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The Committee for Education Funding (CEF), the nation’s oldest and largest education coalition, is a nonpartisan and nonprofit organization focused on the common goal of ensuring adequate federal financial support for education. CEF’s more than 100 member organizations and institutions represent the continuum of education — early childhood education, elementary and secondary education, higher education, adult and workforce education, and educational enhancements such as libraries and museums. Members include students and families, teachers and faculty, administrators, specialized instructional support personnel and other school employees, school board members, librarians, businesses, and education-related organizations.

CEF provides its members, the public, the U.S. Congress, the Executive Branch, and the media with information in support of federal investments in education. CEF’s #HearOurEdStories social media campaign lets teachers, students, parents, and others in the education community tell their members of Congress why federal education funding is so important. It supports CEF’s “5¢ Makes Sense” advocacy campaign to increase investments in education from 2 percent to 5 percent of the federal budget.

CEF is managed by American Continental Group and is governed by the membership as a whole, with a 16-member Board of Directors, including four officers and eight other Board members elected by the membership. CEF publishes timely updates, sponsors briefings on current funding and policy issues led by recognized experts, and holds weekly meetings of its membership that provide a forum for information exchange and policy discussions. CEF provides information and assistance to members of Congress and the Administration on education funding issues and holds numerous briefings and policy meetings with congressional staff and Administration officials during the year. At its annual fall Gala, CEF honors outstanding advocates of federal education investment.

You can find a list of CEF members at the end of this book and online at https://cef.org/about/cef-members/. CEF invites inquiries regarding CEF membership or its publications. CEF’s website (www.cef.org) also has fact sheets, funding tables, and charts on education funding and the importance of the federal investment.

Downloadable versions of the charts in this analysis are available on the CEF website. The site also includes many additional charts on the need for increased federal investments in education, educational outcomes, public opinion, and education funding at the state and federal level.

For questions or additional information, please contact CEF’s Executive Director Sheryl Cohen at cohen@cef.org, or CEF’s president Valerie C. Williams at Valerie.Williams@NASDSE.org.
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CEF Position Statement

"Federal investments in education reap rewards — immediate and long-term — for students, families, communities, and the economy overall. We should be increasing federal education funding, not slashing it."

The Committee for Education Funding (CEF), the nation’s oldest and largest education coalition, is a nonprofit, nonpartisan coalition of more than 100 member organizations and institutions that represent the continuum of education — from early childhood, elementary and secondary, and higher education, to adult and workforce education, and the educational enhancements that increase student achievement, including students, teachers and faculty, parents, administrators, specialized instructional support personnel, librarians, other school personnel, and school board members.

CEF strongly opposes President Trump’s FY 2021 education budget cuts.

The majority of Americans support increasing investments in public education, listing education funding as a top priority in poll after poll. Despite the public’s demonstrated support for education, the president’s FY 2021 budget slashes funding along the education continuum, from early childhood education and elementary and secondary education to higher education, as well as out-of-school educational programs. Congress refused to enact the president’s previous budgets that contained deep cuts to education. We encourage Congress again to reject these cuts and, instead, to increase federal investments in education.

Education investments currently account for less than 2 percent of the federal budget, and funding for Department of Education programs is currently $7 billion below the FY 2011 level in inflation-adjusted terms. The Committee for Education Funding opposes the Administration’s proposed cut of $5.7 billion for the Department of Education, with additional cuts to education-related programs in other agency budgets. These cuts would hurt students of all ages, sharply decreasing support targeted to needy students, teachers, and school leaders, and programs dedicated to serving specific populations, as well as drastically reducing the amount of student grant aid and loans that help make a college education accessible to all.

The Administration’s budget deeply cuts support for education even though investments in education are among the most important and profitable that the nation can make. Simply put, education pays — for students, families, communities, and the economy.

CEF urges Congress once again to reject the president’s harmful education cuts and, instead, to increase the federal education investment to maximize opportunities for students and their families, schools, and our nation.
President’s Fiscal Year 2021 Budget for Education

March 2020

OVERVIEW

The president’s fiscal year (FY) 2021 budget cuts education investments along the continuum — in early childhood education, elementary and secondary education, postsecondary education, and out-of-school educational services. The budget cuts discretionary resources for the Department of Education by $5.69 billion (7.9 percent) below the FY 2020 net funding level, and cuts mandatory spending for student loan programs by $170 billion over ten years. These cuts all reduce resources that help students learn and achieve, train teachers and school leaders, and provide access to higher education.

Polls and surveys consistently show that the American public considers education a top priority and wants to increase federal education investments, currently accounting for less than 2 percent of the federal budget. This public support comes after federal education funding has been cut or stagnant for years, reducing the vital resources that boost student achievement and help prepare a well-rounded workforce for global competition. In fact, Education Department programs currently receive $7 billion less than in FY 2011 after accounting for inflation. The president’s FY 2021 budget would cut those investments to a level below FY 2011 in actual nominal dollars, and to $13 billion below the inflation-adjusted level of 10 years ago.

President’s Education Budget is Below 2011 Level: Is $13 Billion Below in Inflation-Adjusted Terms

(Department of Education Discretionary Funding in Billions of Dollars)

2017, 2019, & 2020 totals reflect rescissions of Pell Grant funds
The president’s FY 2021 budget for education is thematically similar to this Administration’s previous budget requests with two new proposals. Like the Administration’s past proposals that Congress rejected, the budget makes large cuts to education programs along the continuum while proposing federal support for private elementary and secondary education costs, repeating a proposal for a tax credit for donations to scholarship programs. A new proposal eliminates 29 education programs (primarily programs under the Every Student Succeeds Act), consolidates their purposes into a new block grant, and slashes total funding by 20 percent ($4.77 billion) below the level Congress provided for those programs for FY 2020. Also new this year is a substantial increase for Career and Technical Education — a $763 million increase within the Department of Education that is more than offset by the Department’s $5.69 billion total funding cut. The cuts to education are part of the budget’s 5 percent cut to nondefense discretionary (NDD) funding — a cut that reduces NDD funding to $37 billion below the cap that Congress enacted for FY 2021 and to well below what Congress provided for FY 2020. The budget assumes that NDD funding is cut 2 percent deeper each subsequent year and that defense discretionary spending increases by 2 percent more each year.

PRESIDENT’S EDUCATION BUDGET

Many of the education cuts are ones that have been proposed by the Administration in its previous three budgets and that Congress has consistently refused to enact, making it clear a budget that slashes education is a non-starter. The funding cuts support the Administration’s goal of reducing the federal role in education while increasing support for school choice. In addition to the $5.69 billion cut to Education Department appropriations, the budget also makes changes to education programs in other agencies, including eliminating both the $250 million Preschool Development Grant program in the Department of Health and Human Services and the Institute of Museum and Library Services Act. It also creates a new federal tax credit in the Treasury Department of $5 billion per year over 10 years to support scholarships for private school choice and some public school educational activities.

The budget eliminates more than 40 education programs Congress funded this year at almost $26 billion, including the 29 consolidated into the new, smaller block grant (the budget’s eliminations, cuts, funding freezes, and few increases are shown on the list following this Summary). The biggest eliminated programs are:

- Title I, Education for the Disadvantaged State Grant (funded at $16.31 billion), which is folded into the new block grant with an overall 20 percent cut in funding;
- Title II Supporting Effective Instruction State Grant that hires and trains teachers and school leaders ($2.13 billion), also folded into the new block grant, with funding cut by 20 percent;
- Nita M. Lowey 21st Century Community Learning Centers afterschool program ($1.25 billion), folded into the new block grant, with funding cut by 20 percent;
- Title IV-A Student Support and Academic Enrichment grant that provides a flexible block grant schools can use for a variety of purposes ($1.21 billion), folded into the new block grant, with funding cut by 20 percent; and,
- Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants that higher education institutions partially match and then provide to about 1.5 million of the neediest undergraduate students ($865 million).

The president’s budget makes large cuts to other education programs, including a $680 million cut to Federal Work Study and a $140 million cut to TRIO programs. It freezes funding for many other programs while providing only a few substantive programmatic funding increases, including the following:

- $763 million (59 percent) more for career and technical education;
- $137 million (1,087 percent) more for minority science and engineering improvement; and
- $100 million (0.8 percent) more for special education state grants – an increase so small that it will not increase the federal share of special education costs from its current 13 percent, which is only one third of the “full funding” 40 percent federal share pledged in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.
Under this Administration, Department of Education staffing for many programs has declined dramatically, with many programs seeing double digit percentage cuts in staffing. For example, the office overseeing special education had a 14 percent cut in staffing from FY 2017 through FY 2020, and the Institute of Education Sciences had a 12 percent cut over the same period. These cuts in expertise make it harder to provide all the technical assistance and assessment required for effective implementation and oversight, and would be worsened by a FY 2021 budget that further reduces funding.

CEF BUDGET BOOK

This book provides a comprehensive picture of the national education programs in the president’s budget, including several not part of the Department of Education and several not funded by annual discretionary appropriations. There are also charts illustrating overall funding levels, as well as the funding history of each program for the past 15 years. Each article includes a vignette showing real-world examples of how each program’s funding makes a difference in access to high-quality education and educational achievement. Articles that include a video icon (shown at left) have an accompanying video vignette that is posted on CEF’s website (www.cef.org).

The articles describe each program’s purpose, detail the funding history, and demonstrate the impact of the president’s FY 2021 budget. The articles are written by CEF members, and their contact information is provided for those who have more questions.

MORE INFORMATION ON CEF’S WEBSITE

All the charts in this book, along with additional budget and education charts not included in the print edition and the video vignettes, are available at CEF’s website at https://cef.org/cef-budget-book/. Further information on the president’s budget, education charts, fact sheets, and descriptive and advocacy materials are also on CEF’s website at www.cef.org.
Changes in the FY 2021 Education Budget for Discretionary Programs

Dollars in Billions
Listed in order of largest to smallest dollar change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Education, selected discretionary programs</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021 President vs 2020</th>
<th>2021 President vs 2020</th>
<th>% change vs 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Programs with funding increases:**
- Career and technical education .......................................................... 1.290 2.053 0.763 59.1%
- Minority science and engineering improvement ........................................ 0.013 0.150 0.137 1087.2%
- Student aid administration ....................................................................... 1.769 1.883 0.114 6.5%
- IDEA - Special education grants to states .............................................. 12.764 12.864 0.100 0.8%
- Institute of Education Sciences - Assessment .......................................... 0.161 0.189 0.028 17.4%
- Program administration ........................................................................... 0.430 0.449 0.019 4.4%
- Institute of Education Sciences - Statistics ........................................... 0.111 0.114 0.003 2.7%

**Programs with Frozen Funding:**
- Discretionary Pell grants ....................................................................... 22.475 22.475 0.000 0.0%
- Adult education ......................................................................................... 0.671 0.671 0.000 0.0%
- IDEA - Special education grants for infants and families ......................... 0.477 0.477 0.000 0.0%
- IDEA - Special education preschool grants .............................................. 0.394 0.394 0.000 0.0%
- Strengthening HBCUs ............................................................................. 0.325 0.325 0.000 0.0%
- Institute of Education Sciences - Research, development, and dissemination ... 0.196 0.196 0.000 0.0%
- Indian Education ...................................................................................... 0.181 0.181 0.000 0.0%
- Office for Civil Rights ............................................................................. 0.130 0.130 0.000 0.0%
- IDEA - Special education personnel preparation ....................................... 0.090 0.090 0.000 0.0%
- Strengthening historically black graduate institutions ......................... 0.084 0.084 0.000 0.0%
- Institute of Education Sciences - Research in special education ................ 0.057 0.057 0.000 0.0%
- IDEA - Special education technical assistance and dissemination ............ 0.044 0.044 0.000 0.0%
- IDEA - Special education state personnel development .......................... 0.039 0.039 0.000 0.0%
- Strengthening tribally controlled colleges and universities ................... 0.037 0.037 0.000 0.0%
- IDEA - Special education educational technology, media, and materials .... 0.030 0.030 0.000 0.0%
- IDEA - Special education parent information centers ............................ 0.027 0.027 0.000 0.0%
- Special Olympics education programs .................................................... 0.020 0.020 0.000 0.0%
- Supplemental education grants (Compact of Free Association Act) ........ 0.017 0.017 0.000 0.0%
- Transition programs for students with intellectual disabilities .............. 0.012 0.012 0.000 0.0%
- Institute of Education Sciences - Special education studies and evaluations .. 0.011 0.011 0.000 0.0%
- Tribally controlled postsecondary career & technical institutions ........... 0.010 0.010 0.000 0.0%
- Strengthening HBCU masters programs ................................................. 0.010 0.010 0.000 0.0%
- Training and advisory services .............................................................. 0.007 0.007 0.000 0.0%

**Programs with Funding Cuts:**
- Proposed: consolidated Minority-Serving Institutions formula grant (replaces programs in green) .................................................. 0.196 0.196 0.000 0.2%
- Institute of Education Sciences - Research, development, and dissemination ... 0.196 0.196 0.000 0.0%
- Indian Education ...................................................................................... 0.181 0.181 0.000 0.0%
- Office for Civil Rights ............................................................................. 0.130 0.130 0.000 0.0%
- IDEA - Special education personnel preparation ....................................... 0.090 0.090 0.000 0.0%
- Strengthening historically black graduate institutions ......................... 0.084 0.084 0.000 0.0%
- Institute of Education Sciences - Research in special education ................ 0.057 0.057 0.000 0.0%
- IDEA - Special education technical assistance and dissemination ............ 0.044 0.044 0.000 0.0%
- IDEA - Special education state personnel development .......................... 0.039 0.039 0.000 0.0%
- Strengthening tribally controlled colleges and universities ................... 0.037 0.037 0.000 0.0%
- IDEA - Special education educational technology, media, and materials .... 0.030 0.030 0.000 0.0%
- IDEA - Special education parent information centers ............................ 0.027 0.027 0.000 0.0%
- Special Olympics education programs .................................................... 0.020 0.020 0.000 0.0%
- Supplemental education grants (Compact of Free Association Act) ........ 0.017 0.017 0.000 0.0%
- Transition programs for students with intellectual disabilities .............. 0.012 0.012 0.000 0.0%
- Institute of Education Sciences - Special education studies and evaluations .. 0.011 0.011 0.000 0.0%
- Tribally controlled postsecondary career & technical institutions ........... 0.010 0.010 0.000 0.0%
- Strengthening HBCU masters programs ................................................. 0.010 0.010 0.000 0.0%
- Training and advisory services .............................................................. 0.007 0.007 0.000 0.0%

**Proposed: Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (consolidates all programs in grey)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021 President vs 2020</th>
<th>2021 President vs 2020</th>
<th>% change vs 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- 24.129 19.363 -4.766 -19.8%
- 1.180 0.500 -0.680 -57.6%
- 1.090 0.950 -0.140 -12.8%
- 1.486 1.411 -0.075 -5.1%
- 0.053 0.015 -0.038 -71.4%
- 0.378 0.369 -0.009 -2.4%
Changes in the FY 2021 Education Budget, Discretionary Programs, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Education, selected discretionary programs</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eliminated Programs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I: Grants to local educational agencies</td>
<td>16.310</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-16.310 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II: Supporting effective instruction state grants</td>
<td>2.132</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-2.132 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nita Lowey 21st century community learning centers</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-1.250 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IV-A: Student support and academic enrichment grants</td>
<td>1.210</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-1.210 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal supplemental educational opportunity grants (SEOG)</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.865 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Acquisition</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.787 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter schools grants</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.440 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I State Agency Programs: Migrant</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.375 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining early awareness &amp; readiness for undergrad programs (GEAR UP)</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.365 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and school leader incentive grants (previously TIF)</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.200 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I: Comprehensive literacy development grants</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.192 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education innovation and research</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.190 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural education</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.186 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid for Hispanic-serving institutions</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.156 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening institutions</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.108 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnet schools assistance</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.107 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School safety national activities</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.105 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for homeless children and youths</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.102 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promise neighborhoods</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.080 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting effective educator development (SEED)</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.080 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International education and foreign language studies</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.076 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional educational laboratories</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.056 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive centers</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.052 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher quality partnerships</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.050 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Direct Student Loan account (help for Public Service Loan Forgiveness)</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.050 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I State Agency Programs: Neglected and Delinquent</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.048 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IV: Special programs for migrant students (HEP/CAMP)*</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.046 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian education</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.037 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Native education</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.036 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Education Sciences -Statewide longitudinal data systems</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.033 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts in education</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.030 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready to learn programming</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.029 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I: Innovative approaches to literacy</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.027 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-service community schools</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.025 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.025 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate assistance in areas of national need</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.023 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Alaska Native &amp; Native Hawaiian-serving institutions</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.018 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening predominantly black institutions</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.013 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javits gifted and talented students</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.013 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide family engagement centers</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.010 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American history and civics academies and national activities</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.005 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Asian American- &amp; Native Am. Pacific Islander-serving insts</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.004 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Native American-serving nontribal institutions</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.004 -100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes in the FY 2021 Education Budget, Discretionary Programs, continued

## Other related programs, not in the Department of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021 President</th>
<th>2021 President vs 2020</th>
<th>% change vs 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Start, including Early Head Start</td>
<td>10.613</td>
<td>10.613</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care and Development Block Grant</td>
<td>5.826</td>
<td>5.826</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Development Grants</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.275</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Services Technology Act **</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.195</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Services Act**</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The president’s FY 2021 budget consolidates HEP activities in the new ED Block Grant, and CAMP activities in the new TRIO block grant.
** The president’s 2021 budget eliminates the Institute of Museum and Library Services, providing $23 million for its closure in 2021.
FY 2021 President’s Budget for Selected Department of Education and Related Programs

Discretionary Dollars in Billions

(Increases shown in blue, cuts shown in red)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Education, selected discretionary programs</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021 President</th>
<th>% change vs 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged Block Grant (consolidates programs in grey)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.129</td>
<td>-4.766-19.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title I, Education for the Disadvantaged**

Grants to local educational agencies: Title I ........................................................................ 14.910  15.460  15.760  15.860  16.310  0.000 -16.310-100.0%
School improvement grants (struck by P.L. 114-95) ................................................................ 0.450
Comprehensive literacy development grants (previously striving readers) ........................... 0.190  0.190  0.190  0.190  0.192  0.000 -0.192-100.0%
Innovative approaches to literacy (in FIE in 2015) ................................................................. 0.027  0.027  0.027  0.027  0.027  0.000 -0.027-100.0%
State agency programs:
Migrant ...................................................................................................................... 0.375  0.375  0.375  0.375  0.375  0.000 -0.375-100.0%
Neglected and delinquent .............................................................................................. 0.048  0.048  0.048  0.048  0.048  0.000 -0.048-100.0%
Special programs for migrant students (HEP/CAMP)* ................................................... 0.045  0.045  0.045  0.045  0.046  0.000 -0.046-100.0%
Total, Appropriation .................................................................................................... 16.044  16.144  16.444  16.544  16.997  0.000 -16.997-100.0%

**Impact Aid** .................................................................................................................. 1.306  1.329  1.414  1.446  1.486  1.411 -0.075-5.1%

**School Improvement Programs**

Title II - Supporting effective instruction state grants ............................................................ 2.256  2.056  2.056  2.056  2.132  0.000 -2.132-100.0%
Mathematics and science partnerships (eliminated by ESSA) ........................................... 0.153
Nita M. Lowey 21st century community learning centers ................................................. 1.167  1.192  1.212  1.222  1.250  0.000 -1.250-100.0%
State assessments .......................................................................................................... 0.378  0.378  0.378  0.378  0.378  0.378  0.000 -0.009-2.4%
Education for homeless children and youths ............................................................... 0.070  0.077  0.085  0.094  0.102  0.000 -0.102-100.0%
Native Hawaiian education .......................................................................................... 0.033  0.033  0.036  0.036  0.037  0.000 -0.037-100.0%
Alaska Native education ............................................................................................... 0.032  0.032  0.035  0.035  0.036  0.000 -0.036-100.0%
Training and advisory services ...................................................................................... 0.007  0.007  0.007  0.007  0.007  0.007  0.000 0.0%
Rural education ........................................................................................................... 0.176  0.176  0.181  0.181  0.186  0.000 -0.186-100.0%
Supplemental education grants (Compact of Free Association Act) ................................ 0.017  0.017  0.017  0.017  0.017  0.017  0.000 0.0%
Comprehensive centers ................................................................................................. 0.051  0.050  0.052  0.052  0.052  0.000 -0.052-100.0%
Title IV-A - Student support and academic enrichment grants ........................................ 0.400  1.100  1.170  1.217  1.210  0.000 -1.210-100.0%
Total, including advance funding .................................................................................. 4.340  4.409  5.158  5.247  5.405  0.392 -5.013-92.7%

**Safe Schools and Citizenship Education**

School safety national activities ...................................................................................... 0.075  0.068  0.090  0.095  0.105  0.000 -0.105-100.0%
Elementary and secondary school counseling (eliminated by ESSA) ................................ 0.050
Physical education program (eliminated by ESSA) .......................................................... 0.047
Promise neighborhoods ................................................................................................. 0.073  0.073  0.078  0.078  0.080  0.000 -0.080-100.0%
Full-service community schools .................................................................................... 0.010  0.010  0.018  0.018  0.025  0.000 -0.025-100.0%
Total ................................................................................................................................ 0.255  0.151  0.186  0.191  0.210  0.000 -0.210-100.0%

**Indian Education** ........................................................................................................ 0.144  0.165  0.180  0.180  0.181  0.181  0.000 0.0%

