 Budget: total for the subparts listed below: $608,815
AUTHORIZED LEVELS total for the subparts listed below:
- FY 2017: $468,881
- FY 2018: $468,881
- FY 2019: $469,168
- FY 2020: $489,168
  - Subpart 1: Teacher And School Leader Incentive Program
    FY 2016 Appropriation for predecessor Teacher Incentive Fund: $230,000
    FY 2017 Budget: $250,000
    - 49.1% of the amount appropriated for National Activities for each year, FY 2017 through FY 2019 (maximum of $230,221 for FY 2017 and FY 2018; maximum of $230,361 for FY 2019)
    - 47% of the amount appropriated for National Activities for FY 2020 (maximum of $229,909)
  - Subpart 2: Literacy Education for All, Results for the Nation (LEARN)
    FY 2016 Appropriation for predecessor Striving Readers program: $190,000
    FY 2017 Budget: $190,000
    - 34.1% of the amount appropriated for National Activities for each year, FY 2017 through FY 2019 (maximum of $159,888 for FY 2017 and FY 2018; maximum of $159,986 for FY 2019)
    - 36.8% of the amount appropriated for National Activities for FY 2020 (maximum of $180,014)
• **Sec. 2226: Innovative Approaches to Literacy**  
  **FY 2016 Appropriation:** $27,000  
  **FY 2017 Budget:** $27,000  
  No specific authorization of funds. From funds reserved for Subpart 2, the Secretary may award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements, on a competitive basis.

  o **Subpart 3: American History and Civics Education**
    ▪ 1.4% of the amount appropriated for National Activities for each year, FY 2017 through FY 2020 (maximum of $6,564 for FY 2017 and FY 2018; maximum of $6,568 for FY 2019; maximum of $6,848 for FY 2020)

  • **Sec. 2232: Presidential And Congressional Academies For American History And Civics**  
    **FY 2016 Appropriation** for predecessor Presidential and Congressional Teaching Academies: $1,815  
    **FY 2017 Budget:** $1,815  
    (Not less than 26% of the amount available for this subpart is for this section)

  • **Sec. 2233: National Activities**  
    **FY 2016 Appropriation:** NA  
    **FY 2017 Budget:** $0  
    (Not more than 74% of the amount available for this subpart is for this section.)

  o **Subpart 4: Programs of National Significance**
    ▪ 15.4% of the amount appropriated for National Activities for each year, FY 2017 through FY 2019 (maximum of $72,208 for FY 2017 and FY 2018; maximum of $72,252 for FY 2019)
    ▪ 14.8% of the amount appropriated for National Activities for FY 2020 (maximum of $72,397)

  • **Sec. 2242: Supporting Effective Educator Development**  
    **FY 2016 Appropriation:** $93,993 (funded as a 4% set-aside from Teacher Quality State Grants)  
    **FY 2017 Budget:** $100,000  
    (Not less than 74% of the funds for this subpart is for this section. If National Activities is funded at its full authorized level, no less than $53,434 for FY 2017 and FY 2018, $53,466 for FY 2019, and $53,574 for FY 2020.)

  • **Sec. 2243: School Leader Recruitment and Support**  
    **FY 2016 Appropriation** for predecessor School Leadership program: $16,368  
    **FY 2017 Budget:** $30,000  
    (Not less than 22% of the funds for this subpart is for this section. If National Activities is funded at its full authorized level, not less than $15,886 for FY 2017 and FY 2018 and $15,895 for FY 2019 and FY 2020.)

  • **Sec. 2244: Technical Assistance and National Evaluation**  
    **FY 2016 Appropriation:** N/A  
    **FY 2017 Budget:** $0  
    (Not less than 2% of the funds for this subpart is for this section. If National Activities is funded at its full authorized level, no less than $15,886 for FY 2017 and FY 2018 and $15,895 for FY 2019 and FY 2020.)

  • **Sec. 2245: STEM Master Teacher Corps**  
    **FY 2016 Appropriation:** N/A  
    **FY 2017 Budget:** $10,000  
    (Not more than 2% of the funds for this subpart is for this section. If National Activities is funded at its full authorized level, no more than $15,886 for FY 2017 and FY 2018 and $15,895 for FY 2019 and FY 2020.)
PART 1 - ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

TITLE III: LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION FOR ENGLISH LEARNERS AND IMMIGRANT STUDENTS

- PART A: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION, LANGUAGE ENHANCEMENT AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT ACT
  - FY 2016 Appropriation: $737,400
  - FY 2017 Budget: $800,400
  - AUTHORIZED LEVELS:
    - FY 2017: $756,332
    - FY 2018: $769,568
    - FY 2019: $784,960
    - FY 2020: $884,960
    - Subpart 1: Grants and Subgrants for English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement
    - Subpart 2: Accountability and Administration
    - Subpart 3: National Professional Development Project
      (6.5% of the amount appropriated each year except that not more than $2 million of such amount may be reserved for the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Educational Programs in Sec. 3202)

- PART B: GENERAL PROVISIONS

TITLE IV: 21ST CENTURY SCHOOLS

- PART A: STUDENT SUPPORT AND ACADEMIC ENHANCEMENT GRANTS
  - Subpart 1: Student Support And Academic Enrichment Grants
    - FY 2016 Appropriation: NA
    - FY 2017 Budget: $500,000
    - AUTHORIZED LEVELS:
      - FY 2017: $1,650,000
      - FY 2018: $1,600,000
      - FY 2019: $1,600,000
      - FY 2020: $1,600,000
        - Sec. 4107: Well-Rounded Educational Opportunities
        - Sec. 4108: Safe and Healthy Students
        - Sec. 4109: Effective Use of Technology
          NOTE: LEAs receiving an award of $30,000 or more must spend at least 20% of funds on at least one activity in Sec. 4107, at least 20% on at least one activity on Sec. 4108, and a portion of funds on at least one activity under Sec. 4109. LEAs receiving less than $30,000 must only do one of those three.

  - Subpart 2 - Internet Safety

- PART B: 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS
  - FY 2016 Appropriation: $1,166,673
  - FY 2017 Budget: $1,000,000
  - AUTHORIZED LEVELS:
    - FY 2017: $1,000,000
    - FY 2018: $1,100,000
    - FY 2019: $1,100,000
    - FY 2020: $1,100,000
PART C: EXPANDING OPPORTUNITIES THROUGH QUALITY CHARTER SCHOOLS
FY 2016 Appropriation: $333,172
FY 2017 Budget: $350,000
AUTHORIZED LEVELS:
- FY 2017: $270,000
- FY 2018: $270,000
- FY 2019: $300,000
- FY 2020: $300,000

PART D: MAGNET SCHOOLS ASSISTANCE
FY 2016 Appropriation: $96,647
FY 2017 Budget: $115,000
AUTHORIZED LEVELS:
- FY 2017: $94,000
- FY 2018: $96,820
- FY 2019: $102,387
- FY 2020: $108,530

PART E: FAMILY ENGAGEMENT IN EDUCATION PROGRAMS
FY 2016 Appropriation: N/A
FY 2017 Budget: $0
AUTHORIZED LEVELS: $10,000 for each year, FY 2017 through FY 2020

PART F: NATIONAL ACTIVITIES
FY 2016 Appropriation: N/A
FY 2017 Budget: total for the subparts listed below: $472,741
AUTHORIZED LEVELS: total for the subparts listed below:
- FY 2017: $200,741
- FY 2018: $200,741
- FY 2019: $220,741
- FY 2020: $220,741

- Subpart 1: Education Innovation and Research
  FY 2016 Appropriation for current Investing in Innovation: $120,000
  FY 2017 Budget: $180,000
  - 36% of the amount appropriated for National Activities for FY 2017 and FY 2018 after the $5 million reservation for Subpart 3 (maximum of $70,467)
  - 42% of the amount appropriated for National Activities for FY 2019 and FY 2020 after the $5 million reservation for Subpart 3 (maximum of $90,611)

- Subpart 2: Community Support for School Success
  - 36% of the amount appropriated for National Activities for FY 2017 and FY 2018 after the $5 million reservation for Subpart 3 (maximum of $70,467)
  - 32% of the amount appropriated for National Activities for FY 2019 and FY 2020 after the $5 million reservation for Subpart 3 (maximum of $69,037)

  - Sec. 4264: Promise Neighborhoods
    FY 2016 Appropriation: $72,254
    FY 2017 Budget: $128,000
  
  - Sec. 4265: Full Service Community Schools
    FY 2016 Appropriation: $10,000
    FY 2017 Budget: $10,000

  95% of the funds for this Subpart is for these two programs. The Secretary shall award not less than 3 grants under Sec. 4264 and not fewer than 10 grants under Sec. 4265.
PART 1 - ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

- Subpart 3: National Activities for School Safety– includes Project SERV
  - FY 2016 Appropriation for predecessor Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities: $75,000
  - FY 2017 Budget: $90,000
  (Of the amounts appropriated for this Part, $5 million is for this section.)

- Subpart 4: Academic Enrichment
  - 28% of the amount appropriated for National Activities for FY 2017 and FY 2018 after the $5 million reservation for Subpart 3 (maximum of $54,807)
  - 26% of the amount appropriated for National Activities for FY 2019 and FY 2020 after the $5 million reservation for Subpart 3 (maximum of $56,093)
    - Sec. 4641: Awards for Academic Enrichment
      - FY 2016 Appropriation: N/A
      - FY 2017 Budget: $0
    - Sec. 4642: Assistance for Arts Education
      - FY 2016 Appropriation: $27,000
      - FY 2017 Budget: $27,000
    - Sec. 4643: Ready To Learn Programming
      - FY 2016 Appropriation: $25,741
      - FY 2017 Budget: $25,741
    - Sec. 4644: Supporting High-Ability Learners and Learning (Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Students Education Program)
      - FY 2016 Appropriation: $12,000
      - FY 2017 Budget: $12,000

TITLE V: STATE INNOVATION AND LOCAL FLEXIBILITY

- PART A: FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES
- PART B: RURAL EDUCATION INITIATIVE
  - FY 2016 Appropriation: $175,840
  - FY 2017 Budget: $175,840
  - AUTHORIZED LEVELS: $169,840 for each year, FY 2017 through FY 2020
    - Subpart 1: Small, Rural School Achievement Program
    - Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program
- PART C: GENERAL PROVISIONS

TITLE VI: INDIAN, NATIVE HAWAIIAN, AND ALASKA NATIVE EDUCATION

- PART A: INDIAN EDUCATION
  - Subpart 1: Formula Grants to LEAs
    - FY 2016 Appropriation: $100,381
    - FY 2017 Budget: $100,381
    - AUTHORIZED LEVELS:
      - FY 2017: $100,381
      - FY 2018: $102,389
      - FY 2019: $104,436
      - FY 2020: $106,525
o Subpart 2: Special Programs And Projects To Improve Educational Opportunities For Indian Children
   FY 2016 Appropriation: $37,993
   FY 2017 Budget: $67,993
   AUTHORIZED LEVELS: $17,993 for each year, FY 2017 through FY 2020

o Subpart 3: National Activities
   FY 2016 Appropriation: $5,565
   FY 2017 Budget: $6,565
   AUTHORIZED LEVELS: $5,565 for each year, FY 2017 through FY 2020
   ▪ Sec. 6133. Native American and Alaska Native Language Immersion Program
     20% of funds from National Activities is reserved for this program.

o Subpart 4: Federal Administration

o Subpart 5: Definitions, Authorizations OF Appropriations

- PART B: NATIVE HAWAIIAN EDUCATION
  FY 2016 Appropriation: $33,397
  FY 2017 Budget: $33,397
  AUTHORIZED LEVELS: $32,397 for each year, FY 2017 through FY 2020

- PART C: ALASKA NATIVE EDUCATION
  FY 2016 Appropriation: $32,453
  FY 2017 Budget: $32,453
  AUTHORIZED LEVELS: $31,453 for each year, FY 2017 through FY 2020

- TITLE VII: IMPACT AID

- Sec. 7002. Payments relating to federal acquisition of real property
  FY 2016 Appropriation: $66,813
  FY 2017 Budget: $0
  AUTHORIZED LEVELS:
  - FY 2017: $66,813
  - FY 2018: $66,813
  - FY 2019: $66,813
  - FY 2020: $71,998

- Sec. 7003(b). Payments for eligible federally connected children (Basic Support payments)
  FY 2016 Appropriation: $1,168,233
  FY 2017 Budget: $1,168,233
  AUTHORIZED LEVELS:
  - FY 2017: $1,151,233
  - FY 2018: $1,151,233
  - FY 2019: $1,151,233
  - FY 2020: $1,240,573

- Sec. 7003(d). Payments for children with disabilities
  FY 2016 Appropriation: $48,316
  FY 2017 Budget: $48,316
  AUTHORIZED LEVELS:
  - FY 2017: $48,316
  - FY 2018: $48,316
  - FY 2019: $48,316
  - FY 2020: $52,065
TITLE VIII: GENERAL PROVISIONS

PART A: DEFINITIONS
PART B: FLEXIBILITY IN THE USE OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND OTHER FUNDS
PART C: COORDINATION OF PROGRAMS; CONSOLIDATED STATE AND LOCAL PLANS AND APPLICATIONS
PART D: WAIVERS
PART E: APPROVAL AND DISAPPROVAL OF STATE PLANS AND LOCAL APPLICATIONS
PART F: UNIFORM PROVISIONS
SUBPART 1: PRIVATE SCHOOLS
SUBPART 2: OTHER PROVISIONS
SUBPART 3: TEACHER LIABILITY PROTECTION
SUBPART 5: GUN POSSESSION
SUBPART 6: ENVIRONMENTAL TOBACCO SMOKE
PART G: EVALUATIONS

TITLE IX: EDUCATION OF HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS; OTHER LAWS; MISCELLANEOUS

PART A: EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH
FY 2015 Appropriation: $70,000
FY 2017 Budget: $85,000
AUTHORIZED LEVELS: $85,000 for each year, FY 2017 through FY 2020

PART B: OTHER LAWS; MISCELLANEOUS
SUBPART 12. PRESCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANTS
FY 2016 Appropriation: $250,000 for predecessor Preschool Development Grants
FY 2017 Budget: $350,000
AUTHORIZED LEVELS: $250,000 for each year, FY 2017 through FY 2020
ESEA Funding Levels

in thousands

Includes Education for Homeless Children, Race To The Top, Investing in Innovation, and Preschool Development Grants. The FY 2017 budget excludes funding for proposed new K-12 programs.
ESEA/ESSA Funding
[Every Student Succeeds Act]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FY 2017 Budget Request</th>
<th>vs FY 2016 Appropriation</th>
<th>vs FY 2010 Baseline (Adjusted for Inflation &amp; Enrollment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$24.4</td>
<td>+$0.5</td>
<td>+2.1%</td>
<td>-$4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Baseline: represents the actual appropriation for fiscal year 2010 adjusted each year thereafter for inflation and enrollment

**FY 2010 represents the year prior to the start of concerted efforts to restrain nondefense discretionary spending, including the enforcement of spending caps and sequestration under the Budget Control Act.

Sources: Budget request and appropriations data from the U.S. Department of Education Budget Service. NEA calculated the baseline using data from the U.S. Department of Education Budget Service and Projections of Education Statistics to 2022, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. For more information, contact Tom Zembar at 202.822.7109 or TZembar@nea.org.

February 9, 2016

ESEA funding explained:
includes any program authorized or amended under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), now known as the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Funding levels prior to fiscal year 2017 reflect the ESEA version known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB).

Why is the budget request compared to a baseline?
A baseline reflects the funding level required to provide the same level of services in a certain year as was provided in the baseline year by adjusting for changes in the cost of services and enrollment. It is policy-neutral. Including a baseline in a funding chart indicates whether or not current or proposed funding is above, below, or just at the level necessary to keep pace with changes in inflation and enrollment.
Preschool Development Grants
Department of Health and Human Services
Title V, Part D, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)
Section 9212, Every Student Succeeds Act

In 2015, Nevada began implementing its two-part plan to improve program quality and expand services for eligible children in high need communities. Program development efforts included identifying and providing critical wraparound supports for vulnerable families and increasing instructional time to move the State’s half-day Pre-K into a full day experience for children. By the end of 2018, Nevada will provide preschool to an additional 13,760 eligible children.

DESCRIPTION

Jointly administered by the Departments of Education and Health and Human Services, the Preschool Development Grant program is one component of the president’s Preschool for All initiative. The purpose of the program is to expand high quality preschool programs in States that provide early learning opportunities for four-year-olds from low- and moderate-income families. Grant funds are used for development or expansion of high quality preschool systems, including investments in workforce development and quality infrastructure components such as program standards, monitoring, and evaluation and to scale up high quality programs in targeted high need communities.

FY 2014 funds were provided under Race To The Top. FY 2015 and FY 2016 funds were provided under the Fund for the Improvement of Education. ESSA created a new version of PDG and transferred its administration and funding from ED to HHS.
PART 1 - ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT's REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$250.00*</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$350.00**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Funds were appropriated under Race to the Top in FY 2014. In FY 2015 and FY 2016, the program was under ESEA, Title V, Part D, Fund for the Improvement of Education (No Child Left Behind Act).
**Funding for this program has been transferred to the Department of Health and Human Services.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The Administration’s FY 2017 request includes $350 million in discretionary funding for competitively awarded Preschool Development Grants, a $100 million increase to fund the State continuation grant awards.

PROGRAM NEED

Numerous research studies have shown children’s achievement levels from ages three to eight are important predictors of later success. For instance, studies on language acquisition of children from low-income families compared to children from families with two professional parents reveal a gap that begins at 18 months of age and grows over time. This vocabulary gap makes a compelling argument for universal early learning and pre-kindergarten, particularly for children living in poverty. High quality pre-kindergarten programs also increase math and reading achievement, while reducing the likelihood of a child being retained in a grade or needing later interventions. Preschool Development Grants are an important investment for Congress to provide access to strong early learning opportunities that will enable all children to enter school ready to succeed academically and in life.

CONTACT INFO

Kelly Pollitt
National Association of Elementary School Principals
(703) 518-6245  |  kpollitt@naesp.org
Title I Grants to States
Title I, Elementary & Secondary Education Act

Lincoln Park School #44 of the Rochester City School District (RCSD) in Rochester, NY, serves 272 students in grades PK, K, and 2-6. This Title I school has an 89 percent poverty rate and is comprised of 80 percent African American students, 9 percent Hispanic students, and 15 percent students with disabilities. The school was one of five RCSD schools previously slated by the facilities department to close. Over the last two years, however, School #44 has made steady academic gains, moving from 35th ranked to 17th ranked in the district in academic performance. The school has increased its attendance since 2013 and has met the district target of 93 percent attendance in grades 2, 3, 4 and 5. Categorized as a Persistently Struggling School, the school received a School Improvement Grant this school year which further supports its progress.

The school emphasizes: (1) early literacy and use of common formative assessments to provide differentiation of lessons and multiple points of access for students; (2) an expanded learning time model that includes embedded programming with a community partner to improve opportunities and outcomes for high-poverty students; and, (3) support for social/emotional health through PBIS, character education based on the Six Pillars of Character, and restorative justice. School #44 has demonstrated increases in English language arts (ELA) above the district average and is on track to meet its target. Progress indicators including improvement in ELA, attendance, and soft indicators such as school culture are on the rise at School #44.

DESCRIPTION

As the cornerstone of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), Title I provides funds mainly to school districts to help disadvantaged children achieve proficiency on challenging academic standards and improve the performance of low-achieving schools. After 14 years, the 2002 No Child Left Behind (NCLB) amendments to ESEA have been replaced by the 2015 Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The new law continues the traditional federal focus on closing achievement gaps and improving the academic achievement of underperforming groups of students. Title I funding is allocated primarily by formula grants to States and in turn to school districts based on the number and concentration of low-income children and other categories of disadvantaged children residing in these jurisdictions. Two-thirds of children served by Title I are minority students. Children participating in Title I receive primarily reading, language arts, and mathematics instruction through schoolwide approaches or targeted assistance strategies.

The new Title I amendments will be implemented in school year 2017-18. School year 2016-17 will serve as a planning year with programs operating basically under NCLB with minor exceptions. Under the new ESSA, consistently low-performing schools will be identified by States and required to undertake comprehensive or targeted improvement measures to increase academic proficiency, as well as boost school performance on four other accountability indicators. ESSA provides more flexibility to States in designing their accountability systems within the parameters of the law and allows substantial local discretion in developing school improvement interventions. Nonetheless, States and school districts must implement multiple new requirements and new responsibilities within the scope of the ESSA “federal guardrails.” States also must continue, with minimal changes, to implement challenging standards aligned with entry-level college coursework and relevant career skills and the current system of State assessments.

Title I retains authorizations for a variety of specialized subprograms, such as the programs for Migratory and Neglected and Delinquent Children, as well as a separate State Assessment Grant program. The separate authorization of appropriations for School Improvement Grants has been replaced with an larger State set-aside authority, reserving funds from the Title I school district allocations to continue State-awarded subgrants for comprehensive and targeted interventions in low-performing schools.
### FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants to School Districts Basic Grants*</td>
<td>$ 6,459.40</td>
<td>$ 6,459.40</td>
<td>$ 6,459.40</td>
<td>$6,459.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration Grants*</td>
<td>$ 1,362.30</td>
<td>$ 1,362.30</td>
<td>$ 1,362.30</td>
<td>$1,362.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Grants*</td>
<td>$ 3,281.55</td>
<td>$ 3,294.05</td>
<td>$ 3,544.05</td>
<td>$3,769.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Finance Incentive Grants*</td>
<td>$ 3,281.55</td>
<td>$ 3,294.05</td>
<td>$ 3,544.05</td>
<td>$3,769.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$14,384.80</td>
<td>$14,409.80</td>
<td>$14,909.80</td>
<td>$15,359.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants</td>
<td>$ 374.75</td>
<td>$ 374.75</td>
<td>$ 374.75</td>
<td>$ 374.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglected/Delinquent/At Risk</td>
<td>$ 47.61</td>
<td>$ 47.61</td>
<td>$ 47.61</td>
<td>$ 47.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>$ 0.88</td>
<td>$ 0.71**</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduation Initiative</td>
<td>$ 46.27</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
<td>$ -***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Improvement (Turnaround) Grants</td>
<td>$ 505.76</td>
<td>$ 505.76</td>
<td>$ 450.00</td>
<td>$ -***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$15,360.07</td>
<td>$15,338.63</td>
<td>$15,782.16</td>
<td>$15,782.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reflects program levels rather than budget authority, since a portion of the appropriation becomes available October 1.

**Authorized at $710,000 to carry out Title I evaluation under sec. 8601.

*** Program no longer authorized under ESSA.

---

The FY 2017 budget request equals the combined FY 2016 Title I and School Improvement Grants (SIG) funding. ESSA eliminated SIG as a separate program, but increased the State set-aside for school improvement from 4% to 7% from each State’s Title I allocation.
IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2017 budget includes a proposed $15.36 billion increase for the cornerstone ESEA Title I Grants to School Districts, $450 million above the FY 2016 appropriation. This increase would raise the core Title I local school district (LEA) grant program to a new high. ESSA increases the required State set-aside of Title I funds for school improvement activities from 4 to 7 percent, an amount comparable to the previously authorized line item for School Improvement Grants (SIG/ Turnaround). In theory the proposed $450 million increase would offset the reduction in local school district Title I formula allocations resulting from the expanded off the top 7 percent State set-aside. However, proposed appropriations language would redirect nearly $175 million of the $450 million LEA grant increase to an additional expansion of the State school improvement set-aside. In short, school districts would be left with approximately a $175 million cut nationally to their Title I formula allocations under the Title I LEA Grant budget request. Funding for the Migrant and the Neglected and Delinquent programs again would be frozen under the FY 2017 request.

PROGRAM NEED

For school year 2016-17, Title I Grants to LEAs will receive a $500 million increase, although the smaller Title I programs are frozen and remain below their pre-recession funding levels. With this appropriations increase, Title I LEA funding finally has recovered from the $800 million cut under sequestration four years ago. School districts now will be able to restore a level of Title I services that exceeds the school year 2012-13 program. Although some 90 percent of school districts and over half of all public schools participate in the Title I program, the reduction in services over the past four years has fallen most heavily on high poverty schools.
ESSA offers greater Title I program flexibility. However, the law also includes new requirements that will result in more schools being identified for required interventions in numerous school districts now covered by NCLB waivers. Additionally, ESSA authorizes States to substantially increase their State school improvement set-aside and also authorizes another State set-aside to fund direct services projects. Without a substantial increase in Title I LEA grant funds in FY 2017, local Title I formula allotments are expected to fall as a result of the expanded State funding set-asides by 3 and possibly as much as 6 percent, if both new reservations are triggered in individual States. In such instances school districts could suffer local Title I funding cuts that exceed the sequestration cuts of 2013. Unfortunately the recent economic recovery has had minimal impact on the deep poverty level of the 11 million students now included in the Title I funding formula. The unmet funding need for Title I LEA Grants continues at a more than $33 billion shortfall, based on the generally accepted Title I “full funding” level of nearly $50 billion. Even with the FY 2016 appropriations increase, the Title I LEA Grants program remains less than one-third funded.

**CONTACT INFO**

Jeff Simering  
Council of the Great City Schools  
(202) 393-2427  |  jsimering@cgcs.org

**Migrant Education**

In millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Migrant Education (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2002</td>
<td>$396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
<td>$395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>$394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>$390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>$387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>$387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>$378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>$395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td>$395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011</td>
<td>$394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012</td>
<td>$393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013</td>
<td>$393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>$375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>$375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>$375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017 PRES.</td>
<td>$375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Improvement Grants
Title I, Part A, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)

In 2008, Frederick Douglass High School had a graduation rate below 25 percent and was the subject of an HBO Documentary, “Hard Times at Douglass High.” In 2010 the school was one of the first in the Baltimore City Public Schools to receive federal School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds, and immediately hired a new principal who prioritized staff recruitment and development to better meet the needs of teachers and students. The school extended learning time for students and increased planning time, mentoring, and professional development for teachers. The school also required students to enroll in one of two newly created learning academies and increased social and emotional support for the entire school community. After the first year of SIG-funded changes, the school saw double-digit gains in both math and reading. There is still plenty of room for improvement, but data show that things are moving in the right direction: in 2014 the four year graduation rate for Frederick Douglass High School was up to 57 percent.

DESCRIPTION

The School Improvement Grants (SIG) program provides funds to address the needs of low performing districts and schools identified for improvement under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Through FY 2016, the program was funded through a set-aside of Title I LEA grants under Section 1003(a) and a line item appropriation under Section 1003(g). Beginning in FY 2017, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) eliminated the separate line item appropriation for SIG and increased the set-aside percentage. Under ESSA, the program continues to prioritize funding to the lowest performing schools demonstrating the greatest need for funds and the strongest commitment to ensuring the money is used to meet the Act’s goals.

ESSA eliminated SIG as a separate program, but increased the State set-aside for school improvement from 4% to 7% from each State’s Title I allocation. The FY 2017 budget request for Title I equals the combined FY 2016 Title I and School Improvement Grants (SIG) funding.
FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT's REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIG</td>
<td>$505.76</td>
<td>$505.76</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td>$0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SIG is funded through a set-aside of Title I; separate line item eliminated under Every Student Succeeds Act.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The School Improvement Grants program continues to play a critical role in efforts to implement rigorous interventions in the persistently lowest performing schools. The absence of SIG funding in the president’s budget proposal reflects the increased set-aside of Title I funds for the same purpose under ESSA.

PROGRAM NEED

SIG funding dropped to its lowest level in FY 2016. This lower funding level has meant fewer available grants for schools in need at a time when Congress should be increasing the investment in our nation’s lowest-performing schools. SIG provides assistance for important national priorities — raising student achievement and closing achievement gaps — and grant funding can help underwrite proven strategies such as recruiting talented teachers and principals, extending learning time, providing high quality professional development, and targeting support to the most disadvantaged and struggling students. The SIG program’s reliance entirely on a set-aside for funding beginning in FY 2017, as outlined in ESSA, underscores the need for Congress to provide significant increases in the overall Title I program moving forward.

CONTACT INFO

Manish Naik
Council of the Great City Schools
(202) 393-2427  | mnaik@cgcs.org
High School Graduation Initiative
Title I, Part H, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)

In 2010, the U.S. Department of Education selected Massachusetts as one of two State recipients and one of 29 projects nationwide for the federal High School Graduation Initiative. The Massachusetts grant project, known as MassGrad, focused on 133 high schools throughout Massachusetts that exceeded the statewide annual dropout rate of 2.9 percent in the 2008-09 school year. The goal of this program was to support statewide and local efforts for high school dropout prevention, intervention, and recovery. As of 2015, Massachusetts has reduced the annual dropout number by over 3,700 students while increasing the number of students graduating by close to 4 percent.

DESCRIPTION

The High School Graduation Initiative (HSGI) was first funded in FY 2010 at $50 million. The HSGI replaced the School Dropout Prevention Program which last received funding in FY 2006. Awards go to State departments of education and local school districts to reduce the number of students dropping out before completing secondary school, using proven strategies to assist youth who have dropped out to reenter school. Activities include early identification of students at risk of dropping out, programs to encourage youth to reenter school, credit-recovery programs, interventions to increase school completion, and transition services for students moving from middle to high school.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$46.27</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>- - *</td>
<td>$0 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Program eliminated in FY 2015 Omnibus Appropriations.
**Program authorization repealed under the Every Student Succeeds Act.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The Administration did not include funding for this critical program in its budget. A dedicated funding stream must be provided for the High School Graduation Initiative in order to ensure States and districts are supporting students at risk of dropping out or who have already dropped out to complete their high school education successfully.

PROGRAM NEED

Congress eliminated the High School Graduation Initiative in the FY 2015 Omnibus Appropriations bill, and the program authorization was repealed through the Every Student Succeeds Act. No new grants have been awarded to States or local school districts since FY 2010. The elimination of this program will erode the gains made by schools and students across the country by further reducing the resources available to middle and high schools to help all students graduate.
The High School Graduation Initiative is the only federal program specifically targeted toward reducing the nation’s dropout rate. According to the 2013 report *Building a Grad Nation: Progress and Challenge in Ending the High School Dropout Epidemic*, the national high school graduation rate has increased 6.5 percent since 2001 with an average growth of 1.25 percentage points each year from 2006 to 2010. Recent figures from the National Center for Education Statistics show this trend continuing. For the 2013-14 school year, the average graduation rate was 82 percent, up from 81 percent in 2012-13 and 80 percent in 2011-12. Grants such as HSGI help schools continue on the path toward the goal of a 100 percent national graduation rate, ensuring every student receives a high school diploma.

### CONTACT INFO

**David Chodak**  
National Association of Secondary School Principals  
(703) 860-7338  |  chodakd@nassp.org
Comprehensive Literacy Program

Title I, Part E, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)
Title II, Part B, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

The six states receiving funds from the Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy (SRCL) Program all report increases in literacy achievement for participating students. Texas SRCL districts achieved double digit gains in the percentage of students passing the State’s grades five and eight reading assessments. In Nevada, literacy proficiency for participating tenth and eleventh graders climbed from 28 to 51 percent in two years, and proficiency rates for disadvantaged students rose from 26 to 46 percent. Pennsylvania’s SRCL program produced substantial and statistically significant gains on norm-referenced reading tests, which measure individual student performance relative to that of other test takers. In School Year (SY) 2013–14, Pennsylvania’s results showed greater percentages of students across grade levels scoring in the upper quartile and a reduction in the percentage of students scoring in the lowest quartile. In addition, Louisiana State English Language Arts assessment results showed gains in all SRCL districts. For example, during SY 2013–14, the proportion of sixth grade students reading on grade level increased from 65 to 80 percent.

DESCRIPTION

The Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Program (SRCL) first received funding in FY 2010 for the development of a comprehensive literacy program. The purpose of the program was to advance literacy skills, including pre-literacy skills, reading, and writing, for students from birth through grade 12, including limited English proficient students and students with disabilities. One-half of 1 percent of funds goes to Bureau of Indian Education activities, one-half of 1 percent for outlying areas, and up to 5 percent may be used for national activities conducted by the Secretary of Education. The remaining funds were distributed in 2011 through a competitive five-year grant program to six States. At least 95 percent of grant funds must be distributed to local school districts with priority to entities serving the greatest number/percentage of disadvantaged students in low performing schools. Local school districts may use these funds to help improve literacy instruction as well as support intervention activities. With FY 2016 funding, it is expected that a new grant competition will be announced. In addition, as part of Title II (Part B, Subpart 2, Section 2221) of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), a new comprehensive literacy program is authorized based on SRCL. This new program is called the “Literacy Education for All, Results for the Nation (LEARN)” program.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT's REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$158.00</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
<td>$190.00</td>
<td>$190.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Programs included in ESSA, Title II, Part B National Activities are authorized through a percentage set-aside; however, the president’s budget includes specific funding levels for these programs.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The proposed $190 million for Comprehensive Literacy Development Grants is designated as the successor to the SRCL program. Under this program States could receive competitive awards to support the implementation of comprehensive State literacy plans, primarily through subgrants to school districts to fund evidenced-based pre-literacy and literacy interventions in high need schools. The LEARN program builds on the success of the SRCL program, providing States competitive grants to help local districts develop comprehensive literacy instruction plans focused on high quality instruction and evidence-based intervention.
strategies for all students birth to grade 12. Local school districts will use federal funds to support high quality professional development for teachers, teacher leaders, principals and specialized instructional support personnel to improve literacy instruction for struggling readers and writers, including English language learners and students with disabilities.

ESSA replaced Striving Readers with the new Literacy Education for All, Results for the Nation (LEARN) program.

PROGRAM NEED

Young Americans who leave public school without the ability to read, write, speak, and think effectively will be ill-equipped to meet the demands of college, career, and citizenship. Recent results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) show that more than 60 percent of fourth graders and 60 percent of eighth graders struggle with reading in some manner and, therefore, require targeted instructional support. NAEP results also reveal almost half of students of color and students from low-income families enter fifth grade with skills below the basic level on NAEP. Many of the more than 700,000 students who leave American high schools each year without a diploma have low literacy skills. For those students who earn a diploma, an increasing number must take remedial coursework upon entering college without promising results, as students who enroll in a remedial reading course are less likely to eventually earn a degree or certificate.

Without essential literacy skills to master academic course work, students lose the motivation and confidence vital to maintaining their investment in learning. Furthermore, students who do not read or write well are more likely to be retained in school, drop out of high school, become teen parents, or enter the juvenile justice system. Educators need a stronger background in literacy instruction, so they can equip students with the reading and writing skills to learn rigorous content and graduate prepared for the modern world.

CONTACT INFO

Ellen Fern
Washington Partners, LLC
(202) 349-2306   |  efern@wpllc.net
Innovative Approaches to Literacy

Title V, Part D, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)
Title II, Part B, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

Maryetta (OK) School District is an economically depressed community near the end of the “Trail of Tears.” Maryetta is using its grant to improve literacy for its 624 students (K-8) through an intensive Reading Everyday for Academic Development (iREAD) project. Projects are targeted at early readers, as well as motivating older students to continue reading. Maryetta has distributed books for students to read at home and is offering high quality literacy and technology tools.

The Chilton (TX) Independent School District received a grant to enhance literacy programs for students and parents. Chilton is providing books and e-readers for home use, developing literacy programs for students at various age and reading levels, implementing a Family Literacy Night, and developing Parent ESL and GED programs for parents to develop their reading skills along with their children.