**Innovation and Improvement**

Education innovation and research ................................................................................ 0.120  0.100  0.120  0.130  0.190  0.000 -0.190-100.0%
Teacher and school leader incentive grants (previously TIF) ........................................... 0.230  0.200  0.200  0.200  0.200  0.000 -0.200-100.0%
American history and civics academies and national activities ...................................... 0.002  0.004  0.004  0.005  0.005  0.000 -0.005-100.0%
Supporting effective educator development (SEED) ...................................................... 0.094  0.065  0.075  0.075  0.080  0.000 -0.080-100.0%
School leader recruitment and support .......................................................................... 0.016  0.015  0.000
Charter schools grants .................................................................................................... 0.333  0.342  0.400  0.440  0.440  0.000 -0.440-100.0%
Magnet schools assistance ............................................................................................. 0.097  0.098  0.105  0.107  0.107  0.000 -0.107-100.0%
Ready to learn programming ......................................................................................... 0.026  0.026  0.028  0.028  0.028  0.000 -0.028-100.0%
Advanced placement (eliminated by ESSA) .................................................................. 0.028
Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE) ............................................................... 0.292
Arts in education (funded in FIE until 2017) .................................................................. 0.027  0.027  0.029  0.029  0.030  0.000 -0.030-100.0%
Javits gifted and talented students (funded in FIE until 2017) ......................................... 0.012  0.012  0.012  0.012  0.013  0.000 -0.013-100.0%
Statewide family engagement centers ........................................................................... 0.000  0.000  0.010  0.010  0.010  0.000 -0.010-100.0%
Total ................................................................................................................................ 0.988  0.888  0.982  1.036  1.104  0.000 -1.104-100.0%

**English Language Acquisition** ...................................................................................... 0.737  0.737  0.737  0.737  0.787  0.000 -0.787-100.0%
### Special Education (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act)

#### State grants:
- Grants to States
- Preschool grants
- Grants for infants and families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021 President vs 2020 % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Subtotal, State grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021 President vs 2020 % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### State personnel development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021 President vs 2020 % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Technical assistance and dissemination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021 President vs 2020 % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Special Olympics education programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021 President vs 2020 % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Personnel preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021 President vs 2020 % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Parent information centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021 President vs 2020 % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Educational technology, media, and materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021 President vs 2020 % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total, Appropriation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021 President vs 2020 % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Career and technical education

#### State grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021 President vs 2020 % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.118</td>
<td>1.118</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>1.263</td>
<td>1.283</td>
<td>1.963</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### National programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021 President vs 2020 % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Adult education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021 President vs 2020 % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>0.671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Postsecondary education

#### Discretionary Pell grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021 President vs 2020 % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.475</td>
<td>22.475</td>
<td>22.475</td>
<td>22.475</td>
<td>22.475</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Max. grant, total (in actual dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021 President vs 2020 % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,815</td>
<td>5,920</td>
<td>6,095</td>
<td>6,195</td>
<td>6,345</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Recesion of previously appropriated Pell Grant funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021 President vs 2020 % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Campus-based programs:

- Federal supplemental educational opportunity grants (SEOG)
- Federal work-study
- Federal Direct Student Loan account (help for Public Service Loan Forgiveness)
- Proposed: consolidated Minority-Serving Institutions formula grant (replaces programs in green)

### Aid for institutional development:

- Strengthening institutions
- Strengthening tribally controlled colleges and universities
- Strengthening Alaska Native & Native Hawaiian-serving institutions
- Strengthening HBCUs
- Strengthening historically black graduate institutions
- Strengthening HBCU masters programs
- Strengthening predominantly black institutions
- Strengthening Asian American- & Native American-serving institutions
- Strengthening Native American-serving nontribal institutions
- Aid for Hispanic-serving institutions

### Other aid for institutions:

- Minority science and engineering improvement
- International education and foreign language studies
- Transition programs for students with intellectual disabilities
- Tribally controlled postsecondary career & technical institutions

### Assistance for students:

- Federal TRIO programs
- Gaining early awareness & readiness for undergrad programs (GEAR UP)
- Graduate assistance in areas of national need
- Child care access means parents in school
- Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education
- Teacher quality partnerships

---

*(Increases shown in blue, cuts shown in red)*
**Department of Education, selected discretionary programs**

**Institute of Education Sciences**

Research and statistics:
- Research, development, and dissemination
- Statistics
- Regional educational laboratories
- Assessment
- Research in special education
- Statewide longitudinal data systems
- Special education studies and evaluations

Total

**Program Administration**

**Student Aid Administration**

**Office for Civil Rights**

**DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>President vs 2020</th>
<th>% change vs 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISCRETIONARY TOTAL EXCLUDING PELL GRANTS</td>
<td>45,581</td>
<td>45,764</td>
<td>48,392</td>
<td>48,973</td>
<td>50,276</td>
<td>44,086</td>
<td>-6.190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other related programs, not in the Department of Education

**Head Start, including Early Head Start**

**Child Care and Development Block Grant**

**Preschool Development Grants***

**Library Services Technology Act ****

**Museum Services Act*****

*The president’s FY 2021 budget consolidates HEP activities in the new ED Block Grant, and CAMP activities in the new TRIO block grant.

**2017, 2019, and 2020 totals reflect rescissions of previously appropriated funding for Pell Grants.

*** $250 million for Preschool development grants moved from ED to HHS in 2017. 2016 funding not included in ED total.

**** The president’s 2021 budget eliminates the Institute of Museum and Library Services, providing $23 million for its closure in 2021.
BUDGET CHARTS & GRAPHS

The Need to Invest in Education
President Trump’s Budgets Request Largest Education Cuts

Requested change in Department of Education Discretionary Funding vs. Prior Year in billions

Does not include FY 2010 request versus FY 2009, which included $97 billion in Recovery Act funds or FY 2011 request that requested all Pell grant resources as mandatory spending.

SOURCE: Department of Education 2021 request and budget history tables.
Americans Say Lack of Education Funding is Biggest Problem in Schools

Biggest problem facing public schools
National totals, 1969-2019

SOURCE: PDK Poll of the Public’s Attitude toward Public Schools, September 2019
Education Accounts for Less Than 2% of All Federal Spending

2021 President’s Budget Outlays by Category

Defense Discretionary

Non-Defense Discretionary - excluding education

NDD - just education

Mandatory - Social Security

Other Mandatory

Mandatory - Net Interest

SOURCE: CEF based on FY 2021 OMB Budget
Federal Funding Has Been Flat for Years across Education Continuum

Discretionary nominal dollars, in billions

- Elementary and Secondary Education
- Postsecondary Education
- Career and Adult Education
- Other (includes student loan administration)
Federal Support for Public Elementary and Secondary Schools Has Declined in Real Terms

In Constant 2017-18 Dollars
Revenue in billions

President’s FY 2021 Department of Education Discretionary Funding

SOURCE: CEF based on Education Department data
Special Education: Federal Share Falling Further Below “Full Funding” Even as Dollars Increase, Compounding Cost Burden to State and Local Budgets

Federal “Full Funding” would cover 40% of excess cost of educating children with disabilities

in billions

SOURCE: CRS and ED funding history
U.S. Public K-12 Enrollment Continuing to Rise, Private School Enrollment is Flat

Students in thousands

Head Start Funding Provides Services to Fewer than 4 of Every 10 Eligible Children

31% of eligible children ages 3-5 had access to Head Start

7% of eligible children under 3 had access to Early Head Start

PART 1: THE FOUNDATION FOR SUCCESS

Early Childhood, Elementary and Secondary Education
President Trump’s FY 2021 education budget maintains two themes from the Administration’s previous budget requests: (1) reducing the size and scope of the federal role in education by drastically curtailing funding and consolidating and reforming many existing programs; and (2) expanding school choice, including federal support for private schools through a new tax credit. Congress rejected these themes in previous years.

The president’s budget cuts funding for early childhood, elementary, and secondary education by a net of $5.37 billion below the FY 2020 level. However, the size of the cut to existing programs is greater because within that net cut the budget increases special education state grants by $100 million. Funding for some of these programs was frozen for several years until it was boosted a bit in FY 2019 or FY 2020. As a result, some programs have had to reduce either the scope of services or the number of students aided even in the face of growing need. Some of these programs have weathered deep cuts in staffing, including the overall Elementary and Secondary Education office and the office overseeing special education, both of which had a 14 percent cut in staffing from FY 2017 through FY 2020. These cuts in expertise make it harder to provide all the technical assistance and assessment required for effective implementation and oversight, and would be worsened by a FY 2021 budget that further reduces funding.

Below is a summary of the budget’s biggest changes. The articles in this section provide details for each program, including a real-world example of what the program is accomplishing, the impact of the president’s budget, and the need for the program.

- **Eliminate 29 programs, consolidate purposes into a block grant, and cut funding by 20 percent.**
  The biggest new proposal eliminates 29 education programs - mostly programs under the Every Student Succeeds Act – and consolidates their purposes into a new block grant while slashing the total funding by 20 percent ($4.77 billion) below the level Congress provided for those programs for FY 2020. The eliminated programs include almost all elementary and secondary education programs except for special education, Impact Aid, Indian Education, and some assessment and training programs. The eliminated programs include:
  - Title I, the foundational support to help disadvantaged students close achievement gaps;
  - Programs targeted to improving literacy or to aiding hard-to-serve communities, including rural schools, homeless children, and children of agricultural workers; and,
  - Formula grant programs that help train teachers and school leaders (Title II) and provide afterschool services and the flexible block grant (Title IV-A) that helps provide students with a well-rounded education, support safe and healthy students, and support effective use of technology.
  Congress has repeatedly rejected the president’s proposals to eliminate some of these programs. Replacing 29 separate formula and competitive grant programs with a single, much smaller funding stream is a radical change that seems unlikely to be enacted, especially without time for a thorough debate about changing the authorization for all these programs – something Congress has not shown interest in doing this year.

- **School choice tax credit** — In a repeat of a proposal Congress rejected last year, the budget includes a new federal tax credit of $50 billion over ten years to support private school choice and certain public afterschool or tutoring options. The tax credit is not part of the Department of Education Budget. It would — somehow — be limited to $5 billion per year for individual or corporate donations to state-authorized scholarship-granting organizations to be used for private school tuition, afterschool tutoring, extra courses, and certain public school expenses.
### Early Childhood Education, Elementary and Secondary Education Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(in billions of discretionary dollars)</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021 President</th>
<th>2021 +/- 2020</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early Childhood Education (in HHS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start, including Early Head Start</td>
<td>9.863</td>
<td>10.063</td>
<td>10.613</td>
<td>10.613</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care and Development Block Grant</td>
<td>5.226</td>
<td>5.276</td>
<td>5.826</td>
<td>5.826</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Development Grants</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.250</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K-12 Education, Including Special Education</strong></td>
<td>38.467</td>
<td>38.850</td>
<td>40.055</td>
<td>34.940</td>
<td>-5.115</td>
<td>-12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for the Disadvantaged</td>
<td>16.444</td>
<td>16.544</td>
<td>16.997</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-16.997</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary &amp; Sec. Ed. for Disadvantaged Block Grant (2019 comparable shown)</td>
<td>24.129</td>
<td>19.363</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4.766</td>
<td>-19.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Aid</td>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>1.446</td>
<td>1.486</td>
<td>1.411</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Improvement Programs</td>
<td>5.158</td>
<td>5.247</td>
<td>5.405</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5.405</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Education</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation and Improvement</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1.104</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Schools and Citizenship Education</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.210</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Acquisition</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.787</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>13.366</td>
<td>13.469</td>
<td>13.885</td>
<td>13.985</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table shows funding levels for three early childhood programs within the Department of Health and Human Services as well as funding for the elementary and secondary education programs within the Department of Education going back to FY 2018, with comparisons between the president’s FY 2021 request and the level Congress provided for FY 2020.
Title I Grants to States

**Title I, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)**

Morehead Elementary School in Guilford County, NC, a Title I schoolwide program serving 616 students, met its state performance targets with a 2019 performance composite of 73 percent -- a nearly 10 percent increase in the past two years. The Morehead student population is 69.1 percent economically disadvantaged, 21.5 percent English language learners, and 76.5 percent students of color, reflecting the composition of the city of Greensboro where the school is located. Expectations of excellence and student self-esteem coalesce in academic achievement and growth at Morehead. English language learners surpassed ESSA goals in reading by 8.7 percentage points and math by 4.3 percentage points in 2019. The achievement gap between white and black students narrowed in every tested area from 2018 to 2019, with the gap decreasing by 19 percentage points in fifth grade math and by 14.9 percentage points in reading.

As an Expressive Arts Magnet School, all Morehead students engage in specialized classes in dance, drama, physical education, art, and music in rotation, and all K-3 students take violin twice weekly. All students participate in at least one performance each year, ranging from plays in kindergarten to full musical productions in the upper grades. Every student displays a piece of artwork at the annual thematic art show and benefits from numerous visiting artists during the year. Upper grade students have access to free after-school arts and PE classes, including world drumming, violin, chorus, handbells, art, contemporary dance, tap, 5K running, and speed stacking. Arabic and Spanish interpreters introduce students to other languages, and a reading specialist and volunteer tutors reinforce early reading skills. Parents and teachers unite to ensure Morehead students are self-confident, self-disciplined, and successful.

**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. Amended in 2015 by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), the Title I program 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.

Having completed a transition period, most school districts are fully implementing ESSA in school year 2019-20 under state plans reviewed and approved by the U.S. Department of Education. States also identify low-performing and consistently underperforming schools. Identified schools are 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 federal law and allows substantial local discretion in developing school improvement interventions. States also must continue to implement challenging standards aligned with entry-level college coursework and relevant career skills, as well as maintain a system of state academic assessments.

The Title I program retains authorizations for a variety of specialized subprograms, including programs for Migratory Children and Neglected and Delinquent Children, and a separate State Assessment Grant program. However, the separate authorization of appropriations for School Improvement Grants was replaced with a larger state set-aside authority, reserving funds out of the federal 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 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 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>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration Grants**</td>
<td>$ 1,362.30</td>
<td>$ 1,362.30</td>
<td>$ 1,362.30</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Grants**</td>
<td>$ 3,969.05</td>
<td>$ 4,019.05</td>
<td>$ 4,244.05</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Finance Incentive Grants**</td>
<td>$ 3,969.05</td>
<td>$ 4,019.05</td>
<td>$ 4,244.05</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$15,759.80</td>
<td>$15,859.80</td>
<td>$16,309.80</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants</td>
<td>$ 374.75</td>
<td>$ 374.75</td>
<td>$ 374.75</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglected/Delinquent/At-Risk</td>
<td>$ 47.61</td>
<td>$ 47.61</td>
<td>$ 47.61</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$16,182.16</td>
<td>$16,282.16</td>
<td>$16,732.16</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.

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

---

### Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies

in millions

President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.
President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.

President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.
PART 1 — ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2021 budget eliminates funding for the landmark ESEA Title I program for Disadvantaged Students. The ESEA Title I program would be replaced by an Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED) that consolidates 29 separate federal categorical grants currently funded at $24.2 billion into a single $19.4 billion formula grant to the state and local level — a 20 percent cut in overall funding. Virtually all ESEA programs would be folded into the new $19.4 billion block grant, including the Title I LEA grants ($16.3 billion), the Migrant grants ($375 million), the Neglected and Delinquent grants ($48 million), the Title II-A Teacher Professional Development grants ($2.13 billion), the Title III grants for English language learners ($787 million), the Title IV-A Student Enrichment and Support grants ($1.21 billion), and the Title IV-B 21st Century After School grants ($1.25 billion), currently totaling $22.1 billion. In addition, several other currently funded programs totaling $2 billion would be merged into the ESED Block Grant, including the Magnet Schools program, the McKinney-Vento Homeless Education program, the Rural Education program, and the Charter Schools program.

While the details of the K-12 block grant are limited, the Department of Education has stated the consolidated funding would be distributed to the state and local level under the existing Title I formulas, allowing state and local education leaders to determine how to use these more flexible federal block grant funds. The current ESSA state accountability plans would be retained, including statewide performance goals and targets, identification of achievement gaps for current ESSA subgroups, continued reporting of key metrics, and required interventions for the bottom 5 percent of schools and schools with the largest subgroup gaps. Local plans would describe how the needs of various categories of disadvantaged students would be met and would continue to be submitted to the states for approval. Other traditional federal education grant requirements, such as “supplement not supplant” or specific targeted services, have not been defined.

The history of federal “consolidate and cut” budget proposals is replete with examples of short-term and long-term funding reductions, including the Nixon-era revenue sharing proposals, the Reagan-era education block grant, the NCLB Title II consolidation, and the ESSA Title IV consolidation. While the few details on the K-12 block grant allow for only the broadest of financial comparisons, just the impact of the initial funding cut would likely be substantial for the current 60,000 Title I schools and the 25 million students they serve, as well as the millions of students served by the other 28 federal education programs folded into the block grant. At the state and local level, the target populations of the 29 consolidated programs effectively would be competing against each other for these block grant resources, already cut by 20 percent under the Administration’s budget request.

PROGRAM NEED

For the upcoming school year (SY 2020-21), Title I LEA (local school district) Grants will reach $16.31 billion, while the smaller Title I Migrant and Neglected and Delinquent programs remain below their pre-recession funding levels. Even with an increase of $450 million (2.8 percent) for FY 2020, the annual federal Title I formula grant allocations for half of the nation’s school districts may still be less than their current Title I funding levels due to shifts in the number of low-income students in those jurisdictions.

Despite providing additional Title I program flexibility, ESSA includes multiple new requirements, as well as revised state accountability systems resulting in wide variations in the number and percentage of schools identified for federally required interventions. ESSA also directs states to set aside 7 percent of aggregate school district allocations for Title I school improvement projects and authorizes an additional discretionary state set-aside to fund direct student services projects. Comprehensive and targeted school improvement activities for schools identified under the ESSA accountability system must be implemented whether or not the school district receives a state-determined Title I school improvement grant.

School-age child poverty continues to be high even with the recent economic recovery, with 9.2 million students meeting the Census Bureau’s poverty threshold. An unmet funding need or shortfall of nearly $30 billion for Title I LEA Grants continues, based on the generally accepted Title I “full funding” level of nearly $45 billion. In short, the Title I LEA Grant program is barely one-third funded as school districts undertake full implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act and work to meet its accountability requirements.
Nearly 90 percent of the nation’s school districts and over half of all public schools participate in the ESEA Title I program. At the FY 2020 funding level, a majority of these Title I-eligible school districts again are expected to incur an actual reduction in their federal Title I formula grant allocation. A significant funding increase for FY 2021 is needed to meet school responsibilities under ESSA, particularly since the appropriation levels over the past decade have too often failed to keep pace with inflation.

**CONTACT INFO**

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

---

**Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) Program: Literacy Education for All, Results for the Nation (LEARN)**

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

The LEARN program is based on the successes of the Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy (SRCL) program, which first received funding in 2011 to provide comprehensive literacy development grants to six states (GA, LA, MT, NV, PA, and TX). In fall 2017, SRCL grants were awarded to a new cohort of 11 states (GA, KS, KY, LA, MD, MN, MT, NM, ND, OH, and OK), the Bureau of Indian Education, and four territories. In Minnesota, funds were used to develop a multi-faceted coaching model focused on teacher growth and support through job-embedded professional development. Teachers set goals for implementation, and coaches help them work toward these goals through co-planning, coaching conversations, modeling, co-teaching, observation, and goal setting. Leadership teams have also increased their capacity to maintain focus on student literacy development at schools with an intentional, multi-year approach, and ensure quality professional learning that is sustained through coaching and accountability. In 2019, an additional 13 states (AK, AR, CA, GA, HI, KY, LA, MN, MT, NM, OH, RI, and ND) received new CLSD awards. These new grantees are now implementing their comprehensive literacy plans and gathering information about the results for participating students and educators.

**DESCRIPTION**

Title II (Part B, Subpart 2, Section 2221) of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) authorizes a comprehensive literacy program entitled “Literacy Education for All, Results for the Nation” (LEARN). The foundational base for the program was the SRCL program, first funded in FY 2010, which has been renamed as the Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) program. LEARN provides competitive grants to states to help local school districts develop comprehensive, evidence-based literacy instruction and intervention plans for children and youth, birth through grade 12, struggling to reach literacy proficiency. 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. Grantee states must allocate not less than 15 percent of funds for children from birth through kindergarten entry, 40 percent for students in kindergarten through grade 5, and 40 percent for students in grades 6 through 12.
President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.

**FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$190.00</td>
<td>$190.00</td>
<td>$192.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.

**IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET**

The president’s FY 2021 budget eliminates funding for this foundational program as part of a proposal to combine 29 education programs into a unified block grant. This is contrary to congressional intent in ESSA, demonstrated by the authorization of the LEARN Act which supports birth through grade 12 comprehensive literacy instruction. In its FY 2021 budget rationale, the Administration contends that the block grant would give states and school districts “flexibility to support similar activities in response to local needs and circumstances.” In addition, sufficient funds would be reserved under the block grant “to pay continuation awards to existing grantees through the end of their approved project periods.” Contrary to this statement, eliminating funding for LEARN would deprive states of all resources to provide professional development for effective literacy instruction to teachers, principals, school leaders, and specialized instructional support personnel.
PROGRAM NEED

A literacy-rich learning environment beginning in early childhood is essential to improving student rates of school readiness, high school graduation, college access and completion, and workforce readiness. Moreover, the literacy skills students need today are more complex than 50 years ago. Yet, only 35 percent of fourth-grade students and 34 percent of eighth-grade students performed at or above the proficient level in the 2019 NAEP reading assessment (National Center for Education Statistics, 2019), with results for twelfth-grade students still pending. This means more than 65 percent of fourth- and eighth-grade students struggle with reading and therefore require targeted instructional support.

Creating a globally competent workforce depends on students cultivating and using their reading and writing skills to excel in areas such as math, science, and technology. Through comprehensive literacy grants, LEARN funds critical professional development to improve literacy instruction for struggling readers and writers from birth through high school. It is therefore essential the program receive $200 million in FY 2021 as part of an effort to expand the grants to all 50 states.

CONTACT INFO

Amanda Karhuse  
National Association of Secondary School Principals  
(703) 860-7241 • karhusea@nassp.org

Kevin Maher  
American Library Association  
(703) 860-7292 • kmaher@alawash.org

Innovative Approaches to Literacy

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

Three largely rural school districts in Alaska received Innovative Approaches to Literacy (IAL) grants in the 2018 grant cycle. The Bering Strait School District grant targets children aged 1-4 years old through book distribution, educator training, and parent/child literacy workshops. Their library is also distributing education kits to students in grades K-8. Hydaburg City School District is using its grant to modernize and expand its library book, resource (including technology), and program offerings. Yukon-Koyukuk School District received a grant to create programs for motivating young readers, modernizing its library collection, and training librarians and educators in literacy skills support.

DESCRIPTION

Recognizing the link between early literacy and future success, Senator Jack Reed (D-RI) and the late Senator Thad Cochran (R-MS) sponsored legislation directing the Department of Education to create the Innovative Approaches to Literacy (IAL) grant program, targeting underserved school libraries and nonprofit organizations. Created in 2012, IAL replaced the Improving Literacy through School Libraries program. At least half these grants are reserved for school libraries — the only source of federal funds for those entities. IAL grants target high-need communities by providing support for schools that develop and enhance innovative and effective school library programs, provide early literacy services, and provide high-quality and reading level-appropriate books for children. These IAL grants provide models for school libraries of how to create effective literacy programs.
Many school libraries across the United States have a challenging 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 one high school library in a North Dakota high school is 1965, with books on the shelves dating back as far as the 1930s. Sadly, this is not an exception. Many schools across the country face this very same problem. In addition, some children do not have books to read on their own or with family. Therefore, IAL allows schools and nonprofits to provide children with books to keep in their homes. Recent reading scores announced in the 2019 National Assessment of Education Progress show a decline in reading scores for fourth grade students. This troubling decline demonstrates the continued need for IAL, and the program should be increased to reach students in every state.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$27.00</td>
<td>$27.00</td>
<td>$27.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.

**IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET**

For the fourth year in a row, the president’s budget provides no funding for IAL, recommending elimination of a program that directly supports the literacy needs of our youngest students. A report by the Southern Education Foundation found that a majority of U.S. public school students come from low-income families. Children introduced to literacy at an early age are more likely to become lifelong readers, graduate high school, and enroll in college. However, more than one in three American children start kindergarten lacking literacy skills, and many have no books in their homes. IAL grants to nonprofit organizations and school libraries support the distribution of books to young children. The IAL program is vital for struggling families seeking to improve educational opportunities. Schools and districts that previously have received funding will now be forced to choose between cutting other programs or eliminating early literacy programs and book distribution. Highly effective school libraries also 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. These critical functions cannot continue if federal support dedicated to school libraries through IAL is eliminated.

**PROGRAM NEED**

According to the American Academy of Pediatrics, children introduced to early reading and literacy support tend to read earlier and excel in school compared to children who lack the same access to books and literacy activities. Early literacy mastery is a strong indicator of future success in school and in life. Unfortunately more than one in three American children start kindergarten lacking foundational skills to learn to read. Funding for IAL remains below the FY 2012 level of $28.57 million. This low funding level means no grant money for many school libraries in low-income areas that would benefit greatly from IAL and fewer opportunities for children to receive literacy training. Families will continue to struggle to close literacy and technology gaps without this important support program. School libraries provide equitable physical and intellectual access to the resources and tools required for learning in a warm, stimulating, and safe environment.

The program must be maintained, at a minimum, at $27 million in FY 2021 so all students have access to 21st century library and literacy programs.
Impact Aid

Title VII, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

Keller School District #3 currently serves 41 students from kindergarten to sixth grade and is one of Washington state's smallest school districts. The state considers Keller "remote, but necessary." Despite its size and rural nature, Keller provides a wide array of extracurricular classes and afterschool activities. Impact Aid enables Keller to put the time, energy, and resources into an accelerated science program, an afterschool STEM program, and other programs that educate the whole child. School board chairman Patrick Hayes is grateful for Impact Aid because "it allows the district to bring higher technology to a group of students that they wouldn't have otherwise been able to afford."

Impact Aid is the oldest elementary and secondary federal education program. Its purpose is to reimburse school districts for a loss of local revenue due to the presence of non-taxable federal property, such as military installations, Indian Treaty, Trust, or Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act lands, federal low-income housing facilities, national parks, and laboratories. Since 1950 Congress has recognized its obligation to help meet the local responsibility of financing public education in these communities. That same recognition continues today.

The 1,200 federally impacted school districts educate nearly 10 million students. Impact Aid funding is efficient and flexible. Each year congressional appropriations flow directly from the U.S. Department of Education's Impact Aid program office to school districts. Locally elected school board members and appointed district leaders make decisions on how to use these dollars based on the needs and priorities at the local level, from staffing and academic materials to transportation and technology. Impact Aid funding is not supplemental. Without Impact Aid funds, some school districts would not be able to operate due to the limited local tax base.
FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Properties</td>
<td>$73.31</td>
<td>$74.31</td>
<td>$75.31</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Support</td>
<td>$1,270.24</td>
<td>$1,301.24</td>
<td>$1,340.24</td>
<td>$1,340.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabilities</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>$4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,414.11</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,446.11</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,486.11</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,410.80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The Administration fails to meet its obligation to federally connected school districts in its FY 2021 budget. The elimination of Federal Property funding would be disastrous for the 200-plus school district recipients that rely on these general fund dollars for a variety of critical programs and services. The justification that school districts should have adjusted to the loss of local revenue is unfounded; school districts rely on local tax revenue each year to operate schools. In some cases, the federal government is the largest landowner in these communities. As long as the federal government owns property, it must maintain its obligation to students, schools, and taxpayers in those communities through Impact Aid.

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 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). A $50 million increase is required for FY 2021 to fully fund the proration of the program. The Federal Property program needs an additional $2 million to help offset newly eligible districts as the federal government continues to acquire property and to provide a much-needed increase to current school districts. As neighboring districts are able to generate additional revenue, federally impacted schools will fall farther behind without increased Impact Aid funding.
Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants

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

States across the nation are facing teacher shortages caused by challenges in both recruitment and retention. Evidence suggests strong induction and support for early-career or newly arriving teachers can be an effective policy to ensure individuals remain in the classroom. Research points to several key elements of high-quality induction most strongly associated with reduced levels of turnover – having a mentor from the same field, common planning time with other teachers in the same subject, regularly scheduled collaboration with other teachers, and being part of an external network of teachers. A study of induction based on national data found beginning teachers who receive a comprehensive set of induction supports, including these elements, stay in teaching at rates more than twice that of teachers who lack these supports.
A number of states are leveraging Title II, Part A funding to provide comprehensive induction programs to early career teachers. Washington State offers induction and mentoring for new teachers through the Beginning Educator Support Team (BEST) program. Since 2012, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction has offered a competitive grant to fund creation of BEST programs in districts around the state. Required induction components included ongoing professional learning for beginning teachers, monthly formative observations and feedback on beginning teachers’ practice, release time for observation of accomplished teachers, and professional learning for mentors. In addition to state funding, Washington leverages Title II, Part A funds to further support these programs. Other states using these funds to design, implement, expand, or enhance induction programs include Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Kansas, and Ohio.

DESCRIPTION

Previously known as Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, the Supporting Effective Instruction State Grant program is authorized under Title II, Part A of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The program focuses on improving student academic achievement by bolstering skills and expertise of teachers and principals and increasing the number of high-quality teachers and principals in schools. While the program allows for versatility in using the funds for educators, states may reserve up to 3 percent of these funds solely for leadership development activities. The large majority of Title II, Part A funding is distributed by formula to local school districts from state grants, with a separate allocation for National Activities.

President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.
FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,055.83</td>
<td>$2,055.83</td>
<td>$2,131.83</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget abolishes funding for Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants. This would negatively impact schools across the country in their mission to provide students access to highly qualified educators. Almost 200,000 teachers, as well as school leaders, would lose access to professional development and support throughout their careers. Great schools need great educators who have the opportunity to hone their craft to better serve their students.

Further, state plan implementation under ESSA requires states meet multiple new accountability measures and higher standards and places a strong emphasis on improving struggling schools. States rely on well-trained educators to help ensure ESSA plans are implemented well. Students and parents rely on those educators to help every child succeed. High-quality professional development is critical to ensure teachers and principals are equipped with the skills and knowledge to help all children meet college- and career-ready standards. With fewer trained educators, class sizes would balloon in the poorest school districts, especially in rural and urban areas, resulting in less individual attention for students most at risk. The elimination of this program would leave states without the resources to implement ESSA as intended and unable to effectively meet the needs of the students and the communities they serve.

PROGRAM NEED

This essential program is authorized at $2.29 billion. Even with the $76 million FY 2020 increase, the funding level is still substantially below the amount states received ten years ago. Now the Administration would remove all targeted federal support by eliminating this program.

The important role of teachers and principals in enabling student success is well documented. The two most influential school-based factors for student achievement are good teachers and principals, respectively. Yet the United States is facing one of its largest educator shortages in the last 30 years, with almost every state understaffed and significant shortages in some states and fields. Low educator retention is an important driver of this shortage. Many educators leave the classroom well before retirement age due to lack of support and access to high-quality professional development opportunities, poor working conditions, and inadequate salary. Title II, Part A can play a large part in supporting state and local efforts to address these challenges.

Despite these needs and at a time when public school enrollment continues to grow, almost half of states are providing less formula funding now than they did ten years ago (Center on Budget and Policy Priorities). Critical federal Title II, Part A funds are used by states to develop and improve support systems and professional development for teachers and principals. In several states, Title II, Part A is the only funding available for educator professional development. Without significant funding for Title II, Part A, growth for our nation’s educators will be impeded and the growing issue of educator shortages will only be exacerbated.
The Learning Enriched Afterschool Program (LEAP) of Eldon, Missouri, is a comprehensive program that offers academic enrichment, lessons on health and wellness, team building and leadership opportunities, and science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) activities. Since 2011, LEAP has served kindergarten through eighth grade students in the Eldon School District. The program receives 21st Century Community Learning Center funding, allowing it to serve more than 350 students each day across three different sites. Elementary and middle schoolers in LEAP start their afternoons with a healthy snack, homework help, and mentoring before transitioning into their choice of activities, including STEM, chess, yoga, sewing, sign language, cooking, archery, and sports. The program also empowers students to shape the activities offered. Appreciating the critical role staff plays serving as mentors for students — modeling healthful behaviors and positive attitudes — and in creating a space where students feel safe and supported, LEAP regularly dedicates time to ensure their team has the tools and resources needed to best support students. In the most recent evaluation, teachers reported better-developed skills and positive growth mindsets in students who participated regularly in LEAP. The elementary schools’ principals voiced concern for students who were not in the program and suggested they could benefit from the supportive environment.
President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.

### FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,211.67</td>
<td>$1,221.67</td>
<td>$1,249.67</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.*
The president’s FY 2021 budget eliminates funding for the Nita M. Lowey 21st Century Community Learning Center initiative. Funding for FY 2020 stands at $1.25 billion, covering costs associated with quality afterschool and summer learning programs for 1.7 million children provided by local schools and community-based organizations. However, if more funding for programs were available, an additional 9.6 million eligible students would be able to benefit. Elimination of 21st CCLC would result in 1.7 million children losing access to more than 10,000 currently funded local afterschool and summer learning programs. Students would lose educational and enrichment opportunities which evidence shows lead to increased school attendance, improved grades, and higher graduation rates. Furthermore, consolidating or block granting these funds and providing grants exclusively to schools, as the president’s budget proposes, would jeopardize program quality by eliminating training and technical assistance funds and shut the doors of programs operated by community-based, faith-based, and local municipal providers. In fact, the U.S. Department of Education’s most recent evaluation report, 2017-2018 21st CCLC Annual Performance Data, concluded, “Over the past year this program has resulted in over 2 million low-income students and family members having a safe place to receive academic enrichment. The students who participate in the 21st CCLC program are among the most at risk. The performance on the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) measures indicate that many participants are showing improved behavior and homework completion, student grades, and mathematics or reading/language arts assessment results.”

Currently about 1.7 million students are positively impacted by 21st CCLC. However, about 9.6 million students are eligible and would participate in programs if funding and access to local community programs were available. The outcomes of student participation under this program are clear: Students who attended 21st CCLC programs made significant improvements in classroom behavior, homework completion, and class participation. Students also made gains in math and English. Another study indicates regular participation in afterschool programs by students during the elementary years resulted in narrowing the math achievement gap at grade five between high- and low-income students, improving work habits, and reducing the number of school absences (21st CCLC Evaluation Backgrounder A Summary of Formal Evaluations of Afterschool Programs’ Impact on Academics, Behavior, Safety and Family Life, Afterschool Alliance, 2015). 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.

Erik Peterson
Afterschool Alliance
(202) 347-2030 ext. 105  |  epeterson@afterschoolalliance.org

Ellen Fern
BOSE Public Affairs Group
(202) 349-2306 | efern@bosepublicaffairs.com
Grants for State Assessment
Title I, Part B, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

States use Grants for State Assessment to support development and administration of reading and mathematics as required under ESSA, including purchasing test materials and staffing positions. States would be unable to meet ESSA requirements without this funding. In addition to general reading and math assessments, states also use grant funds for English Language Proficiency (ELP) assessments. One state shared, “We would be in big trouble if the allocation decreased or was eliminated!” They added being able to use funds for both general and ELP assessments “frees up some of our state funds to build early learning formative assessments and secure technical assistance to enhance the technical quality of our systems,” important long-term strategies that would not otherwise be possible. Another state has used grant funds to “develop high-quality, technology-enhanced assessment items, and to continue to acquire copyright permissions for high-quality passages for use in assessing students’ ability to read and to write in response to complex texts.” States also use funds to develop enhanced parent reports that offer greater detail about students’ strengths and weaknesses, information about resources to help students succeed, and longitudinal data to show parents how students have performed over time. The variety of assessments and reliable and actionable resources for educators, students, and parents supported by Grants for State Assessment are critically important to students’ success across the country.

DESCRIPTION

These grants encourage and support state efforts to develop and implement high-quality assessments aligned with challenging state academic standards to measure the academic achievement of all students. Continued federal support for these grants is particularly critical as many states revise existing or develop new assessments to meet the requirements of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Sufficient funding also will allow states to conduct audits of existing assessment systems to determine strategies for streamlining the development and administration of those tests. This program provides formula and, when appropriations levels permit, competitive funds to develop and implement assessments required under ESSA.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$378.00</td>
<td>$378.00</td>
<td>$378.00</td>
<td>$369.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget includes $369.1 million for State Assessment Grants, eliminating Competitive Assessment Grants and resulting in a $8.9 million or 2.35 percent reduction from current funding levels. Assessments provide parents and educators with information they need to help students progress and have improved academic outcomes. State assessments help identify schools that need support in closing achievement gaps and providing quality instruction and opportunities for all students to be successful. A cut in funding for this program would negatively impact the development and administration of high-quality assessment systems that 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, especially in 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 ESSA implementation and improvement of assessments.

**CONTACT INFO**

Peter Zamora  
Council of Chief State School Officers  
(202) 336-7003  |  Peter.Zamora@ccssso.org
Education for Homeless Children and Youth

Title VII-B, McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

Mia has lived a good portion of her life bouncing from home to home. Her family officially became homeless in the winter of her sophomore year when they were evicted from their home and moved into a single motel room outside the school district boundaries. Mia is the oldest of three children and lives with her mom and step-dad. Shortly before the eviction, the family car was repossessed, so the family was not able to drive Mia to school. Because of protections afforded Mia by the Education for Homeless Children and Youth (EHCY) Program, she was allowed to stay at her school of origin – Belleville (IL) East High School – and receive transportation assistance. The school also provided Mia and her family with toiletries, food, and clothing.

Mia was allowed to stay at Belleville East in her junior year, even though the family was still living in the motel outside school boundaries. The school continued to provide assistance with transportation and also assisted with food, dress code, and toiletry items when needed. By this time, Mia also required a lot of emotional support. Although she had a roof over her head, Mia’s living situation was very stressful. Five people living in a one-room motel for nearly a year led to a lot of volatility and instability in Mia’s home life. Being able to continue at Belleville East provided a place where she had some stability and continued relationships with teachers, social workers, and other school staff. Midway through the school year, Mia’s family was forced to move to a different hotel even farther from the school, but the school was able to continue providing support to keep Mia at East. Her grades and accomplishments at school were a source of pride for her even when things were so difficult in her home situation. She attended homecoming dances and prom with a donated dress from the “Cinderella’s Closet” at East, and the school did everything possible to allow Mia to have a normal high school experience.

Mia started the 2019-20 school year as a senior and, thanks to some summer school classes, is on track to graduate in May with her class. She and her family were still living in a hotel out of district. In the fall, Belleville East’s Make-A-Change program helped Mia and her family pay the hotel bill for a week to avoid eviction after Mia’s dad was incarcerated and unable to work. The school social worker also connected the family with additional resources in the community to make ends meet. Mia moved out of the hotel with her family in December of 2019, after turning 18, and is living with friends, has a job, and is looking forward to getting her high school diploma in May.

- Melissa Taylor, Director of Student Services
Belleville (IL) Township High School District #201

DESCRIPTION

The Education for Homeless Children and Youth (EHCY) Program is the education subtitle of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. Under this program, students experiencing homelessness may continue their education at their school of origin (the school they attended before becoming homeless) or the school in the area where they are currently staying. Each school district appoints a homeless program liaison. The liaison assists students and their families to navigate this choice and helps students enroll in the new school immediately, even without the usual documents required for registration. This process decreases educational disruption. If a student stays at the school of origin, districts must provide transportation assistance as well.

Funding from the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act supports state coordinators and homeless liaisons in school districts to help identify homeless students, assist with school enrollment, provide services including emergency transportation, school supplies, clothing to meet dress code requirements, hygiene products, professional development for educators, and referrals for community services.
### FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$85.00</td>
<td>$93.50</td>
<td>$101.50</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.

### IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The National Center for Homeless Education reports that during the 2017-18 school year, more than 1.5 million students in America’s public schools experienced homelessness. This represents a 15 percent increase in the number of students experiencing homelessness from just two years prior and is more than double the figure from 2004-2005, the first school year the Center collected data. Congress demonstrated a commitment to this program by appropriating funds well over what the president requested in FY 2020. The president’s request to consolidate this program along with 28 others into the Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant essentially eliminates the Education for Homeless Children and Youth (EHCY) Program. Eliminating this important program means many students experiencing homelessness would no longer have the consistent safety net afforded them for many years.

With the increased number of public school students experiencing homelessness and the negative effect housing instability has on children’s academic performance and health needs, maintaining a dedicated source of funding for this program is vital. The impact of the president’s budget request would be a significant disruption to the progress made in the education of students experiencing homelessness and would also result in a significant impact to local school district revenue. Even with dedicated federal funding, school districts have increased local costs with the rise in homeless student populations, particularly in the area of transportation, which is not covered by the EHCY program.

### PROGRAM NEED

This program helps remove barriers previously faced by children and youth experiencing homelessness to enrolling, attending, and succeeding in school. Homelessness has an impact on academic achievement due to greater mobility, increased absences, and higher stress. All of these factors lead to an interruption of education, lower educational achievement, and an increased risk of dropping out. Homelessness among preschool age children is associated with delays in language, literacy, and social-emotional development. At the elementary level, achievement gaps between homeless and low-income students persist and may even worsen over time. States that disaggregate graduation and dropout rates of homeless youth have found higher dropout and lower graduation rates compared to their peers. The McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act is designed to protect the rights of students experiencing homelessness and offer educational stability despite difficult life circumstances. Funds pay for services such as tutoring or other instructional supports, referrals for health services, emergency transportation, clothing, and school supplies. The McKinney-Vento program is a critical support for all children and youth experiencing homelessness.

### CONTACT INFO

**Melissa Taylor**  
Council of Administrators of Special Education  
Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education  
(618) 222-8273  | mtaylor@bths201.org
**Rural Education Achievement Program**

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

**Winslow School District** is a small rural district enrolling 1,200 students in K-12, located in Waterville, Maine. Winslow relies on REAP dollars to provide supports for the emotional, social, and physical health of their students, including direct services to students for mental health counseling, support for school counselors and social workers in providing resources for more challenging issues, skill development programs aimed at fostering self-confidence and resilience, intramural programs, and motivational speakers. With an ever-growing number of students with significant needs, mental health services for students are essential for them to come to school and, once at school, to be ready to learn. Winslow also uses REAP dollars to provide a range of academic supports and opportunities for enrichment activities, both during and after school, as well as transportation to allow for all students to participate. These opportunities help more students to become engaged in learning in all areas, in turn supporting better school attendance. The elimination of REAP funds — especially when paired with the Administration’s shift in how dollars are awarded — represents a one-two punch that will negate the ability of Winslow School District to continue its supports for mental health counseling, compromising the mental health and well-being of their students.

**DESCRIPTION**

The Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) assists small and low-income rural districts to 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 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$180.84</td>
<td>$180.84</td>
<td>$185.84</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.

**IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET**

Dedicated funding for REAP is eliminated in the president’s budget and is consolidated into the Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED). The ESED block grant, comprised of 29 discrete programs, would be funded at nearly $5 billion below the current total of the consolidated program funding levels. REAP is the only K-12 program dedicated solely to supporting the nation’s rural schools and the students they serve. Eliminating this program will undermine the important programming in rural schools that REAP funding has historically made possible.
It is imperative the program be preserved in its current form as a stand-alone program within ESSA. An increase for REAP of at least $20 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.