DESCRIPTION

From 2002 to 2010, the Improving Literacy through School Libraries program was the primary source of federal funding for school libraries. However, in recent years the president and Congress have consolidated, reduced, or eliminated funding for this important program. In FY 2012 Senators Jack Reed (D-RI) and Thad Cochran (R-MS) recognized the need for a direct funding source for school libraries in the federal budget and were successful in redirecting Department of Education funding to create the Innovative Approaches to Literacy program (IAL). At least half the money appropriated to IAL must be allocated as a competitive grant program for underserved school libraries. The remaining money is allocated through competitive grants to national non-profit organizations that work to improve childhood literacy.

Many school libraries across the United States have a hard time keeping books and materials up to date when local school districts are faced with deep budget cuts. The average copyright date of materials in a school library in a North Dakota high school is 1965, with books on the shelves dating back as far as the 1930s. This North Dakota high school is not an exception. Many schools across the country face this very same problem. How can students prepare for 21st century careers, if they are reading materials that still refer to East and West Germany as contemporary nations or imply that space travel is science fiction?

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$25.00*</td>
<td>$25.00*</td>
<td>$27.00*</td>
<td>$27.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Funded under The Fund for the Improvement of Education.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2017 request to Congress includes $27 million for the IAL program. This would mean a funding freeze for this important early literacy initiative which supports upgrades to substandard school libraries, integration of technology literacy tools, book distribution, and targeted literacy programs for early and older readers and families. Highly effective school libraries provide the tools and resources for education professionals to collaborate on curriculum, materials, and instructional strategies, leading to better and more effective ways to
teach students. A funding freeze for IAL continues a critical collaboration in many of the country’s poorest schools. A 2015 report by the Southern Education Foundation found that a majority of U.S. public school students come from low-income families. The IAL program is vital for these struggling families seeking to improve educational opportunities.

PROGRAM NEED

The impact of sequestration was particularly difficult on school libraries and non-profits addressing critical child literacy needs, the former continuing to face severe underfunding from the federal government. Funding for IAL remains below the FY 2012 appropriations level of $28.57 million. The result will be no grant money for many low-income school libraries that can benefit greatly from IAL and fewer opportunities for children to receive literacy training. Families will continue to struggle to keep pace with literacy and technology gaps without this important support program.

The program must be maintained, at a minimum, at $27 million in FY 2017 so all students have access to 21st century library and literacy programs.

The FY 2012-16 appropriations included funds (FY 2012 = $28.6 million, FY 2013 = $27.1 million, FY 2014 = $25 million, FY 2015 = $25 million, FY 2016 = $27 million) within the Fund for the Improvement of Education for a literacy initiative (Innovative Approaches to Literacy). Through FY 2014 no less than 50% of funds were available for school libraries. The budget proposes $27 million for the new Innovative Approaches to Literacy in ESSA.

CONTACT INFO

Kevin Maher
American Library Association
(202) 628-8410  |  kmaher@alawash.org
Impact Aid

Title VIII, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)
Title VII, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

“The Central Union School District, located in the San Joaquin Valley of California, educates children of both Native American descent and those with a military connection. Without the support of the Impact Aid program, our district would be challenged with providing top quality educational opportunities and services for these young boys and girls as we prepare them for their future. The Impact Aid funding for our district allows us to maintain programs like art, music and physical education, to have a competitive salary schedule to attract teachers, and to provide educational technology opportunities for students. For Central Union, Impact Aid is not just an enhancement; rather it is essential to what we do for all of the children in our district.”

- Thomas Addington, Superintendent

DESCRIPTION

Impact Aid is a partnership between public school districts and the federal government where school districts have significant non-taxable property, such as military installations, Native Trust land, low-rent housing facilities, and communities with national parks and laboratories. Funds may be used for any general fund purpose and, nationwide, benefit 1,300 school districts enrolling more than 11 million students.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Property</td>
<td>$66.81</td>
<td>$66.81</td>
<td>$66.81</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Support</td>
<td>$1,151.23</td>
<td>$1,151.23</td>
<td>$1,168.23</td>
<td>$1,168.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Payments</td>
<td>$48.32</td>
<td>$48.32</td>
<td>$48.32</td>
<td>$48.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$17.41</td>
<td>$17.41</td>
<td>$17.41</td>
<td>$17.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>$4.84</td>
<td>$4.84</td>
<td>$4.84</td>
<td>$71.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,288.61</td>
<td>$1,288.61</td>
<td>$1,305.60</td>
<td>$1,305.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Once again, the Administration’s budget request shortchanges students in federally connected school districts. The proposed elimination of Federal Properties funding for the fifth year in a row would be disastrous for the 239 school district recipients that rely on these general fund dollars for a variety of critical programs and services. It is unacceptable that the Administration proposes to shift funding from 239 school districts to cover the costs of about a dozen school facilities. As long as the federal government owns property within a community, it must maintain its obligation to those communities for the loss of local taxes. The continued stagnation of Impact Aid is concerning. School districts’ needs and costs continue to increase, as do local taxpayers’ contributions. Without continued and increased support for Impact Aid, the federal government fails to meet its obligation to federally impacted school districts.

PROGRAM NEED

The $67.5 million sequester of Impact Aid in FY 2013 had a devastating impact on federally impacted schools. As one of the first programs to be cut, district leaders were forced to make tough choices including reductions in staff, increased class sizes, cuts to afterschool and arts programs, reduced professional
development, fewer bus routes, and delays in technology upgrades and facilities maintenance. While a nearly full restoration of Impact Aid in FY 2014 and a $17 million increase in FY 2016 were welcome relief, tighter discretionary spending in the out years presents a continuing worry to federally impacted schools about the ability of the federal government to maintain its tax obligation.

The Impact Aid program has not been fully funded since 1969. Over the past decade, appropriated levels have not kept pace with increasing education costs (see chart), which for Basic Support has resulted in districts receiving an increasingly lower percentage of their calculated need-based payment (a percentage of a district’s maximum payment). In order to restore the Basic Support Program to 100 percent, the basic need established by Congress, $100 million is needed. Simply to maintain last year’s payment level, $23 million would be necessary. An $8 million increase for Federal Properties would offset newly eligible districts as a result of the Every Student Succeeds Act and ensure sufficient funding for all school districts in the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Dept of ED Payment Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>136.949% of LOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>136.930% of LOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>129.870% of LOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td>115.524% of LOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011</td>
<td>97.066% of LOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012</td>
<td>96.109% of LOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013</td>
<td>88% of LOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>90%-93% of LOT*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>91%-94% of LOT*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Represents estimated final rates.

The budget proposes to eliminate $67 million from payments for federal property and increase facilities maintenance by that same amount.

**CONTACT INFO**

**Jocelyn Bissonnette**
National Association of Federally Impacted Schools
(202) 624-5455 | jocelyn@nafisdc.org
Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants
Title II, Part A, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind Act)
Title II, Part A, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

Since 2010, Toledo, Ohio elementary schools have implemented an intensive reading program called RAISE: Reading Academy Intensive Support Education. This intensive intervention program, designed for 3rd graders not scoring at a proficient level on standardized testing, uses research-based strategies to address the five essential components of literacy instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, reading comprehension, and writing skills. The program provides teachers with a prescribed 90 minute daily instructional framework paired with coordinated professional development for 3rd grade teachers. Across the 3rd grades where the program has been implemented, program data have shown about a 50 percent increase in reading proficiency, exemplifying the effectiveness of this professional development program.

DESCRIPTION

The Supporting Effective Instruction State Grant program, currently known as the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, focuses on improving student academic achievement by bolstering skills development and expertise of teachers and principals and increasing the number of high quality teachers and principals in schools. The large majority of Title II funding is distributed by formula to local school districts, with a separate allocation for National Activities.

Under the new Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), the formula for distributing funding both among and within States is modified so that the percentage of students living in poverty (compared to the percentage of all children) is given more weight than previously.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,349.83</td>
<td>$2,349.83</td>
<td>$2,349.83</td>
<td>$ 2,250.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget proposes to fund Supporting Effective Instruction State grants significantly below the FY 2016 enacted level. However, this allocation no longer includes the Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED) program set-aside, which now has a separate authorization. The Administration’s $99.83 million reduction in proposed funding mirrors the FY 2016 enacted $94 million SEED set-aside.
PART 1 - ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

PROGRAM NEED

This essential program has an ESSA authorization maximum of $2.29 billion, a reduction of $54 million from the appropriated level of the past few years, and lower than any appropriated level for more than a decade. The Administration proposes to fund this program at a level even below that historic low. The important role played by teachers in enabling student success is well documented, and the Administration has placed increased emphasis on the preparation and performance of teachers and school leaders. States may use these funds to develop and improve evaluation and support systems for teachers and principals and to reduce class size to evidence-based levels. However, without significant funding, those efforts will be severely impeded.

CONTACT INFO

Sarah Cohen
American Federation of Teachers
(202) 879-4452  |  scohen@aft.org

In FY 2012 and FY 2013 up to 1.5% was set-aside for a national competitive grant program for educator professional development (SEED). In FY 2014, the set-aside was increased to 2%. In FY 2015, it was increased to 2.3% and broadened to include civic education. In FY 2016, the SEED set-aside is increased to 4% or $93.923 million. ESSA revised the Teacher Quality State grants as the new Supporting Effective Instruction program. It eliminated the SEED set-aside and authorized SEED as a separate program under Title II, Part B, Subpart 4. The president’s budget funds SEED at $100 million.
Mathematics and Science Partnerships
Title II, Part B, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)

The Southeast Alaska Small Schools Math Network provides educators professional development focused on improving and increasing mathematical content knowledge and on acquiring pedagogical skills essential for teaching that content. A coalition of four small southeast Alaskan school districts, (Craig City, Hydaburg City, Southeast Island, and Klawock City School Districts) work with the University of Alaska Southeast Mathematics Department and School of Education to assure teachers can implement the new Alaska State Math Standards and provide the highest quality math education. The network of schools can support each other, pool resources and intentionally focus on the quality of instruction in rural schools. The project focuses on K-8 classroom teachers, as they historically have had the least university level math content coursework and opportunities to learn math methods covering all mathematical strands. The grant provides rich diverse opportunities to meet the teachers’ needs to increase math knowledge, improve deeper understanding, and develop best practices in teaching.

DESCRIPTION

The Mathematics and Science Partnerships program is designed to improve academic achievement in mathematics and science through the enhancement of teaching skills at the elementary and secondary levels. Funds are distributed by formula to State departments of education. States in turn offer competitive grants to partnerships comprised of local school districts in greatest need, higher education institutions or relevant departments within those institutions, and other eligible entities. Partnership grants focus on increasing rigor in and improving science and math curricula aligned with State and local standards, improving teacher competence through high quality professional development, and training teachers in effective integration of technology into curriculum and instruction.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$149.72</td>
<td>$152.72</td>
<td>$152.72</td>
<td>$0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Program authorization repealed under the Every Student Succeeds Act.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget requests $2.25 billion for Title II of the Every Student Succeeds Act. The new law eliminates the Mathematics and Science Partnerships and instead allows states to decide how to spend professional development dollars without a required focus on math and science teachers. Current partnerships provide important professional development and curriculum reforms to help schools improve the quality of STEM education and transition to new math and science standards.
Though recent National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) scores show improvements in math and science achievement, the gains are small and concerns about overall student performance in these subjects persist. Further, the implementation of the Common Core mathematics standards and Next Generation Science Standards underscore the need for resources for educators in these fields. The Math and Science Partnerships program provides vital resources to States for professional development opportunities for teachers critical to improving student achievement in these disciplines.

CONTACT INFO

Della Cronin
Washington Partners, LLC
(202) 349-2322 | dcronin@wpllc.net
21st Century Community Learning Centers
Title IV, Part B, Elementary & Secondary Education Act

SHINE (Schools and Homes in Education) afterschool program, a 21st CCLC program led by Lehigh Carbon Community College in rural Pennsylvania, serves 600 preK–12 students and their families in seven school districts across rural northeast Pennsylvania. Seventy-nine percent of students are low income, 29 percent are minorities, and 30 percent have special needs. The SHINE elementary and middle school program operates three hours a day, four days a week. Transportation and meals are provided with 1-2 hours of STEM, tutoring, and physical and cultural activities aligned with classroom instruction. Afterschool sites are staffed by two teachers and two education majors from community colleges. Local business partners contribute time and money, and STEM professionals contribute to curriculum development. From 2007 to 2012, more than 1,600 first through fifth grade students participated in SHINE, with 79 percent showing improved academic performance and 92 percent with exceptionally good or satisfactory attendance.

DESCRIPTION

The 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) program provides grants to local communities for afterschool programs serving students in low performing schools. Programs are run by schools and/or community organizations in partnership and can also serve children before school and in the summer months. Services include academic enrichment programs to help students meet State and local standards and activities to complement the regular academic program, such as hands-on activities, counseling programs, art, music and more. Under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), 21st CCLC was reauthorized and strengthened to include additional allowable uses such as financial literacy, environmental education, STEM activities, fitness, and nutrition education. ESSA also updated performance metrics and included language allowing funds to be used for activities included as part of expanded learning programs where at least 300 hours are added during the year, schools partner with community organizations, and activities don’t supplant existing programs.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,149.37</td>
<td>$1,151.67</td>
<td>$1,166.67</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget proposal would reduce the 21st CCLC program to the level authorized in the Every Student Succeeds Act, a cut of $167 million below the FY 2016 funding level. This represents the first proposed decrease by an Administration of 21st CCLC funding in more than eight years and would result in more than 168,000 children losing access to high quality afterschool and summer learning programs. Today more than 11 million children go home alone after the school day ends. While 10.2 million children are in a variety of afterschool programs, another 19.4 million children would be enrolled by their parents if programs were available or affordable. Currently 1.6 million young people are served by the 21st CCLC program. Increased costs associated with hiring and retaining qualified program staff, as well as increased demand for programs among students and parents, necessitate an increase in funding rather than a dramatic cut.
**PROGRAM NEED**

Cutting the 21st CCLC program by $167 million below the FY 2016 appropriation will result in denying a significant number of young people important learning opportunities during afterschool, before school and summer hours. The outcomes of student participation in 21st CCLC are clear: Students who attended 21st CCLC programs made significant improvements in classroom behavior, homework completion, and class participation. Students also made gains in their math and English grades. Another study indicates regular participation in afterschool programs by students during the elementary school years resulted in narrowing the math achievement gap at grade five between high-income and low-income students, improved work habits, and reduction in the number of school absences. Closing achievement gaps and equalizing opportunity require the combination of quality, commitment, and time provided through 21st CCLC programs supported by strong evidence and research.

**CONTACT INFO**

**Erik Peterson**  
Afterschool Alliance  
(202) 347-2030  |  epeterson@afterschoolalliance.org

**Ellen Fern**  
Washington Partners, LLC  
(202) 349-2306  |  efern@wpllc.net
Grants for State Assessment

Title VI, Part A, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)
Title I, Part B, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

**DESCRIPTION**

These grants encourage and support State efforts to develop and implement high quality standards and assessments to measure the academic achievement of all students. Continued federal support for these grants is particularly critical as many States transition to more college- and career-ready digital assessments. These new assessments present increased upfront costs to many States, but will lead to long-term cost savings for the country.

**FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$378.00</td>
<td>$378.00</td>
<td>$378.00</td>
<td>$403.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

This program provides formula and competitive funds to develop and implement assessments required under the new Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). In addition, funds may be used to develop instruments aligned to college- and career-ready standards with a focus on accurately measuring student growth, more reliably measuring teacher effectiveness, and helping teachers tailor instruction. The president has proposed a 6.6 percent increase for State assessments, funding that would go a long way toward covering the costs of developing and administering high quality assessment systems that can capture a fuller picture of what students know and are able to do, including tests for English language learners and students with disabilities that reflect each student’s level of mastery.

PROGRAM NEED

Preserving and expanding this grant program is necessary for States to support costly assessments required under current law, as well as the transition and full implementation of college- and career-ready standards and assessments. In past years appropriation levels for this program have reached only a fraction of what is needed. Continued funding for this program must adequately support State implementation or improvement of new digital assessments.

CONTACT INFO

Peter Zamora  
Council of Chief State School Officers  
(202) 336-7003  |  Peter.Zamora@ccsso.org
Education for Homeless Children and Youth
Title VII, Part B, McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

“Since 2008, the Independence School District has seen more than a 65 percent increase in homeless students. Many of these students have experienced traumatic and unpredictable living conditions, which often result in social, developmental and educational gaps. The district’s program, supported in large part by a McKinney-Vento subgrant, provides immeasurable supports and services to students and families, ultimately creating a framework capable of fostering resiliency. The staff and resources provided through the grant allow identified students to receive the additional support and direct services they need to achieve academic and social success. Specifically, the grant provides essential wraparound services, as well as scholarships for early education and before and after school care, tutoring, and counseling. Without the subgrant, districts are not able to provide the same vast array of services that are needed to address the many challenges students in homeless situations face on a daily basis.”

- Nicole A Sequeira, MSW, McKinney-Vento Liaison, Independence School District, Missouri Public Schools

DESCRIPTION

The Education for Homeless Children and Youth (EHCY) Program is the education subtitle of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. Under this program, school districts must maintain students who become homeless at their school of origin, if in their best interest, by providing transportation each day even if they move due to their housing situation. If it is not in their best interest to stay in the same school, McKinney-Vento allows students to enroll in a new school immediately, with or without the records normally required in order to limit educational disruption.

Funding from McKinney-Vento also supports State coordinators and homeless assistance liaisons in school districts to help identify homeless students and assist with school enrollment. Funds may also be used to provide an array of services including transportation, counseling, school supplies, and assessment; professional development for educators; and, referrals for community services.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$65.04</td>
<td>$65.04</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
<td>$85.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

Public schools enrolled over 1.3 million homeless children and youth in the 2013-14 school year, a 7 percent increase over the previous year and a 100 percent increase since the beginning of the recession (2006-07). The FY 2016 budget included an additional 7 percent over the previous year, the first time the funding level had increased since 2009. In addition, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) authorizes a funding level of $85 million beginning in FY2017, a 21 percent increase over the previously authorized level. ESSA also made several amendments to the EHCY program, including new requirements for appropriate capacity for State and local personnel, better identification of homeless children and youth, enhanced school stability, and special protections for preschool children and unaccompanied homeless youth.
President Obama’s FY 2017 budget request of $85 million matches the funding level authorized in the Every Student Succeeds Act. This increase is significant and will be helpful for school districts to implement the new requirements under ESSA. However, as school districts continue to see increases in their homeless student population, additional funding will be needed for schools and teachers to respond to this epic problem and meet children’s educational and health needs.

PROGRAM NEED

This program helps mitigate some of the negative consequences of homelessness for children. According to the National Center on Family Homelessness, homeless children are four times as likely as other children to be sick, twice as likely to repeat a grade, four times as likely to have developmental delays, and twice as likely to have learning disabilities. The stability provided by McKinney-Vento helps prevent homeless students from falling behind in their schoolwork, despite the instability they experience outside of school. Students can receive services such as tutoring or other instructional supports, referrals for health services, transportation, clothing, and school supplies.

CONTACT INFO

Cara Baldari
First Focus
(202) 657-0640  |  carab@firstfocus.org
Rural Education Achievement Program
Title VI, Part B, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)
Title V, Part B, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

Fulda Public Schools is a small rural K-12 school district that serves the community of Fulda, Minnesota, enrolling approximately 341 students. The school district is located in southwest Minnesota about 15 miles north of Interstate 90 on U.S. Highway 59. Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) funding allows the school district to provide a variety of services to its students and school. Without REAP the district would not have the funds available to sustain the level of technology students currently receive. Fulda Public Schools uses REAP funds to make sure its computer labs have computers and software that meet current standards. They also have used the funds to replace old access points in buildings, enabling wireless connections to function at a high level for the 1:1 computer initiative in the classrooms.

DESCRIPTION

The Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) assists small and low-income rural districts raise student achievement where factors such as geographic isolation, poverty, and small enrollment might adversely impact the overall operation of the district. REAP is divided into two separate programs: the Small and Rural Schools Achievement Program and the Rural and Low-Income Schools Program.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$169.84</td>
<td>$169.84</td>
<td>$175.84</td>
<td>$175.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president freezes REAP funding at the FY 2016 level, proposing $175.84 million for FY 2017. This proposal is well below the authorized $300 million amount. The freeze in funding, paired with the costs of implementing the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), means our nation’s rural schools will continue to face funding pressures.
PROGRAM NEED

While funding REAP at the fully authorized amount of $300 million would be a welcome step, the reality of current budget constraints at the federal level make this highly unlikely. A more modest increase, funding REAP at an increase of $25 million for a total of $200 million, would help rural districts overcome the additional costs associated with geographic isolation, a smaller number of students, higher transportation and employee benefit costs, and increased poverty.

CONTACT INFO

Noelle Ellerson
AASA: The School Superintendents Association
(703) 875-0764  | nellerson@aasa.org
Comprehensive Centers
Title II, Sec. 203, Education Technical Assistance Act

The Center on Great Teachers and Leaders (GTL Center) and Great Lakes Comprehensive Center (GLCC) partnered to support the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) on developing social and emotional learning standards for the State. GLCC, with support from the GTL Center on content expertise, served as the project lead and facilitated MDE’s team meetings. The draft standards are now complete and under review. Staff from the GTL Center and GLCC were integral to ensure the standards were rooted in best practice and the development process built synergy across MDE departments around social and emotional learning and school climate. MDE, GLCC, and the GTL Center are planning focus groups with educators to further strengthen the standards, as well as develop guidance documents to assist in rolling these new standards out with the field.

DESCRIPTION

The Comprehensive Centers (CC) help States implement the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and other federal school improvement programs. In turn, this technical assistance builds States’ capacity to assist districts and schools. There are two types of centers – regional comprehensive centers which mainly serve State departments of education within a region, and content centers offering specific expertise and research-based information and products for use throughout the regional network in their work with State departments of education.

The FY 2016 omnibus appropriations act included $1.5 million to establish a new comprehensive center on students at risk of not attaining full literacy skills due to a disability. The authorization for the center is in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), Title II, Part B, National Activities.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$48.45</td>
<td>$48.45</td>
<td>$51.45</td>
<td>$55.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s proposal would increase funding for Comprehensive Centers by $4 million in FY 2017. This additional support will help States adapt to their expanded roles and responsibilities under the new ESSA framework for accountability and school improvement.

PROGRAM NEED

A 2011 independent evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers program found Centers were instrumental in building State capacity and produced high quality, relevant, and useful materials, resulting in greater demand for services than Centers could meet. Additional funding is required to support a new cohort of Centers that will reflect changing priorities and new demands under ESSA. The new Centers will provide expanded support for building State capacity to implement reforms that improve student learning and close achievement and graduation rate gaps, consistent with the expanded roles and responsibilities of States.
**Contact Info**

John Waters  
Knowledge Alliance  
(202) 507-6277  |  waters@knowledgeall.net

---

**Education Technology**

Title II, Part D, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)  
Title IV, Part A, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

“Our educators support full funding of Title IV so States and districts can adequately invest in education technology initiatives and technology professional development for educators. In the past, funds have supported Wisconsin educators to enhance their understanding of how technology can best be used to improve student learning. For many schools, education technology funds are the sole resource for access to powerful learning communities. Often funds are the only source for professional development on emerging technologies that provide students with the skills necessary to compete in the modern-day workforce. Federal education technology funding has helped rural districts form professional learning communities that provide ongoing training to educators. Specifically, the Janesville School District used these funds to deliver robust professional development and training that enhanced the way teachers use technology in the classroom to successfully engage students and advance student learning.”

– The Wisconsin Educational Media Technology Association

**Description**

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) no longer includes a specific education technology program. The previously authorized Enhancing Education Through Technology Program (EETT), last funded in 2011, has been eliminated. Instead, the education technology provisions have been embedded in the new Title IV-A flexible block grant program.

Under this flex grant, each State will receive a Title I formula based allocation, which will be distributed to local school districts under the same formula. Any school district that receives an amount above $30,000 must expend 20 percent of its grant on safe and healthy school programs and another 20 percent on “well-rounded” education programs (e.g., civics, STEM, AP/IB). The remaining 60 percent can be spent on technology, blended learning, and professional development. No more than 15 percent of a district's dollars may be spent on devices, equipment, software and digital content. If a district receives an allocation below $30,000, the law does not require a needs assessment or setting aside percentages for well rounded and safe and healthy student programs. The 15 percent technology purchase cap would continue to apply. Congress intends some of these technology dollars to be used to help bridge the homework gap, providing support for devices and strategies that will improve connectivity for those students unconnected or underconnected to broadband in their homes.

**Funding History (in millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 President’s Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Program was eliminated under ESSA, with some functions included in Title IV, Part A. Programs in the block grant are authorized through a percentage set-aside.
IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2017 budget proposal only provides $500 million, or slightly less than one third of the authorized level, in funding for the Title IV flexible block grant, including the education technology provisions. The Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants program is the third largest authorized program in ESSA. Failing to fully fund the program, as the president’s budget proposes, will undermine bipartisan congressional intent in passing this important law and seriously hinder States’ and districts’ ability to carry out the spirit of ESSA. The Administration also proposes appropriations language allowing States to distribute $50,000 annually to districts on a competitive basis and to limit spending to just one of three listed priorities or specific activities. Congress specifically created a formula grant program and allocating funds competitively means some districts may not receive any Title IV-A monies.

Full funding of Title IV would allow States and districts to spend up to $1 billion of all flex grant monies on education technology initiatives, $150 million of which may be used for actual technology and devices.

A federal investment in support of digital learning is absolutely essential as schools implement personalized instruction, data driven decision making and accountability, digital textbooks, technology professional learning, and online assessments.
PROGRAM NEED

To meet the increasing demands for technology implementation in classrooms and the need for professional development, Title IV should receive maximum funding so districts can adequately support the growth and expansion of digital learning in classrooms. This investment is necessary to create a competitive workforce, technology-proficient educators, well equipped classrooms, sufficiently supported administrative structures, and a curriculum optimized to take advantage of the benefits technology offers to students. The federal government must continue to invest in these key components of digital teaching and learning as schools cannot afford to make these significant investments alone. Additionally, funding technology professional development, hardware and software, and district capacity will leverage the WiFi and broadband infrastructure investments in schools and libraries under the E-Rate program, with its annual cap of $4.9 billion.

The use of technology has opened a wide array of exciting learning avenues in classrooms—from streaming educational videos to 3D printing to hands-on robotics. Teachers no longer stand statically in front of a chalkboard and lecture. Instead they cultivate digital resources and foster creativity by utilizing a plethora of learning devices that engage students in all aspects of learning. Rather than learning solely from their desks, students use technology to collaborate to solve real-world problems, collectively analyze and use data to create advanced science models, and sharpen 21st Century workforce skills. Maximum funding of Title IV would ensure the federal government prioritizes support for the shift to modern classrooms and that all students, regardless of where they live, have the opportunity to engage in digital learning.

CONTACT INFO

Ally Bernstein
International Society for Technology in Education
(202) 263-2956  |  ally@jbernsteinstrategy.com
Student Support and Academic Enrichments Grants
Title IV, Part A, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

DESCRIPTION

The newly enacted Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) includes a flexible block grant program under Title IV, Part A, authorized at $1.65 billion annually. This grant authorizes activities in three broad areas: (1) providing students with a well-rounded education (e.g., college and career counseling, STEM, arts, civics, advanced placement); (2) supporting safe and healthy students (e.g., comprehensive school mental health, drug and violence prevention, health and physical education); and (3) supporting the effective use of technology. Under this grant, each State will receive an allocation based on the Title I funding formula. Using the same Title I formula, the States will then allocate funds to school districts. Any school district receiving a formula allocation above $30,000 must conduct a needs assessment and then must expend 20 percent of its grant on safe and healthy school activities and 20 percent on activities to provide a well-rounded education program. The district may spend the remaining 60 percent of these funds to support any of the three broad areas, but local school districts must spend at least a portion of their grant funds on activities to support the effective use of technology. However, no more than 15 percent of a district’s dollars may be spent on devices, equipment, software and digital content. If a district receives an allocation below $30,000, the law does not require a needs assessment or specific percentage set-asides for well-rounded and safe and healthy students programs. The 15 percent technology purchase cap would continue to apply.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2017 budget proposal would provide $500 million for the Title IV, Part A flexible block grant, less than one-third the authorized level. If fully funded, districts would have $1.65 billion to spend on technology initiatives, school counseling and mental health programs, and well-rounded school programs. The Administration also requested to include language in the appropriations bill that would allow States to distribute $50,000 per year to districts on a competitive basis and would allow States to limit their spending to just one of the three listed priorities, or specific activities within one of the priorities. Congress did not intend for Title IV, Part A funds to be distributed competitively, and adding this appropriations language would mean some districts might not receive any Title IV, Part A funds.

Given the elimination under ESSA of a number of programs focused on the overall health and safety of students, investments in education technology, and supports to help districts ensure access to a well-rounded education, a robust federal investment in support of these programs is essential. Since the Student Support and Academic Enrichments Grants program is the third largest authorized program in ESSA, failing to fully fund it as the president’s FY 2017 budget proposes to do will undermine the bipartisan congressional intent in passing this important law.

PROGRAM NEED

Evidence supports a direct correlation between health and learning that is essential to academic success, school completion, and the development of healthy, resilient, and productive citizens. Schools are uniquely positioned to help children and youth acquire lifelong, health promoting knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors through comprehensive health education, physical education, nutrition, comprehensive school mental and behavioral health services, counseling, and integration among all education and health programs.
Federal investments in education technology ensure schools have technology-proficient educators, well-equipped classrooms, sufficiently supported administrative structures, and a curriculum optimized to take advantage of the benefits technology offers to all students. The federal government must continue to invest in these key components of digital teaching and learning, as schools cannot afford to make these significant investments alone — the investments that provide students with the 21st century skills needed to be competitive in the modern workforce and close the learning and opportunity gaps. Maximum funding of Title IV, Part A would ensure the federal government prioritizes rich and well-rounded curricula, comprehensive school mental and behavioral support services, and digital learning and education technology.

**CONTACT INFO**

**TECHNOLOGY PROVISIONS**

**Ally Bernstein**  
International Society for Technology in Education  
(202) 263-2956  |  ally@jbernsteinstrategy.com

**SAFE AND HEALTHY PROVISIONS**

**Kelly Vaillancourt Strobach**  
National Association of School Psychologists  
(301) 657-0270  |  kvaillancourt@naspweb.org

**WELL-ROUNDED PROVISIONS**

**Megan Wolfe**  
ASCD  
(703) 575-5616  |  megan.wolfe@ascd.org
School Safety National Activities

Title IV, Part A, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)
Title IV, Part F, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

The Baltimore City School District was awarded a Project School Emergency Response to Violence (SERV) grant to provide resources and assistance to local school officials with ongoing recovery efforts following the unrest in Baltimore in April 2015. The nearly $300,000 Project SERV grant will enable the district to hire additional full-time social workers and psychologists to solely support the schools in restoring the learning environment. These additional school employees will conduct home visits for teacher-referred students in need of services, facilitate small group and/or individual sessions with students, prepare lesson plans for teachers to use in classrooms, and provide professional development and training for school staff.

DESCRIPTION

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (SDFSCA) was previously authorized as a national discretionary grant program focused on drug, violence, and bullying prevention, and school-based mental health services. For the last decade only the national programs have been funded. Now referred to as School Safety National Activities, these funds are used for State and local school safety and violence prevention activities in grades K-12 and in institutions of higher education. Activities may be carried out by States and local school districts and by other public and private non-profit organizations.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget proposes to increase funding for Title IV-F national programs. This $15 million increase would allow for the continuation of Project Prevent and School Climate Transformation Grant awards and related technical assistance launched in FY 2014 under the president’s Now is the Time initiative. New funds would be used to support additional Project Prevent grants to help schools and communities break the pervasive cycle of violence, as well as new School Safety and Preparedness grants to support school emergency operation plans at the local level. These grants would help schools train teachers and other school staff to implement evidence-based behavioral intervention strategies to improve school climate, facilitate emergency management and preparedness, and prevent drug use and violence by students. Other funds would be used under Project School Emergency Response to Violence (Project SERV) to provide education-related services to local school districts and institutions of higher education where the learning environment has been disrupted by a violent or traumatic crisis.
PROGRAM NEED

States and school districts annually pay billions of dollars to address the results of substance abuse, school violence, and unaddressed mental health needs. The economic costs to the nation increase when issues such as truancy, school dropout, juvenile detention and incarceration, and diminished academic success are not addressed. The ongoing effects of sequestration have resulted in further reductions for critical prevention services. Schools and districts continue to have an increasingly difficult time maintaining, much less strengthening, current school safety and prevention programs. With no other funding source for school violence prevention initiatives, school districts are typically directed to use Title I funds. That funding source is already stretched thin and scarcely meeting program needs, as the number of students in poverty remains at its highest level in 50 years.

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), includes a new Title IV formula grant, officially replacing the SDFSCA. The newly authorized Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants (see corresponding article) provide flexible funding to school districts to improve student outcomes through a wide range of activities, including those supporting safe and healthy students. This consolidated grant structure includes allowable uses under multiple competing needs and priorities, many of which schools are already struggling to meet. Even at its current budget request level, the formula-based allocation is insufficient to support meaningful uses of funds.

Funding under School Safety National Activities represents an important federal investment in successful prevention and intervention efforts. If the president’s proposal is adopted, this critical program targeting improved school climate through mental health services and prevention could reach additional schools and students. In the absence of these funds, local school districts will still have very limited options to implement such services and interventions.

ESSA eliminated this program, but safe and healthy students is one of the three required uses of funds in the new Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants program.
ESSA eliminated Safe and Drug-Free Schools National Activities, but replaced it with School Safety National Activities.

CONTACT INFO

Libby Nealis
MRM Associates, LLC
(202) 421-3526   |  libbynealis@yahoo.com
Elementary and Secondary School Counseling Program

Title V, Part D, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)

Westside Community Schools in Omaha, Nebraska, is using the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling Program (ESSCP) grant to improve academic success for all students, with an emphasis on closing the achievement gap for low-income students, and to promote positive behavioral, social and emotional development in all students. To accomplish this, the district is using the grant to hire two additional school counselors, one school psychologist, and one school social worker. Additionally the grant is being used to expand Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) to all schools, provide family resources to augment counseling curricula, and provide training to counselors and other district mental health personnel on working with low-income students. Funds also contribute to enhancing and improving the sustainability of the district’s use of the Boys Town Well Managed School social skills development framework and bolstering implementation of a developmentally appropriate comprehensive school counseling program across the district.

DESCRIPTION

The Elementary and Secondary School Counseling Program provides grants to school districts to establish or expand school counseling services. ESSCP is the only federal grant program providing funds to hire qualified school counselors, school social workers, and school psychologists. The goals of the program are to expand students’ access to counseling and mental health services and ultimately increase academic achievement and improve the climate for learning by addressing barriers to success.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESSCP</td>
<td>$49.56</td>
<td>$52.51</td>
<td>$49.56</td>
<td>$0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Program authorization repealed under the Every Student Succeeds Act. Program functions are allowable uses under the Title IV block grant.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The ESSCP was not reauthorized in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Activities under this important program and other vital programs have been subsumed in the newly authorized Title IV, Part A Student Support and Academic Enrichment block grant.

Despite a bipartisan authorization level of $1.65 billion for the Student Support and Academic Enrichment block grant under ESSA, the FY 2017 budget request includes a mere $500 million for a multitude of program activities once under several discretionary grant programs in No Child Left Behind. It is unclear how the block grant will be distributed to local school districts, so the amount of funds that will actually go to support comprehensive school counseling programs remains to be seen.
PROGRAM NEED

Historically the Department of Education consistently received ten times more applications than available funds and as a result only requested new grant applications every two years. This significant demand suggests school districts have a critical need for additional school counselors, school psychologists and school social workers. Moreover, it suggests students are in critical need of the services these professionals provide. Adequate funding for school districts to create and expand comprehensive school counseling programs is imperative.