President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.

**PROGRAM NEED**

**CONTACT INFO**

Noelle Ellerson Ng  
AASA: The School Superintendents Association  
(703) 875-0764 | nellerson@aasa.org
Comprehensive Centers

**Title II, Sec. 203, Education Technical Assistance Act**

*The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requires state departments of education to conduct periodic resource allocation reviews (RARs) in districts that serve low-performing schools. This requirement presents an opportunity for states and districts to examine the connection between resource allocation and academic outcomes. In preparing for the RAR, the Building State Capacity and Productivity Center (BSCP) worked with states on how to tap readily available data — including demographic, financial, and outcomes — so that school leaders could see how their resources compared to those of other schools in the district. States were encouraged to provide the data to district leaders with instructions to share with school leaders (and school staff, if desired) in advance of the resource allocation discussion. To assist states in this effort, the BSCP Comprehensive Center prepared a sample data report as an example of what can be assembled from public sources, as well as step-by-step guidance and a RAR discussion protocol housed on its website.*

**DESCRIPTION**

The Comprehensive Centers, which include 19 regional centers and one national center, help states implement the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and other federal school improvement programs. The Centers provide technical assistance that helps build states’ capacity to assist districts and schools. Previously, the Comprehensive Centers program included content centers focused on specific topics set by the Secretary of Education. In the most recent grant competition, the U.S. Department of Education eliminated the content centers and, instead, expanded the number of regional centers. The Department also added one national comprehensive center charged with providing high-quality universal and targeted capacity-building services.

**FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.

**IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET**

Congress froze funding for the Comprehensive Centers at $52 million in FY 2020. Those limited dollars will support state departments of education to meet the requirements of ESSA implementation, particularly in the areas of accountability and school improvement. The president’s FY 2021 budget eliminates funding for Comprehensive Centers by consolidating the program into the Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant along with 28 other competitive grant programs. The Administration justification states that the block grant lets states decide how best to use funds to meet the needs of their students.

In reality, the proposed consolidation — combined with the reduction in funding for other ESEA programs — will force states to direct critical funding for evidence-based technical assistance into the formula grant programs just to maintain the same level of services for students. Without technical assistance funds, states will not have the support they need to identify and implement evidence-based policies and practices that increase student achievement, improve teacher quality, and turn around low-performing schools.
A rigorous and independent evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers program was conducted through the Institute of Education Sciences in 2019. This evaluation found that states receiving technical assistance reported improvements in their capacity, particularly related to building knowledge and skills.

Centers and states considered the assistance to be instrumental to building capacity, including support for gathering stakeholder input on policy, strategies for navigating transitions in state leadership, and various products and tools.

**CONTACT INFO**

Michele McLaughlin  
Knowledge Alliance  
(202) 770-2218  |  michele@knowledgeall.net

**Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants**

**Title IV, Part A, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)**

"Principals play a large role in overseeing the health and well-being of our students, educators, and the school climate as a whole in order to foster the most conducive learning environment for our children. A full investment in the bipartisan, flexible, Student Support and Academic Enrichment grant program that supports safe and healthy students, a well-rounded education, and the effective use of technology is absolutely critical to ensure our students have the resources they need to thrive emotionally and academically in school. Without a full investment from Congress in the SSAE program, districts will not have the flexibility to invest, expand, and create new programs in these areas, which are necessary for an optimal academic climate where students are given the opportunities to succeed. We urge Congress to continue robustly funding Title IV-A of ESSA."

- Ernest Logan, President, American Federation of School Administrators (AFSA)

"I believe that the SSAE grant program, if fully funded, has the potential to improve the lives of our educators and students by strengthening the opportunities to incorporate various technologies into classrooms that support personalized and blended learning, leading to a brighter future for all students, no matter where they live."

- Pete Just, Chief Operations & Technology Officer, MSD of Wayne Township, Indianapolis, IN

"The Title IV, Part A program is a game changer when it comes to music education in Pennsylvania. When Congress named music and the arts as well-rounded subjects in the Every Student Succeeds Act, they reaffirmed what we already knew – that music education helps to develop the whole child and prepares them to be productive members of society. Not only was that language important, but so was opening up a new funding stream through Title IV, Part A. With funds specifically designated for well-rounded education activities, educators are taking up the charge of assessing how to provide more access to music for their students and using these federal Title IV funds to do that. It’s really a win-win. Taking the time to do an assessment improves programs on a variety of levels, and then the additional funding is crucial to provide more equitable access to music."

- Pennsylvania Music Educators Association
“School psychologists and our colleagues support maximum funding of Title IV-A to promote safe and supportive schools and support the comprehensive mental and behavioral wellness of all students. Here in Connecticut, our schools continue to make great strides to ensure every student feels safe and supported and has access to the comprehensive social-emotional and mental and behavioral health supports they need to be successful. Students cannot learn if their needs are not met, and Title IV-A funds can help expand access to comprehensive mental and behavioral health services, violence prevention initiatives, and other critical services necessary for children to thrive. To date, Connecticut has received approximately $20 million in Title IV-A funds. These funds have been used to implement and expand trauma-informed practices, reduce exclusionary discipline, and expand access to comprehensive learning supports, including access to school-based mental health services. Continued federal investment and maximum funding for this program is critical to ensuring Connecticut’s schools can sustain and expand upon these important initiatives that keep our students safe and healthy and improve overall student success.”

- Tom Brant, President, Connecticut Association of School Psychologists

**DESCRIPTION**

Title IV, Part A, Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), is a flexible block grant program authorized at $1.6 billion. This grant supports activities in three broad areas: (1) providing students with a well-rounded education (e.g., college and career counseling, STEM, arts and music, 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.

Each state receives an allocation based on the Title I funding formula, and, using the same Title I formula, states allocate funds to local school districts. Any school district receiving an amount above $30,000 must conduct a needs assessment and 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 funds on any of the three broad areas, but school districts must spend at least a portion of their grant on activities to support the effective use of technology. No more than 15 percent of a district’s Title IV-A funds 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 programs. The 15 percent technology purchase cap would continue to apply.

**FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,100.00</td>
<td>$1,170.00</td>
<td>$1,210.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.

**IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET**

The president’s FY 2021 budget for education violates congressional intent. The budget consolidates 29 discretionary education programs and combines them into a block grant, at the same time failing to provide funding equal to or an increase over the total current funding for the discrete programs. In fact, the budget has a 20 percent cut below aggregate funding for the 29 programs. Despite the Administration’s budget justification stating the Title IV-A flexible block grant is spread too thin and ineffective, ample evidence supports districts’ use of the now $3 billion investment Congress has made since FY 2018 to support, expand, and create new programs that foster a safe and healthy school climate and learning environment.
Elimination of Title IV-A funds means no federal support to the nation’s school districts for the critical education programs enumerated in ESSA under this grant, including: (1) safe and healthy students activities, such as providing mental health services to students; (2) increasing student access to STEM, computer science, and accelerated learning courses, physical education, the arts, foreign languages, college and career counseling, and support for effective school library programs; and (3) providing students with access to technology and digital materials and educators with professional learning opportunities. Further, given the limited amount of state and local dollars to support these programs, providing no supplemental funding will force school districts to choose among high-quality programs that positively impact students in a variety of ways — for instance, trading off comprehensive school mental health services for Advanced Placement programs — thereby jeopardizing Congress’s intent to provide districts and schools with maximum flexibility.

President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.
PROGRAM NEED

Evidence supports a direct correlation between health and learning 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 physical health and education, nutrition, 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 all students. The federal government must continue to invest in these key components of digital teaching and learning. Schools alone cannot afford to make the significant investments required to close learning and opportunity gaps and provide students with skills necessary to compete in the modern workforce.

The federal government must prioritize, through maximum funding of Title IV, Part A, rich and well-rounded curricula, comprehensive school mental and behavioral health support services, and digital learning and education technology.

CONTACT INFO

TECHNOLOGY PROVISIONS
Ally Bernstein
American Federation of School Administrators
(202) 263-2956   |  ally@bsg-dc.com

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

WELL-ROUNDED PROVISIONS
Tooshar Swain
National Association for Music Education
(703) 860-4000, ext. 224   |  tooshars@nafme.org
School Safety National Activities

Title IV, Part F, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

The Martin County school district (KY) received a five-year school climate transformation grant ($1.5 million). The district is using the grant to implement and expand a multi-tiered behavioral support system, create a team-based model focused on pinpointing behavioral problems for quick intervention, teach conflict resolution skills, train teachers and staff to recognize when students are struggling, and increase access to mental health services. They also hired two school psychologists with grant funds to provide more counseling to students and formed partnerships with county agencies who are able to provide additional support to students, as needed. This grant has helped Martin County coordinate efforts to address student need, effectively teach social skills and conflict resolution, and improve how schools identify and intervene with students who need mental and behavioral health support. These efforts would not have been possible without this federal investment.

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 more than a 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 nonprofit organizations.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$95.00</td>
<td>$105.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget eliminates this critical funding stream dedicated to helping states and local school districts create safe and supportive learning environments and engage in evidence-based violence prevention strategies. Loss of these funds would mean elimination of these programs: School Climate Transformation Grants to provide for multi-tiered systems of support to improve school climate and behavioral outcomes for all students and to help address the opioid crisis; Project Prevent, supporting efforts to help schools and communities break the pervasive cycle of violence; Grants to States for Emergency Management that help states strengthen school emergency operations plans; and, Mental Health Demonstration Grants to help expand the pipeline of school psychologists, school counselors, school social workers, and other mental health professionals in our nation’s schools. In addition, the FY 2020 appropriations bill included a $10 million set aside specifically for districts to hire school psychologists, school counselors, school social workers, and other school mental health professionals to help improve school climate, address students’ social-emotional learning, and improve availability of comprehensive school mental health services.
The elimination of School Safety National Activities means no dedicated funding to help schools improve school climate, a cornerstone of student learning and success. This action threatens school districts’ ability to provide comprehensive mental and behavioral health services, social-emotional learning, and other critical services that directly contribute to the school and life success of millions of children and youth and will force districts to make unreasonable choices about which of these valuable services to cut, all at students’ expense. Eliminating funding also undermines congressional intent that states use federal dollars on specific activities to improve school climate and student safety, efforts known to improve student outcomes. In addition, eliminating the School Safety National Activities Program ends two grant programs directly targeted at hiring more school psychologists, school counselors, school social workers, and other school-employed mental health professionals in underserved districts. Rather than cut funding, the Administration should support efforts to improve comprehensive mental and behavioral health services through these critical and innovative programs.

PROGRAM NEED

States and school districts annually pay billions of dollars to respond to the consequences 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. Ongoing state and local budget constraints have resulted in reductions for critical prevention services. Schools and districts continue to have increasing difficulty initiating and maintaining, much less strengthening, current school safety and prevention programs.

School districts are often directed to use Title I funds for these purposes, when Title I is already stretched thin and scarcely meeting program needs, and with the number of students in poverty at the highest level in 50 years. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) replaced SDFSCA with a new formula grant, the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants (Title IV-A). Title IV-A (see corresponding article) provides flexible funding to school districts to improve student outcomes through a wide range of activities, including supporting safe and healthy students. The consolidated grant includes multiple allowable uses under competing needs and priorities, many of which schools are already struggling to meet. The president’s FY 2021 budget also eliminates Title I and Title IV-A and consolidates them and all other discretionary funding into one block grant, further exacerbating this problem.

Beginning in FY 2019, Congress directed the Department of Education to set aside up to $10 million to develop and implement a Mental Health Demonstration Grant to help improve the pipeline of school-based mental health providers to high-need school districts. These professionals — school psychologists, school counselors, and school social workers — are critical to efforts to improve school climate, school safety, and violence prevention. In FY 2020, an additional $10 million was set aside to help districts hire these professionals as part of efforts to improve school climate and address students’ social-emotional learning.

The proposed elimination of the School Safety National Activities program represents a shortsighted and irresponsible decision to cut funds that support critical efforts targeting improved school climate through mental health services and prevention. In the absence of these funds, local school districts will continue to have very limited options to implement services and interventions.

CONTACT INFO

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

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

Administered by Partners for Education at Berea College, the Knox Promise Neighborhood, a five-year, cradle-to-career grant serving Knox County and Corbin (KY), is helping students in schools in central, eastern, and southeastern Kentucky to succeed. Berea College was awarded federal Promise Neighborhood funds by the U.S. Department of Education for the Knox Promise Neighborhood (2017-21). The total project cost is $45 million — $30 million (67 percent) from federal Promise Neighborhood funds and $15 million (33 percent) from non-federal funds. The initiative supports early childhood programs and also provides resources and staff to help students in K-12 and postsecondary institutions. As an example, rotating Literacy Academies are offered at Corbin Independent, Barbourville Independent, and Knox County Schools. These academies connect families with the online “myON” platform, providing access to thousands of free digital books to strengthen literacy and help parents and adults read to children. Neighborhood funding also supports literacy and wellness services through Save the Children, a private international organization dedicated to ensuring children get a healthy start to life, including help with reading, a core education component. In addition to home visiting and school-based services, Save the Children offers playgroups for children ages 3-5 not currently enrolled in a preschool or Head Start. Children and parents participate together in fun and engaging high-quality learning experiences in a preschool setting. Experiences include math concepts, language and literacy skills, science, and art. In addition to direct support to families, the Knox Promise Neighborhood has provided preschools with technology and curriculum designed to enhance cognitive development and, specifically, math skills. Coaching and professional development for Neighborhood teachers and early childhood staff are also supported.

DESCRIPTION

Promise Neighborhoods is a place-based initiative to help revitalize distressed communities by making high-quality systems of support available to every child and youth. Inspired by the Harlem Children's Zone, Promise Neighborhood grants fund entities including community-based organizations, local universities, neighborhood associations, faith-based organizations, and community foundations to provide communities with coordinated, comprehensive services and school supports aimed at breaking the cycle of poverty. Promise Neighborhoods build partnerships among schools, community organizations, local businesses, and community members to wrap children in high-quality, coordinated health, social, community, and educational supports from cradle to career. These services and supports are designed to build a continuum of both educational programs and family and community assistance and can include high-quality early learning and out-of-school time activities, mental health services, job training, and crime prevention programs.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$78.25</td>
<td>$78.25</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.
IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2021 budget eliminates Promise Neighborhoods funding, consolidating Promise Neighborhoods into the Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant. This new block grant would consolidate 29 discrete programs, including nearly all currently funded formula and competitive grant programs authorized by the Every Student Succeeds Act, into one state formula grant program distributed using the Title I formula. The budget cuts current total funding for the consolidated programs by $4.8 billion, a 20 percent overall reduction. Additionally, the unique scope of Promise Neighborhood activities, intended to support children and youth from birth to and through college, is generally beyond the scope and expertise of the state’s K-12 school system which would administer the new block grant. The budget would reserve sufficient funds under the block grant to pay continuation awards to existing grantees through the end of their approved project periods. Beyond the end of those current grants, no additional high-need communities would receive support to implement comprehensive reforms centered on breaking the intergenerational cycle of poverty through a continuum of services from birth through college.

PROGRAM NEED

The Promise Neighborhoods initiative places education at the center of comprehensive efforts to fight poverty in urban and rural areas. In communities with concentrated poverty, children face barriers such as lack of access to food, health care, and technology, which make achieving academic success even more challenging. The Promise Neighborhoods initiative is an innovative federal education program designed to address these barriers, both in and out of school, meeting the needs of the whole child through a continuum of educational programs and family and community supports. To date, over 1,000 national, state, and local organizations have partnered with Promise Neighborhoods, benefiting students at over 700 schools. Maintaining funding for Promise Neighborhoods will help to scale and sustain the work of current Promise Neighborhoods grants and to launch new projects, allowing additional communities to benefit from this unique program.

CONTACT INFO

Sarah Cohen
American Federation of Teachers
(202) 879-4452 • scohen@aft.org
Full-Service Community Schools

Title IV, Part F, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

The class assignment: Debate ways that power operated during the Haitian Revolution. Students connect this history lesson to their lived experiences of machismo (masculine pride) in their South Bronx community, guided by a teacher who grew up in the community and is a graduate of the school.

This assignment is not reserved for students at an elite school but is available to all young people at Fannie Lou Hamer Freedom High School, a community school in New York City. Here, more than 90 percent of students come from low-income families. They receive an education that builds critical thinking and research skills, using interdisciplinary lessons, hands-on portfolio-based assessments, and internships. Fannie Lou Hamer is part of the New York City Community Schools initiative which began in 2014 and now includes over 200 schools. These schools offer expanded learning time by opening early and staying open late and during summers. They offer students an enriched curriculum—art, music, science, sports, and tutoring — that middle-class families routinely receive. They operate as neighborhood hubs, providing students with integrated student supports including health care and counseling, and engaging parents through invitations to participate in school decisions. This environment reaps big dividends— research published this year from RAND shows attendance and graduation rates at these schools have improved, while disciplinary incidents have decreased.

DESCRIPTION

The Full-Service Community Schools (FSCS) program provides dedicated funding to implement community schools, a place-based strategy tailored to local assets and needs. Schools partner with community agencies and allocate resources to provide an “integrated focus on academics, health and social services, youth and community development, and community engagement.” Many operate on all-day and year-round schedules and serve both children and adults. Although this strategy is appropriate for students of all backgrounds, many community schools are located in neighborhoods where structural forces such as poverty shape the experiences of young people and erect barriers to learning and school success. Community schools vary in the programs they offer and the ways they operate, depending on their local context. However, four features — or pillars—appear in most effective community schools and support the conditions for high-quality teaching and learning: integrated student supports, expanded and enriched learning time and opportunities, active family and community engagement, and collaborative leadership and practices.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$17.50</td>
<td>$17.50</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.
The president’s FY 2021 budget eliminates funding for the FSCS program, even though Congress acted in a bipartisan manner to provide a $7.5 million increase for the current year, funding the program in FY 2020 at $25 million. Eliminating funding would prevent the U.S. Department of Education from issuing five-year grants for community schools, resulting in the loss of a key tool that has been shown to close opportunity and achievement gaps. Without these funds, fewer families would have access to integrated student supports such as nutritional, dental, and counseling services that are essential to student learning. Students and families would lose the academic support that expanded learning opportunities provide, including before- and afterschool enrichment, a longer school day, summer programming, and community-based projects. Schools would lack sufficient support for a full-time community school coordinator, required under the federal grant, to lead efforts to engage families and community partners through a collaborative approach to decision-making. Schools implementing community schools model as part of a school improvement strategy would lose additional funding support. In short, schools impacted by poverty, trauma, and other challenging factors would lose an essential resource that helps improve student learning and community outcomes.

The root of inequality in educational outcomes in the United States is the combination of growing poverty and re-segregation, along with inequality in school funding and resources. Today more than half of children attending public schools qualify for free or reduced-price lunch — the highest percentage since the National Center for Education Statistics began tracking this figure decades ago. Furthermore, children living in poverty in the United States have a much weaker safety net than their peers living in other industrialized countries, where universal health care, housing subsidies, paid parental leave, and high-quality, universally available child care are the norm.

Until our nation ends child poverty and adequately addresses structural societal issues, it must fund the supports necessary to address the out-of-school barriers students farthest from opportunity face. In order for all children to reach their full potential, communities most at risk need the locally tailored supports community schools provide, from integrated wraparound services, including health and nutrition, to expanded learning time and opportunities such as weekend programming and before- and afterschool enrichment. Community schools address student needs while also establishing a one-stop center where families receive a full range of services — health care, job counseling, bilingual services, adult classes, and more. The research is clear that well-implemented community schools lead to improvement in student and school outcomes and positively contribute to meeting the educational needs of low-achieving students in high-poverty schools. Thus far under the program, the Department of Education has awarded 55 grants across the country, the most recent awards in 2019 with 18 to 19 new awards expected in 2020. With the growing need for Community Schools, the president’s termination of funding would deprive additional communities of the opportunity to improve their schools using this effective approach.

Michael A. DiNapoli Jr.
Learning Policy Institute
(202) 804-6619, ext. 331 mdinapoli@learningpolicyinstitute.org
Indian Education Formula Grants (U.S. Department of Education)

**Title VI, Part A, Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)**

The Edmond (OK) Public Schools Indian Education Program, funded by the Title VI Indian Education Formula Grant program, provides culture-based opportunities and services to Native students and their families. As an urban district serving 1,386 Native students from 49 diverse tribes across the state and country, tribal partnerships and community engagement is a key component to the success of individual students and the program as a whole. Funding provided under Title VI empowers students to choose future pathways to college, career, and community success by supporting a college and career specialist, as well as 10 part-time tutors and 6-8 cultural consultants. From ACT Prep and afterschool tutoring to basketweaving and handgames, the Title VI program seeks to serve the unique cultural and academic needs of Native students in the Oklahoma City area.

**DESCRIPTION**

Approximately 620,000, or 93 percent, of Native children are currently enrolled in public schools, both urban and rural, while 48,000, or 7 percent, attend schools within the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) system. There are 183 BIE-funded schools (including 14 peripheral dormitories) located on 63 reservations in 23 states. Funding for Native students is included both in the Department of Education and the Department of Interior, through the Bureau of Indian Education.

Title VI, Part A, supports educational improvement and reform for Indian students, helping to ensure they receive every opportunity to achieve to high standards. The activities include: 1) direct assistance to local school districts and Department of the Interior BIE schools for the education of Indian children, 2) special programs, including demonstrations and the training of Indian individuals as educators, and, 3) Native language, research, evaluation, data collection, technical assistance, and other national activities. The programs promote efforts to meet the unique educational and culturally related academic needs of American Indian and Alaska Native students.

**FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants to LEAs</td>
<td>$105.38</td>
<td>$105.38</td>
<td>$105.38</td>
<td>$105.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programs for Indian Children</td>
<td>$ 67.99</td>
<td>$ 67.99</td>
<td>$ 67.99</td>
<td>$ 63.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Activities</td>
<td>$  6.87</td>
<td>$  6.87</td>
<td>$  7.37</td>
<td>$  7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$180.24</strong></td>
<td><strong>$180.24</strong></td>
<td><strong>$180.74</strong></td>
<td><strong>$180.74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET**

The Administration’s FY 2021 budget freezes funding at the FY 2020 levels for Indian Education in the U.S. Department of Education. Rising costs on the ground and a growing Native student population force schools and tribes to stretch further this limited amount to meet the needs of Native students each year. In other words, taking into account rising enrollments, increasing costs of providing services, and inflation, a freeze in funding is actually a cut.
Since FY 2019, Indian Education has seen an increase of $500,000 in the National Activities account, which funds Native languages, research, and state tribal education partnerships. Increasing funding to $7.37 million reflected congressional support for Native languages. However, there remain significantly more applicants and demand for grants than available dollars.

The history of Indian education reveals that tribes know best how to address the unique needs of their students. Title VI has shown Native students thrive in schools that value their identity and culture. The high school graduation rate for Native students improved between 2010 and 2016 from 65 to 72 percent, but even with this increase, Native students still lag behind the national graduation rate of 85 percent. It is critical Congress work with Native communities and the Administration to fully fund Title VI at $198 million. Providing this funding level would show support of Native cultures and tribal self-determination and would be a major step toward keeping faith with Tribal leaders and Native communities, and closing the achievement and opportunity gaps that impact Native students.

The need for special programs to help more Native students become college ready is also clear. Nearly 20 percent of Native Americans over the age of 25 have not graduated from high school or obtained a GED compared to 12 percent in the general population, and only 15 percent have obtained a bachelor’s degree or higher as compared to 33 percent in the general population. In addition, funding for National Activities supports other critical services including Native language immersion, research, and state tribal education partnership, and ownership of the outcomes for Native students.

Contact Info

Adrienne Elliott
National Indian Education Association
(202) 847-0040 | aelliott@niea.org
Education Innovation and Research

**Title IV, Part F, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)**

*Future Forward is a literacy intervention for students struggling with reading from kindergarten through third grade that combines intensive one-on-one tutoring during the school day with family engagement support embedded in all aspects of the program. Initially developed to serve students in Milwaukee Public Schools, the Future Forward program model was awarded an Investing in Innovation (i3) grant in 2010 by the U.S. Department of Education to further develop the program and test its impact. The external evaluation found the program yielded positive and statistically significant impacts on reading achievement, literacy, and regular school day attendance. Participating students were absent from school, on average, 5.8 fewer times than control students, and the benefit of the program was most significant for students who started the program with greater literacy instruction needs. While only 10 percent of control students below literacy benchmarks at the start of the study met benchmarks at the conclusion of the study, 62 percent of students who participated in the Future Forward program model met benchmarks at the end of the study. Education Analytics was awarded a $7.8 million Education Innovation and Research (EIR) grant to implement Future Forward across multiple regions in the country and evaluate its impact. The initial research evaluation of the Future Forward program model met What Works Clearinghouse standards and suggested promise for Future Forward’s impact as it is currently implemented in 14 sites across three different states.*

**DESCRIPTION**

Education Innovation and Research (EIR) supports development, testing, replication, and expansion of innovative, evidence-based education strategies. EIR provides flexible funding for a broad range of field-driven projects and allows states, school districts, nonprofits, higher education, and small businesses to develop and grow creative programs to improve student achievement. The program 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 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$130.00</td>
<td>$190.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.

**IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET**

Congress increased funding for EIR to $190 million in FY 2020, an increase of $60 million. The president’s budget consolidates the EIR program into the Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant along with 28 other competitive and formula grant programs. The Administration states the block grant lets states decide how best to use funds to meet the needs of their students.

In reality, the consolidation—combined with the reduction in funding for other ESEA formula grant programs — will force states to direct critical funding for evidence-based innovations into the formula grant programs just to maintain the same level of services for students. Without these evidence-based innovation funds, states and districts will not have the critical funding needed to develop and scale up evidence-based innovations that improve...
student achievement and attainment for high-need students.

PROGRAM NEED

Continued investment in this program is particularly important since ESSA requires states and school districts to support the use of evidence-based interventions in schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement or in implementing targeted support and improvement plans. Under the president’s request, no funds will be reserved under the new block grant for continuation costs for current grantees, further eroding the ability to design and implement innovative evidence-based practices. Robust federal investment in identifying such interventions through the EIR program is essential to ensuring local districts have the necessary tools to address the persistent challenges in their lowest performing schools.

CONTACT INFO

Michele McLaughlin
Knowledge Alliance
(202) 770-2218  |  michele@knowledgeall.net
Teacher and School Leader Incentive Grants

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

Arizona’s Amphitheater Unified School District #10 began Project EXCELL with a $29 million grant from the Teacher Incentive Fund (now known as Teacher and School Leader Incentive Grants). The Amphitheater District, which includes 20 K-12 schools on the north side of Tucson (AZ), has been involved in some form of innovative alternative compensation for more than 20 years. Roseanne Lopez, a longtime teacher, principal, and central office administrator in Amphitheater, extended an invitation to anyone in the district who wanted to participate in the design and implementation of the TIF grant, and 120 people— including principals and teachers — volunteered. The collaboration between administrators and teachers from the beginning developed a deep understanding of what needed to occur in schools to motivate teachers. Data indicate improvements in student achievement in all EXCELL schools, with statistically significant increases in math and reading scores across all 20 schools since the implementation of Project EXCELL. In addition, hard-to-staff positions were filled with highly qualified teachers in the targeted areas.

Excerpted from Performance-Based Compensation: Design and Implementation at Six Teacher Incentive Fund Sites, Dr. Jonathan Eckert

DESCRIPTION

Formerly known as the Teacher Incentive Fund, the Teacher and School Leader Incentive Grants (TSL) program supports efforts to develop, implement, improve, or expand human capital management systems or performance-based compensation systems in schools. Recognizing the critical role of effective school leadership on student achievement, the program advances comprehensive evaluation and supports for all educators, focusing especially on those in high-need schools. Through performance-based compensation, including career ladders and supports such as peer-to-peer mentoring and professional development, TSL helps districts increase student achievement by enhancing educators’ effectiveness.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The Administration proposes the consolidation of the TSL program into a block grant with 28 other existing programs, including Title I grants for disadvantaged students, English Language Acquisition, and Title IV-A grants for student support and academic enrichment. According to the Administration’s budget request to Congress, the proposed consolidation “would give States and school districts flexibility to support similar activities in response to local needs and circumstances.” However, the overall amount of the proposed block grant would be $4.7 billion lower than the total current funding allocations for the consolidated programs. This proposed program consolidation and reduction in resources could seriously impact the ability and capacity of school districts to address teacher retention and shortages.
Programs such as the 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 in advancing state and local efforts to close achievement gaps, improve educational equity for all students, and help school districts attract and retain effective educators. The TSL program can be helpful for districts that are implementing mentoring programs for new teachers and for those working to address teacher shortages, particularly in high-need subjects such as science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), as well as coding.

President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.

**CONTACT INFO**

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

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

The National Writing Project’s Supporting Effective Educator Development grant brought the College, Career, and Community Writers Program (C3WP) to 60 local writing projects nationwide. C3WP is an intensive professional development program that provides teachers with a slate of instructional resources and formative assessment tools for the teaching of evidence-based argument writing. The Michigan Chippewa River Writing Project is deeply involved in the program, participating in the 2016-17 Advanced Institute and the 2017-18 Professional Development in High-Need School Grants. Teacher leaders enthusiastically embraced the program, helping their students compose reasoned source-based arguments while also contributing to their site’s Teachers as Writers blog. Subsequently, the editors of the Language Arts Journal of Michigan published a special issue of the journal focused entirely on C3WP. The result is a 10-article collection of teacher-written articles about C3WP representing five different writing projects in the Midwest. Article topics ranged from writing nuanced arguments, preparing for college writing in middle school, C3WP in grades K-3, C3WP and culturally relevant pedagogy, and respectful argument culture. The articles all illustrate the impact C3WP has had on K-12 teaching practice and the positive outcomes for students in the classroom.

**DESCRIPTION**

The Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED) program provides competitive grants to national nonprofit organizations, institutions of higher education, the Bureau of Indian Education, and partnerships for projects supported by a level of at least moderate evidence to improve educator effectiveness. Funds are used to support alternative preparation and certification activities and professional development activities for teachers, principals, and other school leaders. In the FY 2020 appropriations bill, Congress directed the U.S. Department of Education to provide awards to support professional development activities that help educators incorporate social and emotional learning into teaching and support pathways into teaching that provide a strong foundation in child development and learning. Grants also enable services and learning opportunities to be freely available to local school districts. SEED grants create learning and career growth opportunities for aspiring and current educators serving students in high-need schools. In FY 2018, the Department of Education awarded 14 new three-year SEED grants. No new grants were awarded in FY 2019. Grantees focus on supporting improved school leadership and evidence-based professional development in a variety of settings, as well as high-quality instruction across a range of subject areas including literacy, science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM).

**FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.
The president’s FY 2021 budget does not include any funds for SEED and consolidates it into the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant. With funding eliminated for this program, as well as for Title II, Part A, states may choose not to devote any resources to support and increase the number and impact of highly effective educators. In FY 2019 no new SEED grants were awarded. The Department of Education projects that 2018 SEED grantees will reach a significantly fewer number of educators than in previous years. For example, in 2015 SEED grants impacted over 50,000 educators serving 7.8 million students, while in 2018, the Department reported grants would support approximately 12,000 teachers and 1,300 principals over the next three years. Without robust support for this program, evidence-based preparation, development, and enhancement opportunities for educators will be greatly compromised.

Funding for the SEED program will support evidence-based national teacher, principal, and school leader preparation, certification, and professional development programs to prepare educators to effectively serve communities and students most in need. The SEED program is critical to ensuring a continued competitive and merit-based avenue for national nonprofits, institutions of higher education, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and partnerships engaging in the difficult and important work of equipping teachers, principals, and other school leaders with the skills to succeed in our nation’s underserved school districts and high-need schools.

Ellen Fern
BOSE Public Affairs
(202) 349-2306 | efern@bosepublicaffairs.com
Charter Schools Program

Title IV, Part C, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

Washington Leadership Academy (WLA) is a nonprofit Public Charter School operating in Northeast Washington, DC. Its mission is to prepare students to thrive in the world and change it for the better. WLA prepares students to influence and change the world with access to cutting edge technology, internships, and individualized learning while also creating more opportunities for student voice and choice in education. Students at WLA go beyond using technology and become creators of technology, including the creation of virtual reality classrooms and immersive experiences. By 2020 WLA aims to see its first graduating class prepared to thrive in their postsecondary choices and ready to change the world for the better. Charter school funds will support these efforts.

Collegiate Academies (CA) is a nonprofit network of six charter schools operating in New Orleans, Louisiana. CA serves a diverse community of learners regardless of their previous experiences or current abilities. On average, CA scholars enter freshman year reading at a 6th-grade level. Twenty percent of scholars receive special education services, and 14 percent are two years or more older than their on-grade peers. As open enrollment schools, CA schools provide personalized interventions and programming to meet the needs of individual scholars, both with and without individualized education programs. The school environment celebrates growth for all – from freshman through senior year, scholars receive positive reinforcement and support to grow academically, socially, and behaviorally. Strong relationships with teachers and emotional safety in the learning environment support scholars in facing challenges, making mistakes, experiencing failure in pursuit of goals, and picking themselves up to face those same challenges and overcome them. By the end of senior year, 98 percent of CA seniors are accepted into college.

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></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$440.00</td>
<td>$440.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.
IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget eliminates funding for the Charter Schools Grants program, incorporating it into the Elementary and Secondary Education for Disadvantaged Students Block Grant (ESED). Twenty-nine federal education programs are included in ESED, with a 20 percent overall reduction in funding below the combined current amounts for those programs. States would allocate at least 90 percent of block grant funds to local school districts, including charter schools operating as local districts, using the Title I funding formula. The U.S. Department of Education indicates in its budget that funds would be reserved under ESED to pay continuation awards to existing grantees through completion of their projects.

Given the Administration’s strong belief that low-income families should have choice about where their children attend school, eliminating one of only two programs (Magnet Schools) that provide public school choice for families is inconsistent with that message. Families who wish to participate in public schools but prefer the specific mission of particular public charters will now have few if any public options beyond the neighborhood school. Combining the elimination of this program with cuts or eliminations of other federal education programs that serve low-income students will add an additional blow to innovation in the public schools.

PROGRAM NEED

The Charter School Program should remain a discrete funding option. Funding supports innovation and expands opportunities in charter schools for students with disabilities, English learners, and low-income students. Continued funding will also help ensure suitable facilities necessary to strengthen the charter movement.

CONTACT INFO

Myrna Mandlawitz
Committee for Education Funding
(202) 686-1637 | mrmassociates@verizon.net
Magnet Schools Assistance Program

Title IV, Part D, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

By embracing diversity and providing an innovative curriculum focused on individual artistic abilities, New World School of the Arts (NWSA) has established itself as one of Florida’s top magnet schools. Prospective students may submit for the dance, music, theater, or performing arts departments, with admission determined by audition or portfolio review. Students regularly compete at and produce professional-level quality performances. For example, NWSA’s jazz ensemble is nationally known, winning the 2016 Essentially Ellington High School Jazz Band competition. The school has an inclusive, diverse student body: 86 percent of students who take AP tests scored a 3-out-of-5 or higher, and 79 percent of those students are Black or Latino. The school also boasts a 100 percent graduation rate, and the 2017 graduating class received a total of $36 million in scholarships. All told, NWSA, with its high academic performance and standards of excellence within the performing arts world, continues to shine as a premier institution of learning and as an outstanding example of what magnet schools can offer their students.

DESCRIPTION

The Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP) was reauthorized in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and provides multi-year grants to local school districts to establish, expand, or improve magnet schools. It is the only federal education grant designed specifically to promote innovation, choice, and diversity in the classroom. MSAP funds may be used for implementation of specialized curricula and instruction, teacher professional development, and purchase of equipment and technology, as well as other resources that will enable magnet programs to operate and sustain themselves at a high performing level.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$105.00</td>
<td>$107.00</td>
<td>$107.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The Administration’s FY 2021 budget provides no funding for the Magnet Schools Assistance Program, and proposes it be consolidated into the Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED). If adopted into law, the consolidation of the functions of the Magnet Schools Assistance Program into an ESED block grant would have a significant negative impact on public school initiatives to reduce segregation and increase diversity in the classroom. Given the high award amounts for magnet school grants, consolidation into a block grant would effectively eliminate any opportunity for school districts to establish new magnet schools or significantly revise existing ones, effectively halting one of the nation’s most popular public school desegregation strategies.
Magnet schools are public schools that provide specialized theme-based curriculum and instruction in subject areas including STEM, Career and Technical Education (CTE), Fine and Performing Arts, or International Baccalaureate. There are approximately 4,340 magnet schools in the United States that serve nearly 3.5 million students. Free to attend and accessible to all students, magnet schools enroll a higher proportion of low-income students and are more racially and ethnically diverse than traditional public schools. Furthermore, magnet schools are administered by local public school districts, ensuring they are accountable for delivering great results to the communities they serve.

In a 2019 poll, Gallup found that 75 percent of Americans, across racial and political party lines, support the creation of regional magnet schools to reduce racial segregation in the public school system. Magnets were the most popular of four desegregation proposals that Gallup tested. As a sign of their popularity, 65 percent of magnet schools have waiting lists filled with students eager to learn in the magnet school model. As policymakers and school districts seek to provide more opportunities for students and more choices for parents and create more diversity in the classroom, sustained and increased funding for magnet schools will allow them to continue to answer the call for high-quality public education. Funding for magnet schools must be increased from $30.57 per student to $50 per student, a total of $175 million.

President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.

**PROGRAM NEED**

**CONTACT INFO**

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

Title IV, Part F, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

As part of their local Ready To Learn outreach, PBS Utah hosts Family Learning Nights that have reached 15,500+ low-income children and parents and caregivers through Granite School District Title I elementary schools. Ready To Learn Family Learning Nights take place at three different schools each week during the school year. Parents and kids enjoy dinner together and participate in hands-on educational activities focused on reading, math and science, and literacy.

PBS Utah brings Cleone Peterson Eccles Mobile Education Labs to the Ready To Learn Family Learning Nights. The Mobile Education Labs are sets of tablets preloaded with a library of PBS Kids educational apps, including more than 25 educational games that are fun and encourage creativity while reinforcing science, math, social-emotional, and literacy skills.

At the end of the night families receive a book for each child and take-home resources to encourage continued parent engagement and learning in the home. Without funding for the Ready To Learn program, this type of in-depth, family focused educational outreach would not be possible, and over 15,000 kids and families and Utah would lose the benefit of these educational services that help ensure they are able to succeed in school and life.

DESCRIPTION

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. 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 educational children’s programming like Molly of Denali, Ready Jet Go!, The Cat in the Hat Knows a Lot About That, Peg + Cat, SUPER WHY!, Martha Speaks, and many others that have been proven to help prepare children for success in school.

Ready To Learn leverages national-local partnerships that bring the very best educational media content to teachers and caregivers in schools, preschools, and home schools, along with supporting educational content, materials, and training to help incorporate these media resources into a variety of learning settings. Ready To Learn content is on public television, online, in mobile apps, and available through on the ground engagement. Partnerships also include 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 children to make significant academic gains that help to close the achievement gap.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$27.74</td>
<td>$27.74</td>
<td>$29.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.
IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

President Trump’s FY 2021 budget eliminates funding for Ready To Learn. This action would have a negative impact on children and families across the country, particularly in the underserved communities that benefit most from the program. Elimination of the program would also significantly reduce the research, creation, distribution, and evaluation of high-quality, unique, free children’s programming in all its components – broadcast, online, and community/school outreach. The proven results of Ready To Learn’s ability to assist in closing the opportunity gap would be difficult to replicate without the program.

For FY 2021, a funding level of $30 million is recommended to support the creation of high-quality, proven effective educational media content. This funding level will also support on the ground community engagement and outreach to ensure these resources reach the children, families, teachers and schools that need them the most.

PROGRAM NEED

Research shows children who start school behind stay behind, so it is critical to ensure all children are prepared when they enter K-12 education. However, in the United States 52 percent of children ages three and four do not attend preschool. In addition, of the more than 25 million American children under age six, 43 percent are living in low-income households. Research shows 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, nearly 97 percent of American families have access to Ready To Learn content that is proven to help children learn. Funding for this program has created scientifically researched, award-winning educational programming that is helping to close the opportunity gap.

CONTACT INFO

Kate Riley
America’s Public Television Stations
(202) 654-4206   |  kriley@apts.org
Assistance for Arts Education

Title IV, Part F, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)

The Chicago-based nonprofit Chicago Arts Partnerships in Education (CAPE) recently received an Assistance for Arts Education Development and Dissemination (AAEDD) grant to work for four years with Park Forest-Chicago Heights School District 163, a low-income suburban district outside Chicago. This program — “STEAM Ahead” — provides District 163 with CAPE teaching artists who co-plan and co-teach with 163 on-staff art, STEAM, and classroom teachers, impacting all students in kindergarten through fifth grade via curricula that integrates science, technology, engineering, art, and math (STEAM). These artist-teacher teams integrate STEAM content areas and utilize art as an investigative tool in their classrooms, helping students effectively understand and engage the real-world practices of scientists, mathematicians, and engineers. Ongoing professional development for participating educators deepens knowledge of STEAM content areas, STEAM teaching theories and strategies, and how to gauge student learning in STEAM. CAPE’s previous AAEDD research studies have consistently shown the positive impact of integrating the arts on student achievement, including low-performing students, closing the achievement gap in standardized test scores, and the ability to perceive and articulate what they are learning.

– Scott Sikkema, Education Director, Chicago Arts Partnerships in Education

DESCRIPTION

Authorized under Title IV, Part F of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), the Assistance for Arts Education program promotes arts education for students, including disadvantaged students and students with disabilities, through competitive and noncompetitive grant awards. The U.S. Department of Education awards three types of grants: Assistance for Arts Education Development and Dissemination (AAEDD), Professional Development for Arts Educators (PDAE), and the Arts in Education National Program (AENP). AAEDD grants support the expansion, evaluation, and dissemination of innovative models that demonstrate effective arts integration, standards-based instruction, and student academic performance in music and the arts. PDAE grants support projects in schools where 50 percent or more of students are from low-income families and which implement model professional development programs and improve students’ academic performance through arts integration. AENP grants support similar community and national activities, emphasizing service to children from low-income families and children with disabilities. Since 2012, all AENP grants have been awarded to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$29.00</td>
<td>$29.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President's FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.
The president’s budget for FY 2021 proposes eliminating the Assistance for Arts Education program. This radical change would likely result in the cessation of projects already underway, as many of the grants awarded under this program support ongoing, multi-year projects. Elimination of the program will mean fewer opportunities for professional development and dissemination of effective models for arts education, music education, and arts integration.

The focus these programs place on the production and dissemination of innovative models for arts education allows the effects of this federal investment to be multiplied across the country. Despite ESSA’s enumeration of music and the arts as well-rounded education subjects, inequitable access to high-quality arts education persists. The most recent National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) Arts Assessment revealed significant disparities in music and visual art achievement across racial, socio-economic, and gender groups. Music and arts educators frequently cite the need for additional training on teaching students with disabilities. Research studies, many of which were funded through this program, continue to support arts integration and STEAM strategies as beneficial to students’ academic achievement. Adequate funding 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.