CONTACT INFO

Amanda Fitzgerald
American School Counselor Association
(703) 683-2722  |  afitzgerald@schoolcounselor.org
Carol M. White Physical Education Program
Title V, Part D, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)

“Our district was awarded a $1.1 million PEP grant on our fourth attempt at applying. It was a dream come true for me as a physical educator! With the money, we were able to teach lifetime activities such as inline skating, golf, tennis, cross country skiing, snowshoeing and rock climbing. We were able to change the focus in our curriculum to provide as much movement as possible for students in our classes. With heart rate monitors and pedometers, we were able to teach the concepts of target heart rate and moderate-to-vigorous physical activity so students could learn how to increase their physical fitness and health. We received more professional development during our three year grant than we’d had in my previous 25+ years combined. Please do all you can to help keep the PEP Grant alive!!!”

—Carol Atkins, Glendaal Elementary School, Scotia-Glenville Central School District, New York

DESCRIPTION
As the only federal program dedicated to addressing physical education for elementary and secondary school students, the Carol M. White Physical Education Program (PEP) historically provided grants to schools, districts, and community-based organizations to help students meet State physical education standards. PEP was eliminated in the recently passed Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). A new block grant to States was created intended to provide more flexibility for schools and districts to fund a broad array of programs and activities, including those that support safe and healthy students and a well-rounded education. Given the research that supports the connection between student physical activity and higher academic performance, hopefully school and district leaders will access this new funding for physical activity and nutrition programs. (See related article on the new Title IV block grant.)

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$74.58</td>
<td>$44.05</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Program authorization repealed under the Every Student Succeeds Act. Program functions are allowable uses under the Title IV block grant.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET
The PEP program was the only federal education program designed to help students meet State physical education standards and the only program in the Department of Education’s Office of Safe and Healthy Students with a direct impact on student physical health. It has been a successful program since its inception in 2001. Despite previous attempts to eliminate the program, Congress continued funding PEP through FY 2016, awarding more than 1,100 grants totaling around $780 million. The president’s budget provides no funding for PEP and proposes to provide less than half of the authorized funding for all activities under ESSA-Title IV, Part A. At a time when the country battles a childhood obesity epidemic and the exorbitant health care costs associated with it, it is crucial to restore PEP funding or at least provide full funding for Title IV Part A to ensure access to physical education, nutrition education, and school-based physical activity opportunities for all students.
PROGRAM NEED

Due to the FY 2015 and FY 2016 cuts in PEP, no new grants were awarded. Only continuation awards were made. Even at the previously funded level of $75 million, the PEP program funded less than 10 percent of applications received by the Department of Education. Many of the grants are multi-year and require funding over two to three years. Elimination of the discrete funding for physical education programs under PEP will strike a severe blow to the thousands of schools working hard to maintain strong physical education programs, helping them become more relevant, accessible, and enjoyable, and contributing to the health, well-being, and academic achievement of K-12 students.

CONTACT INFO

Megan Wolfe
ASCD
(703) 575-5616 | megan.wolfe@ascd.org

Promise Neighborhoods

Title XIV, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009
Title IV, Part F, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

The Los Angeles Promise Neighborhood is transforming the communities of Pacoima and Hollywood by providing a continuum of integrated “cradle to college and career” services at traditional, charter, pilot, and partnership schools. Through an innovative public-private partnership with the City and County of Los Angeles and Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), the Promise Neighborhood is currently transforming 19 neighborhood schools into full-service community schools, serving over 25,000 students and approximately 9,020 families. The Los Angeles Promise Neighborhood and the Youth Policy Institute (YPI) focus on integrating wraparound services that include prenatal and early childhood development, extended learning time, linked learning, technology initiatives, summer and bridge programs, college preparation, career development, dropout and gang prevention, and reconnections for out of school youth. YPI also provides family support services and adult education.

DESCRIPTION

The Promise Neighborhoods initiative, a project led by the Youth Policy Institute (YPI) and inspired by the Harlem Children’s Zone, uses a comprehensive approach to improve academic achievement and developmental outcomes of children and youth in our most distressed communities. These projects are designed to combat the effects of poverty and improve education and life outcomes from birth through college and career.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$56.75</td>
<td>$56.75</td>
<td>$73.25</td>
<td>$128.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Programs included in ESSA, Title IV, Part F, National Activities are authorized through a percentage set-aside; however, the president’s budget includes specific funding levels for these programs.
IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget requests an increase for the Promise Neighborhoods initiative to $128 million, an increase of $54.75 million over the FY 2016 enacted level. This initiative supports high need communities that combine cradle to career services for children and families with comprehensive reforms centered on high quality schools. FY 2017 funds would support an estimated 15 new grants for communities that seek to break the intergenerational cycle of poverty through a continuum of coordinated services from birth through college.

PROGRAM NEED

Research has demonstrated that out of school factors have a significant impact on student achievement and outcomes. Despite this evidence, there is no organized national effort to help schools address these issues. All communities struggling with high unemployment, poverty, and low student achievement should receive the resources to create and implement initiatives like Promise Neighborhoods that aim to revitalize communities and help break the cycle of intergenerational poverty. Unfortunately, due to sequestration Promise Neighborhoods funding dropped from $59.80 million in FY 2012 to $56.75 million in FY 2013. The program funding levels were essentially frozen from FY 2013 until FY 2016. The FY 2016 Omnibus included $73.25 million for Promise Neighborhoods, which will help scale and sustain the critical work of Promise Neighborhoods affiliated and new projects.

CONTACT INFO

Roxanne Garza
Citizen Schools
(956) 655-7677  |  roxannegarza@citizenschools.org
Full-Service Community Schools

Title V, Part D, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)
Title IV, Part F, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

The non-profit Austin Voices for Education and Youth is transforming Lanier High School and the schools that feed into it by providing a wide spectrum of services designed to assist students and their families in an area facing many difficulties. Services include mentoring, afterschool activities, mental health counselors, adult classes and events, resource fairs, bilingual social workers, nutrition services, medical and dental services, and more. Lanier is Austin’s lowest income neighborhood with a high percentage of refugee families with particular needs that must be met. The Full-Service Community Schools federal grant allows Austin Voices to expand into the neighborhood and be able to provide employment training, computer classes, and a wider array of English as a Second Language services, not just for students but also their families.

DESCRIPTION

The Full-Service Community Schools (FSCS) program provides wraparound academic, health, and social needs by establishing Community Schools. Partners, including schools, community-based organizations, non-profit organizations, and private entities, will coordinate pipeline services, such as high quality early childhood education, supports for transitions to elementary, middle, and high school, family and community engagement, and social, health, nutrition, and mental health services and supports.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>$10.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Programs included in ESSA, Title IV, Part F, National Activities are authorized through a percentage set-aside; however, the president’s budget includes specific funding levels for these programs.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget maintains funding for the FSCS program at its current level. This would ensure the Department of Education will continue to be able to issue five-year grants to our most disadvantaged communities. More families will have access to the health, nutritional, dental, and counseling services they need in order to provide stable learning environments to the students who most need them. The Community School model is gaining traction throughout the country, and nine States have introduced community schools legislation. By 2020, over 10,000 Community Schools are expected to operate around the country. The president’s continued commitment to the Community Schools model ensures this initiative does not lose momentum and can continue to operate in tandem with community and non-profit partners around the country.

PROGRAM NEED

Improving student outcomes involves more than just academics. Students in the most high need neighborhoods also need access to full health and nutritional services to ensure they are able to achieve their maximum potential. Research has begun to show the link between well-being and outcomes in both math and reading. The Community School model addresses these individual needs while also establishing a one-stop center where families can access a full range of needs ranging from health care, job counseling, bilingual services, adult classes, and more. So far the Department of Education has made 32 grants across the country. Despite the growing need for Community Schools, funding for the Community Schools program has remained constant at $10 million per year. Additional funding would allow other communities to benefit from this important program.
Indian Student Education

Title VII, Part A, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)
Title VI, Part A, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

Thanks to the permanent authorization of the STEP program, the Muscogee (Creek) Nation (OK) will be able to continue their collaborative work with the Oklahoma State Department of Education. This partnership allows the Muscogee Nation to continue monitoring two local school districts, Wekeetka Public Schools and Wetumka Public Schools, for grant compliance. The project is funded through Title I, Part A (Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged Student); Title II, Part A (Academic Improvement and Teacher Quality Grant); and Title VII, Part A (Indian Education Formula Grants). Through coordination with the State, the tribal education agency will support various activities, including providing training and professional development for teacher improvement and participation in local school district impact aid committees. Moreover, the tribal education agency will serve as a liaison with the Muscogee Nation and the State department of education to better support issues affecting Native students and implementation of the ESEA grant.

DESCRIPTION

Title VI supports local school districts, Indian tribes and organizations, postsecondary institutions, and other entities meeting the unique educational and culturally related needs of American Indian and Alaska Native students. These funds help students meet the same challenging State academic achievement standards as other students.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants to LEAs</td>
<td>$100.38</td>
<td>$100.38</td>
<td>$100.38</td>
<td>$100.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programs for Indian Children</td>
<td>$ 17.99</td>
<td>$ 17.99</td>
<td>$ 37.99</td>
<td>$ 67.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Activities</td>
<td>$ 5.57</td>
<td>$ 5.57</td>
<td>$ 5.57</td>
<td>$ 6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$123.94</td>
<td>$123.94</td>
<td>$143.94</td>
<td>$174.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Administration’s FY 2017 education budget is $69.4 billion in discretionary funding for the Department of Education, an increase of $1.3 billion – or 2 percent – over the 2016 enacted level to provide necessary expansions of programs as well as support the implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act. The request includes a number of proposals that would benefit Native communities, including funding Title VI at nearly $175 million – as part of the Administration’s commitment to Native students.

**PROGRAM NEED**

Tribes know how to best address the unique needs of their students. It is well documented that Native students are more likely to thrive in environments that align with their culture. This program has produced many success stories. Therefore, it is critical that Congress work with Native communities to enact the Administration’s budget request. This request would be a major step toward the $198 million needed to not only replace the effects of sequestration, but close the achievement gaps for Native students by supporting Native cultures and tribal self-determination.

**CONTACT INFO**

Dimple Patel  
National Indian Education Association  
(202) 847-0034  |  dpatel@niea.org
Education Innovation and Research
Title XIV, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act
Title IV, Part F, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

DESCRIPTION
A federal evidence-based innovation program, Grants for Education Innovation and Research (EIR) will support the development, testing, replication, and expansion of innovative, evidence-based education strategies. Modeled on the successful Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) program, EIR provides flexible funding for a broad range of field-driven projects and allows States, school districts, non-profits, higher education, and small businesses to develop and grow innovative programs to improve student achievement. EIR establishes different categories of grants that align to the strength of evidence supporting the proposal and explicitly requires grantees to help build the evidence base by conducting independent evaluations of the effectiveness of their grant-funded activities.

FUNDING HISTORY* (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$141.60</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$180.00**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*EIR is the successor to Investing in Innovation (i3); FY 2014-16 funding history reflects i3 appropriations. **Programs included in ESSA, Title IV, Part F, National Activities are authorized through a percentage set-aside; however, the president’s budget includes specific funding levels for these programs.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president proposes to fund EIR at $180 million in FY 2017. Funding will support development and testing of promising new ideas in education and replication of programs with high levels of effectiveness, ensuring limited resources fund initiatives that offer the best chance of producing measurable improvements in student learning. It will also help build the supply of and evidence for proven programs, so information can be disseminated to educators who may choose to utilize these effective programs to better serve the needs of their students.

Through this program, the federal government may nurture innovation and support best practices by encouraging entities to pioneer, perfect, and grow creative approaches to improving student achievement and develop models of best practices across the field of education. This approach will help ensure federal education programs harness local ideas, produce measurable results, and scale up what works to achieve desired outcomes and student success. The program will help move evidence-based reform into practice and encourage and fund creative solutions to enduring education problems. EIR will support utilization of research to improve the lives of children, enhance the reputation of research among educators and policy makers, demonstrate the power of proven programs implemented with care and effective leadership, and generate public enthusiasm for evidence-based reform.
PROGRAM NEED

This essential program experienced a cut of $128.74 million under sequestration in FY 2013 and only received a minor increase in FY 2014 ($12 million). The cap placed on funding by this year’s sequester will prevent any significant attempt to return support for educators to pre-sequester levels.

The important role played by teachers in enabling student success is well documented, and the Administration has placed increased emphasis on the preparation and performance of teachers. Without a significant funding increase dedicated to this program’s purposes — particularly professional development — educators will not have the tools to properly meet the Administration’s goals. States also use these funds to reduce class size; however, without additional funding, those efforts will be seriously impeded.

CONTACT INFO

Ilana Brunner
Success for All Foundation
(202) 590-0800  |  ibrunner@successforall.org

ESSA incorporated a revised version of i3 into ESEA as the new Education Innovation and Research program.
Teacher and School Leader Incentive Grants

Title V, Part D, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)  
Title II, Part B, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

In 2010, Knox County Schools in Tennessee was awarded a Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) grant to expand existing efforts around teacher evaluation and professional development. After the first year of implementation, 13 of the 14 schools saw the equivalent of one full year’s growth in student achievement on State assessments, with 11 schools achieving two years’ growth. Additionally, 93 percent of teachers participating in the program funded by TIF reported an increase in collegiality.

DESCRIPTION

Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) grants support efforts to develop and implement performance-based teacher and leader compensation systems in high need schools and districts. The goals of this discretionary grant program are to improve student achievement through increased teacher and leader effectiveness, implement reforms to reward teachers and leaders for increased student achievement, improve the distribution of effective teachers in underserved communities and subject areas, and encourage the creation of sustainable performance-based compensation systems.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$288.77</td>
<td>$230.00</td>
<td>$230.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The Teacher and School Leader Incentive Grants (TSLIG) program is authorized under the recently enacted Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) as the successor to the Teacher Incentive Fund. According to the U.S. Department of Education, the purpose of this new program is to support efforts to “develop, implement, improve, or expand human capital management systems or performance based compensation systems in schools.” Funding for the new program, which emphasizes the role of principals and school leaders, will be awarded through competitive grants of up to three years. The proposed increase of $20 million will support State and local efforts to develop tools and incentives focused on strengthening instruction, improving student academic outcomes, and retaining effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders.
PROGRAM NEED

Programs such as the Teacher Incentive Fund and the new Teacher and School Leader Incentive Grants assist district and school leadership in implementing reforms to boost student achievement through improved instruction, with special emphasis on disadvantaged populations. Maintaining federal investments in this area is critical to advancing State and local efforts to narrow achievement gaps and improve educational equity and opportunity for all students.

CONTACT INFO

Deborah Rigsby
National School Boards Association
(703) 838-6208  | drigsby@nsba.org
Supporting Effective Educator Development Grants

Title V, Part D, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)
Title II, Part B, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

C. Douglas Killough Lewisville HS North, in Lewisville, TX, received embedded professional development services from the North Star of Texas Writing Project in 2014-15 as part of the National Writing Project’s SEED grant supporting work in high need schools. A total of 30 hours of professional development in teaching writing and literacy was provided for English language arts, social studies, and science teachers in grades 9 and 10, with the opportunity for teachers to both participate in and lead classroom demonstrations and debriefing sessions on disciplinary literacy and writing. The scores on the State assessment increased at the end of the academic year, and the North Star of Texas Writing Project was invited to continue the work in 2015-16 thanks to the high quality of the focused professional development.

DESCRIPTION

The Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED) grant program provides competitive grants to national non-profit organizations for projects supported by at least moderate evidence to recruit, select, and prepare or provide professional enhancement activities for teachers, principals, and/or other school leaders. These grants create learning and career growth opportunities for aspiring and current educators serving students in high need schools. Last year the Department of Education awarded 12 new grants impacting over 50,000 educators serving 7.8 million students. SEED grantees focus on supporting high quality instruction across a range of subject areas including science, technology, engineering and math (STEM), literacy, and civics. In FY 2016 language was added to support effective programs to enhance primary source utilization in the classroom. The program previously was funded through a set-aside of up to 4 percent from the Improving Teacher Quality State grant program (ESEA Title II). As part of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), the SEED program is officially authorized, with grantees providing a match of 25 percent from non-federal sources. Applicants that propose to implement evidence-based activities will receive priority in the grant competition.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$42.18</td>
<td>$48.51</td>
<td>$94.00</td>
<td>$100.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Programs included in ESSA, Title II, Part B National Activities are authorized through a percentage set-aside; however, the president’s budget includes specific funding levels for these programs.
IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2017 budget proposes to increase funding for the SEED program by $6 million over the FY 2016 funding level. The proposed increase would expand support for State and local efforts to improve teacher and principal effectiveness and ensure all students have equitable access to effective teachers and principals. With additional funds, the program would increase the number of effective teachers and principals by supporting grantees that provide evidence-based professional development activities or prepare teachers and principals from nontraditional preparation and certification routes to serve in high need districts and schools. The Department of Education would continue to make grants to national non-profit organizations to support teacher and school leader enhancement projects with evidence of effectiveness.

PROGRAM NEED

The Department of Education currently has discretion to set aside up to 4 percent from Title II in FY 2016. The SEED program is critical to ensuring a federal merit-based avenue continues to be available for national non-profits that do the incredibly difficult and important work of equipping teachers and school leaders with the necessary skills to succeed in our nation’s schools.

CONTACT INFO

Ellen Fern
Washington Partners, LLC
(202) 349-2306  |  efern@wpllc.net
School Leader Recruitment and Support Program
Title II, Part A, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)
Title II, Part B, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

In 2013, the school districts of Fayette County, McDowell County, and Raleigh County (WV) received a grant for the Rural West Virginia Principal Development Program Demonstration Project. The goal of the project was to address the critical need for highly qualified administrators in rural West Virginia and to have a positive, sustainable impact on student outcomes. The program uses the six model standards and assessments for school administrators developed by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) and a Community of Practice model specifically designed for school leaders at rural high need schools. The Community of Practice model includes significant problem-based learning activities combined with on-site performance monitoring and feedback, self-reflection, and inquiry. The program has already seen success. Principals specifically cite as the advantages of the program the ability to network with other rural principals and learn strategies for dealing with the specific challenges of rural schools.

DESCRIPTION

The School Leader Recruitment and Support program, previously known as School Leadership, offers competitive grants to help districts recruit, mentor, and train principals and assistant principals to serve in high need schools. Grantees may use program funds to carry out professional development programs in instructional leadership and management, provide financial incentives to aspiring and new principals, and provide stipends to accomplished principals who mentor new principals.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$25.76</td>
<td>$16.37</td>
<td>$16.37</td>
<td>$30.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Programs included in ESSA, Title II, Part B, National Activities are authorized through a percentage set-aside; however, the president’s budget includes specific funding levels for these programs.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

This program historically receives many more grant applications than can be funded. The president’s proposal would help meet that demand and provide significant assistance in training highly effective leaders in high need schools and districts. As the instructional leader of a school, the principal plays a unique and important role in implementing school improvement efforts and creating a climate that fosters excellence in teaching and learning. In today’s achievement focused atmosphere, the stewardship provided by the principal of a school is even more critical.
Research has shown effective school leadership is second only to instruction as a factor in raising student achievement. The School Leadership program is the only federal initiative that directly supports the recruitment, training and retention of high quality school leaders in high need districts. Although the FY 2016 omnibus bill increased discretionary funding for education programs overall, funding for the School Leadership program remained flat. This is especially troubling, because the School Leadership program has been cut each year since FY 2012, with the worst cut occurring in FY 2015. The lack of increased funding follows years of cuts to the program and comes at a time when States are struggling with budget shortfalls and slashing their education budgets, including eliminating assistant principal and other school leadership positions.

ESSA eliminated the School Leaders program but replaced it with the new School Leader Recruitment and Support program.

---

**PROGRAM NEED**

---

**CONTACT INFO**

**Nick Spina**  
American Federation of School Administrators  
(202) 986-4209  |  nspina@AFSAadmin.org

**Sophia Papavizas**  
National Association of Elementary School Principals  
National Association of Secondary School Principals  
(703) 860-7241  |  spapavizas@naesp.org
STEM Master Teacher Corps

Title II, Part B, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

DESCRIPTION

The president’s budget request includes $10 million in first time funding for the STEM Master Teacher Corps program, newly authorized under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The program has been a priority for the White House since a 2012 call for its creation to enlist America’s best and brightest science and math teachers to improve STEM education. Corps members would build their capacity to be leaders in the field and enhance the professional learning of other STEM teachers; identify and share promising practices in their schools, districts, and States; and help students excel in STEM subjects while taking on coaching and mentorship roles in their schools and communities.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The reorganization of federal investments in educator professional development in ESSA allows Title II (Subpart 4) National Activities funds for a competitive grant program to States to develop a STEM Master Teacher Corps or to provide professional development for STEM teachers. Not more than 2 percent of the National Activities allocation may be used for this activity. The president has requested $10 million for this program for FY 2017.

PROGRAM NEED

In October 2015, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) scores in mathematics were 1 and 2 points lower in grades 4 and 8, respectively, than the average scores in 2013. Only 40 percent of fourth grade and 33 percent of eighth grade students performed at or above the proficient level in mathematics. Further, the US ranked 17th in science and 25th in mathematics on the 2009 PISA assessment. It is more important than ever that K-12 schools have qualified teachers in math and science. With the elimination of the Mathematics and Science Partnership program, this new program is one of the few STEM-specific programs in the new ESSA.

CONTACT INFO

Della Cronin
Washington Partners, LLC
(202) 349-2322  |  dcronin@wpllc.net
Transition to Teaching
Title II, Part C, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)

California, like many other States across the country, has teacher shortages in the fields of math, science and special education. California State University-Dominguez Hills has run a Transition to Teaching program since 2001. To date, over 250 math, science, and special education teachers have been prepared through this program, and the average teacher retention rate is 93 percent. This program has proved to be an effective way to recruit teachers for high need fields who stay in the profession.

DESCRIPTION

Transition to Teaching is a grant program that helps recruit, prepare, and retain highly qualified mid-career professionals and recent college graduates who did not major in education to teach in high need schools. In particular, the program focused on pathways to the classroom, which acknowledged prior experience and expertise, thus reducing the time spent meeting relevant State certification or licensing requirements. The program also required candidates receive support for at least their first three years of teaching, which has been shown to increase retention in the profession.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$13.76</td>
<td>$13.70</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Program authorization repealed under the Every Student Succeeds Act.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

Unfortunately, this program was eliminated in the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Therefore, the president’s budget request does not include funding for this program.

PROGRAM NEED

Enrollment in teacher preparation programs is declining while teacher shortages are on the rise. This program provided dedicated funding to support the path of career changers who want to become teachers and are willing to serve in high need schools. The elimination of this program and its funding reduces a pipeline of highly qualified candidates entering classrooms across this nation. Career changers seeking to be teachers will now face an undue hardship instead of being supported when entering the teaching profession.

CONTACT INFO

Deborah Koolbeck
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
(202) 478-4506  | dkoolbeck@aacte.org
Charter Schools Program

Title V, Part B, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)
Title IV, Part C, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

Crossroads Academy of Kansas City (CAKC), located in downtown Kansas City, focuses on three pillars—high expectations, 21st century learning, and community engagement. The school is very diverse—47 percent African American, 33 percent white, 16 percent Latino, 3 percent Asian, 1 percent American Indian, 55 percent free and reduced lunch eligible, 9 percent English Learner, and 7 percent students with disabilities. The school has an extended school day and academic year, which results in 37 percent more instructional time than the Missouri State standard. The school received a three-year startup grant through the Charter Schools Program at $125,000 per year. The grant was not only a substantial amount of funds for the school, but it also showed that the U.S. Department of Education endorsed its vision, which in turn opened more doors in the local philanthropic community for the program. It would have been impossible for the school to meet its fundraising goals and begin serving students without this startup support.

DESCRIPTION

The purpose of the Charter Schools Program is to increase the number of high quality charter schools, evaluate their impact on student achievement, families, and communities, and support efforts to strengthen the charter school authorizing process. Federal funds are available to support the startup of new charter schools and the replication and expansion of high quality charter schools, assist charter schools in accessing credit to acquire and renovate facilities, and carry out national activities that support charter schools. The Charter Schools Program was reauthorized under Title IV, Part C of ESSA. Two-thirds of funds are intended for State grant competitions, 12.5 percent for facilities assistance, and the remainder for national activities.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$248.17</td>
<td>$253.17</td>
<td>$333.17</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s proposed budget recognizes the value of charter schools as an important part of the public school system. While the president does propose an increase in funding, the budget still falls far short of what is needed to meet the demand for charter schools nationwide.
PROGRAM NEED

Despite the funding increase in FY 2016 and the proposed increase in FY 2017, there are still nearly 600,000 students on charter school waiting lists across the country. The large number of students on waiting lists demonstrates there is popular demand for charter schools. A powerful way to meet this demand is for the federal government to increase its financial support of these schools.

CONTACT INFO

Sunil Mansukhani
Committee for Education Funding
(202) 587-2864  |  smansukhani@rabengroup.com
Magnet Schools Assistance Program

Title V, Part C, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)  
Title IV, Part D, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

The Houston Independent School District (HISD) received a three-year $12 million Magnet Schools Assistance Program grant to significantly revise four magnet programs and establish two new science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) schools. All six schools are whole-school STEM programs that emphasize a rich curriculum. They feature distinctive STEM magnet themes that are innovative and specific to the career and workforce needs of local, regional, and global markets. HISD’s cross-cutting and cross-curricular STEM content helps students find careers as engineers, technicians, scientists, and mathematicians in fields related to health and medicine, sustainable processes, and energy.

For example, the Baylor College of Medicine Academy at Ryan Middle School has developed a partnership with Baylor University’s College of Medicine to create a medical and health professions and STEM magnet program. Students at the academy take classes in neuroscience, cardiovascular science, and sports medicine, providing them with an early opportunity to become college and career ready. Sixty percent of the students at Ryan’s Baylor College of Medicine Academy are on the free and reduced lunch plan, yet they do not lag in academic performance. In 2015, virtually all students passed the State assessments in math and reading. Even more impressive, 40 percent of students passed the reading portion at an advanced level!

DESCRIPTION

The Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP) was reauthorized in the Every Student Succeeds Act. MSAP provides grants to local school districts under court-ordered or federally approved voluntary desegregation plans to establish, expand, or improve magnet schools. Projects support the development and design of innovative magnet programs that promote school integration and diversity through public school choice. MSAP funds may be used for the implementation of rigorous curricula and instruction to improve student outcomes, teacher professional development, purchase of equipment and technology, and other resources that will enable magnet schools to operate and sustain themselves at a high performing level.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$91.65</td>
<td>$91.65</td>
<td>$96.65</td>
<td>$115.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2017 budget would increase funding for the Magnet Schools Assistance Program by approximately $18 million. This additional support recognizes the tremendous success of magnet schools and will restore damaging cuts to the program over the last decade. This funding level will provide further assistance to local school districts committed to promoting racial and socioeconomic integration in their school systems and reducing the achievement gap among students. The Administration’s budget sends a clear signal to Congress that it supports the mission of our nation’s magnet schools and is committed to expanding access to STEM, Visual and Performing Arts, International Baccalaureate, and many other exciting theme-based magnet programs that will help students transition to postsecondary education and careers.

PROGRAM NEED

Through voluntary school choice, magnet schools serve a wide array of students from all backgrounds. They provide rigorous education and promote higher level cognitive and social learning. Nationwide, magnet schools are routinely recognized as exemplary education programs. For instance, in last year’s U.S. News and World Report High School Rankings, magnet schools made up 25 percent of the top 100 high schools. This speaks volumes, especially considering they represent less than 5 percent of all public schools.

All students deserve access to an excellent magnet school education to help them reach their full potential. Unfortunately, according to a study conducted by the UCLA Civil Rights Project, 70 percent of magnet schools receiving federal funding from the Magnet School Assistance Program report having a waiting list. To meet this growing public demand and to achieve the goal of equitable access to high quality magnet programs, Congress must support the president’s budget request for the Magnet Schools Assistance Program.

CONTACT INFO

Todd Mann or John Laughner
Magnet Schools of America
(202) 824-0672  |  todd.mann@magnet.edu  |  john.laughner@magnet.edu
Ready To Learn

Title II, Part D, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)
Title IV, Part F, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

Ready To Learn uses the power of public television’s on-air, online, mobile and on the ground educational content to build the math and reading skills of children between the ages of two and eight, especially those from low-income families.

In Tacoma, Washington, local public television station KBTC partnered with the Tacoma Housing Authority and McCarver Elementary School to bring Ready To Learn educational resources to the kids and families most in need. Over seven months KBTC worked with partners to hold many activities incorporating Ready To Learn content, including parent training sessions, spring break camp, summer camp, access to a mobile technology lab, and many others. Many students who participated in these activities showed improvements in learning. Tyler Martin, a 1st grade student who participated in many of these Ready To Learn supported activities, has transformed from a struggling student into an exceptional one.

DESCRIPTION

First authorized in 1992 and reauthorized in 2001 and 2015, Ready To Learn is a competitive grant program funding the research and development of high quality, scientifically-based, multimedia educational content that can be used at home and in the classroom. This content is available free to children nationwide. Ready To Learn grants are a critical part of the development of public television’s groundbreaking content for educational children’s programming like Peg + Cat, SUPER WHY!, Martha Speaks, and many others that have been proven to help prepare children for success in school.

Ready To Learn also supports a national-local partnership that helps teachers and caregivers make the most of these media resources – including online, mobile apps, and television – in schools, preschools, homeschools, Head Start and other childcare centers, libraries, mobile learning labs, Boys and Girls Clubs, and community centers.

Ready To Learn’s math and literacy content is rigorously tested and evaluated to assess its impact on children’s learning. Since 2005 more than 100 research and evaluation studies have shown Ready To Learn literacy and math content engages children, enhances early learning skills, and allows them to make significant academic gains that help to close the achievement gap.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$25.74</td>
<td>$25.74</td>
<td>$25.74</td>
<td>$25.74*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Programs included in ESSA, Title IV, Part F, National Activities are authorized through a percentage set-aside; however, the president’s budget includes specific funding levels for these programs.
IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s proposal to fund Ready To Learn as a stand-alone program recognizes the unique nature of this program and the national-local partnership it supports to create the highest quality and effective proven educational media programming. As a stand-alone program, the Ready To Learn competitive grant funding flows from the U.S. Department of Education to noncommercial telecommunications entities with the expertise to develop the very best educational content and the capacity to distribute it widely. All States and local school districts are able to take advantage of the Ready To Learn created content and use it to the benefit of the children and families they serve.

PROGRAM NEED

Research shows children who start school behind stay behind, so it is critical to ensure all children are prepared when they enter school. However, in the United States 54 percent of three and four year olds do not attend preschool. In addition, of the more than 25 million American children under the age of six, 46 percent are living in low-income households. Research has shown these children often struggle with early math and literacy skills, setting them on a downward trajectory once they enter school. Children from low-income families tend on average to score as much as 25 points lower on standardized tests than their higher income peers.

There is clearly a need for high quality educational content for young children, and Ready To Learn is helping meet that need. Through local public television stations, 99 percent of American families have access to Ready To Learn content proven to help kids learn. Ready To Learn brings content to children in low-income and underserved communities through on the ground outreach by local public television stations and their partner organizations. Funding for this program has created scientifically researched, award-winning programming that is helping to close the achievement gap.

CONTACT INFO

Kate Riley
Association of Public Television Stations
(202) 654-4206  kriley@apts.org
Advanced Placement

Title I, Part G, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)
Title IV, Part A, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

Benjamin Acquah was a senior last year at Benjamin Banneker Academic High School in Washington, DC. He knew that taking Advanced Placement (AP) classes could help him earn college credit and significantly reduce the cost of his college education. He took five AP classes funded through the federal program during his time at Banneker. He said these AP courses were an important step in his journey to college.

“The benefits of an AP course are blind – they are indifferent to race, age, gender, and even national origin. They test effort and ability and that’s why it means so much to me. I’ve experienced the good it can do firsthand. Maintain the support for AP courses. They were my chance to overcome barriers, and they will continue to do so for students everywhere.”

DESCRIPTION

The AP Test Fee program provides funds for low-income students to take Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) exams. AP and IB programs increase the rigor of high school curricula and offer a proven avenue to postsecondary success while significantly reducing the cost since college credits are awarded for successful exam scores. Since the program’s inception just over 16 years ago, the number of AP exams taken by low-income students across the nation has increased significantly, from 82,000 exams in 1999 to more than 800,000 exams in 2015.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$28.48</td>
<td>$28.48</td>
<td>$28.48</td>
<td>$0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Program authorization repealed under the Every Student Succeeds Act. Program functions are allowable uses under the Title IV block grant.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

In his FY 2017 budget, the president included $500 million for Title IV, Part A (Student Support and Academic Enrichment grants). This block grant is intended to support States and districts in providing students with access to a well-rounded education, strengthening school conditions for learning, and improving the effective use of technology. Funding for AP is available through the well-rounded education grants. The president’s request is well under the $1.6 billion authorized by ESSA and would result in very small grants to cover a wide variety of activities for a majority of school districts.

PROGRAM NEED

Low-income students with the potential to succeed in AP must be able to access these opportunities. To ensure students are served by the numerous programs included in the new ESSA block grant, we recommend $1.6 billion be provided in FY 2017 to fund programs included under Title IV, Part A, as authorized.

CONTACT INFO

Karen Lanning
The College Board
(202) 741-4748 | klanning@collegeboard.org
ARTS IN EDUCATION

Title V, Part D, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)
Title IV, Part F, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

In 2014, school districts in the Grand Rapids (MI) area were awarded a competitive grant made possible by the Arts in Education Program. In partnership with Mind Meets Music, the ‘Innovative Arts’ project is designed to integrate standards-based music and arts programs into a well-rounded elementary school curriculum. The project also focuses on strengthening standards instruction within those programs and improving academic performance, including skills in creating and responding through music and arts. ‘Innovative Arts’ currently serves more than 4,000 students, 70 percent of whom live in poverty. The project works with Title I and School Improvement Grant (SIG) schools and aids primarily low income students, English language learners, and Latino and African American students. Project participants showed a 34 percent increase in reading test scores as compared to students who did not participate.

DESCRIPTION

The Assistance for Arts Education program is the reincarnation of the Arts in Education program under No Child Left Behind. Competitive and noncompetitive awards are authorized to strengthen music and arts programs as a part of a well-rounded education and to integrate the arts into core curricula. Local school districts use competitive awards to create material for integrating a range of arts disciplines (music, dance, theater, and visual arts) into elementary and middle school curricula. The program supports the expansion, evaluation, and dissemination of innovative models that demonstrate effective integration, instruction, and student academic performance in music and arts. The program also authorizes noncompetitive awards to Very Special Arts, which encourages involvement and greater awareness of music and arts for persons with disabilities, and to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts to support music and arts education programs.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$27.00</td>
<td>$27.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Programs included in ESSA, Title IV, Part F, National Activities are authorized through a percentage set-aside; however, the president’s budget includes specific funding levels for these programs.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2017 budget proposal includes $27 million for the Assistance for Arts Education program. States and school districts are given the flexibility to determine how funds are used to support well-rounded education and develop strategies to best meet their needs. As a small piece of a much broader competitive program, there will be limited funding for music and arts education and integration. Further, the lack of any new funding and the broad programmatic structure limit the ability to target music and arts integration resources.
PROGRAM NEED

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (U.S. Department of Education), frequency of instruction for music and arts continues to be an issue among public schools. Despite the fact that music education and visual arts are offered at 94 percent and 85 percent of public schools respectively, only 10 percent of music programs and 6 percent of visual arts programs are offered three to four times a week. An appropriation of $30 million for the Assistance for Arts Education program will support additional competitive grants to improve music and arts learning, and findings from model projects may be more widely disseminated. In addition, the Assistance for Arts Education program can provide unique federal support for professional development for music and arts educators, evaluation and national dissemination, and ongoing national music and arts education integration initiatives.

CONTACT INFO

Ronny Lau  
National Association for Music Education  
(703) 860-4000, Ext. 225   |  ronnyl@nafme.org

Gifted and Talented Program

Title V, Part D, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)  
Title IV, Part F, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

Solomon, a fourth grader, was constantly in motion, told elaborate fabrications, talked back and would utter sarcastic comments during lessons that sent the class into total chaos. He had difficulty completing work, but when he did, he finished quickly, especially math. I could see he needed another avenue for his energies. I suggested he create a class store or be a peer mediator. Neither activity interested him, and other alternatives were met with little success. How I wish I had known then about U-STARS~PLUS and been in a school using that program! Through U-STARS~PLUS we shift our thinking about young children from “at risk” to “at-potential.” We use the TOPS (Teachers Observations of Potential in Students, 2010) to help us recognize student strengths across nine domains (learns easily, shows advanced skills, displays curiosity and creativity, has strong interests, shows advanced reasoning and problem-solving, displays spatial abilities, shows motivation, shows social perceptiveness, and displays leadership), and we adapt instructional practices to focus on nurturing these strengths. Maintaining and increasing funding of Javits is critical, so programs such as this can flourish and directly influence positive outcomes.

DESCRIPTION

As the only federal program dedicated to addressing the unique educational needs of students with gifts and talents, the Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Students Education Act focuses its resources on children who have traditionally been underrepresented in gifted education programs – students with disabilities, English language learners, and individuals from economically disadvantaged backgrounds. Through a system of competitive research, State capacity building grants, and a national research center on gifted education, the Javits Act fills a critical void in our nation’s education system.
FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$12.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Program included in ESSA, Title IV, Part F, National Activities are authorized through a percentage set-aside; however, the president’s budget includes specific funding levels for these programs.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The Javits program is the only federal initiative targeted specifically to gifted and talented students. While the president’s budget justification to Congress proposes $12 million to cover the continuation costs of current Javits grants, a larger investment is needed to adequately address the needs of high ability students across the nation. A greater investment would allow increased best practices research, development of interventions to increase the number of disadvantaged students performing at advanced levels, and support for closing the achievement gap among students at the highest levels of academic attainment.

PROGRAM NEED

Reports indicate every State has a growing “excellence gap,” with students from low-income or minority backgrounds less likely to reach advanced levels on State and national assessments than their more advantaged peers. The Javits program is the only federally funded national effort that confronts this reality by supporting evidence-based research on best practices. This research informs educators on how to best and most effectively serve students with gifts and talents. The Javits program requires at least $20 million to help States expand their capacity to provide services to help gifted students realize their full potential, especially students from disadvantaged backgrounds. An investment of $20 million would allow 10 to 15 States to implement innovative approaches based on their specific needs. As States cut funding even further and as the United States continues to fall behind on international indicators of excellence, this funding is more critical than ever.

CONTACT INFO

Deborah Ziegler
The Council for Exceptional Children
(703) 264-9406 | debz@cec.sped.org
Statewide Family Engagement Centers

Title V, Part D, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)
Title IV, Part E, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

The Kansas Parent Information Resource Center (KPIRC)—a project of the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE)—promotes meaningful family engagement at all levels of education. KPIRC supports Kansas schools, families and communities by developing resources and networking opportunities to foster family-school-community partnerships that promote the educational success of every Kansas child. To that end, KPIRC provides technical assistance to over 2,100 educators a year for the development of family-friendly policies and programs, as well as ensuring that over 1,400 families a year receive literacy training and resources to support their children’s academic achievement. KPIRC supports Kansas communities by creating early learning programs to promote school readiness and distributes over 45,000 resources and holds roughly 90 community meetings a year. Without an adequate and sustained federal investment in the Statewide Family Engagement Centers (SFEC), programs like KPIRC will not be able to support as many schools, families and communities to help improve educational opportunities for all students.

—Jane Groff, Executive Director, Kansas Parent Information Resource Center

DESCRIPTION

Formerly called the Parent Information Resource Centers (PIRC), the Statewide Family Engagement Centers (SFEC) program under the Every Student succeeds Act funds federal competitive grants to statewide organizations or a consortium of organizations to promote and implement evidenced-based family engagement strategies. The improved SFEC program provides much needed technical assistance and partnership development to States and school districts, fostering engagement with families to further the academic and developmental progress of their children and support positive student outcomes. SFECs also provide vital direct services to improve communication among students, teachers, school leaders, counselors, administrators and other school personnel and enhance understanding of district, State and federal policies.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The PIRC program has not been funded since FY 2010. The president’s budget did not include funding for this important program. A dedicated funding stream for the Statewide Family Engagement Centers grant program must be provided in order to ensure school districts implement systematic family engagement practices to improve student outcomes. Support needs to be provided to States, districts and communities in their efforts to strengthen relationships between families and schools to further academic and developmental progress of children.

In order to better engage parents and families, this funding must be allocated to create evidence-based approaches to family engagement. A strong federal investment to improve and expand family engagement within the public education system would ensure families are equal partners with schools in their child’s education.
PROGRAM NEED

Research shows parent and family engagement matters for student success, resulting in better outcomes in school and in life. Having parents and families as partners in their child’s education contributes to a range of positive student outcomes, including improved student achievement, decreased disciplinary issues, and improved family and school partnerships. Additional research shows parent and family engagement can have important benefits to schools, as well, including promoting higher expectations for students, shared ownership of a student’s success, and stronger student performance.

With effective policies, schools and school districts can help families understand and prepare for day-to-day content and achievement standards as well as State and local academic assessments. Engaged families are also better equipped to monitor their child’s progress and work with educators to improve achievements.

Funds for Statewide Family Engagement Centers are designed to help schools and districts educate teachers, specialized instructional support personnel, principals and other staff about the value of family participation in the educational process. Supporting family engagement is important to all parents and of particular importance to those who struggled in school or failed to graduate from high school themselves. These activities are an essential component of breaking that cycle for the next generation.

CONTACT INFO

Lindsay Kubatzky
National PTA
(703) 518-1262, lkubatzky@pta.org
Race to the Top
American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009

In December 2014, 18 States received new Preschool Development Grants to build or expand high quality preschool for four-year-olds from low- and moderate-income families. More than 18,000 additional children across the country will be served during the first year of the program. These grants were funded under Race to the Top authority in FY 2014.

DESCRIPTION

Race to the Top (RTTT) provides funds to States and school districts on a competitive basis to implement five core reforms. Several iterations of RTTT have highlighted different needs over the course of the program’s existence, including grants to States, the Early Learning Challenge Fund, and a RTTT-District competition. In FY 2014, Preschool Development Grants were funded through Race to the Top, but in FY 2015 the same preschool grants were appropriated through the Fund for the Improvement of Education under the No Child Left Behind Act. No funds were provided for any Race to the Top programs in the FY 2015 or FY 2016 omnibus funding bills.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$250.00*</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In FY 2014 these funds were designated for Preschool Development Grants under the Race to the Top authority.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2017 budget request does not include any funding for Race to the Top. The budget proposal does include $350 million for the Preschool Development Grants, a $100 million increase that would provide competitive awards to nearly all States that apply for funding. However, this new funding is provided through the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, as authorized in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015.

PROGRAM NEED

The Race to the Top program, first authorized under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, is somewhat unique among federal education grants which traditionally focus on services for a particular group of at-risk students or address a particular problem in education. Instead, Race to the Top grants provide a fairly flexible infusion of funds to initiate or carry out reforms in the design and delivery of education at the State and local level.
The FY 2014 Omnibus provided $250 million under Race To The Top for Preschool Development Grants. See next chart. The FY 2015 CRomnibus and the FY 2016 omnibus continued $250 million in funding for Preschool Development Grants as a separate program under the Fund for the Improvement of Education.

**CONTACT INFO**

**Jeff Simering or Manish Naik**
Council of the Great City Schools
(202) 393-2427 | jsimering@cgcs.org | mnaik@cgcs.org
Language Acquisition Grants
Title III, Part A, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind)
Title III, Part A, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

Palm Beach County School District (FL) uses a portion of Title III funds to build the capacity of educators in supporting the social-emotional needs of English language learners (ELLs). In partnership with a local State university, the district provides scholarships to bilingual educators to earn master’s degrees in guidance and counseling while employed as interim “English as a Second or Other Language (ESOL) bilingual/bicultural guidance counselors” in schools with large ELL populations. These candidates offer supplemental support beyond that provided by existing counseling staff, focusing expressly on the ELL population. The ESOL bilingual/bicultural guidance counselors provide counseling to promote academic, social and personal growth of ELLs; assist students with scheduling and appropriate programming; facilitate transitions from elementary and middle school; ensure students have access to educational opportunities such as magnet programs, academies and honors/advanced classes; and monitor their academic progress toward graduation.

DESCRIPTION

Language Acquisition Grants are provided on a formula basis to improve instructional programs for English language learners (ELLs). Grants help ensure students develop academic English and high levels of academic achievement to meet the same challenging State content and performance standards as their English-proficient peers. The program assists States, school districts, and institutions of higher education in building capacity to more effectively teach ELL students through efforts including upgrading curricula, acquiring instructional materials, and providing teacher training opportunities. School districts may also be eligible for Title III funds that must be used to pay for activities providing enhanced educational opportunities for immigrant children and youth.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$723.40</td>
<td>$737.40</td>
<td>$737.40</td>
<td>$800.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2017 budget request increases funding for Title III by $63 million, or 8.5 percent, over the FY 2016 funding level. Estimates of ELL enrollment vary between 4.7 and 5.2 million students, depending on the data source and the methodology used in the calculation. The most recent data available on the Department of Education’s EDDataexpress indicate the State-reported number of ELLs for the 2013-14 school year was 4.9 million. Using the 4.9 million figure, the FY 2017 funding would provide an estimated $154 per student.
PROGRAM NEED

Results from the 2013 and 2015 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) indicate persistent achievement gaps between ELLs and non-ELLs. Gaps average around 25 percentage points in both reading and math. School districts implementing new college and career ready standards need to intensify their efforts to reduce this achievement gap. Districts rely on Title III to supplement existing investments in services and professional development to ensure ELLs have access to college and career ready standards. Title III funds are needed to assist school districts in providing quality instructional services to the growing number of American born children who come from homes where English is not spoken, as well the increased number of refugee families settling in the United States.

CONTACT INFO

Gabriela Uro
Council of the Great City Schools
(202) 393-2427  |  guro@cgcs.org

The FY 2015 increase was for grants to LEAs that had a significant increase during the 2014–15 school year in the number or percentage of immigrant children and youth. Funds were for supplemental academic and non-academic services and supports to those children and youth.
IDEA State Grants
Part B, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

Savannah is a bright young adult who was diagnosed in sixth grade with a learning disability related to mathematics after years of struggling in school. Despite Savannah's learning disability, accommodations and special education allow her to participate in class alongside her peers without disabilities. Throughout middle and high school, Savannah was provided assistive technology, and her special education teachers used interventions that allowed her to catch up to grade level in math, while spending most of her time in the general education classroom. Through these critical supports, Savannah was able not only to graduate from high school, but to continue her education at Arizona State University's Barrett Honors College. Here is Savannah's journey in her own words:

“One of my earliest memories is of crying in frustration because math made no sense to me. The numbers were a foreign language and confused me to no end. Despite my frustration, my mom worked hard to help me succeed. She encouraged me to see my struggles as something to accept and accommodate, rather than avoid. Over time I began to love school and accepted the necessity of special education services for my learning disability. Slowly I became the person I always wanted to be: smart, hardworking, dedicated, excited, and outgoing. Special education was not a bad thing, and neither was my learning disability.”

DESCRIPTION

The Individuals with Disabilities (IDEA) State Grant program (Part B) provides services and supports to over 6 million students from ages 3-21 (unless a State sets a higher or lower termination age). Students’ disabilities must be within one of 13 enumerated categories of disability and must require educational supports and services in order to make academic progress on a level consistent with their non-disabled peers. The majority of all students with disabilities are educated in the general education classroom for 80 percent or more of the school day. Students receive an Individualized Education Program (IEP) with input from general and special education staff, other specialists, the child’s parents, and the student as appropriate. The Part B program provides formula grants to States. In turn, States pass the majority of funds to local school districts to provide students with the essential specialized instruction designed to meet their unique needs and prepare them for further education, employment, and independent living. Allowable uses of funds include hiring teachers and specialized instructional support personnel, such as speech-language pathologists and school psychologists, and purchasing assistive technology. States monitor local school districts for compliance with the law, provide technical assistance, and offer mediation services.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>$11,472.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>$11,497.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>$11,912.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</td>
<td>$11,912.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2017 request of $11,912.85 for IDEA Part B would freeze funding at the FY 2016 level, providing a per-child average of $1,777 for the 6.7 million children with disabilities. A federal contribution at this level only maintains a stagnant 16 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure, far below the 40 percent funding promised by Congress when IDEA was first enacted in 1975. This amount does not acknowledge increased costs faced by States and local school districts in meeting the needs of students with disabilities.
**PROGRAM NEED**

IDEA Part B is the largest program under IDEA, serving approximately 6.7 million pre-K through 12th grade students. The receipt of special education supports and services is a civil right, and the number of students who require assistance does not decrease when federal funding is stagnant. Although IDEA received much needed relief from sequestration under the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, funding remains less than half the original congressional commitment when the law was passed in 1975. Funding for Part B has a direct and immediate impact on the capacity of schools to provide all necessary services to students with disabilities. A large majority of students with disabilities, with proper educational supports, will be able to make progress in the general education environment and graduate from high school on time. With more intensive supports provided under the IDEA, students with more significant disabilities also have an excellent opportunity to achieve academic success and successful post-school outcomes.

**CONTACT INFO**

**Nancy Reder**  
National Association of State Directors of Special Education  
(703) 519-1506  |  nancy.reder@nasdse.org

**Lindsay Jones** or **Kim Hymes**  
National Center for Learning Disabilities  
(202) 628-2662  |  ljones@ncld.org  |  khymes@ncld.org
IDEA Preschool Program
Part B, Sec. 619, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

Veronica entered an inclusive community preschool program just a few months after turning three years old. She had been receiving IDEA early intervention services at home, and her family prepared to make the transition into community-based services with the support and guidance of their early intervention team. Veronica has developmental delays that primarily impact language and communication and social, emotional and interpersonal skills. Veronica receives individualized special instruction that focuses on developing her skills in expressive communication and peer interactions in an inclusive preschool classroom. For example, one of her IEP goals is to increase independent engagement and participation in daily routines and activities. Itinerant teachers and therapists from the public school district and teachers in the preschool program all support Veronica and her family on making progress toward identified goals and to ultimately help her be prepared for school. Special education and related services are funded in part by IDEA. The funding from IDEA also helps the preschool program strive to remain fully inclusive and ensure every child leaves ready for success in kindergarten and beyond.

DESCRIPTION

IDEA Preschool Grants are intended to assist States and local school districts to ensure preschool children with disabilities ages 3 through 5 are identified early and receive a free appropriate public education. In addition, the federal contribution to preschool special education facilitates the continuity of services for children with disabilities transitioning to school from the Infant and Toddler program (Part C, ages birth through 2) that provides early intervention services.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$353.24</td>
<td>$353.24</td>
<td>$368.24</td>
<td>$403.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The president has requested a $35 million increase in funding for the IDEA Preschool Grants. Funding for this program has decreased considerably from ten years ago when funding was at $385 million. In FY 2016 this program was increased by $15 million, the first increase in over a decade. Research tells us early childhood special education can help avoid the need for more costly and intensive services and supports when children are older. The Part C Infant and Toddler program has received some modest increases over the past few years, and almost all infants and toddlers served under the Part C program will continue to need services under the Preschool program when they reach age three. As part of the president’s emphasis on early childhood education, this program needs an increased financial investment.
**PROGRAM NEED**

In FY 2013, sequestration cuts for this program totaled approximately $19 million, making it difficult for school districts to appropriately serve all children who need assistance. Cuts in federal funding required States and local school districts to invest more funds to support this program. Federal cuts are especially unwise in the face of strong research demonstrating early learning gains reduce educational and other expenditures over a lifetime. The Preschool program serves approximately 753,000 children with disabilities ages 3 through 5. The program guarantees a free appropriate public education, entitling children to special education and related services that will enable them to grow and learn and prepare to enter school with their non-disabled peers. Program emphasis is on serving children in inclusive settings, such as Head Start, child care, and preschool programs. The IDEA Preschool program is designed to ensure an appropriate transition for children from the Part C program, serve them appropriately in preschool, and ensure a smooth transition to school and the K-12 special education program if necessary.

**CONTACT INFO**

Deborah Ziegler  
The Council for Exceptional Children  
(703) 264-9406  |  debz@cec.sped.org
**Special Education (IDEA) Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget Request</th>
<th>vs FY 2016 Appropriation</th>
<th>vs FY 2010 Baseline (Adjusted for Inflation &amp; Enrollment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017</td>
<td>$13.1</td>
<td>+$0.1</td>
<td>-$1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Baseline represents the actual appropriation for fiscal year 2010 adjusted each year thereafter for inflation and enrollment.*

**FY 2010 represents the year prior to the start of concerted efforts to restrain nondefense discretionary spending, including the enforcement of spending caps and sequestration under the Budget Control Act.**


| February 9, 2016

---

**Special education (IDEA) funding explained:**

Includes all programs authorized under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

**Why is the budget request compared to a baseline?**

A baseline reflects the funding level required to provide the same level of services in a certain year as was provided in the baseline year by adjusting for changes in the cost of services and enrollment. It is policy-neutral. Including a baseline in a funding chart indicates whether or not current or proposed funding is above, below, or just at the level necessary to keep pace with changes in inflation and enrollment.
U.S. Department of Education Budget Request, FY2017

**Special Education (IDEA): Average Federal Share Per Child**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Education Grants to States (IDEA Part B-611)</th>
<th>FY 2017 Budget Request</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>Full Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Federal Share Per Child as a Percentage of Excess Cost</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Full Funding: represents the federal commitment to provide 40 percent of the excess cost (as measured by the national average per pupil expenditure) of educating children, ages 3 through 21, with disabilities.

**What is full funding?**
The assumption underlying the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and its predecessor legislation, is that, on average, the cost of educating children with disabilities is twice the cost (measured as the national average per pupil expenditure) of educating other children. Congress determined that the federal government would pay up to 40 percent of this "excess" cost, which is referred to as full funding.

Source: NEA calculations based on data from the U.S. Department of Education Budget Service and the Congressional Research Service. For more information, contact Tom Zembar at 202.832.7109 or TZembar@nea.org. | February 9, 2016
IDEA Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities

Part C, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

When Jay was a year and a half old, he was diagnosed with autism and began receiving early intervention services from Easter Seals Eastern Pennsylvania. At the time, Jay was nonverbal, had difficulty playing appropriately with toys or other children, was unable to sit for structured activities, and had severe behavioral challenges. After six months of early intervention, Jay was using several signs to communicate, sitting for at least 5-10 minutes per structured activity, and showing a marked decrease in negative behaviors. Today, at almost three years old, Jay is able to sit and attend to structured activities for 30 minutes, plays appropriately, and has age-appropriate expressive and receptive language — progress that may not have been possible without the early intervention services Easter Seals provided!

DESCRIPTION

IDEA Part C, the Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities program, serves 334,000 children ages birth through two years and their families through formula grants to States to develop and implement a statewide comprehensive, multidisciplinary, interagency early intervention system. Congress enacted this program after determining there was an urgent and substantial need to provide the earliest intervention possible for young children who have, or are at risk of having, disabilities or developmental delays. Studies have demonstrated that providing early intervention services to children and their families is one of the most effective strategies in helping children with disabilities attain favorable educational outcomes.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT's REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$438.50</td>
<td>$438.56</td>
<td>$458.56</td>
<td>$503.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The $45 million increase in the president’s budget would recoup nearly all funding lost due to sequestration. While this is a welcome increase, a substantial investment is needed to ensure early intervention programs reach the children who need these services. The proposed funding level will help to address the needs of approximately 376,000 infants and toddlers with disabilities.

PROGRAM NEED

Due to mounting fiscal pressure over the last two decades, States have narrowed the eligibility requirements for this voluntary program, and any funding reduction means fewer children served. While the number of children served has grown by 57 percent in the last 20 years, funding per child has decreased by 36 percent since 1999. As a result, 20 percent of States have narrowed their eligibility criteria over the last decade, and 75 percent now charge families for services. While the $20 million increase for Part C services in FY 2016 helped to recoup a portion of the funding lost during the sequester, an additional $45 million is needed to bring this program back to pre-sequester levels. An even more substantial investment is needed to ensure early intervention programs reach all the children who need these services.
Special Education Grants for Infants and Families (IDEA Part C) in millions

CONTACT INFO

Eileen Dombrowski
Easter Seals
(202) 347-3066 | edombrowski@easterseals.com
IDEA National Programs
Part D, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

The U.S. Department of Education’s Office for Special Education Programs (OSEP) has recently established a Results-Driven Accountability (RDA) system to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. A key component of RDA requires States to develop State Systemic Improvement Plans that include specific targets and the steps that will be taken to meet those targets. Under the Part D Technical Assistance & Dissemination grant program, OSEP funded the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) to help States meet their targets. Now in its second year of funding, NCSI has established collaboratives of States with similar targets, such as improving graduation rates, so States can learn from each other about how different strategies are working. The collaboratives, in the short time of their existence, are providing both expertise and opportunities for ongoing collaboration. States will begin reporting the impact of this work in February 2017.

DESCRIPTION

Part D programs are often referred to as the “backbone” of special education. States receive funding through these competitive grant programs to train special educators on the use of evidence-based strategies and to support families by connecting them to important information and resources to assist their children. Grants support the following activities, each with a separate funding stream: (1) State Personnel Development Grants; (2) technical assistance and dissemination; (3) personnel preparation; (4) parent information centers; (5) technical and media centers; and, (6) Special Olympics education programs.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Personnel Development Grants</td>
<td>$41.63</td>
<td>$41.63</td>
<td>$41.63</td>
<td>$41.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance &amp; Dissemination</td>
<td>$44.35</td>
<td>$44.35</td>
<td>$44.35</td>
<td>$54.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Preparation</td>
<td>$83.70</td>
<td>$83.70</td>
<td>$83.70</td>
<td>$83.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Information Centers</td>
<td>$27.41</td>
<td>$27.41</td>
<td>$27.41</td>
<td>$27.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology and Media Centers</td>
<td>$28.05</td>
<td>$28.05</td>
<td>$30.05</td>
<td>$30.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Olympics Education Program</td>
<td>$ 7.58</td>
<td>$ 7.58</td>
<td>$10.08</td>
<td>$10.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget freezes funding for most of the Part D programs with the exception of TA&D. That increase is intended to fund model demonstration projects to build the evidence base for promising practices for students who need intensive services and supports. It is not clear whether these additional funds would go to States to expand existing programs or to fund additional technical assistance centers, with a minimal amount of funding going to States and/or local school districts. In general, a funding freeze represents a recognition of, and commitment to, maintaining supports that will help States and local districts ensure students with disabilities receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.
PROGRAM NEED

While these programs represent less than 2 percent of the national expenditure for educating students with disabilities, they provide the critical infrastructure of practice improvements that support the implementation of IDEA. Funds support more than 50 technical assistance and dissemination centers, higher education personnel preparation programs to prepare highly qualified special educators, centers to provide assistance to parents in all 50 states, technology and media centers, and Special Olympics education programs. Without the Part D program, educators and parents would not have the preparation and support to ensure positive outcomes for all students with disabilities.

CONTACT INFO

Nancy Reder
National Association of State Directors of Special Education
(703) 519-1506 | nancy.reder@nasdse.org

Jane West
HECSE/TED
(202) 812-9096 | jwestdc@gmail.com

School Renovation and Modernization

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009
Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2016

In August 2014, the Duval County Public Schools in Jacksonville, Florida, announced a continuation of efforts to upgrade school technology and data systems, largely possible due to support the district received from interest-free bonding authority through the federal Qualified Zone Academy Bond (QZAB) program. The Jacksonville school system is using the bonds to fund infrastructure improvements such as electrical retrofitting and the installation of high-density wireless networks in over 100 schools. The bonding authority also supports improved access to technology through the purchase of a data portal system for parents, students, teachers and community partners; one-to-one or two-to-one learning devices for all middle schools throughout the district; and, interactive teaching bundles for all middle school teachers and core subject teachers (language arts, math, science, and social studies) in the district’s Transformation Schools.

DESCRIPTION

The Qualified School Construction Bond (QSCB) and Qualified Zone Academy Bond (QZAB) programs help States and school districts address the challenges they face in modernizing aging schools. Entities issuing federal school construction bonds receive interest-free bonding authority that can be used for specific infrastructure and instructional improvements, including enhancing building safety, expanding facilities to allow for smaller class size, and increasing access to learning technologies. QSCBs offer additional benefits and can be used for new construction and land acquisition. ARRA authorized QSCB and QZAB bondholders to receive a federal tax credit in lieu of interest payments, but the Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment (HIRE) Act of 2010 (P.L. 111–147) amended the Internal Revenue Code, allowing the option of issuing QSCBs and QZABs as specified tax credit bonds with a direct-pay subsidy. Another option for school districts in recent years was the now expired Build America Bonds (BABs), taxable bonds with a 35 percent interest subsidy rate from the Treasury Department.
FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Zone Academy Bonds*</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified School Construction Bonds*</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The school construction bonding provisions are traditionally authorized and funded through separate tax legislation rather than annual federal appropriations, although tax legislation was included with the FY 2016 omnibus spending bill.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>America Fast Forward Bonds</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>NA*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The president’s FY 2017 budget proposes a new type of bond and includes no limit on bonding authority or the amount available.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

Federal bond programs operate according to calendar rather than federal fiscal years. ARRA authorized QSCBs and BABs for the first time for 2009 and 2010, while extending and expanding QZAB authorization for the same period. A QZAB extension for 2015 and 2016 was authorized by Congress under the tax extenders legislation in December 2015 and was attached to the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2016. While additional bonding authority for QZABs, QSCBs, and BABs was not included in the president’s budget request for FY 2017, the budget proposal again includes the America Fast Forward Bond program. Similar to the BABs, America Fast Forward Bonds would be permanent taxable bonds issued by State and local governments for which the federal government makes direct payments to issuers in an amount equal to 28 percent of the interest on the bonds.

The Administration first proposed Fast Forward bonds in the FY 2014 budget proposal and included a special subsidy of 50 percent for school construction projects in 2014 and 2015. The increased subsidy for education projects was not included in the FY 2017 budget proposal. The president’s FY 2017 budget also proposes technical changes to private activity bonds, eliminating the private corporation ownership requirement and removing the separate volume cap for qualified public educational facilities.

PROGRAM NEED

The amount of bonding authority approved for QSCBs and QZABs in recent years falls well short of existing needs. A 2011 survey of urban school districts found these systems need approximately $20.1 billion in new construction, $61.4 billion in repair, renovation, and modernization, and $19 billion in deferred maintenance costs, or some $100.5 billion in total facilities needs. A new study released by the Institute of Education Sciences in 2014 estimates a nationwide need of almost $200 billion.

Continuous federal investment in school modernization is necessary to address a recognized and established local need and will help more students receive a high quality education in safe, modern, and well-equipped buildings. Funds for school modernization would not only improve student learning, but would also put hundreds of thousands of Americans in the construction industry back to work.

CONTACT INFO

Manish Naik
Council of the Great City Schools
(202) 393-2427 | mnaik@cgcs.org
Teach to Lead

Proposed Program

DESCRIPTION

Teach to Lead, a proposed new competitive grant program, would fund teacher-developed and teacher-led projects for improving student learning and student success. Funds would support a non-profit organization to design and implement a national competition. One-time three-year grants would go directly to teachers for the development, implementation, expansion and dissemination of projects designed to improve outcomes for all students in high need schools or schools targeting the educational needs of low achieving students.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

In an effort to build on the U.S. Department of Education’s existing Teach to Lead initiative, the president proposes a new one-time competitive grant program funded at $10 million for FY 2017. Grant awards would provide direct support to teachers who develop innovative solutions in the classroom with the potential for wider impact on improving student outcomes.

PROGRAM NEED

This program has the potential to build upon the promising work by the Department’s Teach to Lead initiative that has included educator convenings across the country. The new competitive grant program would help expand on the work done by teachers who have identified problems of practice impacting their schools and communities and developed outcomes based action plans currently being implemented. The grant competition process has the potential to generate a great deal of interest nationwide, empowering teachers to share problem-solving action plans to create more authentic opportunities to lead from the classroom.

CONTACT INFO

Corey Williams
National Education Association
(202) 822-7215  |  cwilliams@nea.org
Stronger Together Grants
Proposed Program

DESCRIPTION

The Stronger Together Grants proposal is a core element of the Administration’s efforts to remove barriers to learning facing children living in deep poverty. The program also is intended to provide relief for high poverty schools as they work to improve academic and life outcomes for these students. The Stronger Together Grants program will provide new competitive planning and implementation grants for voluntary, community-developed socioeconomic integration plans. Grants will provide local school districts, consortia of school districts, or regional educational authorities with resources to develop and implement comprehensive strategies to address the effects of concentrated poverty in public schools.

Stronger Together Grants will be used for research and analysis, family engagement activities, revising school boundary and assignment policies, establishing open or controlled school choice zones, and the creation or expansion of theme-based magnet or charter schools that attract students from diverse backgrounds. Grantees also will be encouraged to partner with local housing and transportation authorities, institutions of higher education, and community-based organizations to support implementation.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget requests $120 million for the Stronger Together Grants program. It will award ten one-year planning grants averaging $2 million each to help support a number of activities. Uses of funds may include fostering family and community engagement, assessing economic stratification, evaluating the adequacy of transportation infrastructure, and increasing capacity for data collection. Four implementation grant awards averaging $25 million each for up to five years will support communities currently implementing strategies to improve racial and socioeconomic diversity. Overall, funding will impact approximately 500 schools.

PROGRAM NEED

There is overwhelming evidence demonstrating that school integration by race and socioeconomic status is strongly associated with a range of short and long term benefits for all racial groups. Unfortunately, more than 60 years after the Brown v. Board of Education decision, our nation’s school systems remain largely segregated by race and class, even as our country becomes increasingly diverse. According to the UCLA Civil Rights Project, today a majority of African-American and Latino students attend schools that are predominately low-income and non-white, leading to what researchers define as “double segregation.” By promoting socioeconomic diversity through the Stronger Together Grants program, our nation will be able to reduce the disparities in educational opportunities that are closely associated with race and economic class.

CONTACT INFO

Todd Mann or John Laughner
Magnet Schools of America
(202) 824-0672  |  todd.mann@magnet.edu  |  john.laughner@magnet.edu
**Next Generation High Schools**

Proposed Program

**DESCRIPTION**

The proposed Next Generation High Schools program will provide competitive grants to local school districts that partner with institutions of higher education, non-profits, community-based organizations, government agencies, and business or industry-related organizations to prepare high school students for the future. The program goal is to transform the high school experience to provide students with challenging and relevant academic and career-related learning experiences that prepare them to transition to postsecondary education and careers. Priority will be given to projects with an emphasis on supporting college- and career-readiness in STEM fields, particularly for student groups underrepresented in those fields. Funds could be used to redesign academic content and instructional practices to align with postsecondary education and careers. Other uses of funds include providing personalized learning opportunities and academic and wraparound support services and high quality career and college exploration and counseling services. Grantees may also choose to offer opportunities to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school, career-related experiences, or project-based learning. Other options involve making more strategic use of learning time, including effective application of technology, redesigning school calendars, and competency-based progression, and providing evidence-based professional development to educators.

**FUNDING HISTORY** *(in millions)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET**

As part of the Administration’s plans for reauthorization of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act and implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act, these new grants are focused on better preparing high school students for careers in high need STEM fields. Grantees would leverage existing federal, State, and local funds and resources to implement their programs. Special consideration would be given to applicants with an emphasis on supporting college- and career-readiness in STEM fields, particularly for underrepresented groups in this field. This proposal builds on the first ever White House Summit on Next Generation High Schools held in November 2015.

**PROGRAM NEED**

While 82 percent of high school seniors are now graduating college, bridging the gap from high school to postsecondary education and workforce readiness is critical to our continued economic growth. This program would help provide high school students with relevant and rigorous academic and career-related learning opportunities to enhance the academic foundation and job-related skills leading to college and careers. The comprehensive approach applied in this program will help students gain the academic content, cognitive competencies, and employable skills needed for success in the 21st century.

**CONTACT INFO**

David Chodak  
National Association of Secondary School Principals  
(703) 860-7338  |  chodakd@nassp.org
RESPECT: Best Job in the World

Proposed Program

DESCRIPTION

Proposed RESPECT: Best Job in the World is a one time mandatory funding program which would support the redesign of an estimated 200 high need schools. Based on educator feedback, funding would help to create models that transform these schools into the best places to advance a career in education, with the goal of attracting and retaining talented and effective teachers and school leaders. The program would award competitive grants of up to $250 million to States, with subgrants to districts where schools have been identified by States for comprehensive support and improvement. Eligible districts would conduct a needs assessment, including educator and community stakeholder input, aimed at identifying incentives and policies for attracting and retaining effective teachers and school leaders and dramatically changing school environments for both students and teachers.

Funds would be available for use over a five-year period and would be targeted to (1) creating advancement opportunities for effective teachers in high need schools, (2) enhancing teachers’ effectiveness through teacher-led professional development opportunities, and, (3) leveraging teacher leadership to improve working conditions and create school climates conducive to teaching and learning. The program also would include strong evaluation requirements focused on building the evidence base for effective, replicable strategies.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

Funds would support the implementation of teacher-led development opportunities that improve instruction and help high need schools and districts foster positive school climates that encourage success for students and teachers alike. By leveraging teacher leadership to improve working conditions in high need schools, those schools would become the best places to work and learn. Working with the most vulnerable students will be transformed into the most attractive job for effective educators.

PROGRAM NEED

This program has enormous potential to dramatically change the ability of high need schools to attract and retain talented, committed, and accomplished teachers. The goal is to support comprehensive, locally developed efforts to transform high need schools into the best places to begin and advance a career in education, thus improving their ability to provide students with equitable access to effective teachers. Teachers see the challenges their students and schools face, and they develop solutions that fit the unique needs of their communities. Teachers are best positioned to lead these reforms. Across the country, we need teachers to use their insights and expertise to help us solve the most pressing challenges in education, or we will not live up to our promise as a country.

CONTACT INFO

Kelly Broughan
Teach For America
(202) 650-7872  |  Kelly.Broughan@teachforamerica.org
Computer Science for All
Proposed Program

DESCRIPTION

Computer Science for All is a proposed initiative designed to “empower all American students...to learn computer science and be equipped with the computation thinking skills they need to be creators in the digital economy.” The proposal calls for $4 billion over three years in mandatory funds to be distributed to states and $100 million in discretionary funding to be distributed to school districts to expand K-12 computer science classes by training teachers, expanding access to high quality instructional materials and building effective regional partnerships. In addition, $135 million allocated to the National Science Foundation and the Corporation for National and Community Services will support expanding computer science and training more computer science teachers.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$2,100.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $2 billion in mandatory and $100 million in discretionary funding.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

Building on the Administration’s commitment to improving STEM education and giving young people the skills to be successful in the 21st century workforce, the president has requested significant new resources to increase State and local momentum. The program is intended to encourage States and school districts to use these federal dollars to support the goal of access for every child to a computer science class during the K-12 educational experience.