Rob Edwards  
National Association for Music Education  
(571) 323-5892   |  robe@nafme.org
Gifted and Talented Program

**Title IV, Part F, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)**

The successfully completed Project North Star, operated through the Minnesota Department of Education, focused on elevating culturally responsive identification and services — including computer science education — for underserved rural students. A three-year federal Javits grant, the project had a special emphasis on Native students. The grant was executed through a three-pronged approach: preparing teachers to effectively identify and instruct underserved gifted populations, including curriculum adaptation and instructional differentiation; preparing school leaders to support gifted students and understand unique needs of underserved gifted populations through instructional leadership, identification systems, and services; and, family and community outreach and support through engagement with rural families, tribal leaders and others to advocate for underserved gifted students and supplement school programs outside the classroom.

**DESCRIPTION**

As the only federal program dedicated to addressing the unique educational needs of gifted and talented students, the Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Students Education Act focuses its resources on children traditionally underrepresented in gifted education programs — students with disabilities, English language learners, and individuals from economically disadvantaged backgrounds. Through a system of competitive research grants, 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></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.

**IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET**

The president’s FY 2021 budget eliminates funding for the Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Students Education Act. The FY 2020 allocation of $13 million is just enough to cover continuation costs of current Javits grants, and an even larger investment is critical to adequately address the needs of high-ability students across the nation. An increased investment would allow enhanced 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 that informs educators about how to most effectively serve gifted and talented students. An investment of at least $32 million is essential to assist states to expand their capacity to provide services to gifted students, especially students from disadvantaged backgrounds, and to implement innovative approaches. As states cut funding even further and as the United States continues to fall behind on international indicators of excellence, this federal investment is more critical than ever.

CONTACT INFO

Kuna Tavalin
Council for Exceptional Children
(202) 669-2669   | kunat@cec.sped.org

Statewide Family Engagement Centers

Statewide Family Engagement Center (SFEC) grantees are in their second year of a five-year grant cycle. The 12 grantees hail from across rural, suburban, and urban areas across the country. They focus on evidence-based programming that targets marginalized families to involve them actively in their children’s education and on developing robust statewide partnerships to reach and engage more parents in leadership and educational decision making. Each grantee has taken a unique approach to engaging with families as critical partners in their child's education. For example, the Arizona SFEC, led by the National Center for Families Learning, has launched six of twelve model demonstration sites across the state. With a concentration on family literacy, direct services include parenting classes with age-appropriate strategies for engaging in literacy with their child, financial literacy, English acquisition, GED classes, and training on how to navigate school websites. Parents interact with children in the classroom, experiencing first hand their child’s daily activities. This has resulted in a decrease in chronic absenteeism because more parents recognize the value of schooling, even in the early years. In addition, 82 percent of parents report their children show an increased interest in books, and, in the first year of the grant, 26,120 books were distributed to families. Families are also bringing family literacy strategies into the home, making formerly stressful homework assignments fun and communication with school a positive experience. A “train the trainer” model has been created so partners can gain new tools to effectively engage parents in educational decision making. In year two of the grant, the Arizona Statewide Professional Development system will launch.

DESCRIPTION

The Statewide Family Engagement Centers (SFEC) program, authorized at $10 million under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), provides federal competitive grants to statewide organizations or a consortium of statewide organizations to promote and implement evidenced-based family engagement strategies. The SFEC program provides much-needed technical assistance and partnership development to states and school districts for fostering meaningful engagement with families to further their children's academic and developmental progress. SFECs also provide vital direct services to improve the communication among children, teachers, school leaders, counselors, administrators, and other school personnel to enhance parent understanding and engagement in district, state, and federal education policies.
PART 1 — ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget eliminates funding for the SEFC program, despite the U.S. Department of Education’s issuing the first round of grant awards in fall 2018. A dedicated funding stream for the SEFC grant program must be maintained and the funding level increased to ensure evidence-based direct services and systemic improvement of family engagement are continued and enhanced. This federal investment to improve and expand family engagement in public education will help put more families at the table as equal partners in their child’s education.

PROGRAM NEED

Research shows parent and family engagement matters for student success, improving both school and life outcomes. Family engagement contributes to improved student attendance and achievement, decreased disciplinary issues, and improved family and school partnerships. Effective family engagement means schools and school districts prepare families to understand content and achievement standards and state and local academic assessments. Research shows a student’s academic achievement is directly linked to the education level of the primary caretaker. Thus, truly robust family engagement includes conducting adult education instruction alongside early childhood education such as the family literacy model, a grant priority for the Statewide Family Engagement Centers. Engaged families are better equipped to monitor their child’s progress and work with educators to improve achievement.

Funds for Statewide Family Engagement Centers are designed to provide schools and districts with techniques to educate teachers, specialized instructional support personnel, principals, and other staff to engage all families, especially those who are marginalized, in a meaningful way. Centers build ties among the community, families, and schools. This kind of support is valuable for all parents and of particular importance to parents who themselves struggled in school or failed to graduate from high school. Family engagement is an essential component of breaking that cycle for the next generation.

CONTACT INFO

Jacki Ball
National PTA
(703) 518-1243 | jball@pta.org

Kuna Tavalin
Stride Policy Solutions
(202) 669-2669 | ktavalin@stridepolicy.com
Language Acquisition Grants

**Title III, Part A, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (Every Student Succeeds Act)**

The Metro-Nashville (TN) Public Schools use Title III funds to provide job-embedded professional development through coaches who are specifically trained and knowledgeable in effective instructional practices for English language learners (ELL). Coaches operationalize job-embedded professional development by conducting coaching cycles, professional learning communities, and classroom lab experiences. Title III funds also are used to help acquire instructional materials to support rigorous instruction for ELLs and to provide training on English Language Development standards, Complex Text, and Academic Conversations.

**DESCRIPTION**

Language Acquisition Grants are provided on a formula basis to improve instructional programs for ELLs. Programs aim to develop academic English and high levels of academic achievement in order for ELLs 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 ELLs through efforts including upgrading curricula, acquiring instructional materials, and providing teacher training opportunities. Title III funds may also be used to pay for activities that enhance educational opportunities for immigrant children and youth.

**FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$737.40</td>
<td>$737.40</td>
<td>$787.40</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.

**IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET**

The president’s FY 2021 budget eliminates Title III funding for English language learners. Title III is one of the 29 federal categorial grants consolidated into the Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED), which would give state and local education leaders flexibility to determine how to use these diminished funds. States and local districts could determine how much of the block grant funding would go toward improving instruction for ELLs. This comes when dedicated funding is needed more than ever, with notable increases in ELL enrollment, according to the 2017 data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Specifically, ELL enrollment in K-12 public schools increased from 4,843,963 in School Year 2015-16 to 4,952,699 in School Year 2017-18.
School districts across the nation continue their efforts to address the achievement gaps in the performance of ELLs compared to their English-proficient peers. Districts engage in supplemental efforts, including providing professional development to improve instruction for ELLs that prepares the growing number of ELLs to be college- and career-ready. Funds from this program are critical to ensuring this population is spotlighted and their continuing needs adequately addressed.

President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding.

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

Part B, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

Meet NK: A happy, healthy, and smart girl who loves fashion and creating things. Her parents would describe her as hardworking, creative, and smart, but frustrated as she has struggled with math and reading. NK was diagnosed with dyslexia and dyscalculia – learning disabilities in reading and math. After recognizing her disabilities in 2nd grade, NK’s teachers, parents, and other specialized instructional support personnel came together to create a plan (an individualized education program, or IEP) tailored specifically for NK. She had been falling behind in reading and math, but her IEP set ambitious goals and provided for specialized instruction and accommodations to help her catch up to her peers. NK was able to spend most of her day in the general education classroom and still receive the instruction she needed from her reading and math interventionists. NK is now in high school! As part of graduation requirements, she is interning with the owner of a local clothing boutique to learn practical business and financial literacy skills, while also learning about the fashion industry. She has worked with her transition team to develop a post-graduation plan, which includes studying fashion design at the state university. Her ultimate goal is to one day live and work in New York City.

DESCRIPTION

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) State Grant program (Part B) provides services and supports to around 7 million students, or 14 percent, of all public school students from ages 3-21 (unless a state sets a higher termination age). Students are deemed eligible for Part B services within one of 13 enumerated disability categories, and they must require educational supports and services to make academic progress on a level consistent with nondisabled peers. The majority of students with disabilities are educated in the general education classroom for 80 percent or more of the school day. An Individualized Education Program (IEP) is designed for each student with input from general and special education staff, other specialists, the child’s parents, and the student as appropriate. Part B funds are sent to states through a specific funding formula. 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></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$12,277.85</td>
<td>$12,364.39</td>
<td>$12,764.39</td>
<td>$12,864.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2021 budget of $12.86 billion for IDEA State Grants adds $100 million, or a 0.8 percent increase over FY 2020. This additional funding would provide a per-child average of $1,739. Additional federal dollars are desperately needed, as this increase covers only a portion of annual inflation. The current federal contribution at this level is around 13 percent of the excess cost of educating students with disabilities, far below the 40 percent 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, nor does it factor in the growing number of students. Over time, these increased costs have resulted in an erosion of purchasing power and resources.
**PROGRAM NEED**

Part B is the largest program under the IDEA, serving approximately 6.7 million preK-12 students. The guarantee 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. In fact, the number of students requiring special education has grown, as has the complexity of challenges for those students. All the while, funding is not keeping pace. Additionally, funding remains less than half the original congressional commitment when the law was passed in 1975. Part B dollars have 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.

Students with disabilities and educators will feel the impact if funds are not increased. An increase of just $100 million will result in school districts and states straining to make up the difference to provide appropriate services to all eligible children.

**CONTACT INFO**

Valerie C. Williams  
National Association of State Directors of Special Education  
(703) 519-1504 | valerie.williams@nasdse.org

Meghan Whittaker  
National Center for Learning Disabilities  
(202) 464-2140 | mwhittaker@ncld.org
IDEA Preschool Program

Part B, Sec. 619, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

William’s parents have been celebrating every major milestone he achieves. He began to smile, babble, reach, crawl, and walk on time, and each was a momentous occasion! Now that William is 3, they are worried about his motor skills and his speech. He sometimes takes extra time to respond when asked a question, and he doesn’t always get his thoughts out clearly. They also noticed he appears to be clumsy, having trouble with certain movements. Luckily, William enrolled in a preschool program this year. Quickly, the professionals at William’s school evaluated him and determined he has a developmental delay and is eligible for special education services. The school designed an Individualized Education Program (IEP) tailored to his specific needs, providing speech therapy to help with his language development and communication and occupational therapy to help with coordination and motor control. His IEP team also ensured he engaged in social activities with typically developing young children in his school. William has been making great progress, and the professionals who support him will continue to monitor his success and determine whether this developmental delay persists into his elementary school years. IDEA preschool funding is critical to support professionals and provision of critical services necessary for growth and full participation early in children’s academic lives.

DESCRIPTION

States and local school districts use IDEA Preschool Grants to help ensure 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), which provides early intervention services.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$381.12</td>
<td>$391.12</td>
<td>$394.12</td>
<td>$394.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2021 budget freezes funding for the IDEA Preschool Grants program at $394.12 million. In FY 2016 this program saw a small increase of $15 million, the first forward movement in over a decade. In FY 2017, funding for the IDEA Preschool program was again frozen, and in FY 2018, FY 2019, and FY 2020 there were only small increases. The president’s FY 2021 budget fails to move the needle on funding and support for children with disabilities. Research affirms early childhood special education can help avoid the need for more costly and intensive services and supports when children are older. While the Part C Infant and Toddler program has received some small increases over the past few years, an increasing number of infants and toddlers served under the Part C program will continue to need services under the Preschool program when they reach age three.
PROGRAM NEED

Funding for this program stagnated for many years and only recently have very small increases been realized. A higher federal investment is warranted, especially with strong research demonstrating early learning gains reduce educational and other expenditures over a lifetime. The Preschool program serves approximately 760,000 children with disabilities ages 3 through 5. The program guarantees a free appropriate public education, entitling children with disabilities to special education and specialized instructional support services that will enable them to grow, learn, and prepare to enter school with children without disabilities. 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 they are ready to enter school and the K-12 special education program if necessary.

CONTACT INFO

Meghan Whittaker  
National Center for Learning Disabilities  
(202) 464-2140 | mwhittaker@ncld.org
IDEA Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities

**Part C, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)**

Angie has a history of seizure disorder. At a year old, she was referred by her pediatrician to an IDEA-Part C program due to her parents’ concerns about new swallowing problems that began when they tried her on more solid foods. Pureed foods and liquids had been fine, but when Angie’s parents introduced her to harder solid foods, she had difficulty swallowing. Angie’s parents wanted her to be able to safely eat the same foods the rest of the family enjoys. They also wanted Angie's grandparents to feel comfortable feeding her since they provide regular child care. Through the Part C program, a speech-language pathologist (SLP) performed a clinical evaluation of swallowing and also referred Angie for a video fluoroscopic swallow study. The SLP and occupational therapist worked together with the family to identify the best feeding position and utensils to maximize Angie’s ability to safely manage softer solids. Then, the SLP implemented strategies and prompts to help Angie take smaller bites, “chew and swallow hard,” and alternate small bites of food with small sips of liquid. The SLP also trained Angie’s family to implement this safe swallow protocol at home. Over the past several months, the SLP and Angie’s family have been working on introducing new textures and different solid foods. Now, at age 18 months, Angie can use a spoon to feed herself small bites of softer solids with minimal cuing and shows no signs of coughing or choking. Her grandparents feel more comfortable babysitting her at mealtime and understand how to implement safe swallowing strategies. With early intervention through the Part C program, children’s early developmental challenges can be addressed and hopefully alleviate the need for more intensive services later on.

**DESCRIPTION**

The IDEA-Part C Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities program serves approximately 388,000 children, birth through age two, and their families. These formula grants to states are used 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>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$470.00</td>
<td>$470.00</td>
<td>$477.00</td>
<td>$477.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET**

The president’s FY 2021 budget freezes funding for this critical program. While a funding freeze is better than past attempts to reduce investment, more resources are desperately required to cover the increasing number of children served under Part C and to maintain the level and quality of services. A substantial investment is needed to ensure early intervention services reach all children who require them. These investments reduce later costs as fewer children may need extended special education services.
PROGRAM NEED

The number of children in IDEA-Part C has grown by 97 percent in the last 20 years, requiring significant new funding to meet their needs. Without additional dollars, the program will continue to be limited in the number of children it can serve, despite a rapidly growing demand.

CONTACT INFO

Erik Lazdins
American Speech-Language-Hearing Association
(202) 624-8198 | elazdins@asha.org
### IDEA National Activities

**Part D, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)**

The Department of Special Education at San Francisco State University is recruiting, preparing, retaining, and graduating fully certified teachers to serve students who are deaf-blind through a partnership between a university credential program and California Deaf-Blind Services (CDBS). CDBS is an Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) funded training and technical assistance project serving students who are deaf-blind and their families. It is anticipated the project outcomes will include preparation of at least 28 credentialed teachers who have a specialization in deaf-blindness, employment of 95 percent of graduates in one year of graduation within their area of preparation, and employment of 80 percent of the graduates in high-poverty schools.

### DESCRIPTION

Part D programs are often referred to as the “backbone” of special education, supporting an infrastructure that serves as a quality assurance mechanism for the provision of mandated services to students with disabilities. States, institutions of higher education, and nonprofit expert organizations receive funding through these competitive grant programs to support the provision of evidence-based strategies for students 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) technology and media centers; and (6) Special Olympics education programs.

### FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Personnel Development Grants</td>
<td>$38.63</td>
<td>$38.63</td>
<td>$38.63</td>
<td>$38.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance &amp; Dissemination</td>
<td>$44.35</td>
<td>$44.35</td>
<td>$44.35</td>
<td>$44.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Preparation</td>
<td>$83.70</td>
<td>$87.20</td>
<td>$89.70</td>
<td>$89.70</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>$29.55</td>
<td>$29.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Olympics Education Program</td>
<td>$15.08</td>
<td>$17.58</td>
<td>$20.08</td>
<td>$20.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

Funding is frozen for all Part D programs in the president’s FY 2021 budget, which means the special education infrastructure is not keeping pace with the growing need in states and local school districts. State personnel grants and personnel preparation are particularly critical, as shortages for special education teachers and specialized instructional support personnel continue to grow. Funds for parent information centers should be increased to ensure families understand and are able to advocate for their children’s educational programs. Technology and media dollars support competitive awards available for continuing research and development on special education to provide best practices to meet children’s needs. The president’s budget is inadequate to meet increasing demands.
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 the IDEA. With a critical shortage of special education teachers in every state and the continued need to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, these funds are essential for the delivery of the promise of the IDEA. These funds support more than 50 technical assistance and dissemination centers, higher education personnel preparation programs to prepare effective special educators and specialized instructional support personnel, 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 necessary to ensure positive outcomes for all students with disabilities.

Valerie C. Williams
National Association of State Directors of Special Education
(703) 519-1504 | valerie.williams@nasdse.org

Jane E. West
Higher Education Consortium for Special Education
(202) 812-9096 | jwestdc@gmail.com

School Renovation and Modernization

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

In 2015, voters approved a bond referendum allowing the Dallas Independent School District to build and improve school facilities and implement technology upgrades throughout the school system. The local community supported the measure, recognizing the need for updated classrooms, science labs, and performing arts spaces; improved campus security and student transportation systems; increased opportunities for high-quality pre-kindergarten and early learning opportunities; expanded technology infrastructure; more school choice and diverse learning opportunities; and, overall advances to ensure equity of access to all district students. As part of Dallas’s 2015 Bond Program, the district issued $4.4 million in federal interest-free Qualified Zone Academy Bonds (QZABs), the proceeds of which were used for needed upgrades to the district’s technology equipment and software. Overall, the Bond Program aims to construct 9 new and replacement schools, build 19 additions to existing schools, support educational adequacy improvements, and create or repurpose learning spaces for new educational programs, including career technology, transformation schools, innovation schools, early childhood schools and over-age schools.

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.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (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 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Zone Academy Bonds*</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
<td>$ 0.00</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. Previously authorized bonding authority for school facility improvements remains 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 in 2009, while extending and expanding the existing QZAB program's authorization. A QZAB extension was approved by Congress in subsequent years, most recently in the 113th Congress for 2015 and 2016. The tax reform overhaul in the first session of the 115th Congress repealed tax credit bonds. The president's FY 2021 budget proposal includes $1 trillion in direct infrastructure investments such as transportation, roads and bridges, waterways and ports, broadband, and rural projects. The Administration's centerpiece infrastructure proposal does not include any mention of school facilities or additional bonding authority for QZABs, QSCBs, and BABs, other than the inclusion of Bureau of Indian Education schools in a list of deferred maintenance projects for the Public Lands Infrastructure Fund. The Environmental Protection Agency FY 2021 budget request does include $50 million to support healthier schools by identifying and addressing environmental hazards.

PROGRAM NEED

The elimination of bonding authority for QSCBs and QZABs in 2017 entrenched the federal government’s disregard for the nation’s longstanding school facility needs. A 2011 survey of urban school districts found those systems alone need approximately $20 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. Studies released by the Institute of Education Sciences in 2014 and the Center for Green Schools in 2016 estimated a nationwide need between $145 and $200 billion to modernize school facilities. The 2017 Infrastructure Report Card released by the American Society of Civil Engineers gave the nation's schools a grade of “D+” and included the finding that 24 percent of public school buildings were rated as being in fair or poor condition. A bipartisan amendment to the FY 2019 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies appropriations bill required the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to study the state of America's public school facilities – the first time Congress has authorized GAO to undertake such a review since the mid-1990s. The House Committee on Education and Labor approved the Rebuild America's Schools Act in the first session of the 116th Congress, which would provide $100 billion in grants and bonding authority to states and school districts to support long-term improvements to public school facilities, yet no further action has been taken in the House or Senate. 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
PART 2: EDUCATION, CAREER AND LIFELONG LEARNING
The Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act

Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, Perkins V

Nebraska’s reVISION initiative allows schools to evaluate their career preparation and career guidance systems and improve them in a way tailored to each school’s greatest areas of need. ReVISION began in 2012 with 13 schools based on an investment from the state using Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education (Perkins IV) state reserve funds. Since then, the program has been scaled and serves 100 districts across the state. Before applying for the grant, participants spent a year assessing their career preparation system, working with postsecondary partners, regional industry leaders, school counselors, and career educators, with support and guidance provided by the Educational Service Unit and the Nebraska Department of Education. Participating districts report lasting impacts from the reVISION work. In a 2017 survey, 87 percent reported the adoption of at least one new CTE course or program as a result of the reVISION initiative, and many reported adjusting or discontinuing outdated programs. As Nebraska implements Perkins V, reVISION will become the foundation on which local CTE programs are developed. Innovative programs like this exist across the country, and Perkins CTE grants allow them to improve, grow, and scale. CTE State Grants foster innovation and allow state and local leaders to offer technical assistance and provide professional development that strengthens CTE programs. It is imperative to fund CTE State Grants at a level that supports continued implementation of high-quality CTE programs.