PROGRAM NEED

Last year, there were more than 600,000 unfilled high paying technology jobs across the United States. By 2018, 51 percent of all STEM jobs are projected to be in computer science-related fields. Computer science and data science are not only important to the computing and technology sector, but also for industries such as transportation, healthcare, education, government and financial services. Parents increasingly recognize this need. More than 9 of 10 parents surveyed by Google in 2015 indicated they want computer science taught at their child’s school. Even as other advanced economies are making computer science courses available to all students, by some estimates just one quarter of all K-12 schools in the United States offer high quality computer science with programming and coding. Twenty-two States still do not allow these courses to count toward high school graduation. Computer Science for All aims to ensure all schools are giving their students access to these critical 21st century skills.

CONTACT INFO

Della Cronin
Washington Partners, LLC
(202) 349-2322  | dcronin@wpllc.net
Part 2. Education, Careers, and Lifelong Learning
The Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act

Combining rigorous academic coursework with world class technical training, graduates from Aviation High School (AHS) in Queens can earn their high school diploma along with an industry-recognized certification. AHS partnered with airline companies to create an on-site classroom located in an annex at J.F.K. International Airport where students get hands-on experience working on a functioning 727 aircraft donated by FedEx. Students are also able to participate in internships with the airlines while still in high school. Upon graduation, students are immediately ready to move into a college education or employment in an aviation field. Despite serving a community of largely low-income families, the school boasted an 88 percent graduation rate. AHS has been awarded seven straight “A” ratings by the New York City Department of Education and has been recognized as one of the best high schools in the nation by U.S. News & World Report.

DESCRIPTION

The Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act (Perkins) provides critical funds to States to invest in career and technical education (CTE). States distribute funds to eligible institutions and school districts by formula to support CTE programs that provide students with the academic, technical, and employability skills needed to succeed in the 21st century workforce.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTE State Grants</td>
<td>$1,117.60</td>
<td>$1,117.60</td>
<td>$1,117.60</td>
<td>$1,192.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Programs</td>
<td>$ 7.42</td>
<td>$ 7.42</td>
<td>$ 7.42</td>
<td>$ 9.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The budget proposal freezes funding for the Perkins CTE State Grant program at $1,117.60 billion, $5.43 million below the pre-sequestration level. The request includes an additional $75 million for Perkins; however, these additional funds would support the proposed American Technical Training Fund for competitive grants to support short term or accelerated job training programs in high-demand fields. The recommended $2 million increase for CTE National Programs would provide technical assistance and evaluation support for projects under the American Technical Training Fund proposal.

PROGRAM NEED

The erosion of Perkins funding has negatively impacted high schools, tech centers, community colleges, employers, and millions of CTE students nationwide. The proposed budget would fund Perkins grants to States at $168.71 million below the FY 2007 level, one of the program’s lowest funding levels in a decade. Once adjusted for inflation, this amounts to a 23 percent decline in Perkins State funding, despite the growing need for resources to serve millions of CTE students nationwide. An increased federal investment in Perkins State grants is needed to support secondary and postsecondary CTE, while ensuring access to high quality programs for all students.
The increase of $75 million in the budget is for a grant competition for a proposed American Technical Training Fund (ATTF).

**CONTACT INFO**

**Mitch Coppes**  
Association for Career and Technical Education  
(703) 683-9316  | mcoppes@acteonline.org

**Steve Voytek**  
National Association of State Directors of Career Technical Education Consortium  
(301) 588-9631  | svoytek@careertech.org
Career and technical education (CTEA) funding explained:
includes state grants (Title I) and national programs (section 114) authorized under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act (CTEA).

Why is the budget request compared to a baseline?
A baseline reflects the funding level required to provide the same level of services in a certain year as was provided in the baseline year by adjusting for changes in the cost of services and enrollment. It is policy-neutral. Including a baseline in a funding chart indicates whether or not current or proposed funding is above, below, or just at the level necessary to keep pace with changes in inflation and enrollment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career and Technical Education (CTEA) Funding</th>
<th>FY 2017 Budget Request</th>
<th>vs FY 2016 Appropriation</th>
<th>vs FY 2010 Baseline (Adjusted for Inflation &amp; Enrollment)**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1.2</td>
<td>+$0.1</td>
<td>-$0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+6.8%</td>
<td>-12.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY 2010 represents the year prior to the start of concerted efforts to restrain nondefense discretionary spending, including the enforcement of spending caps and sequestration under the Budget Control Act.

Sources: Budget request and appropriations data from the U.S. Department of Education Budget Service. NEA calculated the baseline using data from the U.S. Department of Education Budget Service and Projections of Education Statistics to 2022, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. For more information, contact Tom Zembar at 202.822.7109 or T.Zembar@nea.org.
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Adult Education and Family Literacy

Title II, Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA)

In Louisville, KY, the Jefferson County Public Schools Adult Education (JCPSAE) program serves roughly 5,000 adults annually through WIOA Title II—students like Ellen, who moved to the United States from Ghana 10 years ago. She faced many barriers: no GED or high school diploma, three small children at home, and English as her second language. Ellen joined the JCPSAE Family Literacy program, where she was able to earn her GED credential, and then, through a partnership with JCPSAE and Jefferson Community and Technical College, she received a full scholarship to begin nursing classes. When Ellen registered for classes, she explained, “I feel like I am in heaven, just being here on this campus.” Today Ellen’s children are thriving in school while Ellen is in college pursuing a nursing degree and maintaining a 4.0 GPA. WIOA Title II funding has forever altered the trajectory of Ellen’s life.

DESCRIPTION

In July 2014, President Obama signed the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), which reauthorized the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA) as Title II, WIOA. AEFLA-funded programs assist low skilled adults to become literate and proficient in English, secure citizenship, and obtain knowledge and skills for employment and self sufficiency. These programs have also played a key role in helping low-skilled parents obtain the necessary skills to become full partners in their children’s educational development. The AEFLA reauthorization promises greater integration of adult education with occupational education and training and career pathways systems and explicitly authorizes the use of program funds for integrated education and training and workforce preparation activities. The law also codifies the English Literacy/Civics Education program, the main federal funding source for States and communities to provide limited English proficient adults with expanded access to high quality English literacy programs linked to civics education.

The bulk of federal adult education funds is sent to States and distributed as grants to local adult education providers. AEFLA is the foundation for State and community efforts to improve adult education and literacy systems, supporting teacher training, curriculum development, and accountability measurements.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Grants</td>
<td>$563.96</td>
<td>$568.96</td>
<td>$581.96</td>
<td>$581.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Leadership Activities</td>
<td>$ 13.71</td>
<td>$ 13.71</td>
<td>$ 13.71</td>
<td>$ 24.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The proposed budget of $606.67 for adult education is $28.53 million below AEFLA’s authorized level of $635.20 million. State grants would be frozen at the FY 2016 level, with $69,835 set aside (12 percent, as authorized in AEFLA) for continuation of English Literacy/Civics Education State Grants. National Leadership Activities would receive an $11 million increase above FY 2016 and $12.71 million over the FY 2017 authorized amount. AEFLA contains a formula cap on National Leadership Activities of 2 percent of the total appropriation, not to exceed $15 million. The Administration proposes the increase for National Leadership Activities to support State efforts to improve adult education standards and assessments, carry out data collection, and support interoperability of data systems and improved reporting to meet WIOA requirements.
While Congress provided a welcome increase of $13 million in State Grants for FY 2016, the federal investment in this program has largely been on the decline in real dollars since FY 2002. While this increase is preserved in the president’s budget, that funding level would continue to support just 1.6 million of the 36 million adults who would benefit from this important services.

**PROGRAM NEED**

A 2013 international survey conducted by the Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC) found millions of American adults struggle with basic skills, impeding their ability to fully participate in the labor market, access education and training, take charge of their health, and participate meaningfully in social and civic life. Roughly 36 million adults, one in six, lack basic literacy skills. Nearly one in three has poor numeracy skills. Behind these alarming figures are stories like Ellen’s, men and women eager to upgrade their skills and then achieving success when given that opportunity. Investing in their education is critical to our nation’s economic competitiveness. Mean proficiency scores in literacy and numeracy for American adults were below the average of many other countries in the survey.

It is critical to preserve federal adult education and literacy funding through WIOA Title II and find ways to increase the investment in the future to help more individuals who desperately need these services. Other sources of federal funding for this population are dwindling, and State funding has also been significantly reduced in the past several years. As a result, all 50 States have waiting lists for adult education program services. In addition, WIOA created a number of new requirements for AEFLA programs. Effective career pathway and integrated program models are both challenging and costly to implement and require intensive professional development up front. It is unrealistic to expect States and local communities to absorb the additional associated costs as federal resources have steadily declined.

**CONTACT INFO**

Jeff Carter  
National Coalition for Literacy  
(202) 374-4387  |  jcarter@literacypolicy.org
Library Services and Technology Act
The Museum and Library Services Act

A Six Mile Regional Library District (Granite City, IL) building was undergoing a renovation project when a flood damaged a portion of the library materials housed temporarily in a closed school. Over 1,500 books were damaged by this flood, most from the library’s adult non-fiction collection. The District applied for, and was awarded, an LSTA grant to help replace the damaged materials, providing the community with access to quality content and information.

The Mauney Memorial Library (Kings Mountain, NC) used an LSTA grant to provide training and assistance to local businesses in its Kings Mountain Small Business Success Project. The grant allowed the library to provide one on one guidance to local businesses seeking to enhance their internet presence, improve customer service, increase safety and on-line security, receive technology training, and learn how to file government forms.

DESCRIPTION

The Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) is the primary annual source of funding for libraries in the federal budget. The majority of funding is a population-based grant distributed to each State library agency through the Grants to States program administered by the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), a small independent federal government agency. Each State library agency determines how best to spend its allotted funds. Many States use their funding to help library users find jobs and build resumes or obtain a GED, support younger students with homework and afterschool programs, help children avoid the “summer slide” with summer reading programs, assist businesses to expand their operations, allow patrons to access government documents and file forms, and many other important activities. LSTA also provides money to States for professional development for librarians under the Laura Bush 21st Century Library Professionals program that supports the recruitment and education of the next generation of librarians and facility and library leaders.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$180.91</td>
<td>$180.91</td>
<td>$182.94</td>
<td>$182.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

Many libraries are seeing record high levels of users — 4.2 million visits each day to the more than 16,000 public libraries in the U.S. — while experiencing budget cuts at the State and local levels. Now is not the time for the federal government to cut funding to libraries. These resources are urgently needed, especially given States with tight budgets must match the IMLS federal funds, making cuts even more devastating to the library community and its patrons. With many people still out of work or underemployed, working to learn new skills, and seeking degrees and/or certifications, the public library has been the one place they can go to receive help searching for a job and building a resume. We urge Congress to at least maintain funding at the FY 2016 level of $182.94 million, including $155.79 million for the Grants to States program. Even a small cut, as proposed in the Administration’s budget, will mean a serious decrease in support for a number of important projects in each State that would benefit many children, job seekers, and businesses.
PROGRAM NEED

In December 2010, Congress reauthorized LSTA under the Museum and Library Services Act (MLSA) with an authorization level of $232 million, well beyond the current funding amount. As a result of sequestration in FY 2013, LSTA funding was reduced to $175 million and has slowly increased. In many States, public libraries were not able to provide summer reading programs, with the result that many K-12 students were unable to maintain their reading level over the summer break. Modest increases in FY 2016 raised LSTA to $182.94 million, still far below authorized levels. LSTA should be reauthorized in 2016, and funding levels should more closely approach the authorization.

While MLSA authorized this program at $232 million in December 2010, we urge Congress to at least maintain funding for LSTA at $182.94 million and funding for Grants to States at $155.79 million. These funds will help meet the urgent needs of libraries to provide services on which many people in every community rely each day.

CONTACT INFO

Kevin Maher
American Library Association
(202) 628-8410  |  kmaher@alawash.org
Office of Museum Services
Institute of Museum and Library Services

In 2015, The Magic House, a St. Louis children’s museum, received a Museums for America grant to research, develop, fabricate, and assess a new early childhood STEM exhibit for children ages two through six. The 1,500 square foot learning environment will engage children in self-directed activities that align with State educational standards for science and math. The museum will also create a new guided field trip program, a professional development workshop for educators in early childhood STEM education, and tools and resources for parents and caregivers.

DESCRIPTION

Despite its small size, the IMLS Office of Museum Services (OMS) is the largest source of funding dedicated to helping our nation’s museums connect people to information and ideas. OMS supports all types of museums—including historic sites and living collections—in their work to stimulate lifelong learning for every American, spur economic development, and anchor community identity. OMS, which receives funding under the Museum Services Act and the African American History and Culture Act, awards competitive discretionary grants in every State. These grants are used to preserve and digitize collections, educate students, reach new audiences, and enhance community engagement.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 President’s Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$30.13</td>
<td>$30.13</td>
<td>$31.34</td>
<td>$31.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

While the increase proposed by the president’s budget is very small, it comes at a critical time for our nation’s museums and will have an important effect on their ability to preserve collections, inspire students, produce innovative learning methods, and reach new audiences. With OMS’s two primary grant programs funding only 30 and 38 percent of all applications last year, this is a much needed increase. The president’s budget will still leave many highly qualified applications unfunded, but it will help museums make an impact in several identified priority areas, such as STEM education, national digital infrastructure, and early childhood-family learning. The budget also sets out key strategic focuses on training for collections care, deepening museums’ role as community-centered organizations, and serving veterans and military families.
PROGRAM NEED

Museums spend over $2 billion every year on education programs, but could do much more for their communities with increased capacity. The minimal federal investment made through OMS grants leverages significant private, State, and local funding for maximum impact. Congress passed legislation in late 2010 authorizing annual funding of $38.60 million for OMS. This legislation contained several provisions to further support museums, particularly at the State level, but many of these activities cannot be accomplished without sustained funding. Since that authorization, funding was slashed from the FY 2010 level of $35.21 million and has not yet recovered. With only a fraction of our nation’s museums being reached and many highly rated applications going unfunded, we urge Congress to fully fund the IMLS Office of Museum Services at its authorized level.

CONTACT INFO

Ben Kershaw
American Alliance of Museums
(202) 218-7699  |  bkershaw@aam-us.org
Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA)

A manufacturing business in Brevard County, FL, needed to recertify 38 employees within three weeks or face losing a big contract forcing layoffs. Traditional networks couldn’t do the training for four months and the local community college capacity was no more than 15 at a time. CareerSource Brevard, the county’s WIOA supported workforce development board, heard about the problem and found a manufacturer willing to open its on-site training facility and teach the class. All students were taught at the same time over two days. CareerSource Brevard paid for half the training costs, with a total of under $2,000 for all 38 to be recertified! In Portland, Oregon, Sary Dobhran’s life took an unexpected turn when she found herself suddenly widowed and pregnant with her first child. Fluent in four languages and armed with a college degree, Sary was confident she could find work. After searching unsuccessfully for nine months and trying to support herself and her child on $400/month, she had to reinvent herself. When Sary learned about the Green Careers Training Project, she couldn’t have been more excited. Worksystems, Portland’s workforce development board, and its partners coordinated Green Careers to help people get training and support while also helping green businesses access a skilled workforce. Today Sary is an assistant site auditor conducting energy audits for homeowners interested in saving money on their utility bills. She loves interacting with people and, above all, she loves earning a living wage with benefits that provide a better life for her and her son.

DESCRIPTION

The purpose of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) is to better align the workforce system with education and economic development in an effort to create a collective response to economic and labor market challenges on the national, State, and local levels. WIOA recognizes that the nation’s labor market processes over 100 million transactions in the labor market involving hiring and separations.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5,933.45</td>
<td>$5,923.55</td>
<td>$6,030.63</td>
<td>$6,216.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Primary Program Budget Focus for the Employment & Training Programs under WIOA.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

Congress passed the Workforce Innovation & Opportunity Act in July 2014. The Act replaced the Workforce Investment Act, after over 10 years of deliberation on Congress’s vision for the nation’s workforce development system. That vision included local business-led workforce boards with responsibilities to analyze regional labor market data, consult with businesses to vet the data and determine skill needs, communicate findings to their regional system, and evaluate investments based on efficiency, effectiveness, access and equity for current and emerging job seekers. To accomplish this work, Congress established budget targets. Neither the FY 2016 omnibus appropriations bill nor the president’s FY 2017 proposal include full funding of WIOA. Title I — adult, youth and dislocated workers — falls short of the Act’s estimates by approximately $300 million, mostly for dislocated workers.
PROGRAM NEED

Despite robust jobs market reports in recent months, several factors should be kept in mind. Youth unemployment is twice the national average. The 5.8 million youth ages 16-24 not in school or unemployed cost taxpayers $93 billion annually. In addition, as many as 22 million Americans can be considered underemployed, meaning they are working in positions that do not utilize all of their skills. Job training and apprenticeship programs can help to adjust that disparity.

Nationwide over 13 million people sought the assistance of WIOA programs, with over 7.8 million entering employment. Workforce Development Boards provide a 1.5:1 to as much as a 3.5:1 return on investment in States nationwide. In a 2014 study, 47 percent of employers said the lack of technical competencies made it difficult to fill jobs. Only 22 percent of companies report they would hire someone who needs additional training in order to fill a role.

As foreign nations commit more funding to their national skill development, the United States must do likewise. This is especially important to meet the specific needs identified by employers.

CONTACT INFO

Ronald D. Painter  
National Association of Workforce Boards  
(202) 857-7900  │  painterr@nawb.org

Jeff Carter  
National Council of State Directors of Adult Literacy  
(202) 624-5250  │  jcarter@ncsdae.org
Part 3. The Gateway to Opportunity

Higher Education
President Obama continues his focus on college affordability and completion throughout the FY 2017 budget request. The budget highlights the commitment to ensuring all students, particularly those from underrepresented and low-income communities, have access to quality educational opportunities without accumulating unmanageable student debt.

The president has consistently stressed Americans need more advanced education and skills to meet the demands of a global economy and that a strong investment in higher education and research is necessary to secure the nation’s future national and economic security. The budget proposes to invest in and improve federal student aid programs, along with initiatives to significantly increase the number of people enrolling and completing college. Combining the discretionary and mandatory funding requests, the overall federal investment in postsecondary education would provide almost $140 billion in grants, loans, and work-study to 12.1 million students.

The cornerstone of federal student financial aid is the Pell Grant program, which provides aid to the country’s neediest college students. The president’s budget request provides sufficient discretionary money to maintain the Pell Grant base award of $4,860 which, with the mandatory add-on funds and statutory inflation adjustment, is projected to increase the maximum grant for the 2017-18 academic year by $120 to $5,935. Mandatory funds set aside in the College Cost Reduction and Access Act of 2007 to index the mandatory add-on to the Consumer Price Index (CPI) expire at the end of FY 2017. The budget proposes to permanently continue the inflation adjustment beyond FY 2017 at a cost of $33 billion over ten years. This extension would be paid for with mandatory funds.

The budget proposes two new reforms to the Pell Grant program, which provide incentives to students to complete their degrees on time. First, the budget proposes the Pell for Accelerated Completion, which is the reinstatement of “year-round” Pell. Students completing a full course load in the fall and spring are eligible for Pell assistance for summer school to ensure on time or early completion. Second, the budget proposes an On-Track Pell Bonus, to provide a $300 add-on to a student’s grant if he or she is taking 15 credits or more per semester. These reforms would be paid for using the current Pell program surplus.

The Pell program is currently running a surplus, though it will face a funding shortfall in several years.
## Student Aid Savings Enacted

In millions of dollars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PELL GRANTS POLICY CHANGES</th>
<th>FISCAL IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discretionary savings are from program costs, mandatory savings from budget authority</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enacted in the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011: Public Law 112–10</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Eliminated summer Pell/year-round Pell effective July 1, 2011.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. discretionary savings (FY 2012-21)</td>
<td>-32,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. mandatory savings (FY 2012-21)</td>
<td>-8,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enacted in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012: Public Law 112–74.</strong> NOTE: Most of these savings were used to maintain the maximum Pell grant award.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Effective July 1, 2012, increased the level at which a student qualifies for a ‘0’ Expected Family Contribution to a formula with a base of $23,000 and inflated for future years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. discretionary savings (FY 2012-21)</td>
<td>-3,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. mandatory savings (FY 2012-21)</td>
<td>-183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Effective July 1, 2012, raised the minimum eligibility level from 5 percent to 10 percent of the maximum award.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. discretionary savings (FY 2012-21)</td>
<td>-382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. mandatory savings (FY 2012-21)</td>
<td>-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Effective July 1, 2012, limited students receiving Pell grants to a maximum of the equivalent of 6 years/12 semesters full-time enrollment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. discretionary savings (FY 2012-21)</td>
<td>-5,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. mandatory savings (FY 2012-21)</td>
<td>-1,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Effective July 1, 2012, amended the requirements related to ability-to-benefit, so students without a high school degree or GED are only eligible for student aid if they completed secondary school in a home setting, except that students enrolled prior to July 1, 2012, would continue to be eligible for aid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. discretionary savings (FY 2012-21)</td>
<td>-2,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. mandatory savings (FY 2012-21)</td>
<td>-637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions of #2-5 on Discretionary</td>
<td>+459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions of #2-5 on Mandatory</td>
<td>+116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL PELL SAVINGS</strong></td>
<td>-53,579</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### STUDENT LOANS POLICY CHANGES
(all mandatory savings from outlays)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fiscal Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enacted in The Budget Control Act of 2011: Public Law 112-25</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Eliminated the in-school interest subsidy for graduate student loans (FY 2012-21). <strong>NOTE:</strong> $17 billion of these savings was transferred to the Pell Grant program.</td>
<td>-18,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Eliminate loan repayment incentives (FY 2012-21).</td>
<td>-3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Yearly impact of mandatory sequester cut on increasing student loan origination fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. FY 2013</td>
<td>-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. FY 2014</td>
<td>-122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. FY 2015</td>
<td>-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. FY 2016</td>
<td>-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enacted in the Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act of 2013: Public Law 113-28</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Changed the interest rate on all new subsidized, unsubsidized, gradPLUS, and parent loans made on or after July 1, 2013. (FY 2013-23)</td>
<td>- 775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enacted in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012: Public Law 112-74</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Beginning July 1, 2012, and ending June 30, 2014, eliminated the federal interest subsidy on all new subsidized student loans while the borrower is in the six-month post-school grace period. Interest would accrue during the grace period and would be capitalized when the loan entered repayments. (FY 2012-21)</td>
<td>-1,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enacted in the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act: Public Law 112-141</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Limited to 150% of program length the period an undergraduate can receive a subsidized Stafford loan.</td>
<td>-1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL STUDENT LOAN SAVINGS</strong></td>
<td>-25,113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elimination of Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership (LEAP) Program


-64

**TOTAL STUDENT AID SAVINGS**

-78,756

Sources for all numbers are CBO cost estimates or OMB data.
Other key components of the student aid budget include the campus-based aid programs, which provide additional grants, loans, and work opportunities to financially needy students. The budget freezes funding for the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG) and the Federal Work-Study (FWS) programs and reworks the Perkins Loan program to provide a significant new source of unsubsidized loans to low-income students. As in past years, the president proposes to change the allocation and distribution formula for the campus-based aid programs to target funding toward institutions enrolling and graduating higher numbers of Pell-eligible students and offering affordable education that does not leave students with unmanageable debt upon program completion.

In the area of student loans, the budget proposes to create a single “Pay As You Earn” (PAYE) income-driven repayment plan for borrowers starting July 1, 2017. Repayment would be capped at 10 percent of discretionary income, and remaining balances would be forgiven after 20 years (25 years for graduate school). The FY 2017 budget request includes many of the same proposals for student loan reform outlined in previous budgets, which focus on reducing program complexity, targeting benefits to increase program effectiveness, and eliminating program abuses.

A freeze in funding is proposed for most of the institutional support programs designated to specific categories of institutions serving traditionally underserved and underrepresented populations, such as Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Hispanic-Serving Institutions, Native American-Serving Institutions, and Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander Institutions. Increased mandatory funds are requested across the Title III programs and would be available for developing STEM and articulation programs at Hispanic-Serving Institutions.

Funding freezes also are proposed for a number of other important programs that promote access to college and enhance academic preparation and support services to help low-income and first generation students succeed in postsecondary education. These include the TRIO programs and Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP). Within TRIO, a $20 million set-aside is requested to support a separate Demonstration Project for additional evidence-based college access and success strategies.

The president’s budget proposes several new and expanded sources of funding for teacher preparation:

- **RESPECT: Best Job in the World:** $1 billion in mandatory funding to support nationwide efforts to attract and retain effective teachers in high need schools by increasing compensation and paths for advancement, implementing teacher led development opportunities to improve instruction, and creating working conditions and school climates conducive to student success.

- **Teacher and Principal Pathways:** $125 million for grants to institutions of higher education and non-profit organizations to create or expand high quality pathways into the teacher profession, particularly for high need schools and high need subjects. The current Teacher Quality Partnership program would be absorbed into this new program.

- **Teach to Lead:** $10 million to develop innovative reforms with the potential for wider impact on improving student outcomes.

The only grant aid available through the Department of Education for academically talented graduate students—the Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) program—would be frozen at $29 million. Title VI—International Education and Foreign Language Studies would be cut by $4.9 million.

The budget includes new and expanded programs designed to invest in evidence-based strategies that show promising results and encourage States to reinvest in and reward public institutions offering increased access, quality education, and student success, especially to low-income students. Many of the new programs and spending proposals would require congressional approval in authorization or appropriations legislation. These programs include:
■ **America’s College Promise**, the new mandatory funded initiative that would offer students a free community college education if they maintain a 2.5 GPA and make steady progress toward completing their program at eligible institutions. Four-year HBCUs and Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs) that engage in reforms and innovations to improve student outcomes could also be eligible for grants to provide reduced or free tuition for Pell-eligible students.

■ **College Opportunity and Graduation Bonus**, a proposed mandatory funded competitive grant program that would award $547 million in grants to institutions successfully enrolling and graduating on time a significant number of low- and moderate-income students.

■ **HBCU and MSI Innovation for Completion Fund**, providing $30 million to increase completion by low-income and students of color at these institutions.

■ **The First in the World (FITW)**, $100 million to revive this competitive grant program targeted to innovation, which was zeroed out in FY 2016.

The budget also proposes expansions and revisions to higher education tax benefits including (See the Summary/Analysis section on page 15 for details):

■ Providing a new Community College Partnership Tax Credit.
■ Expanding and modifying the AOTC and repealing the Lifetime Learning Credit.
■ Repealing the student loan interest deduction and providing exclusion for certain debt relief and scholarships from taxable income.

The higher education community appreciates the president’s continued support for the Pell Grant program, the campus-based aid programs, and the other core programs that help low-income students enter and graduate from college. However, it is important to acknowledge over the past several years budget savings measures adopted by Congress and the Administration have had a serious negative impact on postsecondary students. In fact since 2011, students in higher education have lost over $75 billion in financial aid benefits. These losses have occurred through elimination of the year-round Pell Grant, zero funding of the Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnerships program, removal of the in-school interest subsidy for graduate and professional students, and various eligibility changes in the Pell Grant program. The cumulative effect of these changes on students is daunting. While CEF greatly appreciates that some of the sequestration funds were replaced in FY 2014, these programs are not adequately funded to meet the demonstrated need.

CEF members look forward to working with Congress and the Administration on efforts to increase program funds, expand student aid eligibility, and reward schools for offering strong student-centered programs and high quality education. CEF will work to retain important student-focused benefits and to avoid additional cuts in important areas like graduate education, student support services, academic preparation, and teacher quality.
**Higher education (HEA) discretionary funding explained:**

Includes all programs authorized under the Higher Education Act (HEA), except for federal student aid (Federal Pell Grants and campus-based programs), and related programs authorized under other laws. Discretionary funding is subject to the annual appropriations process. Congress must provide the funding each year by program.

**Why is the budget request compared to a baseline?**

A baseline reflects the funding level required to provide the same level of services in a certain year as was provided in the baseline year by adjusting for changes in the cost of services and enrollment. It is policy-neutral. Including a baseline in a funding chart indicates whether or not current or proposed funding is above, below, or just at the level necessary to keep pace with changes in inflation and enrollment.

**Higher Education (HEA) Discretionary Funding excluding Federal Student Aid**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2.2</td>
<td>$1.8</td>
<td>$2.6</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>$3.4</td>
<td>baseline*</td>
<td>Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Baseline: represents the actual appropriation for fiscal year 2010 adjusted each year thereafter for inflation and enrollment.

**FY 2017 Budget Request vs FY 2016 Appropriation vs FY 2010 Baseline (Adjusted for Inflation & Enrollment)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher Education (HEA) Discretionary Funding excluding Federal Student Aid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+$0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-$0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-18.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** Budget request and appropriations data from the U.S. Department of Education Budget Service. NEA calculated the baseline using data from the U.S. Department of Education Budget Service and Projections of Education Statistics to 2022, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. For more information, contact Tom Zembar at 202.822.7109 or TZembar@nea.org.

**February 9, 2016**
Number of Recipients by Federal Aid Program (with Average Aid Received)
2014-15

Federal Aid Programs (with Average Aid per Recipient)

- Federal Education Tax Benefits ($1,310)
- Federal Pell Grant ($3,670)
- Stafford Subsidized Loans ($3,750)
- Stafford Unsubsidized Loans ($3,660)
- FSEOG ($500)
- Federal Work-Study ($1,800)
- Post-9-11 GI Bill Veterans Benefits ($14,110)
- Perkins Loan ($2,140)

Number of Recipients in Millions

- 14.0 million
- 8.2 million
- 6.6 million
- 7.8 million
- 1.5 million
- 638,000
- 890,000
- 550,000

SOURCE: The College Board, Trends in Student Aid 2015, Figure 7.

For detailed data, visit trends.collegeboard.org.
Total Undergraduate Student Aid by Source and Type (with Average Aid Received)
In billions, 2014-15

SOURCE: The College Board, Trends in Student Aid 2015, Figure 2A.

For detailed data, visit: trends.collegeboard.org.
Federal Student Aid per Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Student in 2014 Dollars
1994-95 to 2014-15

SOURCE: The College Board, Trends in Student Aid 2015, Figure 6.

For detailed data, visit: trends.collegeboard.org.
Total Grant Aid in 2014 Dollars by Source of Grant
1994-95 to 2014-15

SOURCE: The College Board, Trends in Student Aid 2015, Figure 4.
For detailed data, visit: trends.collegeboard.org.
Pell Grants
Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1, Higher Education Act

“It was a hard earned privilege to be admitted to Georgetown, but it has been a blessing to attend. The cost of attendance would have been insurmountable without a Pell Grant supplementing the aid provided by Georgetown. As the daughter of a teenage mother and undocumented father, my parents instilled a hard work ethic in me and, despite the statistics, there was never a doubt that I would be the first generation of my family to attend university. Yet when I first looked into the finances of attending college, it seemed like a distant dream. Even with scholarships and my parents and myself working, I thought I would be forced to borrow crippling loans.

Alas, I was blessed to not worry about these things, as I am a proud Pell Grant recipient. Money remains a concern but not a worry as Pell Grants have allowed me to focus on getting the most out of what Georgetown has to offer. I maintain a Federal Work-Study job alongside my full course schedule and serve as president of the Caribbean Culture Circle, student board chair of the Georgetown Scholarship Program, and a competitive member of the Boxing team. Without Pell Grants, I would not be able to be the student I am.”

-Quaila Hugh, Georgetown University

DESCRIPTION

The Pell Grant Program provides grants to low-income undergraduate students to help them finance their college education. Grants vary in amount on the basis of need, with the highest need students receiving the largest awards. Pell is the foundation of the federal financial aid program and is the key to providing equal access to postsecondary education for all citizens.

The Pell Grant Program is unusual in that it is an appropriated entitlement. The program makes awards to all eligible students like an entitlement, but the majority of the program’s funding is provided in the annual appropriations process. Additional mandatory funding that provides inflation-adjusted add-ons to the maximum award has been provided through recent legislation.

In many years, the Pell program either faces a funding shortfall or surplus, since appropriations are based on projected enrollments. Currently, the program has a surplus but in a few years will once again face a funding shortfall.
In addition, the budget proposes additional changes to the Pell Grant program, including:

- Over $33 billion in mandatory funding provided in the College Cost Reduction and Access Act of 2007 to index the annual statutory inflation adjustment, the maximum grant for the 2017-18 academic year would increase to a projected $5,935. With the mandatory add-on funds and statutory inflation adjustment, the maximum grant for the 2017-18 academic year would increase to a projected $5,935.

- The FY 2017 budget proposes to continue the inflation adjustment beyond that date at a cost of $33 billion over 10 years.

In addition, the budget proposes additional changes to the Pell Grant program, including:

- The restoration of year-round Pell Grants, which would provide eligibility for additional Pell support to full-time students who are enrolled for a third semester (for a total of 150 percent of the maximum award in an academic year).
- An On-Track Pell Bonus that would provide a $300 bonus to students if they are enrolled for 15 credits a semester.
- The Second Chance Pell program which would extend Pell Grant participation to otherwise eligible individuals who are incarcerated and eligible for release.
- Strengthening the academic progress requirements to encourage students to graduate and complete their studies on time.
- Moving the Iraq and Afghanistan Service Grant Program into the Pell Grant program to assure eligible children of veterans receive the full Pell award for which they qualify.

**PROGRAM NEED**

More than 7.7 million students rely on Pell Grants to afford and attend college. In 2015-15 award year, about 72 percent of Pell recipients had incomes of $30,000 or less. Students and institutions depend on the federal government to maintain consistent support so they can budget and plan for higher education. Therefore, it is critical Congress provide appropriated funding in FY 2017 sufficient to maintain the discretionary portion of the maximum award at $4,860. A drop below that level will cause reductions in the already enacted mandatory increases, resulting in a double cut to students. Further, changes to the Pell funding formula in the FY 2012 appropriations already resulted in hundreds of thousands of students losing their eligibility or seeing their award levels reduced.

Pell grant funding is now just 22 percent of federal student aid, with loans comprising over 24 percent.

The Pell grant program was exempt from sequestration in FY 2013. In addition to these discretionary levels, Pell grants has had varying levels of mandatory funding since FY 2008.
The current discretionary appropriated maximum award is $4,860. Mandatory funds automatically increase the maximum award each year through FY 2017. The budget projects a maximum Pell of $5,935 in award year 2017-18 and $6,235 for those taking at least 15 credits through the On-Track Pell Bonus proposal.

**CONTACT INFO**

**Megan McClean Coval** or **Stephen Payne**
National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators
(202) 785-0453 | mccleanm@nasfaa.org | paynes@nasfaa.org
Undergraduate Enrollment and Percentage of Undergraduate Students Receiving Pell Grants
2004-05 to 2014-15

Trends in Student Aid 2015, Figure 23.

For detailed data, visit: trends.collegeboard.org.

SOURCE: The College Board, Trends in Student Aid 2015, Figure 23.
Pell Recipients - Type & Control

Maximum and Average Pell Grants in 2014 Dollars
1976-77 to 2014-15


SOURCE: The College Board, Trends in Student Aid 2015, Figure 24.
Total Pell Expenditures, Maximum and Average Pell Grants in 2014 Dollars and Number of Recipients
1979-80 to 2014-15

Inflation-Adjusted Maximum Pell Grant and Published Prices at Public and Private Nonprofit Four-Year Institutions in 2015 Dollars
1995-96 to 2015-16

SOURCE: The College Board, Trends in Student Aid 2015, Figure 26.
Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants
Title IV, Part A, Subpart 3, Higher Education Act

Karen Larios is an independent undergraduate student at Georgetown University. When Karen was six years old, her single mother passed away from cancer, and she was adopted by an aunt. Karen’s aunt worked very hard as a low wage factory worker on the south side of Chicago to sustain them both. However, she did not support Karen’s decision to pursue higher education. Upon her acceptance to Georgetown, Karen was forced to leave her home and travel to Washington, DC, with nothing but a few belongings.

Karen has been able to attend Georgetown thanks to a financial aid package that includes a Supplemental Education Opportunity Grant (SEOG), a Pell Grant, a private scholarship, and a generous Georgetown scholarship. The aid she received has been critical and necessary to get her through college.

While at Georgetown, she has been a board member of HOPE, a student-run organization dedicated to addressing issues of homelessness in the Washington, DC, area. She is an active member of the Georgetown Aspiring Minority Business Leaders and Entrepreneurs (G.A.M.B.L.E) and an intern at the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities where she works on issues related to higher education and federal financial aid. Karen graduates from Georgetown’s McDonough School of Business in May 2016 with a double major in International Business and Marketing. She hopes to be an example for her community and to continue to be an advocate of federal financial aid.

DESCRIPTION

SEOG is a campus-based aid program with a required 25 percent institutional match that provides financial aid officers flexibility to help students when their financial circumstances drastically change. SEOG provides up to $4,000 in additional grant aid targeted for exceptionally needy students. The grant expands college choices for low-income students and is a critical component of the federal student aid package. SEOG assists the neediest students with average family incomes of $19,000 or less at 3,800 institutions across the country.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$733.13</td>
<td>$733.13</td>
<td>$733.13</td>
<td>$733.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s proposed budget would freeze funds for the SEOG program at $733.13 million, the same level as the FY 2016 appropriations. SEOG awards go to the neediest students, so a strong investment in this program is extremely important to assist these young adults to attend college.
The president’s budget also calls for reforms in the allocation of campus-based funds, to “direct funding toward institutions that enroll and graduate higher numbers of Pell-eligible students, and offer an affordable and quality education such that graduates can repay their educational debt.” These proposed policy changes would require congressional action before they could take effect.

**PROGRAM NEED**

There is a tremendous effort to serve the neediest students through the SEOG program. Financial aid offices are well aware of students like Karen Larios who need additional support to pay for college. SEOG supplements the Pell Grant program and is a buffer for students with special financial needs or whose families have had difficult situations and still want their children to go to college. SEOG should be preserved and increased, given the growth in the number of students eligible for need-based aid. Additional funding would allow more institutions to participate in the program and provide more grant aid to students. Grant aid is more effective than loans in keeping low-income students in college and persisting to completion and minimizes student loan debt burden.

![Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants](chart.png)

**CONTACT INFO**

Cyndy Littlefield  
Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities  
(202) 862-9893  |  cyndylit@aol.com

Stephanie Giesecke  
National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities  
(202) 785-8866  |  Stephanie@naicu.edu
Federal Work-Study Program (FWS)

Title IV, Part C, Higher Education Act

Very often FWS work experience relates directly to a student’s field of study or community service—both of which are valuable to the student, the institution, and the surrounding community. For example, a student who attended a large, four-year public institution majored in elementary education. She held a Work-Study job through a reading program at a low-income school. The work and experience she gained there nicely complemented her educational studies. The experience of working with students from low-income backgrounds helped her in her first year of teaching kindergarten. Just like this student’s experience, many FWS opportunities provide students the chance to find employment in areas of interest and relevance to their major, giving them practical real world work experience.

**DESCRIPTION**

The FWS program provides funds to institutions for awards to needy students for part-time employment that assists in financing college costs. Students can receive FWS funds at approximately 3,400 participating postsecondary institutions, which provide a funding match. The work-study program is cost-effective for the federal government because institutions and employers contribute funds. In addition, this shared aspect of the program provides an element of institutional commitment. The program provides students with much needed funding and work opportunities, helping integrate students into college life and persist to graduation. Institutions must use at least 7 percent of their FWS allocation to employ students in community service jobs that serve the needs of the community and give students enriching and rewarding experiences. While the vast majority of funds go directly toward need-based student compensation, a portion of funds may also be used to develop off campus jobs for students.

**FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$974.73</td>
<td>$989.73</td>
<td>$989.73</td>
<td>$989.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET**

The Administration’s FY 2017 budget request proposes to freeze FWS funding at the FY 2015 and FY 2016 level. When combined with institutional matching funds, this request would provide over $1.1 billion of aid for participating institutions estimated to support 674,000 recipients.

The president’s budget also calls for reforms in the allocation of campus-based funds, to “direct funding toward institutions that enroll and graduate higher numbers of Pell-eligible students, and offer an affordable and quality education such that graduates can repay their educational debt.” These proposed policy changes would require congressional action before they could take effect.
PROGRAM NEED

It is imperative, in light of two consecutive years of a funding freeze, that the FWS program receives at least the funding level requested by President Obama. These funds ensure availability of job opportunities to help students complete their degrees in a timely manner. Any cuts to the program would hinder students’ ability to finance their education, likely resulting in higher debt burdens. In addition to earning money to help pay postsecondary expenses, students gain valuable work experience through FWS, enabling them to better contribute to society.

CONTACT INFO

Megan McClean Coval or Stephen Payne
National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators
(202) 785-0453  |  mccleanm@nasfaa.org  |  paynes@nasfaa.org
Federal Perkins Loan Program

Title IV, Part E, Higher Education Act

“I wanted to extend my gratitude to Temple University and the Bursar’s Office. With the rising costs of tuition, attending college might seem impossible for some students. I come from a single parent home, and my mom did everything in her power to see that I graduated. When my mom was laid off from her job, I thought graduating would no longer be possible. I received some scholarships, but it was still not enough to cover the entire cost of tuition as well as room and board. Without the assistance of the Federal Perkins Loan, finishing college would have been very difficult. I am now a college graduate, and I am thankful for all the financial assistance I received during my undergraduate years. College can be an expensive investment, but I am glad that I had the Perkins Loan to assist me.”

—Kayla McBride, Temple University Class of 2015

DESCRIPTION

The Perkins Loan Program is a campus-based aid program that provides low-interest loans to the neediest college students. Colleges originate, service, and collect the loans, all of which are recycled in a revolving fund to provide loans to future students. The federal government is authorized to add capital contributions every year, and colleges match a third or more, which stretches federal dollars. Since the program was created in 1958, institutions have invested millions of dollars of their own funds through this match. Funding is also authorized for loan cancellations because federal law requires Perkins Loan Revolving Funds be reimbursed at schools meeting their obligation to cancel loans for borrowers who work in certain public service fields such as teaching, nursing, law enforcement, firefighting, the Peace Corps, child care, libraries, and the military. Cancellations have not been funded in recent years, and many schools are owed millions of dollars in unreimbursed cancellation funds.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Capital Contributions</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellations</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The Administration proposes to create a new $8.5 billion Unsubsidized Perkins Loan Program, which would allow more institutions into the program and expand loan availability. However, many of the favorable benefits of the current Perkins Loan Program, such as a fixed 5 percent interest rate, non-accrual of interest during the in-school and nine-month grace periods, and more helpful cancellation options for many public service jobs, would be lost.

The Perkins Loan Program was set to expire on September 30, 2015, but has been extended through September 30, 2017, in order to allow the authorizing committees time to complete reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. The legislation limited student eligibility, including removing graduate students from eligibility after this academic year. However, eligibility could be restored by Congress later. Appropriators should provide reimbursements to campus revolving funds for cancelled loans, fulfilling a responsibility set forth in the law. This would allow more funding to be available for low-income students to finance their education.

PROGRAM NEED

To fund required cancellations and to recover at least part of past funding shortfalls, $150 million is needed for the Perkins Loan Program. Ideally, Congress would reimburse campus Perkins funds for all unreimbursed cancellations owed, now estimated at more than $400 million, including funds institutions themselves contributed to the Perkins Loan Program. This would help thousands of additional students. The Perkins program provides loans to students who cannot borrow or afford more expensive private student loans and is a key part of making higher education accessible and affordable for low-income students. Loans allow schools to fill gaps for students to continue their education. The program also provides an important incentive for people who wish to go into public service by offering targeted loan cancellations for specific professions in areas of national need.

CONTACT INFO

Harrison Wadsworth or Wes Huffman
Coalition of Higher Education Assistance Organizations
(202) 289-3910  hwadsworth@wpllc.net  whuffman@wpllc.net
The William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan program helps millions of students achieve their postsecondary goals every year. At one four-year public institution, a high achieving, low-income student was admitted to the prestigious College of Agriculture. The student was eligible for a full Pell Grant. However, the Pell Grant did not cover the total cost of attendance, leaving the student with unmet need. The Direct Loan program made the difference in this student’s ability to attend college. The student was able to borrow the remaining amount needed and had a successful college career.

DESCRIPTION

The Department of Education administers the Direct Loan program, which is the primary source of federal student loans. This vast program covers four loan types: subsidized Stafford loans, unsubsidized Stafford loans, PLUS loans for parents of dependent students, and PLUS loans for graduate/professional students (all PLUS loans are unsubsidized). The program makes low-interest loans available to students and their families to pay the costs of postsecondary education and has become the largest federal student aid program. The program also provides other benefits such as loan forgiveness, income-based repayment, and borrower protections that help prevent students from defaulting on their loan obligations. These benefits and favorable loan terms generally make federal Direct Loans a better option for students and families than private or alternative student loans.

In 2013, Congress passed a long awaited bipartisan compromise bill that links student loan interest rates to pending market rates. Each year interest rates will be tied to the 10-year Treasury bond, plus the following percentage add-ons:

- 2.05 percent for undergraduate Stafford (subsidized and unsubsidized).
- 3.6 percent for graduate Stafford.
- 4.6 percent for PLUS (parents and graduate students).

In addition, the law set caps on the rates: 8.25 percent for undergraduate Stafford; 9.5 percent for graduate Stafford; and 10.5 percent for PLUS. Loans would be “variable-fixed,” meaning students would receive a new rate with each new loan, with that rate remaining fixed for the life of the loan.

As of July 2012, graduate students no longer qualify for an in-school interest subsidy on federal loans. However, the FY 2015 omnibus appropriations package did partially restore eligibility for federal student aid to college students without a high school diploma or GED enrolled in approved career pathway programs.
In 2014, President Obama issued an executive action calling for the expansion of Pay As You Earn (PAYE) to an additional five million borrowers. The result after a negotiated rule-making process in the first half of 2015 came in the form of REPAYE, or the Revised Pay As You Earn repayment plan, a new income-driven repayment plan effective July 2016. The Department of Education noted in the release of the new plan, now one of five income-driven repayment plans, that it hoped Congress would use REPAYE as a model for a single streamlined repayment plan developed in the context of reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget makes no major changes to the lending side of the Direct Loan Program, but does propose a single pay-as-you-earn repayment plan, similar to the REPAYE plan. Individuals who first borrowed prior to July 1, 2017, would be eligible to select among the existing repayment plans. All future borrowers would only be eligible for this modified REPAYE.

For this streamlined repayment plan, the budget proposes the following:

- Eliminating the standard payment cap under PAYE so high-income, high balance borrowers pay an equitable share of their earnings as their income rises.
- Calculating payments for married borrowers filing separately on the combined household Adjusted Gross Income.
- Capping Public Service Loan Forgiveness (PSLF) at the aggregate loan limit of $57,500 for independent undergraduate students to protect against institutional practices that may further increase student indebtedness, while ensuring the program provides sufficient relief for students committed to public service.
- Establishing a 25-year forgiveness period for borrowers with balances above the aggregate loan limit for independent undergraduate students.
- Preventing payments made under non-income driven repayment plans from being applied toward PSLF to ensure loan forgiveness is targeted to students with the greatest need.
- Capping the amount of interest that can accrue when a borrower’s monthly payment is insufficient to cover interest costs, thus avoiding ballooning loan balances.

PROGRAM NEED

As a part of sequestration, there was a formula for certain mandatory programs to secure savings. For Direct Loans, this resulted in increases to the loan origination fee. Though sequestration was suspended under the Bipartisan Budget Act, loan origination fees remain a hidden cost for students. When returning to the table to address sequestration in the future, the elimination of the increases in origination fees would allow for greater long term predictability for students, as would the complete elimination of the origination fees. While nominal, increases present great unpredictability for students and a heavy administrative burden for financial aid administrators as they must make adjustments in the middle of an award year.

Graduate students lost the federally funded in-school interest subsidy, which allowed for subsidized Stafford loans. The in-school subsidy for undergraduates is often on the table and at risk of being cut. Students depend on federal student loans to finance the costs of college and need increased federal support to help them keep student loans affordable.

CONTACT INFO

Megan McClean Coval or Stephen Payne
National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators
(202) 785-0453  |  mccleanm@nasfaa.org  |  paynes@nasfaa.org
Total Amount Borrowed from Federal Subsidized, Unsubsidized, and PLUS Loans in Millions of 2014 Dollars
2002-03 to 2014-15, Selected Years

SOURCE: The College Board, Trends in Student Aid 2015, Figure 8A.

For detailed data, visit trends.collegeboard.org.
Student Load Debt Exceeds $1.3 Trillion

Source: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (US) research.stlouisfed.org myf.red/g/3nns
Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education Grant Program (TEACH)

Title IV, Part A, Subpart 9, Higher Education Act

“I became passionate about teaching when I realized I could help and encourage young people to build a strong future for themselves. I want to become an educator, so I can advocate for students and help them find their voice and confidence — especially those students whose voices have gone unheard and who feel as though they have been pushed away. The Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education (TEACH) grant helps me reduce my student loan debt and reduces the number of hours I need to work each month. With that free time, I can meet with a mentor to learn more about being an effective educator and gain experience in the classroom. I love having the time to work with students at different grade levels. It helps me see all that is possible as a teacher, and I know I would not be able to do this without financial assistance. The TEACH grant has reduced my financial stress and allowed me to focus on what is most important as I prepare to become a teacher.”

—Darius Ortega, undergraduate student, Portland State University, Portland, OR

DESCRIPTION

TEACH is a mandatory spending program providing up to $4,000 a year, for a maximum of $16,000, in grant aid to undergraduate and post-baccalaureate students who plan to become teachers of high need subjects (mathematics, science, special education, foreign languages, bilingual education, and reading). In addition, current teachers or retirees from high need fields are eligible for $4,000 per year, for a maximum of $8,000, to pursue master’s degrees (also with a focus on high needs subjects). Within eight years of finishing the program, grant recipients must fulfill a four-year teaching obligation in schools receiving Title I funds. If the service obligation is not fulfilled, the grants convert to unsubsidized loans repaid with interest.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$18.39</td>
<td>$15.91</td>
<td>$15.71</td>
<td>$12.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

While President Obama’s budget request includes continued funding for the TEACH Grant program, there is concern regarding the proposed elimination of the program beginning in FY 2021. At that time, the Administration proposes to expand loan forgiveness for educators. Elimination of this grant would become an additional barrier to any student considering teaching as a career by restricting access to financial support for his or her education.

PROGRAM NEED

Currently enrollment in teacher preparation programs is declining while teacher shortages are on the rise. TEACH grants represent a federal commitment to the future of the teaching profession. Over the last five years, grants have been awarded to more than 100,000 teacher candidates in high need subject areas who maintain at least a 3.25 GPA and commit to four-year service obligations with high need students. The TEACH Grant program has been successful in attracting teachers to work in the most challenging classrooms. The top three subject areas taught by TEACH recipients are math, science, and special education.
High School Equivalency Program (HEP) and College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP)

Title IV, Part A, Subpart 5, Higher Education Act

Daniel Ramirez-Gordillo is the son of farm workers and the second youngest child in a family of eight. Daniel is the first person in his family to attend a four-year institution, New Mexico State University, and he participated in the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP). He worked almost 40 hours a week and nearly dropped out of college during his freshman year, but the CAMP program helped him stay in school and graduate with honors with a BS in biology. Daniel then earned his Master’s degree and PhD in biomedical research. Currently Daniel is in post-doctoral training at the University of Denver, and he plans to apply for a faculty position and continue his research in diseases that affect the older population.

DESCRIPTION

For nearly five decades, the High School Equivalency Program (HEP) and CAMP projects have been successful in closing the access and completion gaps for low-income farm worker migrant and seasonal worker students. HEP and CAMP are the only federal programs that provide these students with the educational opportunities and supports to succeed in higher education. HEP recruits migrant students aged 16 and over and provides academic and comprehensive support services to help them obtain a GED and gain employment or admission to college or a training program. CAMP assists students in their first year of college with academic and personal counseling, stipends, and other support services, and helps students obtain student financial aid for their remaining undergraduate years. Currently there are approximately 80 HEP and CAMP programs at institutions of higher education throughout the United States.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$34.62</td>
<td>$37.47</td>
<td>$44.62</td>
<td>$44.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2017 budget provides $44.62 million for HEP and CAMP, a freeze in funding at the FY 2016 number. The FY 2017 request would support outreach, technical assistance, and professional development activities. These services are in high demand, and much greater funding is required to meet the needs of farm worker migrant students across the country to ensure they have access to educational and job...
opportunities. The proposed funding level will allow the Department of Education to consider the geographic distribution of grants to ensure there are HEP/CAMP projects in the areas of the country with the most need for such programs.

The Department of Education estimates the FY 2017 budget proposal would support a larger number of new grants in each program, and additional new students would receive HEP and CAMP services.

**PROGRAM NEED**

The Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 recognized the importance of HEP and CAMP by increasing the authorization levels to $75 million, an increase of $55 million. Funding at the authorized level must be provided to ensure these students have equal opportunity to receive a quality education. Farm worker, migrant, and seasonal worker children are among the most disadvantaged and particularly at risk for poor educational, employment, and earnings outcomes. The dropout rate of these students is very high, and they encounter tremendous obstacles in completing high school and pursuing higher education. HEP and CAMP focus on identifying migrant youth who have not been able to complete high school or pursue further education due to inconsistent access to equitable educational opportunity. In targeting out of school youth, HEP and CAMP are able to provide services in flexible locations at times that meet the needs of this working population.

**CONTACT INFO**

Irene Bueno
NVG, LLC
(202) 540-1070  |  ibueno@nvgllc.com
Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU)
Title III, Parts A, B, F, Higher Education Act

DESCRIPTION

Funding for the Title III programs, or Aid for Institutional Development programs, is targeted to minority-serving and other institutions that enroll a large percentage of financially disadvantaged students. The institutions, which must demonstrate lower than average per-student expenditures, rely on these highly competitive awards to improve educational programs and related services for low-income and historically underrepresented populations. Eligible entities include institutions of higher education with specific programs for Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities, Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions, Predominantly Black Institutions, Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions, and Native American-Serving Nontribal Institutions.

The Strengthening Institutions program (Title III—A of HEA) provides critical support for colleges that have fewer resources and serve high proportions of low-income and historically underrepresented populations. Eligible institutions must award bachelor degrees or be a junior or community college, have below average expenditures, and enroll a significant percentage of disadvantaged students. These highly competitive awards help colleges improve educational programs and facilities, professional development, administrative and fund management, and services for disadvantaged students.

Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs)

This program was part of the original Higher Education Act, as enacted by Congress in 1965. The nation’s 105 designated HBCUs represent about 3 percent of all Title IV eligible colleges and universities, while enrolling about 10.5 percent of African American students. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, approximately 16 percent of African Americans who currently have undergraduate degrees earned them at an HBCU. Grants provided under the Strengthening HBCU program enable eligible colleges to better serve students, using funds to rent or purchase scientific and laboratory equipment, improve classrooms and libraries, enhance teacher training, expand student services, and improve fund and administrative management.

Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions (HBGIs)

This program provides five-year formula grants to 24 historically black universities that offer medical, law, veterinary, and other postgraduate degrees. Grants are used to provide scholarships and fellowships for needy graduate and professional students. Funds also support renovations and improvements of instructional facilities while enabling the institutions to strengthen development offices, purchase technical journals, and support academic success.

Strengthening Predominantly Black Institutions (PBIs)

The Strengthening PBIs provides formula-based discretionary development grants to institutions with enrollments of at least 1,000 undergraduates. The student body must be at least 40 percent African American and at least 50 percent low-income or first generation college students. Community colleges and other eligible institutions must demonstrate their average educational and general expenditures per student are low in comparison to other undergraduate institutions that offer similar academic programs. Funds enable the colleges to expand teacher education programs, upgrade academic facilities, encourage student persistence, and better serve the academic needs of their students. PBI mandatory funding allows for highly competitive grants to be awarded to colleges to enhance STEM education, teacher education, and other priority programs for African American students.
Minority Science and Engineering Improvement Program (MSEIP)

The MSEIP grants are designed to increase participation of underrepresented ethnic and racial minorities in science and engineering programs and support science and engineering programs at predominantly minority institutions. Colleges and universities with minority enrollments in excess of 50 percent are eligible to receive assistance under MSEIP.

### FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT's REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Strengthening Institutions  
(discretionary) | $ 79.14 | $ 80.46 | $ 86.53 | $ 86.53 |
| Strengthening HBCUs  
(discretionary) | $ 223.78 | $ 227.52 | $ 244.69 | $ 244.69 |
|  
(mandatory)* | $ 78.88 | $ 78.80 | $ 79.22 | $ 85.00 |
| Strengthening HBGIs  
(discretionary) | $ 57.87 | $ 58.84 | $ 63.28 | $ 63.28 |
| Strengthening PBIs  
(discretionary) | $ 9.09 | $ 9.24 | $ 9.94 | $ 9.94 |
|  
(mandatory)* | $ 13.92 | $ 13.91 | $ 13.98 | $ 15.00 |
| MSEIP  
(discretionary) | $ 8.97 | $ 8.97 | $ 9.65 | $ 9.65 |

* Mandatory totals include funds provided by the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act (SAFRA) within the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 and mandatory appropriations provided under Title VIII, Part AA, Sections 897 and 898 of the HEA. Amounts include sequester reductions of 7.2 percent in 2014, 7.3 percent in 2015, and 6.8 percent in 2016.

### IMPACT OF PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The Administration is proposing $30 million to fund a new HBCU and MSI Innovation to Completion Fund. This program would support innovative and evidence-based interventions at HBCUs and MSIs to increase college completion. At the same time, the budget proposes to freeze discretionary funding for the existing Title III and Title V programs.

Significant funding is needed for the current Title III and Title V programs as they provide much needed resources to colleges serving large percentages of disadvantaged and minority students, precisely the students who will comprise the majority of tomorrow’s workforce.

### PROGRAM NEED

Strengthening institutional grants enables colleges to better serve large percentages of minority and disadvantaged students. Funds support programs that provide equal educational opportunity and strong academics and are used for improvements in instructional facilities, scientific equipment, curriculum development, faculty development, and other areas that promote access and success.

### CONTACT INFO

Laurie Quarles  
American Association of Community Colleges  
(202) 728-0200  |  lquarles@aacc.nche.edu
Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSI)

Title III, Part F; Title V, Parts A-B, Higher Education Act

Through the STEMpact project, Union County College (NJ) — partnering with Kean University — works to improve access and success of at-risk, Hispanic and low-income students completing postsecondary degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), and teacher education majors. This effort addresses President Obama’s call for a diverse 21st century STEM-trained workforce. The colleges are developing a strong model of transfer and articulation to promote the success of Hispanics and low-income students in STEM and teacher education fields.

—Title V, Part A

The California State University, Dominguez Hills, Promoting Excellence in Graduate Studies Center is funded by a PPOHA (Promoting Postbaccalaureate Opportunities for Hispanic Americans) grant designed to improve critical thinking, strengthen research and writing skills, enhance intellectual development, promote graduate level scholarship, and strengthen graduate students’ ties to the academic community.

—Title V, Part B

Otero Junior College (OJC) in Colorado is partnering with Trinidad State Junior College (TSJC) to increase enrollment, retention and completion rates with an added emphasis on transfer to four-year institutions. Students in an 11-county region of Southern Colorado, including 29 high schools, are being served by Semillas de STEM (Seeds of STEM).

—Title III, Part F

DESCRIPTION

Title V, Part A of HEA provides direct grants to HSIs, defined as non-profit institutions of higher education with an enrollment of undergraduate full-time equivalent students at least 25 percent Hispanic at the end of the award year immediately preceding the date of application. HSIs enroll and educate a disproportionate number of minority, low-income, and first generation college students. The purposes of the program are to expand educational opportunities for, and improve academic attainment of, Hispanic students, and expand and enhance academic offerings, program quality, and institutional stability of the institutions that educate the majority of Hispanic students and help large numbers of Hispanic and other low-income students complete postsecondary degrees.

Funds may be used for a number of activities, including purchase of scientific or laboratory equipment and other educational materials; construction or renovation of instructional facilities; faculty development and professional development; academic tutoring or counseling programs; administrative management; distance learning; student support services, such as outreach, academic supports, mentoring, scholarships, fellowships, and other financial assistance; distance learning technologies; articulation agreements; programs facilitating students’ transfer from two- to four-year institutions; and education, counseling services, and financial information to improve the financial and economic literacy of students and their families.

Five-year individual development grants, five-year cooperative arrangement development grants, and one-year planning grants may be awarded under Title V, Part A. The maximum award for Individual Development Grants in FY 2014 was $525,000 per year and $650,000 for Cooperative Development Grants.
Promoting Postbaccalaureate Opportunities for Hispanic Americans Program (Title V, Part B):

The PPOHA program provides grants to expand graduate school opportunities for and improve academic attainment of Hispanic students. Grants are also used to expand postbaccalaureate academic offerings and enhance program quality in postsecondary institutions educating the majority of Hispanic college students, helping large numbers of Hispanic and low-income students complete postsecondary degrees. In order to receive a PPOHA grant, an institution of higher education must offer a postbaccalaureate certificate or program and must be designated as an eligible institution and meet the program-specific requirements to be defined as an HSI.

Hispanic-Serving Institutions Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics and Articulation Programs (Title III, Part F):

HSI STEM & Articulation Programs grants are competitively awarded to postsecondary institutions with 25 percent or more Hispanic student enrollment. Grantees focus on increasing the number of Hispanic and other low-income students who attain degrees in the fields of science, technology, engineering and mathematics, and developing model transfer and articulation agreements between two-year Hispanic-serving institutions and four-year institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title III—Part F (mandatory)</td>
<td>$ 92.80*</td>
<td>$ 92.70*</td>
<td>$ 93.20*</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title V—Part A</td>
<td>$ 98.58</td>
<td>$100.23</td>
<td>$107.80</td>
<td>$107.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title V—Part B</td>
<td>$ 8.85</td>
<td>$ 8.99</td>
<td>$ 9.67</td>
<td>$ 9.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title V—Part B (mandatory)</td>
<td>$ 10.67**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$210.90</td>
<td>$201.92</td>
<td>$210.67</td>
<td>$217.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mandatory totals include funds provided by the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act (SAFRA) within the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 and mandatory appropriations provided under Title VIII, Part AA, Sections 897 and 898 of the HEA.

** $10.6 million in mandatory funds for Title V, Part B, as authorized in the Higher Education Act, ended after FY 2014, effectively cutting funding by 50 percent.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The Administration proposes a freeze in discretionary funding for existing HSIs’ institutional development related programs. Title V funds provide much needed resources to these colleges and universities that serve the largest percentage of low-income, first generation and minority students, expected to comprise the majority of tomorrow’s workforce. Current funding, awarded through highly competitive grants, is not nearly enough to serve the academic and support needs of all 435 HSIs and the 1.75 million Hispanic students and 3.8 million students of all races/ethnicities currently enrolled.
The Administration proposes the creation of a Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs) Innovation for Completion Fund of $30 million. The proposal could duplicate efforts and dilute already limited resources directed at the HSIs and MSIs doing the most to attract, enroll, support, and graduate low-income students and students of all colors completing degree programs. Instead, targeted and significant increased funding to current Title V and Title III programs is needed to ensure HSIs can maintain current developmental programs and the U.S. Department of Education can effectively support the recent explosive growth in HSIs—6 percent above the 2013-14 academic year and 10.5 percent over the 2012-13 academic year.

**PROGRAM NEED**

HSI grants enable colleges to better serve large percentages of Hispanic and other minority and disadvantaged students. Funds support programs that provide equal educational opportunity and strong academics and are used for improvements in instructional facilities, scientific equipment, curriculum development, faculty development, and other areas that promote access and success. As recently as FY 2010, HSIs received almost a third less federal funding on a per student basis as other institutions of higher education.

**CONTACT INFO**

Luis Maldonado  
Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU)  
(202) 261-2087  |  luis.maldonado@hacu.net
Tribal Colleges and Universities and Other Title III Programs
Title III, Parts A and F, Higher Education Act

DESCRIPTION

The goal of the Title III, Strengthening Institutions programs is “to improve the academic quality, institutional management and fiscal stability of eligible institutions, in order to increase their self-sufficiency and strengthen their capacity to make a substantial contribution to the higher education resources of the Nation.” Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs) are tribally or federally chartered, Their enrollments are majority American Indian/Alaska Native who are members of federally recognized tribes or the biological children of tribal members. The TCU program is specifically designed to address the critical unmet needs of American Indian/Alaska Native students and communities, in order to effectively prepare them to succeed in a globally competitive workforce.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>$25.24</td>
<td>$25.66</td>
<td>$27.60</td>
<td>$27.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>$27.84</td>
<td>$27.81</td>
<td>$27.96</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mandatory funds are provided under the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act (SAFRA) within the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (P.L. 111-152)

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

Funding for TCUs provides much needed resources to tribally and federally chartered colleges currently operating more than 85 campuses and sites in 15 States. Significant funding is necessary to ensure these institutions are able to maintain current programs and expand their capacity to meet the growing needs of students seeking to access and succeed in higher education and achieve their future career goals.

PROGRAM NEED

The majority of students at all TCUs are Native American/Alaska Native tribal members or their biological children, and over 70 percent of these students receive Pell Grants. TCUs, by any definition truly developing institutions, provide quality higher education opportunities to some of the most rural, isolated, impoverished, and historically underserved areas of the country. Title III funds provide a step toward equal educational opportunity for those residing in Indian Country through high quality, culturally appropriate academic programs, as well as improvements to instructional facilities, scientific equipment, curriculum development, faculty development, and other areas that promote access to and success in higher education.
Other Title III programs

These programs are intended to help eligible institutions of higher education increase their self-sufficiency and expand capacity to serve low-income students by providing funds to improve and strengthen the academic quality, institutional management, and fiscal stability of eligible institutions.

Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions
An Alaska Native-serving institution may receive a grant under Title III, section 317 if, at the time of application, it has an enrollment of undergraduate students that is at least 20 percent Alaska Native students. A Native Hawaiian-serving institution may receive a grant under section 317 if, at the time of application, it has an enrollment of undergraduate students that is at least 10 percent Native Hawaiian students.

Funding History (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>$12.62</td>
<td>$12.83</td>
<td>$13.80</td>
<td>$13.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>$13.92</td>
<td>$13.91</td>
<td>$13.98</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-serving Institutions
An Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-serving institution may receive a grant under Title III, section 320 if, at the time of submission, it certifies an enrollment of undergraduate students is at least 10 percent of whom are Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander.

Funding History (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>$3.06</td>
<td>$3.11</td>
<td>$3.35</td>
<td>$3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>$4.64</td>
<td>$4.64</td>
<td>$4.66</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Native American-Serving, Nontribal Institutions
A Native American-serving, nontribal institution may receive a Title III, section 319 grant if at the time of submission it certifies an enrollment of undergraduate students that is not less than 10 percent Native American. Students self-identify as American Indian, and no documentation of tribal membership is required in determining the percentage of Native American students enrolled at a NASNTI.

Funding History (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>$3.06</td>
<td>$3.11</td>
<td>$3.35</td>
<td>$3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>$4.64</td>
<td>$4.64</td>
<td>$4.66</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONTACT INFO

Meg Goetz
American Indian Higher Education Consortium
(703) 838-0400  | mgoetz@aihec.org
International Education Programs and Foreign Language Studies

Title VI, Parts A and B, Higher Education Act
Section 102(b)(6), Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange (Fulbright Hays) Act

At University of California-Berkeley, the Institute of East Asian Studies is funded in part with NRC, FLAS, and Fulbright Group Projects Abroad grants through Title VI. These grants have helped restore courses on Mongolian language, history and culture. Mongolian, a strategic language rarely taught in the US, is now thriving in Berkeley supported by its local Mongolian community, the largest outside of Mongolia.

Another Title VI project at Berkeley, which has received praise from the U.S. Department of Education, sends middle and high school teachers to China to learn about language, history, and culture for incorporation into their classroom lessons. Teachers have reported it is difficult to teach California’s standards related to China because there is so little material, but they are thrilled with the information and experiences they can share with their students after participating in the summer institutes. Since the first year, the program has trained over 100 teachers throughout California and their lessons have touched thousands of students.

DESCRIPTION

The International Education and Foreign Language Studies (IEFLS) Domestic Programs support comprehensive language training, intensive study of world areas and cultures, academic research and programming, and extensive outreach to K-12 classrooms. In addition, funds support collaborations between four-year postsecondary institutions and community colleges and strong ties between American higher education institutions and international partners. These efforts promote American students’ global competencies and enhance their understanding of populations around the world. Title VI programs offer resources and expertise that serve the nation’s economic, diplomatic, defense, and national security needs. These programs also enable university collaborations on international issues with federal, State, and local agencies, business and industry, and the military.

Title VI programs fund collaborations and partnerships among educational entities, businesses, governments and centers, and programs and fellowships at higher education institutions. Programs focus on increasing the number of experts in world languages and area studies to meet national security needs and train a globally competent workforce. Among these programs are:

- National Resource Centers (NRCs) at universities—comprehensive centers of excellence that train students and scholars, maintain library collections and research facilities, conduct research on world affairs, operate summer institutes in the U.S. and abroad, and provide expertise at all levels of government.
- Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) Fellowships, supporting academic year and summer fellowships for graduate and undergraduate level training at universities offering programs of excellence.
- Centers for International Business Education (CIBE), focusing comprehensive university expertise on improving international business education across disciplines.
- Language Resource Centers (LRCs), which support improvements in teaching and learning of less commonly taught foreign languages.
The International Education and Foreign Language Studies (IEFLS) Overseas Programs (Fulbright-Hays Act) support overseas study and research for American students, teachers, and college faculty. Institutions support short term projects, group training, and research in modern foreign languages and intensive language training in major world areas (excluding Western Europe). In addition programs provide opportunities overseas to study and conduct advanced research and fellowships for scholars specializing in less commonly taught languages and major world areas outside Western Europe.

### FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Programs</td>
<td>$65.10</td>
<td>$65.10</td>
<td>$65.10</td>
<td>$65.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Programs</td>
<td>$7.06</td>
<td>$7.06</td>
<td>$7.06</td>
<td>$2.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s proposal would cut $4.9 million from the Title VI Overseas Programs. After proposing a $2 million increase for this account last year, this decrease is surprising, particularly given the important work undertaken with Title VI funds — improving the capacity of school districts to teach global competencies through increased teacher training, immersion into understanding of world cultures and global issues, and summer study abroad.

The budget request freezes funding for the Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language (UISFL) Program to maintain domestic programs that support teaching of less commonly taught languages and building global competencies. The proposal states that the request would support IEFLS program continuation grants and fellowships.

### PROGRAM NEED

In recent years, funding for Title VI programs has suffered devastating cuts that have not been restored. Without an investment of additional funds, there will be no new or expanded programs, and the international knowledge and expertise developed over the past fifty years are at risk.

An increased federal investment in Title VI is necessary to expand the nation’s capacity in international education, research, and foreign language studies, especially in the less commonly taught languages of American strategic interest. In an increasingly global economy, additional funds are needed to ensure a steady pipeline of individuals with global understanding and language proficiency across professions, address the severe shortage of Americans who can speak less commonly taught languages, and strengthen the nation’s competitive advantage.

Title VI programs serve as a national resource. They ensure the country is able to address vital demands in government, education, business, economics, foreign affairs, and defense, particularly in relation to languages and regions defined as high priority by the federal government. These programs lead the way in expanding access to international studies and language programs and help deliver global opportunities to a broader population.