DESCRIPTION

The Perkins Act was reauthorized in 2018. The Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, known as Perkins V, provides investments in Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs in all 50 states and the territories. These programs currently serve around 12 million learners a year. CTE programs provide middle school, high school, postsecondary and adult learners with the knowledge and skills to be prepared for college and careers. Students enrolled in CTE programs progress along a pathway of increasingly specific academic and technical courses. They often have the opportunity to participate in internships, engage with employers, and apply their knowledge and skills through hands-on projects. The federal investment in Perkins V is essential for increasing learner access to high-quality CTE programs. With a focus on program improvement, this investment has been critical to ensuring programs meet the ever-changing needs of learners and employers.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTE State Grants</td>
<td>$1,192.60</td>
<td>$1,262.60</td>
<td>$1,282.60</td>
<td>$1,962.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Programs</td>
<td>$ 7.42</td>
<td>$ 7.42</td>
<td>$ 7.42</td>
<td>$ 90.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget provides a $680 million, or 53 percent, increase in funding above the FY 2020 level for CTE State Grants, which would bring the total for FY 2021 to $1.963 billion. This is the most significant increase in federal funding ever proposed for CTE. CTE has been persistently underfunded, and, in inflation-adjusted dollars, funding is far below levels of decades ago. This much-needed increase would help meet the needs of students, employers and communities.

The budget also provides a considerable increase to the National Programs account, bringing the FY 2021 level to $90 million. Most of these funds would support new Innovation and Modernization grants, to be distributed competitively for the purpose of demonstrating new CTE models and taking proven programs to scale. The budget calls for new grants to focus on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields, including computer science.

The budget includes a recommendation that Congress authorize statutory changes to increase the fees collected for H-1B visas and redirect 15 percent of that revenue to provide an increase in funding for CTE State Grants. However, the president’s budget does not fully address how this large increase would be funded, and at what expense to other possible education programs serving the same students as Perkins.
The budget calls for new grants to focus on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields, including computer science. The budget includes a recommendation that Congress authorize statutory changes to increase the fees collected for H-1B visas and redirect 15 percent of that revenue to provide an increase in funding for CTE State Grants. However, the president’s budget still questions about how this large increase would be funded.

Program Need

With the recent reauthorization of Perkins, an increased federal investment in CTE State Grants is more critical now than ever. Today CTE is preparing learners of all backgrounds for promising career paths and giving employers and the American economy a competitive edge. However, the 21st century economy is creating skilled careers faster than schools, colleges, and CTE programs – with current resources – can prepare learners for these opportunities. Between FY 2004 and FY 2017, funding for CTE State Grants declined by over $77 million dollars, the equivalent of $427 million inflation-adjusted dollars (28 percent). While Perkins CTE State Grant funding has been modestly increased recently, these increases are not enough to make up for the previous decade of cuts and the growing need in today’s economy for skilled workers. Expanding the federal investment in CTE programs will create a brighter future for our country – creating more career options for learners, better results for employers, and increased growth for our economy. Building on the increases in FY 2018, FY 2019, and FY 2020, Congress should double the federal investment in CTE State Grants from the FY 2018 level by FY 2024.

Contact Information

Michael Matthews
Association for Career and Technical Education
(703) 683-9316  mmatthews@acteonline.org

Meredith Hills
Advance CTE
(301) 588-9630  mhills@careertech.org
PROGRAM NEED

With the recent reauthorization of Perkins, an increased federal investment in CTE State Grants is more critical now than ever. Today CTE is preparing learners of all backgrounds for promising career paths and giving employers and the American economy a competitive edge. However, the 21st century economy is creating skilled careers faster than schools, colleges, and CTE programs — with current resources — can prepare learners for these opportunities. Between FY 2004 and FY 2017, funding for CTE State Grants declined by over $77 million, the equivalent of $427 million inflation-adjusted dollars (28 percent). While Perkins CTE State Grant funding has been modestly increased recently, these increases are not enough to make up for the previous decade of cuts and the growing need in today’s economy for skilled workers. Expanding the federal investment in CTE programs will create a brighter future for our country — creating more career options for learners, better results for employers, and increased growth for our economy. Building on the increases in FY 2018, FY 2019, and FY 2020, Congress should double the federal investment in CTE State Grants from the FY 2018 level by FY 2024.

CONTACT INFO

Michael Matthews  
Association for Career and Technical Education  
(703) 683-9316   |  mmatthews@acteonline.org

Meredith Hills  
Advance CTE  
(301) 588-9630  |  mhills@careertech.org
Adult Education and Family Literacy

Title II, Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA)

Denise hid behind a secret for most of her life until one day her three-year-old son asked her to read him a book. She couldn’t do it. The 49-year-old mother could not read.

At age six, Denise had difficulty reading children’s books. She found ways to make it through school without revealing her secret. She sat in the back of class to avoid calling attention to herself. She skimmed textbook indexes, bolded texts, copied from reports she found online, made up overviews of reading assignments, and even practiced speaking articulately to sound knowledgeable. These workarounds got her through high school, despite reading at only a 4th- or 5th-grade reading level. She skipped college to settle into office jobs. Only later, as an adult, did she learn her challenges stemmed from dyslexia.

Finally, the day came when her son wanted to hear his mother read a story — a special moment for most moms. Denise’s husband motivated her to seek help to learn to read from the San Diego Council on Literacy, a group supported by Adult Education and Family Literacy (AEFLA) state grants. Now Denise serves as a member of the Council’s board of directors...and now, she can read to her son!

DESCRIPTION

The Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA) is the current iteration of the adult literacy state grant program originally included in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The program was strengthened significantly under the National Literacy Act of 1991, and many key elements of that Act were integrated into AEFLA when it became Title II of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) in 1998. In 2014, with passage of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), the successor to WIA, Congress reaffirmed a federal commitment to fund education programs aimed at adults without a high school credential or lacking basic language and math skills. The Act also supports assistance to low-skilled parents to obtain knowledge that allows them to become full partners in their children’s educational development.

The 2014 AEFLA reauthorization in WIOA promoted greater integration of adult education services with occupational education and training and career pathways systems, and explicitly authorized use of funds for integrated adult education and training programs. The law also codified the English Literacy/Civics Education program, the main federal funding source for states and communities to provide non-native speakers of English with English literacy programs linked to civics education.

Most AEFLA funds go to states as a block grant and are then distributed through a competitive grant process to local adult education providers. These providers operate as independent organizations or as part of school districts, community colleges, municipalities, multi-services centers, libraries, faith-based organizations, housing developments, workplaces, and unions. States match federal funding at 25 percent (cash or in kind) and must satisfy a “maintenance of effort” provision requiring expenditure of at least 90 percent of the prior year contribution. Some funds are allocated to support system-wide initiatives such as teacher training, curriculum development, and accountability measurement. In addition to state grants, a formula set-aside supports national leadership activities, conducted by the U.S. Department of Education, which must “enhance the quality and outcomes of adult education and literacy activities and programs nationwide.”

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Grants</td>
<td>$616.96</td>
<td>$641.96</td>
<td>$656.96</td>
<td>$656.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Leadership Activities</td>
<td>$13.71</td>
<td>$13.71</td>
<td>$13.71</td>
<td>$13.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The president’s total budget of $670.67 million for adult education for FY 2021 represents a freeze in funding at the FY 2020 level. A freeze in funding is actually a decrease, as costs to provide services continue to increase. In fact, president’s budget will continue to support fewer than 1.4 million of the 43 million adults, who would benefit from adult education services.

According to the latest international assessments, over 40 million adults in the U.S. score at the lowest levels of literacy proficiency. Many of these adults are part of the workforce — 64 percent of adults with low academic skills are employed — but they earn low wages, and lack the skills to succeed in postsecondary education and training. Yet today the publicly funded adult education system is serving fewer than 1.4 million people annually, in contrast with about 2.8 million people served in 2002. Survey data suggest that millions of low-skilled American adults would like to enroll in Adult Education services but cannot access a program. Waiting lists for classes in all 50 states are common.

Meeting demand for services would be a wise investment in our economy and in the public good. Low literacy costs the country billions each year in non-productivity in the workforce, health care costs, crime, and loss of tax revenue due to unemployment. Federal, state, and local governments recoup their investment in adult education through tax revenue and reduced expenses that result when more adults have greater literacy proficiency and attain a high school diploma. Lack of investment in adult education has likely hindered efforts to improve outcomes in K-12, as children of parents with low literacy skills have a 72 percent chance of being at the lowest reading levels themselves.

In addition, WIOA imposed many new requirements on AEFLA programs. Effective career pathway and integrated program models show promise but are both challenging and costly to implement. A robust additional investment in adult education for FY 2021 would ensure these innovations are on solid footing in every state as Congress begins the next reauthorization of WIOA.

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

The Connecticut State Library Division of Library Development has given a high priority to improving services and resources to patrons of the Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped. The state serves more than 7,000 patrons under this program. The library lends books and magazines in recorded formats, along with necessary playback equipment, for free to any Connecticut adult or child who is unable to read regular print due to a visual or physical disability. In 2017, the State Library announced that LSTA grants allowed the state to deliver 157,000 talking books.

The impact of LSTA grants across a state can be best exemplified by FY 2017 data released by the Missouri State Library. With the support of LSTA grants, Missouri was able to reach 170,544 children and teens through summer reading programs, and 119 library districts offered early literacy programs for children ages 0-6. In addition, 122 Missouri public libraries used the Statewide Courier Service to share 917,788 items expanding access to library materials, and 4,054 library staff members took part in 150 training opportunities which helped improve library services to patrons across the state.

DESCRIPTION

The Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) is the only source of direct federal funding for libraries. LSTA Grants to States program is a population-based grant administered by the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) going to all 50 states and the territories. Each state is required to provide a one-third match. The state library agency determines at the local level how best to spend its allotted funds. States use grants to help veterans transition to civilian life, small businesses expand their technology resources, patrons build resumes and find jobs, and families with children with disabilities get the resources they need. Funding supports children in completing homework assignments and building literacy skills. LSTA also provides money to states for professional development for librarians under the Laura Bush 21st Century Library Professionals program, supporting recruitment and education of the next generation of librarians and facility and library leaders. Funds also support National Leadership Grants and grants for Native American Library Services.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$189.27</td>
<td>$189.27</td>
<td>$195.45</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

For the fourth straight year the president’s short-sighted budget eliminates funding for LSTA and again fails to recognize the contributions libraries make in communities across the nation. With more than 4 million visits each day, libraries are seeing record levels of users seeking out their services. Libraries and trained librarians make communities better places to live. This loss of federal funding will be amplified by a loss of state funding, since states are required to match 33 percent of the amount of their LSTA Grants to States.

LSTA supports a wide range of services to small businesses, veterans, job seekers, students, families, and many others. LSTA allows states and local public libraries to create services specific to their patrons’ needs, many of which will be eliminated without LSTA support. The modest investment in libraries is repaid when a job seeker finds employment, a child learns to read, veterans transition to civilian life, a student completes homework and gets into college, children and adults with print disabilities can access books, and entrepreneurs are able to grow their businesses online – all through their local library.
Congress reauthorized LSTA with broad bipartisan support, with an authorization level of $232 million. The Museum and Library Services Act (P.L. 115-410) strengthened LSTA to support data-driven tools to tailor services to address and meet community needs, help libraries prepare for and provide services after a disaster or emergency, enhance services for Native Americans, and recruit and train library and information science professionals from a broad range of backgrounds. Congress continues to demonstrate wide bipartisan support for LSTA through annual “Dear Appropriator” letters.

The authorized level of $232 million for LSTA is well above current funding. In addition, several years of cuts have seen funding for LSTA fall further behind and much below its previous high in FY 2010 of $213.50 million. Congress needs to support local library services at $232 million for LSTA to meet urgent needs of library patrons.

Libraries provide a wide array of services for patrons, many of which are supported by LSTA funds. Consider that 77 percent of libraries offer online health resources, 95 percent offer online homework assistance, 95 percent provide summer reading programs, 97 percent help patrons complete online government forms, 84 percent offer technology training, and nearly 100 percent offer free Wi-Fi access. LSTA grants allow patrons to participate in a 21st century Internet-driven economy which makes communities better places to live. For many patrons, the library is often the only free resource available to access the Internet, utilize 3D printers, retrieve government information, file forms, find career and educational tools, apply for jobs, or utilize commercial databases.

**CONTACT INFO**

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

Institute of Museum and Library Services

In 2019, in response to the needs of St. Louis students, teachers, and schools, the Contemporary Art Museum St. Louis in Missouri was awarded a $193,753 Museums for America Office of Museum Services grant to expand its ArtReach programs. The museum will provide arts education opportunities for middle and high school students by partnering with nearby schools through multi-week engagements with teaching artists, hosting drop-in workshops introducing contemporary art practices, and organizing field trips to the museum. The project will also include mentoring for art teachers in partnership with schools and a portfolio day to prepare high school students for college admissions processes. With the guidance of an evaluation consultant, the museum will measure success using formative and summative evaluation techniques, and develop tools to consistently track and analyze project activities.

DESCRIPTION

Despite its small size, the IMLS Office of Museum Services (OMS) is the largest source of federal 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 like zoos and aquariums — 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>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$34.71</td>
<td>$34.71</td>
<td>$38.51</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s elimination of this small, vital agency is both alarming and misguided. At a cost of less than ten cents per American, the Office of Museum Services makes no appreciable contribution to the budget deficit. In fact, the economic activity of museums generates $8 billion in tax revenue for the federal government, far more than they receive in federal funding. Despite its miniscule cost, OMS makes an immense contribution to museums’ ability to care for their collections, educate learners of every age, and serve their communities. The minimal federal investment currently made through OMS grants also leverages significant private, state, and local funding for maximum impact.

The president’s budget fails to acknowledge the bipartisan consensus in Congress that this program is an excellent use of taxpayer dollars. OMS has set records for congressional support during the appropriations submission process in each of the last seven years, with 178 representatives and 41 senators signing FY 2020 appropriations letters on its behalf. Moreover, Congress overwhelmingly reauthorized OMS in late 2018 through the Museum and Library Services Act of 2018 (P.L.115-410). This legislation was passed with widespread support by unanimous consent in the Senate and by a vote of 331 to 28 in the House, showing Congress’ renewed bipartisan support for the agency’s programs and a continuing commitment to its funding.
PROGRAM NEED

Museums spend over $2 billion every year on education programs, three-quarters of which is at the K-12 level. However, they could do much more for their communities with greater resources. Children who visited a museum during kindergarten had higher achievement scores in reading, mathematics, and science in third grade than children who did not. Children who are most at risk for deficits and delays in achievement also see this benefit. Recent rigorous studies of single-visit field trips to art museums around the country found participating students demonstrated greater knowledge of and interest in art, and also scored higher than peers in measures of critical thinking, empathy, tolerance, and comfort with multiple viewpoints about works of art. For students from rural or high-poverty regions, the increase was even more significant. And multiple, facilitated classroom visits to art museums have a measurable impact on key aspects of student learning.

In FY 2019, Congress provided $242 million to IMLS, of which $34.7 million was directed to the Office of Museum Services. With this funding, OMS provided 219 grants to museums and related organizations in 48 states and the District of Columbia.

There is high demand for OMS dollars. In FY 2019 OMS received 938 applications requesting nearly $134 million, but current funding has allowed the agency to fund only a small fraction of the highly rated grant applications it receives. The Inspire! Grants for Small Museums program, designed to encourage small institutions to apply for OMS funding, generated 202 applications in its first year. OMS awarded 30 grants totaling $1.1 million, representing 15 percent of the applicants and demonstrating a need for continued support for the nation’s small museums. These figures do not take into account the fact that many museums may not even apply due to the low prospects of receiving a grant. With current funding reaching only a fraction of our nation’s museums and many highly rated applications going unfunded, we urge Congress to support the IMLS Office of Museum Services at $42.71 million, the amount approved by the U.S. House of Representatives last year.

CONTACT INFO

Barry Szczesny
American Alliance of Museums
(202) 218-7699  |  bszczesny@aam-us.org
Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA)

Myranda was a full-time nursing student at North Central Michigan College, while also working a full-time job and taking care of her family and three children. She constantly worried about how she was going to afford textbooks, classes, supplies, and other necessities.

When she discovered the Class Room Training (CRT) program through Michigan Works!, she immediately took advantage of the opportunity to jump on board with financial assistance for school. Thanks to the support this program offered, she was able to cut back some hours at work without having to worry about making ends meet for her family, and keep her focus on the most important thing – nursing school. Thanks to the help MW! provided, Myranda participated in the Student Nurses Association, received her Associates of Applied Sciences in Nursing, and passed the NCLEX exam.

DESCRIPTION

The purpose of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) is to better align the workforce system, including 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 also places emphasis on local business-led workforce development boards to determine critical industries and skills and learning providers, advancing the businesses and labor force that help ensure their region's economic resiliency.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$3,456.25</td>
<td>$3,452.89</td>
<td>$3,487.83</td>
<td>$3,487.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Primary Program Budget Focus for the Employment & Training Programs under WIOA Including: Adult, Dislocated Worker, Youth, and Wagner-Peyser funds.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Congress passed the Workforce Innovation & Opportunity Act in July 2014. The Act replaced the Workforce Investment Act, after over ten 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. Current WIOA appropriations are not substantial enough to address the gap of over 6 million vacant positions employers are trying to find qualified workers to fill.
Program Need

Estimates vary widely regarding the number of positions that will be eliminated as automation continues to develop and is utilized in the workplace. However, there is little argument that most current job tasks will be altered by technology. At the same time, roughly 11 million Americans are unemployed, involuntarily working part time, or considered underemployed. WIOA provides mechanisms for state and local workforce development boards to analyze their labor market to ascertain skill needs and funding to provide job match assistance, career counseling, skills assessments, and limited tuition assistance for skill development. Workforce boards have engaged over 10 million people, most of whom needed to overcome skill challenges to be competitive in the labor market. Despite these challenges, placement rates for many programs were over 70 percent and rising for the third consecutive year.

Contact Info

Ronald D. Painter
National Association of Workforce Boards
(202) 857-7900 | painterr@nawb.org
PART 3: THE GATEWAY TO OPPORTUNITY

Higher Education
Section Overview

Part 3: Higher Education

President Trump’s FY 2021 budget would make college more expensive for low- and middle-income students. It includes massive reductions in funding or elimination of programs across the full range of higher education programs, totaling $2.2 billion in the annually appropriated programs, and $190 billion over 10 years in student loans. The budget also reflects the Administration’s approach to reauthorization of the Higher Education Act (HEA), including proposals for “one grant-one loan,” restructuring work-study, changing student loan repayment plans, and program consolidations.

The cornerstone of federal student financial aid is the Pell Grant program, which provides grant aid to the neediest college students. The president’s budget provides sufficient discretionary and mandatory funding to maintain the current maximum grant level of $6,345. However, the budget also expands the program to include eligibility for short-term credential and licensure programs that lead to immediate high-need employment and moves the Iraq and Afghanistan Service Grants into the program, without providing additional funding for these expansions.

The budget eliminates funding for the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG) program, which provides up to $4,000 in institutionally matched grant aid for the poorest students. Funding for the Federal Work-Study (FWS) program is cut by more than 50 percent and is restructured to be available only for undergraduate students in job training, rather than student aid, thus cutting the number of recipients in half.

Federal student loans are completely revamped in the budget proposal. Most importantly, the budget eliminates subsidized loans, meaning the government would no longer pay the interest on loans while students are in school. This program is need based and is targeted at low-income students, most of whom are Pell Grant recipients. If this budget were enacted, low-income students’ loans would immediately cost $5,000 more on average. Eliminating this provision returns $18 billion to the U.S. Treasury over 10 years.

Other student loan changes are related to repayment. The budget eliminates the Public Service Loan Forgiveness (PSLF) program, which forgives loans for borrowers working in various public service fields or certain types of nonprofits after 120 payments (equivalent to 10 years of monthly payments). This cuts $52 billion over 10 years in borrower benefits. The budget also replaces the existing repayment plans with one income-driven repayment plan. The new plan caps monthly payments at 12.5 percent of discretionary income, up from 10 percent currently, but provides forgiveness of the loans after 15 years of repayment (from 20 currently) for borrowers with only undergraduate loans. For borrowers with any graduate debt, forgiveness is provided after 30 years, a significant increase over the 10, 20, or 25 years currently for those borrowers, depending on their plan.

Important programs that promote access to college, enhance academic preparation and support services, and assist low-income and first-generation students to succeed in postsecondary education are also cut. The budget eliminates funding for Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP), and consolidates its activities into a restructured TRIO program funded through a state formula grant mechanism. In addition to consolidating the programs, TRIO funding is cut $140 million, asking states to do more with less.

For the Strengthening Institutions programs, the budget freezes funding for Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Tribally Controlled Colleges, while consolidating $196 million in funding from six existing programs to create a new Minority-Serving Institutions program that would be distributed as a state formula grant. These programs help specific categories of institutions that focus on traditionally underserved and underrepresented populations, such as Hispanic-Serving Institutions, Native American-Serving Institutions, Asian American and Pacific Islander Institutions, and Predominantly Black Institutions.
Four other small but important higher education programs are also eliminated in the FY 2021 budget: Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN), the only grant aid available through the Department of Education for graduate students in the humanities; Title VI-International Education and Foreign Language Studies; the Teacher Quality Partnership program that supports partnerships between local school districts and higher education institutions to produce skilled teachers; and the Fund for Improvement in Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) which funds pilot and experimental projects for innovations in higher education.

The higher education community is very concerned about the budget put forward by the president. While the changes to income-driven repayment ultimately may reduce the cost to some undergraduate borrowers, that proposal is more than offset by the significant increase in the cost of borrowing for low-income students, graduate students, and students in public interest fields. Combined with unprecedented funding cuts to need-based student aid and reductions in other forms of support for low- and middle-income families, enactment of this budget would have a devastating impact on the ability of students to attend and afford college and for borrowers to manage their debt.

CEF members look forward to working with Congress to ensure funding is maintained for federal student aid programs and other higher education programs supporting students throughout their college careers at levels that ensure access, affordability, and completion for low- and middle-income students.