### CONTACT INFO

Carolyn Henrich  
University of California  
(202) 974-6308  | carolyn.henrich@ucdc.edu
"We all know that innovation can take many forms and, as a key part of the Administration’s goal to promote college access and affordability, the First in the World program aims to support a wide range of innovation to improve student outcomes."

—U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan

**DESCRIPTION**

The First in the World (FITW) grant program began in FY 2014 and was continued in FY 2015 under the Fund for Improvement in Postsecondary Education (FIPSE). The program was targeted to developing, replicating, and disseminating creative solutions and evidence-based practices to address widespread challenges in higher education for students at risk of not persisting in and completing postsecondary programs. Targeted student populations include adult learners, working students, part-time students, low-income students, students of color, students with disabilities, and first generation students.

In FY 2015, the Department of Education divided the program into two competitions: development grants and validation grants. Development grant recipients would develop or test practices supported by strong theory and whose efficacy should be systematically studied. Validation grant recipients would expand projects supported by moderate evidence of effectiveness to the regional or national level. The Department awarded $60 million in grants to 17 colleges, universities, and other higher education organizations in September 2015.

**FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIPSE grants (Total)</td>
<td>$79.40</td>
<td>$67.78</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FITW grants</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET**

The FY 2017 budget request for FIPSE provides a total of $100 million for the third year of the First in the World program, $96.5 million of which would support grants. FITW provides funding for institutions of higher education to develop and test innovative strategies and practices that improve college completion rates and make college more affordable, particularly for low-income students. In addition, the Administration has stated it plans to set aside up to 30 percent of available FITW funds to support the implementation of projects at Minority-Serving Institutions.
**PROGRAM NEED**

The FITW competition is part of the federal effort to drive innovation at the institutional level and fund promising projects, which after rigorous evaluation might be successfully replicated and brought to scale. For example, FITW would provide funds to improve enrollment of low-income students at selective institutions and improve college completion. FITW would support the president’s goal for the nation to lead the world in college attainment by 2020.

**CONTACT INFO**

Megan McClean Coval or Stephen Payne  
National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators  
(202) 785-0453  |  mccleanm@nasfaa.org  |  paynes@nasfaa.org
Federal TRIO Programs
Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2, Higher Education Act

“In high school, I was a ‘straight A’ student with a lot of potential, but little direction when it came to college. My dreams were only as big as the world right in front of me—local colleges that were inexpensive but not terribly rigorous. When I joined TRIO, doors were opened to me that I hadn’t even known existed. I learned about scholarships that allowed me to consider schools previously outside my reach. I participated in summer internships that led to future internship experiences in Washington, DC, and Mexico. Most of all, I learned to dream outside my comfort zone and then work hard to achieve my goals. This May I will be graduating at the top of my class from a college that I love, and I have the Federal TRIO programs to thank for my success.”

DESCRIPTION

The TRIO programs provide a pipeline of educational outreach and supportive services to approximately 785,000 low-income students ranging from sixth graders to doctoral candidates, including military veterans, adult learners, and students with disabilities. Through seven programs (Talent Search, Upward Bound, Upward Bound Math-Science, Student Support Services, Ronald E. McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement, Educational Opportunity Centers, and Veterans Upward Bound), TRIO motivates and prepares first generation individuals from families with incomes below 150 percent of the poverty level and where neither parent has a college degree. Through nearly 3,000 projects, TRIO operates in virtually every congressional district in the United States and several independent territories.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$838.25</td>
<td>$839.75</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2017 budget proposal threatens to roll back the progress achieved last year. Not only does the Administration's proposal freeze funding for the TRIO programs as a whole, but it also calls for the Department of Education to cut funding for several of the individual TRIO programs. The Administration then proposes to use the “savings” created by these programmatic reductions to fund a $20 million TRIO Demonstration initiative. In FY 2016, Congress explicitly rejected such proposal in the report language to the final funding legislation.
PROGRAM NEED

Despite a significant boost in FY 2016, the Federal TRIO programs remain in need of a strong funding increase if they are to meet the extensive needs of America’s low-income, first generation college students. A funding increase is particularly necessary in FY 2017 as the Department of Education will host competitions for four TRIO grant programs — Upward Bound, Upward Bound Math-Science, Veterans Upward Bound, and McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement. This year presents the opportunity to restore access for thousands of students and communities to the academic, financial, and cultural supports provided by these and other TRIO programs.

All seven TRIO programs provide a pipeline of services to students in need. Talent Search, Upward Bound, and Upward Bound Math-Science provide early exposure to the possibility of college and prepare students to apply to and succeed in higher education. For students enrolled in college, Student Support Services provides retention, transfer, and completion services designed to ensure low-income, first generation college students earn degrees. It is the natural complement to the federal investment in financial aid programs, such as the Pell Grant. In addition, the Veterans Upward Bound program sends more veterans back into the classroom, and Educational Opportunity Centers steer more out of work and underemployed adults into education programs. Finally, McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement provides opportunities for underrepresented students to pursue doctoral degrees.

CONTACT INFO

Kimberly Jones
Council for Opportunity in Education
(202) 347-7430 │ kimberly.jones@coenet.us
Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP)

Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2, Higher Education Act

“At a time when I was just hoping to be average, the Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP) encouraged, enhanced, and equipped me to be much more. Through the extraordinary educators leading my GEAR UP program, I was able to raise my GPA from a 2.0 to a 3.9. GEAR UP encouraged me to take the right courses, provided mentoring and tutoring support when I needed it, helped me get my hands on financial aid, and exposed me to several college campuses. In addition, GEAR UP helped me develop my leadership skills and become more involved in my community. Without GEAR UP, I just don’t know how I could have successfully navigated from high school to college. Upon graduating high school, I was honored to be one of the 140 students invited to the First Lady’s “Beating the Odds Summit” last summer. Thanks to GEAR UP, I am now a Chemical Engineering student at Louisiana State University. I can honestly say that GEAR UP prepared me for college and lifelong success.”

—Darius Spurlock, GEAR UP alumnus and freshman at Louisiana State University

DESCRIPTION

GEAR UP is a highly competitive discretionary grant program that increases the number of low-income, minority, and first generation students prepared to enter and succeed in postsecondary education. The program is expected to serve 570,400 students in FY 2016. Beginning no later than seventh grade, the program serves entire grade levels of students through high school and into their first year of college. GEAR UP provides a comprehensive suite of research-based programs that address academic, social, and financial barriers to higher education. Common programs include tutoring, mentoring, academic preparation, financial education, parental engagement, professional development for educators, and scholarships. GEAR UP strengthens local pathways to college by fostering partnerships among K-12 schools, institutions of higher education, local and State education departments, businesses, and community-based organizations. These partnerships are required to match federal funding dollar for dollar, effectively doubling the investment in advancing college readiness and completion for low-income students.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$301.64</td>
<td>$301.64</td>
<td>$322.75</td>
<td>$322.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

If GEAR UP’s funding is frozen, as proposed by the Administration’s budget, the Department of Education will be able to host a modest but insufficient competition for new awards. The Department of Education projects upward of eight new State grant awards and 14 partnership grant awards. However, with 13 State and partnership grants expiring, the lack of new funds for the program will substantially limit the number of students, schools, and communities served by the program. Given that the most recent competition in FY 2014 yielded over 250 applicants, the Administration’s proposal will unnecessarily put the GEAR UP program out of reach for the overwhelming number of interested communities. As national and State political, civic, and business leaders are calling for systemic approaches to accelerate college readiness and success for low-income students, the underinvestment in GEAR UP severely hampers our nation’s ability to meet critical education and workforce priorities.
PROGRAM NEED

In an independent study by the New America Foundation titled *Rebalancing Resources and Incentives in Federal Student Aid*, GEAR UP is cited as “the most promising of these [college outreach] programs.” The study calls for “triple-funding for GEAR UP” to expand grantees’ capacity to serve multiple cohorts. Despite GEAR UP’s demonstrated success in increasing high school graduation and college enrollment rates for low-income, minority, and first generation students, only a fraction of eligible students and communities benefit from the program. Year after year, hundreds of communities develop complex partnerships and strategic plans to apply for GEAR UP, but the lack of resources has resulted in a competitive environment in which only just a few applicants are funded. Dozens of near perfect applications (based on peer review) have gone unfunded. By modestly increasing GEAR UP by $20 million in FY 2017, it is estimated the program could serve an additional 50,000 students in low-income schools across the nation.

CONTACT INFO

Alex Chough
National Council for Community and Education Partnerships
(202) 530-1135, Ext. 110   |  alex_chough@edpartnerships.org
Graduate Education
Title VII, Part A, Subpart 2, Higher Education Act

“The University of California, Irvine, has been able to increase the participation of women in chemical engineering and materials science engineering programs to almost 50 percent of new incoming students, and this year a quarter of the admitted PhD students are underrepresented minorities, due to the extra support offered by the GAANN program.”

—Martha Mecartney, Professor of Chemical Engineering and Materials Science, UC Irvine

DESCRIPTION

The only Department of Education scholarship assistance for graduate students is provided through the Graduate Assistance in the Areas of National Need (GAANN) program. Through competitive awards to institutions, GAANN provides fellowships to graduate students who demonstrate financial need and have superior academic ability. Eligible institutions must seek talented students from underrepresented backgrounds, offer them the social and academic supports they need, and provide an institutional match of 25 percent. The Department, after consultation with appropriate federal agencies including the National Science Foundation, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Homeland Security, designates certain academic fields as “areas of national need” for the awards competition. In recent years, these areas have included STEM fields (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics), critically needed foreign languages and area studies, and nursing.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$29.29</td>
<td>$29.29</td>
<td>$29.29</td>
<td>$29.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget proposes $29.29 million for GAANN, continuing a five-year funding freeze. This figure is $1.6 million below the FY 2012 appropriations level and is essentially the same annual funding level the program has received since FY 2000. The impact this erosion has had on federal support for graduate education was heightened further in 2012 with the elimination of the Jacob K. Javits Fellowship Program for graduate students pursuing degrees in the social sciences, arts and humanities. GAANN now is the only source of grant support for graduate students in the Department of Education. The long term decline in value of the GAANN program is highlighted in the Department’s estimates for anticipated awards. In FY 2015 the Administration made 95 new awards, which provided approximately 475 fellowships. The FY 2016 funding will allow the Department to add 20 new awards, which will provide 89 additional fellowships. No new awards will be made in FY 2017. In comparison, GAANN supported 1,200 fellows in the 2000-01 academic year.
PROGRAM NEED

A stronger national commitment to graduate education is needed to assure a continued pipeline of skilled workers in all sectors of the economy, as well as qualified professors who will mentor and train the teachers and students of tomorrow. Graduate students are talented individuals who drive excellence in teaching and learning, generate discoveries, patent inventions, develop new products and solutions, and influence the worlds of music, art, and design. Graduate students also add to our nation’s economic competitiveness, innovation, and national security in business, academia, government, and a broad range of fields.

A Department of Education study found that GAANN fellows had better degree completion rates and faster time-to-degree than graduate students overall. The Department acknowledges, through support of graduate study in key disciplines, that GAANN helps address the problem of insufficient numbers of students pursuing graduate degrees in critical scientific and technical fields and other areas of national need. Unfortunately continued flat funding of GAANN does not adequately recognize the role graduate education plays in the advancement of national prosperity or demonstrate support for greater postsecondary access to students in financial need and from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds.

CONTACT INFO

Carolyn Henrich
University of California
(202) 974-6308   | carolyn.henrich@ucdc.edu

Child Care Access Means Parents in School (CCAMPIS)

Title IV, Part A, Subpart 7, Higher Education Act

College students who are also parents face a number of obstacles, including finding safe and affordable childcare. The Child Care Means Parents in School (CCAMPIS) program directly impacts and assists Pell-eligible college students attending St. Louis Community College (STLCC) by providing financial support for their childcare needs. STLCC’s CCAMPIS program promotes increased parent support services via parent/child learning events and resource materials as well as professional development for childcare services staff. In supporting parents with campus-based childcare services, retention and graduation rates for STLCC students are expected to increase.

DESCRIPTION

Created by the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, the CCAMPIS program supports the participation of low-income parents in postsecondary education through campus-based childcare services. Grants are awarded through a competitive process to institutions of higher education that enroll large numbers of Pell Grant recipients. In addition to campus-based childcare for infants and toddlers, the program also funds before- and after-school care for older children and parenting classes.
FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$15.13</td>
<td>$15.13</td>
<td>$15.13</td>
<td>$15.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s proposal freezes funding for the program at $15.13 million, which would support approximately 85 continuation grants. While there are hundreds of campus childcare centers in the United States, they are only able to meet a small percentage of the demand for services. Expanding access to on-campus childcare helps increase access to higher education for low-income students and increases retention, especially for single parents.

PROGRAM NEED

Without an increased investment, thousands of low-income students across the country continue to lack access to quality childcare. This directly impacts college enrollment for students with young children and is often cited as the reason why they withdraw prior to completing a certificate or degree.

CONTACT INFO

Laurie Quarles  
American Association of Community Colleges  
(202) 728-0200  | lquarles@aacc.nche.edu
Teacher and Principal Pathways
Proposed Program Consolidation

DESCRIPTION

The proposed Teacher and Principal Pathways program would make competitive grants to institutions of higher education and other non-profit entities to support the creation and expansion of high quality teacher and principal preparation programs.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

This new program consolidates the currently authorized Teacher Quality Partnership and Transition to Teaching programs into a larger funding stream with greater flexibility and a stronger emphasis on evidence-based practices in teacher and principal preparation.

PROGRAM NEED

This investment would significantly expand the diversity and number of new teachers and principals who have high quality, evidence-based training and preparation for their important roles in high need school districts. Improving the preparation of our nation’s educators, teachers and principals is a critical element to ensuring all students have access to prepared and profession-ready educators. However, preparation is just one component to ensuring effective teachers and principals for all students. To ensure a continuum of effective educators, resources should be devoted to recruitment, preparation, ongoing professional development and retention to make sure all students have excellent teachers and principals throughout their education.

CONTACT INFO

Sophia Papavizas
National Association of Elementary School Principals
National Association of Secondary School Principals
(703) 860-7241  |  spapavizas@naesp.org

Nick Spina
American Federation of School Administrators
(202) 986-4209  |  nspina@AFSAadmin.org
Teacher Quality Partnership Grants
Title II, Part A, Higher Education Act

After transferring to Virginia Commonwealth University, Ashley Jackson discovered she had a strong affinity for underrepresented populations in STEM fields. As an African American woman from rural Virginia studying engineering and physics, Ashley doubted her own abilities. Although she graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree in each field, Ashley realized there are gaps in our education system. In response, she decided to begin teaching “...to make a difference for students by helping them feel science and math are meaningful...for their futures.” As a Richmond Teacher Residency (RTR) participant, Ashley is preparing to teach middle school math for Richmond Public Schools. She feels students “just need to be embraced and made to feel as though they are not the only ones who have struggled.” Ashley values RTR because the program provided a powerful education that allows her to be the kind of teacher and mentor who can “make a difference to students . . . and be that small spark of faith.”

DESCRIPTION

The Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) Program funds competitive grants to partnerships of higher education institutions, high need local school districts, and other stakeholders to reform and strengthen teacher preparation. At the heart of the TQP program is a focus on clinical practice and teacher residencies, as well as the implementation of more authentic integration of education curricula with the arts and sciences. In addition, TQP grantees develop metrics to evaluate the effectiveness of program graduates once they enter the classroom. Graduates of TQP programs are required to work in a high need school for three years, ensuring the best prepared and effective teachers are serving where they are needed the most.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 President’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$40.59</td>
<td>$40.59</td>
<td>$43.09</td>
<td>$0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Program is proposed for consolidation with Transition to Teaching into a new “Teacher and Principal Pathways.”

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget would eliminate this program, ending the federal government’s only investment in the reform and strengthening of teacher preparation. Instead the budget proposes a new program, Teacher and Principal Pathways, which lacks key components of the Teacher Quality Partnerships, including but not limited to a dedicated investment for clinical and teacher residency preparation. This is particularly troubling in light of recommendations calling for an increase in clinical residencies in teacher preparation programs from the profession and national organizations, including the Council of Chief State School Officers, American Federation of Teachers, National Association of State Boards of Education, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, and the National Education Association.
PROGRAM NEED

The Teacher Quality Partnership grants support preparation programs producing graduates who are profession ready and serving in high need schools. The grants require strong partnerships between higher education, high need school districts and other key education stakeholders. Research shows that extensive clinical and induction components of a preparation program are key elements of teacher quality and retention — both of which are required in the TQP program. With a growing teacher shortage across the nation, this program is vital in ensuring that profession ready teachers serve and stay in high need schools. The first grants for this newly authorized program were awarded in September 2009 and a second round in March 2010. Twenty-four new grants were awarded again in September 2014 from funding allocated to the program in the FY 2014 omnibus. It is critical Congress continues to invest in the TQP program, so new grantees have opportunities for full five-year grant cycles to reform their educator preparation programs and graduate more profession ready teachers.

CONTACT INFO

Deborah Koolbeck
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
(202) 478-4506  |  dkoolbeck@aacte.org
America’s College Promise

Proposed Program

**DESCRIPTION**

Proposed by the president for the second time, America’s College Promise (ACP) offers students a free community college education and strives to improve college enrollment and completion rates by increasing the overall federal and State investment in public postsecondary education. In order to be eligible for the program as introduced in 2015, students must maintain a minimum 2.5 GPA and show steady progress toward completing their program of study. States would be prompted to invest more in eligible institutions and community colleges that offer academic programs allowing students to earn half the credit needed for a four-year degree at a public institution or career training leading to a certificate or degree in demand by employers. Students with an adjusted gross income of $200,000 and above are not eligible.

The president’s budget allocates $1.3 billion in mandatory funds to States in order to cover 75 percent of the average cost of community college. In turn, States would contribute the match required to eliminate tuition for eligible students. Federal funds would be allocated using a formula based in part on student enrollment and completion or transfer rates. States would also be required to maintain their levels of higher education investments, work at all levels of education to reduce the need for postsecondary remediation, and allocate a significant portion of funding based on performance. States that already invest more and charge students less could make smaller contributions, though all participating States will be required to put up some matching funds. If States achieve “tuition-free community college,” part of their grants may be used for other improvements to community colleges and public institutions. There are still many details to be decided before this proposal would be operational if funded in FY 2017.

The ACP proposal also includes grants to four-year Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs) to offer newly enrolled low-income students with up to two years at zero or significantly reduced tuition. At least 35 percent of an institution’s student body must be low-income to qualify, and colleges must implement reforms to improve student outcomes. This additional proposal originated in the America’s College Promise Act, introduced last summer.

**FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$1,257.33*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The proposal would cost an estimated $60.8 billion over 10 years in mandatory funds.

**IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET**

America’s College Promise would serve as a zero or significantly reduced tuition program funded by new federal and State resources. Eligible low- and moderate-income students could still receive student aid to cover other costs of attendance, such as books, supplies, housing, and transportation. Only public institutions of higher education would be eligible to receive ACP funding. Colleges would adopt “promising and evidence-based institutional reforms and innovative practices” to improve student outcomes. Further, the State Performance Funding Formula must meet minimum criteria set by the Department of Education, including protecting against funding gaps among different types of public institutions and ensuring all students have an opportunity to succeed.
PROGRAM NEED

Today more than ever Americans need increased knowledge and skills to meet the demands of a growing global economy. The president’s budget request states that by 2020 an estimated 65 percent of new job openings will require postsecondary education or training, but approximately 100 million adults today have no college experience. This new program would eliminate community college tuition and fees for eligible students, regardless of age or whether they are recent high school graduates, as well as significantly lower the costs for some low-income students in HBCUs and MSIs.

CONTACT INFO

Jim Hermes
American Association of Community Colleges
(202) 416-4501  |  jhermes@aacc.nche.edu

College Opportunity and Graduation Bonus Grants

Title II, Part A, Higher Education Act

States facing budget challenges over the past several years have experimented with incentives to improve the return on their investments in higher education. Today more than half of States have funding initiatives in place that reward institutions of higher education and students for meeting and exceeding enrollment and completion goals. Some States reward colleges that improve their course completion and graduation rates, and some reward students for taking increased course loads and graduating on time. For example, with enhanced counseling at participating institutions and larger grants for students who take 15 credits per term, Indiana has increased the percentage of students in its 21st Century Scholars program taking 30 or more credits a year by 55 percent. In addition, the course completion rate for these students improved by 56 percent over the prior year.

DESCRIPTION

The College Opportunity and Graduation Bonus program would provide grants, through mandatory funding, to colleges that enroll and graduate on time a significant number of low- and moderate-income students, while encouraging all colleges and universities to improve in these areas. Grants would support innovations and interventions to increase college access and successful completion. Eligible colleges would receive grants equal to their number of on-time Pell graduates multiplied by a tiered bonus amount per student, varying by institution type. An additional bonus would be available for schools where Pell recipients comprise a significant portion of the graduating class, while also examining graduation and student loan default rates.
FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$547.79*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mandatory funding, with $5.7 billion proposed over the next 10 years.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

By rewarding institutional performance, this program would drive the adoption of best practices to further increase college access and success for low-income students. Fostering investments in technology and innovative learning models would establish a strong foundation for eligible institutions to continue to serve this critical constituency while reducing costs. The initiative would effectively coordinate federal and State investments in higher education, while better aligning the interests of students, higher education institutions, and taxpayers.

PROGRAM NEED

Incentives to encourage States and institutions to invest in higher education are welcome, as is the continued focus on low- and middle-income students. Grants made under this program could increase need-based aid at institutions and provide student support services that help low-income students achieve on time graduation. Additionally, by helping students to graduate on time, institutions will also assist students to minimize student loan burden by reducing their years of borrowing.

CONTACT INFO

Frank Ballmann
National Association of State Student Grant and Aid Programs
(202) 721-1186 | frank@nassgap.org
Student Aid Administration

Title I, Part D, and Title IV, Part D, Higher Education Act

DESCRIPTION

Student Aid Administration funds are used to administer the federal student financial assistance programs authorized under Title IV of the Higher Education Act. Federal Student Aid (FSA), a part of the U.S. Department of Education, is the largest provider of student financial aid for postsecondary students in the nation. FSA processes nearly 21 million student financial aid applications and annually provides more than $150 billion in federal grants, loans, and work-study funds to help more than 13 million students pay for postsecondary education. FSA also administers a loan portfolio of over $1.2 trillion and protects students and taxpayers by ensuring federal resources are used appropriately.

Student aid administration funds are used to educate students and their families about financial aid and to process financial aid applications, originate, disburse, and service student loans, and collect defaulted loans. Administration funds ensure federal resources are used appropriately by schools, guaranty agencies, and students. Funds are also used to improve services for students, parents, schools, and other program participants, reduce student aid administration costs, increase the efficiency of program operations, and oversee student aid processing and delivery systems. Enforcement activities and improved data collection, analysis, and public dissemination of information are also functions underwritten by these dollars.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,392.89</td>
<td>$1,396.92</td>
<td>$1,551.85</td>
<td>$1,631.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The budget would provide $1.6 billion to administer federal student aid programs, an increase of $80.1 million or 5 percent over the FY 2016 level. The majority of this increase, 74 percent, is needed to cover higher servicing costs stemming from increased loan volume and more borrowers entering repayment. A $14 million allocation would be used to increase staff to enhance the Department of Education’s enforcement actions against high-risk institutions participating in Title IV programs. The Enforcement Office (EO) works with multiple federal and State agencies to identify potential misconduct early and to increase oversight, enforcement, and redress. The EO will also carry out enforcement of the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act.

PROGRAM NEED

The Administration needs sufficient funds to manage its growing loan portfolio while also improving borrower satisfaction and outcomes, providing common borrower experiences, and allowing for efficient reporting of financial information and borrower and program data. The Department is working to implement a state of the art complaint system to enhance the quality of services and increase the accountability of the Department, its contractors, and postsecondary education institutions. In addition, funds are used for the following:
- Expand outreach and educational efforts to ensure borrowers understand repayment options and offer assistance for at-risk borrowers and those who might have missed the first payment after the grace period ended, dropped out of school without completing a degree, or are in default with low balances, to get back into repayment.
- Improve FSA’s core functions in technology, infrastructure, and data security, as well as upgrades in staff support and training to carry out FSA’s mission.
- Develop new tools and resources that help students and families make financial preparations for postsecondary education and manage their student loan obligations.
- Add staff for increased fraud prevention, institutional accountability, and oversight efforts.

Funding for student aid administration must be adequate for the federal government to fulfill its responsibilities to successfully administer the federal student aid programs and should never compete for dollars from any of the other student aid programs.

CONTACT INFO

Carolyn Henrich
University of California
(202) 974-6308  |  carolyn.henrich@ucdc.edu
Federally Funded Research

DESCRIPTION

From the time of our nation’s founding, the federal government has played a critical role in supporting research and scientific discovery. Since World War II, American leaders have agreed we must invest in science and engineering at our universities to keep the country safe, healthy, and globally competitive. The returns on those investments form the basis of our economic and national security and have yielded health and technology advances that far outpace those of any other nation. Federal agencies that fund university research include the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the National Science Foundation (NSF), the Departments of Defense, Energy, Commerce, Agriculture, Interior, Homeland Security, Transportation, and Education, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and the National Endowment for the Humanities. In addition to spurring new discoveries, these research investments are central to educating graduate students, playing a significant role in preparing the American workforce in all sectors of the economy.

FUNDING HISTORY (in billions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$64.73</td>
<td>$66.03</td>
<td>$68.95</td>
<td>$72.85*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This figure represents the Office of Management and Budget’s estimate of annual budget authority for federal basic and applied research accounts across multiple agencies. It is a simple way to portray the extensive federal investment in science and technology.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s proposed FY 2017 budget would provide an overall increase of 5.6 percent to basic and applied research accounts across the federal research landscape. The Department of Agriculture’s Agriculture and Food Research Initiative (AFRI) would double its capacity to $700 million, and the Department of Energy’s Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy (ARPA-E) would jump 20 percent to $350 million. Other agencies would experience cuts, such as the Department of Defense basic research account which would be reduced significantly to $2.1 billion (-9 percent). The NSF budget would increase by 6.7 percent to a total of $7.9 billion, and the NIH budget would receive a 3.3 percent increase to $33.1 billion. The biggest obstacle to federal research and development spending in FY 2017 will likely be the Administration’s reliance on new mandatory funding mechanisms in several of the research agencies, which would require additional legislation beyond regular appropriations in order to occur. Without the mandatory funding proposed by the Administration, the overall increases for research would amount to 1.5 percent, which is below inflation.
PROGRAM NEED

The low discretionary spending caps have had a negative impact on federal research funding in the aggregate, and funding levels have not kept up with growing needs. The deterioration of federal funding for research, at a time when other countries are increasing their investments, is creating an innovation deficit for the United States. This puts the nation at a competitive disadvantage and endangers our role as world innovation leader. Federal funding for research should be bolstered every year and not allowed to decay, even in tight budget circumstances. As an investment with a proven track record of strong returns, federal funding for research is closely tied to our nation’s economic health. Insufficiently funding this investment will have deleterious impacts on the national economy and future federal budgets, constricting funding for all programs into the foreseeable future. We must close the innovation deficit with robust federal support for research. In FY 2017 NIH should be funded at least at $34.5 billion, NSF at least at $8 billion, and AFRI at the proposed level of $700 million, and all agencies should be funded well above inflationary growth.

CONTACT INFO

Christopher C. Carter
University of California
(202) 974-6310 • chris.carter@ucdc.edu
Segal AmeriCorps Education Award
National and Community Service Act

"Three years ago I decided to become a teacher. When I first considered a career in education, I wasn't sure I could afford it. Growing up in a low-income community, I knew the odds were against me, but my father taught me that resilience was critical, making me the first in my family to earn a college degree. The financial support I received from AmeriCorps as a Teach For America corps member made it all possible. As an AmeriCorps participant, I received a stipend toward my master's degree and was able to defer my student loans for two years, while the CNCS paid the interest accrued. This support was essential to me. During my time as a corps member, AmeriCorps funding made it possible for me to work in a community similar to the one I grew up in. My students don’t have access to many of the same resources that wealthier communities do, but just like I did growing up, they have a great deal of resilience. I plan to devote my life to helping students achieve, to give them not only instructional support, but holistic support, and I cannot emphasize enough the impact that AmeriCorps had on my decision. All over the country, AmeriCorps programs are making it possible for people to make similar commitments to service."

—Angel Arroyo, Segal AmeriCorps Education Award recipient, Teach For America 2013 Corps Member, Brownsville Middle School, Miami, FL

DESCRIPTION

The Segal AmeriCorps Education Award is a benefit received by participants who complete service in an approved AmeriCorps program, including AmeriCorps VISTA, AmeriCorps NCCC, or AmeriCorps State and National. Teach For America is a proud member of the AmeriCorps national service network. Individuals teaching in low-income areas who work to expand educational opportunity in ways that can change children's lives are eligible for Segal AmeriCorps education awards. AmeriCorps teaching programs recruit diverse groups of leaders with a record of achievement and provide intensive training, support and career development to help these leaders increase their impact by teaching in low-income communities.

The maximum amount of a full-time Segal AmeriCorps education award ($5,935 in FY 2017) is equivalent to the maximum amount of the Pell Grant for the year in which the national service position was approved. The value of the award is prorated based on the length of service, and AmeriCorps members may receive more than the aggregate value of two full-time education awards. Education awards can be used toward repayment of qualified student loans and/or payment of higher education expenses. Many Teach For America participants use their education awards to obtain teaching certification. AmeriCorps also provides a loan forbearance benefit, which allows AmeriCorps members to postpone regular monthly student loan payments during their service. Additionally, AmeriCorps will pay up to 100 percent of the interest accrued on qualified student loans after each successful year serving as an AmeriCorps member.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT's REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,049.95</td>
<td>$1,054.95</td>
<td>$1,094.92</td>
<td>$1,096.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget for FY 2017 proposes $1.1 billion for the Corporation for National & Community Service (CNCS), the agency that funds AmeriCorps. This represents essentially a freeze in funding when compared to CNCS’s current budget. The request also includes $206.8 million for the National Service Trust, which will fund Segal AmeriCorps Education Awards for 87,400 AmeriCorps members who serve in 2017.

PROGRAM NEED

Record numbers of Americans are stepping forward to serve, and increasing numbers of communities are looking for innovative ways to address local challenges, including placing effective teachers in our lowest performing schools. Therefore, this investment in national service is vitally important. In addition to helping teachers serving in AmeriCorps address credentialing costs and student loan debt, a recent study by economists at Columbia University found for every dollar invested in national service, the returns to society equal $3.95 in terms of higher earnings, increased output, and other community-wide benefits. Fully funding the president’s budget request for CNCS and providing Segal Education Awards will engage millions of Americans in service, including helping teachers in low-income areas.

CONTACT INFO

Kelly Broughan
Teach For America
(202) 552-2400  |  kelly.broughan@teachforamerica.org
Part 4. Forging Success

Educational Research, Statistics and Improvement
The Institute of Education Sciences
Titles I, II and III, Education Sciences Reform Act

DESCRIPTION
The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) houses major programs of federal education research and development, statistics, assessments, and program evaluation. The IES Director oversees the operation of the Institute through four national centers: the National Center for Education Research, the National Center for Education Statistics, the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, and the National Center for Special Education Research.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$576.94</td>
<td>$573.94</td>
<td>$618.02</td>
<td>$693.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET
For 2017, the Administration is seeking $693.8 million for IES activities, an increase of $75.8 million over the 2016 appropriation. This request would enable IES to award approximately $55.5 million in new research and development grants in early learning, elementary, secondary, postsecondary, and adult education in 2017, including research focused on issues related to students with disabilities. NCES would receive an additional $13.4 million to support a wide range of activities, including re-initiating the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study Birth Cohort, developing a study on college loan performance, collecting additional data through the Teaching and Learning International Survey, supporting the My Brother’s Keeper initiative, and creating P–12 and postsecondary information hubs. The Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems program would receive an additional $46.5 million to make new grants to support the expansion of existing systems to provide near real-time information to policymakers on the impact of various education strategies, as well as to support enhanced national activities to improve data coordination, quality, and use.

The request also would provide an increase for dissemination activities through an investment in Data Quality Initiatives (DQIs) to improve the Department’s program performance data and reporting. Finally, the request would continue the Administration’s commitment to supporting the Assessment, Regional Educational Laboratories, and Special Education Studies and Evaluations programs.

PROGRAM NEED
The president’s proposed increase would support increased investments in research, development, and evaluation to build a rich evidence base on what works and making this evidence more accessible to practitioners and policymakers. Despite decades of education research, including the recent growth in research explicitly addressing improving learning in subjects such as reading and mathematics, there continue to be many unanswered questions about how children and adults learn in these areas and how best to support that learning. Continued investment in the long term programs of research is necessary to accumulate empirical knowledge and develop theories that will ultimately result in improved academic achievement.

CONTACT INFO

John Waters
Knowledge Alliance
(202) 507-6277 | waters@knowledgeall.net
Regional Educational Laboratories
Title I, Part D, Education Sciences Reform Act

School improvement has taken center stage in the national discussion about education, but the viewpoints of students — those mostly affected by school change — are seldom heard. REL West, which noticed a growing interest by Nevada educators to incorporate the “student voice concept” into their school change efforts, created the Speak Out, Listen Up! toolkit. The toolkit is a set of tools that educators and other adults use to elicit students’ ideas about school-related issues, listen to what they have to say, and use their input to help shape change. It was originally developed by the Nevada Education Research Alliance, of which the REL West is a member, to evaluate its dropout prevention efforts. Its use has expanded throughout the western region to help strengthen academic interventions and social emotional learning activities.

DESCRIPTION

Administered by the Institute of Education Sciences, the Regional Educational Laboratories (REL) serve as a necessary bridge between the research community and States and local school districts. They conduct applied research and development projects and widely disseminate these results within the region, along with other high quality research. A new feature under the current REL contract is the establishment and leadership of research alliances at the district, State, or regional level focused on addressing current problems of practice. As these research alliances begin to implement their agendas, increased funding for RELs would ensure they have the funds necessary to act in a timely way on the State, local, and regional research needs identified by the stakeholders closest to the challenges.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$54.42</td>
<td>$54.42</td>
<td>$54.42</td>
<td>$54.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

Key REL activities include providing technical assistance on data analysis, evaluating programs and strategies, and analyzing State and district data to inform educational improvement. The requested funds would be used to support the first-year activities for 9 of the 10 RELs under new five-year contracts (REL Southwest is on a different schedule and will be competed in FY 2017). This investment continues to emphasize the need for conducting and disseminating rigorous research, while also addressing stakeholder concerns and ensuring REL activities are aligned with other federal education investments and initiatives.

PROGRAM NEED

Education policymakers and other decision makers have never been more in need of trustworthy education research, as well as guidance in how to use it. The RELs suffered a reduction of $3 million due to the FY 2013 sequester and remain funded at that reduced level. Restoring their funding to pre-sequester levels would enable them to most effectively fill their role as a critical bridge between education research and practice, emphasizing technical assistance in performing data analysis, evaluating programs, and using data from State longitudinal data systems for research and evaluation that address important issues of policy and practice.
Education Research, Development, and Dissemination

Title I, Education Sciences Reform Act

DESCRIPTION

This budget line provides support for the Department’s core education research programs. It includes the National Research and Development Centers that address specific topics such as early childhood development and learning, testing and assessment, and reading comprehension. These funds also support the What Works Clearinghouse, the Education Research Information Clearinghouse, and impact studies.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$179.86</td>
<td>$179.86</td>
<td>$195.00</td>
<td>$209.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The request includes an increase of $14.3 million over the 2016 appropriation to support critical investments in education research, development, dissemination, and evaluation that provide parents, teachers, schools, and policymakers with evidence-based information on effective educational practices. The request would enable IES to sustain its efforts to produce and support the use of evidence-based practices in the field and in the Department, make approximately $52.3 million in new research awards, and provide an increase of $2 million to make enhancements to dissemination activities by investing in Data Quality Initiatives to improve the Department’s program performance data and reporting.
PROGRAM NEED

While the programs within IES provide a structure and leadership for research, development, and dissemination, all three activities suffer due to inadequate resources. These programs lost approximately $10 million due to the FY 2013 sequester, and the requested increase in funding would help maintain a regular cycle of research grants. Those grants provide a consistent source of support for building a high quality evidence base for what works in education, as well as providing ongoing support for IES’s dissemination efforts to ensure evidence informs practice.

CONTACT INFO

John Waters
Knowledge Alliance
(202) 507-6277  |  waters@knowledgeall.net
National Center for Education Statistics
Title I, Part C, Education Sciences Reform Act

DESCRIPTION

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) collects and synthesizes statistics for studies on a wide range of education topics such as teacher shortages, comparisons of American and other nations’ student achievement, high school dropout rates, preparation for higher education, and college costs. With this information, NCES provides objective and scientifically-based statistical reports on the condition of education in the United States. These data and reports are invaluable to policymakers, practitioners, analysts and researchers in appraising a range of education topics. The implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act is likely to increase the State data needs from NCES. Data from the statistics and student assessment programs, both domestic and international, help practitioners set curriculum, instruction, and student performance standards.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>$103.06</td>
<td>$103.06</td>
<td>$112.00</td>
<td>$125.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The Administration proposes a $13.4 million increase for NCES in FY 2017 to support a range of high priority policy issues. Of this increase, $7.1 million would fund the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study to support a large sample field test in 2017, providing an essential tool to States as they expand high quality preschool programs under the Preschool Development Grants program. An additional $2.5 million would support a study on student loan repayment and defaults, with another $2.8 million for the Teaching and Learning International Survey. In addition, $500,000 would fund statistical work on the My Brother’s Keeper initiative, and $500,000 would be used for the development of P-12 and Postsecondary Information Hubs.

PROGRAM NEED

The Administration’s proposed budget will allow NCES to continue core activities in cross-sectional studies, longitudinal studies, international studies, administrative data collections and support, and cross-cutting activities. In addition, the budget increase will help NCES provide recent and relevant information to inform Department policy decisions on postsecondary education, global competitiveness, early childhood education, and high need youth.
CONTACT INFO

Juliane Baron or Christy Talbot
American Educational Research Association
(202) 238-3200  |  jbaron@aera.net or ctalbot@aera.net
National Assessment of Educational Progress
Title II, Education Sciences Reform Act

DESCRIPTION

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is the only representative and continuing assessment of American students' achievement. “The nation's report card” describes the educational achievement of students at specific grade levels and subjects and contains data to provide information about special subpopulations (e.g., minorities, students in urban schools). It provides an objective national standard for appraising State developed achievement standards, information that will be critical with the upcoming implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). NAEP is also the source of unbiased student performance data for policymakers, educators, parents, and the public.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT'S REQUEST</td>
<td>$132.00</td>
<td>$129.00</td>
<td>$149.00</td>
<td>$149.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

President Obama proposes to freeze funding for the National Assessment of Educational Progress in FY 2017 at $149 million. NAEP State-level assessments are held every other year, resulting in costs being considerably higher in some years and lower in others. Accordingly, the Department requests that NAEP funds be available for two years, providing flexibility for this cycle.

PROGRAM NEED

NAEP plays a critical role in helping to benchmark national education progress. Since most States and districts use their own unique assessments, such a benchmark is essential and will likely be even more important as States work to develop accountability systems with the increased flexibility granted under ESSA.

CONTACT INFO

Juliane Baron or Christy Talbot
American Educational Research Association
(202) 238-3200 | jbaron@aera.net | ctalbot@aera.net
Research in Special Education/Special Education Studies and Evaluation

Title I, Part E, Education Sciences Reform Act
Section 664, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

DESCRIPTION

This account supports research to address gaps in scientific knowledge necessary to improve special education and early intervention services and results for infants, toddlers, and children with disabilities. Special Education Studies and Evaluation funds support competitive grants to assess the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the effectiveness of special education and early intervention programs and services.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research in Special Education</td>
<td>$54.00</td>
<td>$54.00</td>
<td>$54.00</td>
<td>$54.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies and Evaluation</td>
<td>$10.82</td>
<td>$10.82</td>
<td>$10.82</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget proposes $54 million in FY 2017 for Research in Special Education, frozen at the FY 2016 level, and $13 million for Special Education Studies and Evaluation, a slight increase over the previous year’s level. These critical investments would be used to support studies, evaluations, and assessments related to the implementation of IDEA. In addition, the 2017 request level would allow the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) to support a new study to enable data collection from States, local school districts, and schools, providing Congress, the Administration, and other stakeholders with updated information on IDEA implementation.

PROGRAM NEED

The capacity of the field to conduct rigorous and relevant research on topics specific to the education of children and youth with disabilities is still developing. The FY 2013 sequester cuts to this program were fully restored through the FY 2014 Consolidated Appropriations Act. However, there still a strong call from the field to support a broad range of research, development, and evaluation activities critical to building a scientific enterprise that can provide solutions to the nation’s special education challenges.

CONTACT INFO

Augustus Mays
WestEd
(202) 471-2468   | amays@wested.org
Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems
Title II, Education Sciences Reform Act

DESCRIPTION

The Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) program provides grants to States to assist in the design, development, and implementation of longitudinal data systems that can track individual students throughout their school career. Systems developed through these grants should help improve data quality, promote linkages, encourage the accurate and timely generation of data for reporting and improving student outcomes, and facilitate research to further improve student outcomes.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$34.54</td>
<td>$34.54</td>
<td>$34.54</td>
<td>$81.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget proposes $81.02 million in FY 2017 for the SLDS program, an increase of $46.5 million over the FY 2016 level. These funds would pay for continuation costs of grants awarded in 2015, a new competition in FY 2017 that would allow more States to leverage existing data to examine local education issues and concerns, and national activities to improve data coordination, quality, and use.

PROGRAM NEED

Supporting the use of longitudinal data is vital as States transition to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). ESSA introduces new requirements for States to collect and report data to the public. For example, States’ SLDS will need to be positioned to assist in meeting new postsecondary enrollment, teacher qualification, and per pupil data expenditure requirements under ESSA. To continue to support States in improving data quality, coordination, and use as they make the transition to ESSA, it is critically important Congress fund this account at the level of the president’s request.

CONTACT INFO

Augustus Mays
WestEd
(202) 471-2468 | amays@wested.org
Part 5.
Education-Related Programs
Meeting the Human Needs of America’s Children
Head Start
Economic Opportunity Act of 1964

"Two years after Head Start launched nationally, a class was established in my home town of Hinton, West Virginia. It was a summer program at the time, and we met in what would eventually be my 5th grade classroom at Central Elementary School. We hatched chickens in an incubator — starting my lifelong love of science — and I would play with Kristie, who is still my best friend and was in my wedding. Thanks to an excellent teacher, Mrs. Pack, I did get a head start. I learned to love learning, and that love has stayed with me my whole life. In fact, when my mom called my Head Start teacher, she said every day I came bounding in the door with the same question: 'What are we going to learn today?' That’s a foundation that all children can have.”

—Sylvia Mathews Burwell, Head Start Alumna, Secretary, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
(Excerpt, Speech to National Head Start Association, April 2, 2015)

DESCRIPTION

Administered by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Head Start is a federal grant program that provides comprehensive child development services for economically disadvantaged three and four year old children to prepare them to succeed in school. Serving 1.1 million children annually, Head Start promotes children’s social, emotional, and cognitive development by providing educational, health, nutritional, social and other important services, with an emphasis on engaging parents in their child’s learning and development. Congress established Early Head Start in FY 1995 to serve children from birth to three years of age. Early Head Start, which serves 145,000 families, promotes healthy prenatal outcomes for pregnant women, enhances the development of young children, and promotes healthy family functioning. In addition, the Migrant and Seasonal Head Start (MSHS) serves approximately 30,000 children of migrant farmworker families, and the American Indian and Alaskan Native Head Start serves approximately 35,000 Native American and Alaska Native children and their families.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$8,597.85</td>
<td>$8,598.10*</td>
<td>$9,168.10**</td>
<td>$9,601.72***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes $500 million for Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships.
**Includes $635 million for Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships.
***Includes $645 million for Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships.
The FY 2016 increase includes a $141 million COLA for Head Start, $294 million to support grantees in expanding to full school day and full school year services and a $135 million increase for expanding Early Head Start (EHS), including through EHS-Child Care Partnerships. The FY 2017 budget request includes $294 million to support grantees in expanding to full school day and full school year services, and $142 million for a cost of living adjustment for all grantees. The budget includes $645 million for EHS-Child Care Partnerships.

**IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET**

The president’s budget expands funding for Head Start by $434 million, with $292 million dedicated to the Administration’s priority to increase the number of children in full school day (at least 6 hours) and full school year (170 days per year) programs. Although research demonstrates that increasing the duration of Head Start services to full day/full year has the potential to significantly improve early education and development outcomes of children and benefit working parents, only 57 percent of Head Start preschoolers are currently enrolled in full day/full-year programs. The additional funding will facilitate the transition to full day/full year services without causing a reduction in existing Head Start slots. In addition, the president’s budget increases funding for Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships to $645 million to allow more Early Head Start providers to partner and align with child care facilities to provide high quality learning opportunities for eligible children and families. As a result of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (BBA), Head Start will not face sequestration cuts this year. However, because the BBA provides only temporary relief, Head Start will continue to face potential funding cuts that hamper its ability to improve outcomes for millions of children eligible to benefit from services.
PROGRAM NEED

According to the Census Bureau, more than 16 million children live in families whose incomes fall below the Federal Poverty Level. Poor and lower income children are significantly more likely to experience gaps in cognitive development as a result of economic insecurity and toxic stress, which can impede early brain development and result in educational inequalities long before they enter kindergarten.

Head Start is an effective early childhood program that helps close the achievement gap and prepare children to succeed in school and in life. Head Start improves child health, development, and school readiness, increasing the chances that preschoolers will complete high school and go on to college. Despite these benefits, Head Start only serves approximately 42 percent of eligible low-income, preschool children, and Early Head Start serves only 4 percent of eligible preschoolers. To give children a strong start in life and help vulnerable families overcome the challenges of poverty, funding for Head Start and Early Head Start should be significantly increased. Head Start is currently undergoing rulemaking to improve its quality and efficiency. It is anticipated Head Start will be reauthorized in the 115th Congress, which provides an opportunity for Congress to further improve and expand this important program.

CONTACT INFO

Karen Howard
First Focus
(202) 510-0929  |  karenh@firstfocus.net

Child Care and Development Fund
Child Care and Development Block Grant Act (CCDBG)
Section 418, Social Security Act

Katie, a mother of two young children from the Baltimore area, was separated from her husband and was looking ahead to a new career to support her family. She joined a waiting list for Maryland’s child care subsidy program, funded through the Child Care and Development Block Grant. With the subsidy, she was able to pay for the children to attend summer camp and to defray a large portion of before and after school child care. She has now become an optician, but is still earning only $14 an hour. The child care subsidy is crucial to her being able to meet her children’s needs.

DESCRIPTION

The Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) is the major source of federal child care assistance for children ages birth to 13 in low- and moderate-income families. It provides access to high quality child care environments that allows parents to work with the comfort of knowing their children are receiving good care. To qualify for child care assistance, families must be working or in school and must meet income eligibility guidelines set by States within broad parameters in federal law. At least 7 percent of CCDF funds that States receive must be used to increase the quality of care in FY 2015. CCDF is funded through both discretionary and mandatory appropriations.
### FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>$5,275.25</td>
<td>$5,352.00</td>
<td>$5,678.00</td>
<td>$9,543.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These figures represent the discretionary and mandatory portions of CCDF.

### IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget includes a historic investment in child care, proposing a combined $9.54 billion of mandatory and discretionary funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grant program. This represents an increase of over $3.8 billion in funding for this program. Within that amount, $3.7 billion is designated for FY 2017, with a total of $82 billion over 10 years, to provide voluntary child care assistance to every low- and moderate-income child under the age of four. An additional $200 million is provided to implement the quality provisions of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Reauthorization Act and $40 million for a grant program to provide child care assistance in rural areas and for individuals working non-traditional hours. The increased funding is estimated to provide child care services to an additional 1.1 million children and families. In addition to providing child care assistance through the CCDBG, credit available to working families through the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit would be tripled, providing assistance to more families to secure quality child care.

### PROGRAM NEED

More than 12 million children in the United States under age five attend child care every week. With the costs of child care rivaling the price of in-state tuition at a public four-year college in 33 States, high quality, affordable child care is out of reach for many working parents. High quality child care serves two important purposes: to promote the safety and healthy development of children while their parents are at work and allow parents to go to school or maintain stable employment to support their families. While sequestration cuts to the discretionary portion of CCDF were restored in the FY 2014 Consolidated Appropriations Act, only a small portion of eligible children receive assistance and many States have waiting lists for child care support. Furthermore, although the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 provided temporary relief to sequestration and reduced budgetary caps for FY 2016 and FY2017, funding levels remain woefully inadequate to provide meaningful assistance to working families in need of quality child care. Additionally, CCDBG was reauthorized in 2014 with additional safety and quality requirements, all of which require additional funding to avoid a negative impact on enrollment rates. In an era where a majority of mothers with young children work, it is imperative Congress significantly expand funding for this critical program, in order to serve a greater number of eligible children and assist States in their efforts to improve child care quality and early learning opportunities for low-income children.

### CONTACT INFO

Karen Howard  
First Focus  
(202) 510-0929  |  karenh@firstfocus.net
Child Nutrition Programs
National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act

“My oldest nephew has just finished his PhD in Physics from the U of Minnesota and is now working for Intel. At the Thanksgiving dinner table he is telling his newly pregnant sister-in-law and brother, ‘You really need to get on WIC as soon as possible. I know you think you can buy your own food, but it isn’t about the food. It is the information and support that you will receive throughout your pregnancy and until your child turns five. Without WIC we never would have known about ECFE, parenting groups or how to care for my wife’s special anemia. We would not have known to get my son tested for anemia. We never would have had all of the great information on breastfeeding and who to call when we had trouble getting our second baby to latch. You are lucky to qualify for this program, and you need to take advantage of it as soon as possible. It is easy to register for WIC. When you call, they talk to you as if they can’t wait to see you in their clinic.’”

—WIC participant, Minnesota (Courtesy of the National WIC Association)

DESCRIPTION

The National School Lunch, School Breakfast, Special Milk, Summer Food Service, and Child and Adult Care Food programs are mandatory accounts administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). The Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) is a discretionary initiative administered by USDA. These programs help ensure children have access to nutritious meals throughout the year that help to ensure their healthy development and academic success. For example, the National School Lunch program provides nutritionally balanced, low cost or free lunches to children each school day in public and non-profit private schools. All of these initiatives were reauthorized through the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 and are up for reauthorization through The Improving Child Nutrition Integrity and Access Act of 2016.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Nutrition</td>
<td>$19,288.00</td>
<td>$21,300.20</td>
<td>$22,149.75</td>
<td>$23,230.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC</td>
<td>$ 6,715.80</td>
<td>$ 6,623.00</td>
<td>$ 6,350.00</td>
<td>$ 6,350.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

With the FY 2017 budget, the Obama Administration once again shows its dedication to fighting child hunger and improving child nutrition. Both the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) are funded at appropriate levels to serve the over 8 million and 44 million individuals participating in each respective program on a monthly basis. The president’s budget also provides over $23 billion in funding for the Child Nutrition Programs, including the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and School Breakfast Program (SBP). This investment will provide healthy meals in school each day for the over 32 million students participating in the NSLP and 15 million students participating in the SBP.
The budget includes one new initiative. In an effort to eliminate the uptick in child hunger over the summer months, the proposal calls for a $12 billion investment over the next decade for expansion of the Summer Electronic Benefit Transfer for Children Program. This permanent expansion would scale up current demonstrations nationwide over a 10-year rollout, providing $45 per month for each child in families eligible for free and reduced-price meals. Families will be able to use their benefits at SNAP retailers, making it far easier to access healthy food while the NSLP and SBP are shut down over summer break.

PROGRAM NEED

President Obama’s FY 2017 budget makes essential investments in key nutrition programs proven to reduce child hunger, increase access to healthy meals, and help children grow and learn. However, more needs to be done. Innovative solutions coupled with strong financial backing are needed to end the battle with hunger that continues to plague far too many children and families in America. The Administration’s proposal to allow States to use Medicaid data to certify all eligible students for free and reduced-price meals is an example of a sensible and innovative strategy to end child hunger, but more funding is needed for technical assistance to States making this transition. The FY 2017 budget provides $10 million for a pilot in the Summer Food Service Program that would create non-congregate meal sites in areas of need. This investment should begin to reduce child hunger in rural areas and tribal lands, but additional funding is necessary in order to reach the maximum number of eligible children.

CONTACT INFO

Elliott Gluck
First Focus
(202) 657-0690  |  elliottg@firstfocus.org
Medicaid: Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment Programs

Title XIX, Social Security Act

The Detroit Public Schools and 32 other public school districts in the metropolitan area rely on the Wayne County Regional Educational Service Agency (Wayne RESA) to collect and submit federal Medicaid reimbursement claims for school-based health services provided to low-income Medicaid-eligible students. The multi-million dollar costs associated with speech therapy, occupational and physical therapies and audiology, and psychological services are partially covered by Medicaid. The $20 million in Medicaid reimbursements received last year assisted in providing services to over 11,000 special needs students across the 33 school districts of Wayne County. Medicaid reimbursements are critical to support updated equipment and purchase assistive aids and materials, and particularly to offset some of the costs of the specialized staffing needed to serve these high need students.

DESCRIPTION

Medicaid programs work through State and local health agencies and other service providers to detect and treat eligible low-income children and adults for a broad range of health deficiencies, such as speech, hearing, vision, and dental problems or physical impairments. Children make up some 40 percent of all Medicaid recipients but account for only 20 percent of Medicaid costs. Many schools participate in the Medicaid program in order to address child health problems that often have detrimental effects on their academic performance. Most of the medical services reimbursed to schools under Medicaid are provided to children with disabilities.

FUNDING HISTORY (in billions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$305.84</td>
<td>$368.41</td>
<td>$356.82*</td>
<td>$377.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FY 2016 estimated.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2017 Medicaid budget of $378 billion estimates over 27 million children will receive Medicaid services, some 40 percent of all individuals served in the Medicaid program. The number of Medicaid beneficiaries is projected to grow consistently in FY 2017 with provisions of the Affordable Care Act that extend Medicaid eligibility to all individuals in every State with family incomes up to 133 percent of the federal poverty level. The federal government will pay 100 percent of the costs for these newly eligible individuals through 2016, phasing down to 90 percent in 2020. For school-based services, the lifting of previously restrictive guidance from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) has allowed school districts to continue to receive critical reimbursements for Medicaid-eligible services provided to eligible students at school sites. Despite the threat of another round of sequestration cuts affecting certain federal entitlement programs, the Medicaid program is exempt from across the board sequestration of funds.
**PROGRAM NEED**

More than one in five children in America has health coverage through the Medicaid program. Medicaid participation provides access to preventive, basic, acute, and specialized health services, in addition to prescription medications not otherwise generally available to low-income children and families. In recent years, actions taken by the Obama Administration have helped schools providing services to eligible students receive federal reimbursements. School health personnel are often among the few health professionals to whom low-income children have regular access. The 2014 guidance from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) removed additional federal administrative barriers to provision and reimbursement of school-based health services for eligible low-income children. Maintaining an effective school-based Medicaid program is critical to support medically underserved children.

**CONTACT INFO**

Jeff Simering  
Council of the Great City Schools  
(202) 393-2427 | jsimering@cgcs.org

---

**Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP)**

**Title XXI, Social Security Act**

A mother in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, has 3 boys, including twin sons born 10 weeks premature. In their early years the twins had a number of health issues due to their prematurity. Because affordable coverage through CHIP was available for her family, mom was able to make sure her babies got the care they needed when they needed it. CHIP has been a lifeline for the family, providing access to specialized care and medications for the twins as well as vaccinations, well child checkups, and care for routine illnesses like ear infections for all three boys. The family reports the best thing about CHIP is that it offers comprehensive affordable care. Without CHIP the family would not have been able to see the doctors and afford the cost of medications that have been so important for the children’s healthy development.

**DESCRIPTION**

CHIP provides enhanced federal matching payments to States to assist in providing health care coverage for millions of low-income uninsured children whose families earn too much to qualify for Medicaid, but who do not have options for employer provided coverage or cannot afford to purchase private insurance on their own. The program was created in 1997 and reauthorized in 2009. CHIP is authorized through 2019. Funding for CHIP was recently extended for two years. Additional funding for CHIP will be required after FY 2017.
FUNDING HISTORY  (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$9,314.00</td>
<td>$9,233.00</td>
<td>$14,426.00</td>
<td>$15,015.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The FY 2017 budget provides funding to continue coverage for low-income children, with a particular focus on enrolling those children who are already eligible for Medicaid or CHIP. The goal is to improve the availability and accessibility of health coverage by increasing enrollment in CHIP and Medicaid. The FY 2017 target of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) is to increase children’s enrollment in coverage (Medicaid and CHIP) from 43.7 million children in FY 2014 to 46.1 million in FY 2017.

PROGRAM NEED

In FY 2015, according to the CMS actuary, 8.9 million individuals received health insurance funded through CHIP. Currently there are 4.4 million uninsured children in the United States, approximately two-thirds of whom are eligible but not enrolled in CHIP or Medicaid. In 2009 Congress reauthorized CHIP (P.L. 111-3) through September 2013, providing $44 billion through 2013 to maintain State programs and insure more children. In 2010 the Affordable Care Act extended funding for CHIP through FY 2015, providing an additional $28.8 billion in budget authority over the baseline. In 2015, as part of the Medicare and CHIP Reauthorization Act (MACRA) (P.L. 114-10), Congress provided $5.6 billion for a two-year extension of CHIP funding. Although CHIP is authorized through FY 2019, CHIP funding is set to expire on September 30, 2017, requiring congressional action at that point to continue the program.

CONTACT INFO

Lisa Shapiro
First Focus
(202) 657-0675  |  lisas@firstfocus.net
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
School Health Programs

Washington’s Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction receives funding from the CDC to help school districts create healthy school nutrition environments, strengthen physical education, and promote physical activity. One school district created a “Mighty Milers” program to encourage more physical activity during recess. At one participating school, 385 students and 16 staff completed more than 6,435 miles. In another school, staff created and delivered GYMBAGs (Get Youth Moving – Brain Activity Gear) to 5th grade classrooms. These bags were filled with equipment to increase physical activity during the school day. School volunteers created “Move-It Mondays” and new “Walk-to-School” routes, and they collaborated with nutrition services for “Grab-and-Go” breakfast. Connecting community partners and families increases opportunities to create sustainable healthy changes for schools. Healthier schools help lead to lifelong success.

—Lisa Rakoz, Program Supervisor, Healthiest Next Generation
Washington State Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction

DESCRIPTION

Since the late 1970s the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) have developed evidence-based tools and built leadership capacity in States and localities to effectively improve the health of K-12 students. The CDC’s Healthy Schools Program (HSP), housed in the Division of Population Health in the National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, provides basic funding to all States to improve the nutrition environment and increase physical activity. HSP provides additional funding to 32 States to implement enhanced strategies in these areas and improve management of chronic conditions and delivery of school health services. In addition, HSP funds seven non-governmental organizations. These organizations focus on increasing capacity of education and health agencies, community-based organizations, and postsecondary institutions to promote and implement sustainable strategies in schools and districts and provide training in effective interventions to improve health outcomes for K-12 students.

The Division of Adolescent and School Health (DASH) in the National Center for HIV/AIDS, Viral Hepatitis, Sexually Transmitted Diseases and Tuberculosis Prevention funds national school-based surveillance activities. DASH also funds school-based prevention programs in selected States and districts to increase evidence-based sexual health education programs in schools, create more supportive school environments for adolescents at highest risk for HIV, and increase HIV counseling and testing among adolescents.
FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Schools Program (School Health Branch)</td>
<td>$15.40</td>
<td>$15.40</td>
<td>$15.40</td>
<td>$15.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Adolescent and School Health</td>
<td>$31.20</td>
<td>$31.20</td>
<td>$33.08</td>
<td>$33.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

Prior to FY 2012 funding for the HSP promoted sustainable school health activities by supporting a designated school health coordinator in each funded State department of education to oversee activities and ensure cross-agency collaboration. However, funding for the HSP has been frozen since FY 2012. All 50 States now receive funding; however, States are only able to conduct minimal school-based health activities because funding is at such a low rate (about $75,000 per State for basic funding). This amount is insufficient to support a school health coordinator and implement important evidence-based strategies. The low funding level also has contributed to a significant decline in State health and education agencies’ ability to engage in collaborative activities.

Historically DASH was funded at levels that supported activities in all 50 States. Since the dramatic loss of funding in FY 2012, however, DASH has reduced its school-based prevention program reach to just 19 State departments of education and 17 local school districts, representing only 65 percent of the most vulnerable secondary school students in the United States.

PROGRAM NEED

Society as a whole benefits when young people are healthy and academically successful, as health and educational attainment are inextricably linked. Schools can play an important role in educating about, modeling, and reinforcing healthy behaviors, and supporting school-based or school-linked health services. Nearly one-third of high school students are overweight or obese and only one-third of high school students have daily physical education class. Schools are the best setting for modeling healthy eating and physical activity habits that can last well into adulthood. Schools have direct contact with 55 million young people for at least six hours per day and up to 13 crucial years of social, physical, emotional and intellectual development. They are well positioned to contribute to the health and well-being of every student, and particularly those most in need in our society. Over 50 percent of children now live in households in poverty. Therefore, it is even more crucial that schools assume a prominent role in monitoring and addressing chronic diseases and ensuring school and district leaders are equipped to provide supportive and healthy school environments in which children can thrive and succeed.

CONTACT INFO

Megan Wolfe
ASCD
(703) 575-5616 | megan.wolfe@ascd.org
Children’s Health Protection Program


In 2014, the Greater Southeast Development Corporation in Newport News, VA, launched a program to raise awareness about the community’s low air quality and disproportionate asthma rates in children. Supported by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s Children’s Health Protection Program, grant funds helped establish the Southeast Asthma Network, a public health arm of the Corporation that will launch a summer camp for children with asthma that includes an environmental education component. The overall goal of the initiative is to identify a scientific basis for the high asthma rates in the community. “We want to know specifics. If there’s a cause, then there’s a cure. [With the support of the EPA grant] we’ll be better armed to deal with the triggers,” said Linwood DeBrew, Executive Director of the Corporation.

DESCRIPTION

The Children’s Health Protection Program, administered by the Office of Children’s Health Protection (OCHP) in the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), supports national efforts to protect children’s health from environmental threats by ensuring all EPA programs and activities address the unique vulnerabilities of children. The program has four major goals: (1) reduce negative environmental impacts on children through involvement in EPA rulemaking, policy, enforcement actions, research and applications of science focused on prenatal and childhood vulnerabilities; (2) protect children through safe chemicals management; (3) coordinate community-based programs to eliminate threats to children’s health; and, (4) measure and communicate progress on children’s environmental health. The program also manages the Children’s Health Protection Advisory Committee (CHPAC), a body of external researchers, academics, healthcare providers, environmentalists, State and tribal government employees, and members of the public tasked with providing advice, information, and recommendations to the agency in developing regulations, guidance, and policies relevant to children’s health.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President’s Request</td>
<td>$6.55</td>
<td>$6.55</td>
<td>$6.55</td>
<td>$7.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget would increase funding for OCHP by almost $1.3 million. This increase would provide additional resources for technical assistance and emergency response services to communities through Pediatric Environmental Health Specialty Units, a source of medical information and advice on environmental conditions that influence reproductive and children’s health. Additionally, a funding increase would expand the EPA’s capacity to provide technical assistance to States and communities to help them identify the best approaches to protecting children from environmental health hazards, including research and implementation of community-based programs.
PROGRAM NEED

Because children's bodies are still developing, research shows they are more vulnerable than adults to certain environmental hazards, including air pollutants, pesticide residue on food, contaminants in drinking water, and toxic chemicals found in the home. Children's vulnerability to environmental hazards also may stem from behaviors which can expose them to such hazards. For example, children spend more time outdoors and are therefore more likely to come into contact with air pollutants that may produce complications in children with asthma. Children also receive greater relative exposures to chemicals because they inhale or ingest more air, food, and water on a body weight basis than adults.

Despite White House and advocate requests for increased funding for OCHP, the department's funding continues to decrease. OCHP released the first ever federal guidelines on environmental health in schools in 2012. However, due to frozen funding levels, the implementation of these guidelines has been slow, and the agency has had limited ability to support State agencies to address the environmental health risks in schools.

CONTACT INFO

Jessica Seitz
YMCA USA
(202) 688-4731  |  Jessica.seitz@ymca.net
School Safety and School/Community Violence Prevention

Supported by funding from the U.S. Department of Justice’s Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), the YMCA of the USA’s Reach & Rise® National Mentoring Program is offered in 38 states. Reach & Rise® is an evidence-based “therapeutic” one-to-one mentoring program for youth ages 6-17 who lack role models and live in communities challenged by poverty, crime, substance abuse, gangs, single parent households and other social factors. Through Reach & Rise®, employees with training in mental health match each youth with an adult for 12 to 18 months of mentoring. This experience provides youth with positive, consistent, and nurturing relationships with adults, improving self-esteem, decision-making skills, school performance and interpersonal relationships. Mentoring programs can have a positive influence in the lives of youth and help them reach their full potential and prevent involvement in the juvenile justice system.

DESCRIPTION

Through several programs, the Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, and Justice are engaged in collaborative efforts to improve school safety and prevent school and community violence. Each program has a specific and distinct purpose, all of which ensure schools and communities remain safe and supportive for children and youth.

The Department of Education’s School Safety Program is a competitive grant program that fosters a safe, secure, and drug-free learning environment, including efforts to create positive school climates and counter the effects of pervasive violence on students. The National Institute of Justice’s Comprehensive School Safety Initiative funds large-scale, integrated research efforts to increase school safety and improve collaboration among the law enforcement, mental health, and education communities.

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention runs a number of programs specifically designed to reduce youth and community violence. The largest of these is Youth Mentoring, supporting community-based mentoring programs to promote positive outcomes for youth most at risk of becoming involved in the juvenile justice system and those who have already encountered the system. The comprehensive Delinquency Prevention Program funds a number of projects: the National Forum on Youth Violence Prevention, an initiative that brings together diverse stakeholders from various cities to seek solutions aimed at curbing youth violence at the local level; the Community-Based Violence Prevention Program focused on public health approaches to reduce youth violence; and, school safety programs to encourage collaboration between schools and the juvenile justice system.
FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education’s School Safety Program</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive School Safety Initiative</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Mentoring Program</td>
<td>$85.50</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency Prevention Program</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$17.50</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Violence Prevention Initiatives</td>
<td>$ 5.50*</td>
<td>$ 6.00*</td>
<td>$ 8.00*</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Funds from the Delinquency Prevention Program

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

While the president’s budget proposes to freeze funding for the Comprehensive School Safety Initiative and reduce funding for the OJJDP Youth Mentoring Program, it also includes increases for the Departments of Education and Justice school safety and delinquency prevention programs. These increases will allow for continued exploration and expansion of evidence-based approaches to keep our children and communities safe and free of violence.

PROGRAM NEED

Improving overall school and community safety requires innovative solutions and collaboration among all stakeholders. The community and school environments must be both physically and psychologically safe to promote student learning and overall positive development. Historically, schools, communities, and law enforcement have operated in silos with little collaboration or coordination of services. Additionally, many school safety efforts have focused primarily on physical measures (e.g., metal detectors) and often only in response to a tragedy. Effective school safety is a daily commitment that requires coordination and integration of existing systems designed to promote a positive and supportive school and community culture, reduce negative behaviors, support student mental and behavioral health, minimize the impact of crises when they occur, and keep youngsters out of the juvenile justice system. Unfortunately, many schools and communities are not able to address school and community safety in a comprehensive manner due to inadequate financial resources and a lack of school-employed professionals (school psychologists, school social workers, school counselors) who are trained to meet the wide range of student behavioral and mental health needs and coordinate with community professionals. Each of these programs meets a specific need, including funding research about the most effective practices to provide guidance to schools and communities about what works best and providing funds to hire personnel needed to implement evidence-based models and programs.

CONTACT INFO

Kelly Vaillancourt Strobach
National Association of School Psychologists
(301) 657-02790  |  kvaillancourt@nasweb.org

Jessica Seitz
YMCA of the USA
(202) 688-4731  |  jessica.seitz@ymca.net
Generation Indigenous
Cross-Agency Program

The suicide epidemic in Indian Country is a reality for too many Native youth. Teressa “Tessa” Baldwin is an Alaska Native from Kotzebue who has dedicated her life to addressing high suicide rates within her community. Tessa is currently a senior at Mr. Edgucumbe High School in Sitka, Alaska, and has been personally affected by this epidemic. As a young adult, she channeled inspiration from mentors and activists such as Carol Waters and Barbara Franks. In doing so, Tessa was able to overcome her sadness and begin a journey as an advocate for suicide prevention. Tessa told herself, “I want to be part of the solution and not the problem with Alaska’s suicide rates.” Tessa founded Hope4Alaska, a campaign dedicated to raising awareness and increasing suicide prevention. By securing funding to provide workshops and training in schools, Tessa continues to make a difference across the State.

—The Center for Native American Youth, 2016

DESCRIPTION

Generation Indigenous (Gen I) is a new five-part White House initiative first funded in FY 2016 that fosters partnerships among federal agencies and with non-profits and provides new resources to increase opportunities for Native youth to succeed. Gen I includes: (1) Native Youth Community Projects which will be administered by the U.S. Department of Education through the existing Demonstration Grants Program; (2) National Tribal Youth Network, a partnership between the White House and the Aspen Institute’s Center for Native American Youth (CNAY) which will establish an interactive online portal for Native youth; (3) White House Native Youth Report, released December 2014; (4) Cabinet listening tour; and, (5) White House Tribal Youth Gathering in summer 2015.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Indian Education</td>
<td>$852.37</td>
<td>$912.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Youth Community Projects</td>
<td>$ 22.89</td>
<td>$ 53.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The significant increase for the Department of the Interior’s Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) budget will transform the agency to better meet the needs of American Indian students. The Administration’s total BIE FY 2017 funding request is $912 million, $59.63 million above FY 2016 levels. This increase will allow BIE to increase opportunities and improve outcomes in the classroom, provide excellent instructional services and teacher quality, promote enhanced Native language and cultural curricula and programming, and enhance Broadband and digital access. The budget seeks to incentivize creative solutions to school transformations, including $138 million for education construction to improve school infrastructure and facilities. The Administration’s vision for Native Youth Community Projects is to foster college and career readiness for Native youth. The budget proposes $53 million, a $30.11 million increase, to support community-driven strategies to improve the college and career readiness of Native youth by focusing on the unique educational needs of Native children.
PROGRAM NEED

It is crucial that the Generation Indigenous Initiative is funded as the president has requested as a way to solidify the Administration’s renewed commitment to supporting Native children. Through the integrated, comprehensive, and culturally appropriate approach to help improve the lives and opportunities for Native youth, the Generation Indigenous Initiative is a vital program for this nation’s most vulnerable students.

CONTACT INFO

Dimple Patel
National Indian Education Association
(202) 847-0034 | dpatel@niea.org