Number of Recipients by Federal Aid Program (with Average Aid Received)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Aid Program</th>
<th>Number of Recipients (in Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Federal Education Tax Benefits ($1,520)</td>
<td>10.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Pell Grant ($4,150)</td>
<td>6.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Subsidized and Unsubsidized Loans ($9,050)</td>
<td>7.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Subsidized Loans ($3,910)</td>
<td>5.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Unsubsidized Loans ($7,490)</td>
<td>6.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSEOG ($500)</td>
<td>1.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Work-Study ($1,650)</td>
<td>613,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post/9-11 GI Bill Benefits ($15,990)</td>
<td>699,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: The College Board, Trends in Student Aid 2019, Figure 7.
Federal Support Falls to Less Than 60% of Undergraduate Student Aid

Billions of 2017 Constant Dollars

SOURCE: The College Board, Trends in Student Aid 2019, Figure 3.
Total Grant Aid by Source of Grant

1998-1999 to 2018-2019

SOURCE: The College Board, Trends in Student Aid 2019, Figure 5.
Maylene is a senior at the University of Massachusetts Amherst majoring in sociology and education policy. Her interest in education finance policies was first piqued during a gap year volunteer position in a Boston fourth-grade classroom. As she watched many of her students struggle to meet state education standards, she questioned how school funding mechanisms impacted the quality of her students’ schooling. Like many others who first enter the field of education, Maylene was shocked to learn about the role of property taxes in school budgets and the inequitable resource allocation that can occur as a result of residential segregation.

Maylene continued to pursue her interest in education policy at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, taking a combination of undergraduate and graduate courses in Sociology and Education to further contextualize how education finance policies can combat or reinforce educational disparities. Coincidentally, she also obtained a position at the University’s financial aid office, sparking her interest in higher education finance. Maylene loves her job and has sought additional opportunities to deepen her knowledge of education finance policies, including an internship with the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA) where she worked with NASFAA’s policy team to advocate for policies that would benefit financial aid administrators and promote student success. As a result of her experiences both in and out of the classroom during her time at UMass Amherst, Maylene is looking forward to pursuing a career in financial aid administration after graduating in May 2020.

None of these opportunities would have been possible for Maylene without the help of the Federal Pell Grant program. As a first-generation student, she worried she would not be able to afford college. However, the Pell grant provided Maylene with peace of mind, allowing her to navigate higher education without having to worry about how she would pay her tuition bill. With the help of the Pell Grant, Maylene has been able to focus on opportunities and extracurricular activities that have equipped her with the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in the financial aid profession.

The Federal Pell Grant Program, the largest grant program administered by the U.S. Department of Education, provides grants to low-income undergraduate students to help 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 dollars augment the discretionary funding.
### PELL GRANTS: COSTS, FUNDING, AND MAXIMUM AWARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding and Costs (in billions of dollars)</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 President’s Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Appropriations</td>
<td>$22.475</td>
<td>$22.475</td>
<td>$22.475</td>
<td>$22.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Resources Available for Discretionary Award</td>
<td>$1.334</td>
<td>$1.370</td>
<td>$1.405</td>
<td>$1.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Spending (BA) for Inflationary Add-on</td>
<td>$5.977</td>
<td>$5.388</td>
<td>$5.738</td>
<td>$5.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescission of Unobligated Balances</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>-$0.6</td>
<td>-$0.5</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Costs</td>
<td>$30.584</td>
<td>$28.280</td>
<td>$29.631</td>
<td>$30.384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Award (in actual dollars)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Maximum Award</td>
<td>$5,035</td>
<td>$5,135</td>
<td>$5,285</td>
<td>$5,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Funding</td>
<td>$1,060</td>
<td>$1,060</td>
<td>$1,060</td>
<td>$1,060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 2017 reflects $22.475 billion in appropriations minus a rescission of $1.31 billion of previously appropriated funding.
FY 2019 reflects $22.475 billion in appropriations minus a rescission of $600 million of previously appropriated funding.
FY 2020 reflects $22.475 billion in appropriations minus a rescission of $500 million of previously appropriated funding.
In addition to these discretionary amounts, Pell grants have had varying levels of mandatory funding since FY 2008.
As shown in the chart above, the president’s budget freezes the maximum award at $6,345, through a combination of discretionary and mandatory funding, and is sufficient to cover that amount. A provision in the College Cost Reduction and Access Act of 2007 to index the annual maximum Pell Grant award to the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) expired after FY 2017, but Congress has chosen to increase the maximum grant each year since then. The president does not propose extending the inflation adjustment or any increase to the maximum award at all, thereby decreasing the purchasing power of the Pell Grant.

The president’s budget does not include a rescission to the unobligated balances in the Pell Grant program as seen in previous years’ budgets. It does, however, expand Pell Grant eligibility to incarcerated students and students enrolled in short-term programs, but does so without providing increases in discretionary funding. Because the program operates as an entitlement, expanding eligibility to more students without increasing discretionary funding moves the program closer to a funding shortfall in the event appropriated funds do not cover an upward fluctuation in enrollment. Estimates of current Pell Grant spending anticipate a depletion of the program’s reserves within the next four fiscal years if Congress freezes the maximum grant at the FY 2020 level and continues to appropriate the same amount of new discretionary funding each year, along with a $500 million rescission to the unobligated balances in the program. However, any economic downturn can significantly exacerbate this timeline as Pell Grant participation is increased by displaced workers and others pursuing postsecondary education to retool.
Almost One-Third of Undergraduates Receive Pell Grants

About 7 million students rely on Pell Grants to attend and afford college. Students and institutions depend on the federal government to maintain consistent support to make higher education access possible for all. Therefore, it is critical Congress provide sufficient funding in FY 2021 to increase the maximum Pell grant amount to $7,000. This increase to the maximum grant, which goes beyond simply keeping pace with inflation, represents a critical first step toward fully restoring the Pell Grant’s purchasing power.

In addition, the annual inflation adjustment to the maximum award, which expired in FY 2017, should be restored for FY 2021 and years moving forward to ensure the Pell Grant keeps pace with inflation. Further, Congress should avoid continued rescissions of the unobligated balances in Pell. These important funds protect the program from enrollment fluctuations to ensure low-income students have the opportunity to receive need-based grants to pursue postsecondary education.

CONTACT INFO

Rachel Gentry
National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators
(202) 785-6948  |  gentryr@nasfaa.org
Pell Grant Recipients by Type and Control of Institution

SOURCE: FY 2021 U.S. Department of Education Congressional Budget Justification
Maximum Pell Grant No Longer Covers Much of Average Cost of College

Fanuel Achinda is a freshman at Rockhurst University studying biology with an emphasis in forensics and leadership studies. Achinda was born in the United States but lived much of his early life in Tanzania with his mother Anna, his father Robert, and seven brothers and sisters. In 2011, his siblings and mother moved to Vermont, where Achinda’s father had moved six years prior. Fanuel joined his family the next year. The siblings relied on each other as they navigated the challenges of settling in a new country, new schools, and a new life.

In 2015, Achinda’s father died from pancreatic cancer, a seismic loss for the family. In the wake of that tragedy, Fanuel and his older brother stepped up as leaders, together serving as family decision makers along with his mother. Fanuel also worked as a sous chef while attending high school to support his family, enjoying the challenge and creativity that cooking allowed him. As he navigated this period of change and loss, he also overcame a heart murmur and made the Webster Groves High School soccer team, helping as the team played its way to the state championship finals in 2018.

His father’s death motivated him to pursue medicine, hoping he could someday make a difference in others’ lives. Hoping to make that dream a reality, when choosing a college, financial aid was an important factor. The aid package offered by Rockhurst, including a Supplemental Education Opportunity Grant, was critical in allowing him to attend a four-year university where he could begin to pursue his ultimate goal of becoming a trauma surgeon. Achinda has found his fit at Rockhurst, drawn to the community feel and rigorous academics. He got involved immediately in several campus organizations such as Voices for Justice, the campus social justice group, Student Senate, Student Activities Board, and the Black Student Union. Never one to shrink from a challenge, he said these opportunities have taught him valuable lessons about leadership and broadened his perspective.

The Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG) provides up to $4,000 in additional aid to Pell Grant recipients. Originally created as the campus-based partner to the federal Pell Grant (originally Basic Educational Opportunity Grant or BEOG), federal SEOG dollars are matched by participating institutions to generate more than $1 billion in grant aid for low-income students. In addition to being a core part of a financial aid package, the flexibility of the campus-based program allows financial aid officers to help students if their financial situation drastically changes due to life circumstances.

More than 1.7 million students receive SEOG grants at roughly 3,700 institutions nationwide. In 2017-18, approximately 70 percent of dependent SEOG recipients came from families with an annual income of less than $30,000. The average award is $672, which helps students not have to work or borrow more to pay for college.
IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget eliminates all funding for the SEOG program, cutting $865 million. The more than 1.7 million SEOG recipients would lose critical grant aid if the president’s budget were enacted, causing students to face the tough choice of borrowing more to pay for college or dropping out because they cannot afford their education.

PROGRAM NEED

Instead of eliminating funding for SEOG, the program level should be increased to $1.052 billion. This additional funding would restore the purchasing power for students to the pre-sequester levels with inflation. Studies show additional grant aid makes a significant difference in low-income students persisting to completion, allowing students to focus on academics, rather than worrying about the need to work or borrow more to pay for their education.

CONTACT INFO

Jenny Smulson
Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities
(202) 862-9893  |  jsmulson@ajcunet.edu

Stephanie Giesecke
National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities
(202) 739-0461  |  stephanie@naicu.edu
Federal Work-Study Program (FWS)

**Title IV, Part C, Higher Education Act**

Morgan always knew she wanted to attend college. Her mother had been able to attend college with the help of an employer who paid for her education, but Morgan was very concerned about the cost of college and incurring significant debt. When she decided on the University of Maryland, College Park, she completed the FAFSA and was informed she qualified for Federal Work-Study (FWS).

Throughout her undergraduate career, Morgan worked as a FWS student with an afterschool mentorship and math tutoring program called America Counts. A partnership between the university and Prince George’s County Public Schools, America Counts aims to provide a high-quality mentoring program that enriches learning opportunities for college students, elementary school students, and the local community. Her job with America Counts allowed Morgan to earn income throughout her undergraduate career and graduate with significantly less student debt than she would have otherwise, but the impact of this FWS job went far beyond providing financial resources that helped pay for college. While Morgan initially joined America Counts because she was eligible to receive Federal Work-Study, her involvement in the program as a FWS student cultivated her passion for education and put her on the path to her dream career.

The professional experience and skills Morgan gained through her Federal Work-Study job helped her be successful after graduation in May 2018. Her FWS position gave her the passion and qualifications necessary to be admitted to Urban Teachers, a program through which she is completing a master’s in education at the Johns Hopkins University and teaching full-time in Baltimore City Public Schools. In her own words, Morgan shared, “Federal Work-Study was the key to successfully completing my undergraduate degree and landing my dream job. I thoroughly believe I would not be living my dream had I not received Federal Work-Study, which introduced me to the America Counts program and my passion for education.”

**DESCRIPTION**

The Federal Work-Study (FWS) program provides awards to institutions assisting needy students in financing college costs through part-time employment. The program offers a cost-effective strategy for the federal government since both institutions and employers must have “skin in the game” through matching federal dollars and promoting institutional commitment to federal student aid. To receive FWS funds, institutions must use at least 7 percent of their FWS allocation to employ students in jobs that serve the needs of the community and provide students an enriching and rewarding experience. 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 employment opportunities. The FWS program provides students with much needed funding and employment opportunities, helping integrate students into college life while promoting persistence through graduation. Today students at approximately 3,400 participating postsecondary institutions are eligible to receive work-study funding. Of dependent undergraduate FWS recipients in 2017-18, 45 percent had family incomes below $42,000.
FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,130.00</td>
<td>$1,130.00</td>
<td>$1,180.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The Administration’s FY 2021 budget cuts FWS by 58 percent to $500 million. According to the Department of Education, this request would cut the number of work-study recipients by 57 percent, amounting to 416,000 fewer recipients. If enacted, this would amount to the largest percentage cut and the largest dollar-for-dollar cut in the program’s history.

Because of the current “base guarantee” component of the FWS allocation formula which ensures funds to institutions at the level of their award year 1999-2000 allocation, a large cut to FWS will have dramatically different implications for different institutions. Based on an analysis by the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA), FWS funding at a level less than approximately $660 million would mean institutions would receive — at most — the base guarantee as their total allocation in award year 2021-22, with no funding for the “fair share” portion. If the budget were enacted with only $500 million for FWS, institutions would receive approximately 75 percent of their “base guarantee” and no “fair share” funds, a potentially devastating cut particularly for those institutions with low “base guarantee” allocations.

The budget also would revise the FWS allocation formula and restrict eligibility to undergraduate students. In 2017-18, 44,751 graduate students – 7.3 percent of all recipients – received work-study support, the only non-loan source of federal student aid still available to graduate students.
Rather than cutting funding for FWS, the program level should be increased to $1.467 billion. Federal Work-Study ensures availability of job opportunities to help students complete their degrees in a timely manner. Cuts to the program hinder students’ ability to finance their education, likely resulting in higher college debt. In addition to earning money to help pay for postsecondary expenses, students gain valuable work experience through FWS, enabling them to be more competitive in today’s workforce. At a time when work experience is more valuable than ever, work-study represents an already effective program that multiplies federal dollars through institutional and employer matching to aid students with the necessary funds to complete their college degree.

CONTACT INFO

Rachel Gentry
National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators
(202) 785-6948 | gentryr@nasfaa.org

William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program

Title IV, Part D, Higher Education Act

Born in Missoula, Montana, Cody Meixner attended the University of Montana where he studied political science and government and served as the president of the student government association. To cover the cost of attending college, Cody relied on financial aid, including the Pell Grant, Federal Work-Study, Federal Direct Loans, and the Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG). Cody graduated from the University of Montana in 2016 and, with the help of the Graduate PLUS program, enrolled at the American University Washington College of Law. He earned his JD in 2019 and is now a practicing attorney focusing on higher education law while completing his MPA by taking his final three courses online. Cody shared the following about his experience with federal student aid:

“Without financial aid, I may not have had access to higher education. As a first-generation college student from a low-income background, I depended heavily upon financial aid such as the Pell Grant, SEOG, and federal loans to help balance classes, extracurricular activities, and multiple jobs. These experiences not only keep students busy but are integral to developing well-rounded graduates with the skills to become employed after graduation and continue to contribute to society. Though I would certainly have preferred additional grant funding, the federal student loans I receive made it possible to complete my undergraduate and law degrees and pursue a career that I love while wrapping up my master’s degree. Thanks to federal student aid programs, I am now a practicing attorney and the first in my family to complete undergraduate and professional degrees.”
The Department of Education administers the primary and largest source of federal student loans, the Direct Loan program. Covering 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. The program also provides loan forgiveness options, a variety of fixed and income-driven repayment plans, and borrower protections to 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 linked student loan interest rates to pending market rates. As a result, 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 these 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. Direct Loan borrowers pay an origination fee on every new loan disbursed. Established in statute, for subsidized and unsubsidized loans the origination fee is 1 percent, and for PLUS loans the fee is 4 percent. Under the Budget Control Act, origination fees are increased annually based on the mandatory adjustment percentage provided by the Office of Management and Budget. For loans disbursed on or after October 1, 2019, the subsidized and unsubsidized loan fee is 1.059 percent, while the fee for PLUS loans is 4.236 percent.

President Trump eliminates the in-school interest subsidy for Federal Direct Loans for undergraduate students. The subsidy would be eliminated for new borrowers who receive their first loan on or after July 1, 2021, with an exception for students who borrowed their first loans prior to that date and who are borrowing to complete their current course of study. With graduate and professional students already removed from eligibility in 2011, eliminating the in-school interest subsidy for undergraduate students with financial need will result in increasing the costs of college by thousands of dollars. According to an analysis by the Institute for College Access and Success, a student starting school in 2018-19 who borrows the maximum aggregate subsidized loan amount ($23,000) and graduates in five years would enter repayment with $3,400 in additional student loan debt without the in-school interest subsidy.

The president’s budget would also limit the amount of loans graduate students and parents can borrow. All graduate borrowing would be consolidated under one graduate loan program with the same corresponding loan terms and conditions as current Graduate PLUS loans. Graduate students would have an annual borrowing limit of $50,000 and an aggregate cap of $100,000. Parent PLUS loans would have an aggregate limit of $26,500, the difference between eligible amounts for dependent and independent students ($31,000 and $57,500, respectively). Depending on their parents’ eligibility for borrowing, some dependent undergraduates may be eligible to borrow an additional amount, up to the independent undergraduate limit.
In addition, President Trump consolidates income-driven repayment (IDR) plans into a single plan: a new IDR plan with a discretionary income cap of 12.5 percent and a 15-year repayment term for undergraduates, but a 30-year repayment term for graduate students. The new plan would be the only income-driven repayment option for borrowers who originate their first loan on or after July 1, 2021, "with an exception for students who borrowed their first loans prior to July 1, 2021, and who are borrowing to complete their current course of study." Those borrowers would retain access to the current slate of income-driven repayment options.

The president’s budget also eliminates the Public Service Loan Forgiveness (PSLF) program. The same grandfathering provisions for the elimination of subsidized loans and the new income-driven repayment plan would apply to PSLF: borrowers who originated their first loan before July 1, 2021, would be eligible for PSLF. The elimination of PSLF would have severe consequences for public service professions nationwide.

**PROGRAM NEED**

Under sequestration imposed by the Budget Control Act, loan origination fees are increased annually based on the mandatory adjustment percentage provided by the Office of Management and Budget. Origination fee increases present great unpredictability for students and a heavy administrative burden for financial aid administrators, as both are forced to make adjustments in the middle of an award year, creating confusion for students and families.

Students depend on federal student loans, a form of self-help aid, to finance the cost of college. The restoration of eligibility for graduate and professional students for the in-school interest subsidy would aid our nation’s commitment to advanced education while limiting student debt. Ensuring the in-school interest subsidy remains in place for undergraduates also remains an important priority.

**CONTACT INFO**

Rachel Gentry  
National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators  
(202) 785-6948  |  gentryr@nasfaa.org
Total Annual Amount Borrowed in Federal Subsidized, Unsubsidized, and PLUS Loans

![Bar chart showing annual amounts borrowed in millions of 2018 dollars for undergraduate and graduate students.](chart.png)

**Source:** The College Board, Trends in Student Aid 2019, Figure 9A.
Public Service Loan Forgiveness

Title IV, Part D, Section 455 of the Higher Education Act

“PSLF has allowed me to serve the community as a prosecutor working to seek justice in every case. The financial burden of student loans would have made this impossible without PSLF. It has opened doors to people who traditionally wouldn’t be able to makes ends meet to do this important work. Opening those doors to people with different backgrounds and different perspectives creates a broader conversation on how to achieve the justice we seek.”

— Lisa Franchini
Successful PSLF Program Participant

DESCRIPTION

Created in 2007 with large bipartisan support, the Public Service Loan Forgiveness (PSLF) program is an education and workforce investment initiative for federal student loan borrowers who enter and persist in public service fields. PSLF allows borrowers who make 120 qualifying monthly payments while working full-time for an eligible public service employer to have the remaining balance of their qualifying federal Direct Loans forgiven.

PSLF was created before Direct Loans became the primary federal loan borrowers use to finance their education and before numerous other income-driven repayment plans were introduced. Thus, the repayment criteria left many borrowers believing they would qualify, only to find out later they were enrolled in repayment plans that didn’t qualify. To address this problem, in 2018 Congress created an additional fund — known as the Temporary Expanded Public Service Loan Forgiveness Fund (TEPSLF) — that would allow those in ineligible repayment plans to become eligible and apply for loan forgiveness.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$350.00*</td>
<td>$350.00*</td>
<td>$50.00*</td>
<td>$0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PSLF is a mandatory spending program; thus, it does not need an annual appropriation. The amounts listed are for the TEPSLF fund operated out of the Department of Education. TEPSLF is a congressional creation, and the president has never requested funds for this programmatic fix.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2021 budget eliminates the PSLF program and does not request funds for the TEPSLF program.
PROGRAM NEED

Graduates employed in public service provide an immeasurable benefit to American society. Thus, increasing the quantity and quality of graduates who pursue public interest work should be a priority for the federal government. PSLF was created to do just that. The goals of the PSLF program are to encourage individuals to enter public service fields, create incentives that promote a long-term commitment to public service, and increase vital services to individuals, states, and the nation. Hence, the primary benefit of PSLF derives from the value that directly accrues to the beneficiaries of those services and society in general.

Additionally, students who pursue postsecondary education, especially those attending graduate or professional school, should be free to give back to society without the long-term burden of student loan debt. PSLF makes it feasible for professionals to enter public service careers, such as teaching, legal aid, and law enforcement, which are typically compensated at a level that can make it difficult for them to repay their student loans.

With education costs continuing to rise and workforce shortages in high-need areas, the PSLF program is more important than ever. Therefore, it is not only critical that Congress protect the main program from elimination, but it must also provide an adequate funding stream for borrowers who completed all other aspects of the program but were denied due to immaterial technicalities. In short, Congress must 1) maintain the program and its mandatory funding stream, and 2) raise the TEPSLF program funding level back to $350 million per year until a broader permanent solution for ineligible borrowers can be achieved through a reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

CONTACT INFO

Monica Konaté
AccessLex Institute
(202) 596-3193 | mkonate@accesslex.org
Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education Grant Program (TEACH)

Title IV, Part A, Subpart 9, Higher Education Act

"I knew I could not depend on my parents or family members to help me pay for college, no matter how much they might like to. My dream of teaching someday seemed daunting and almost impossible as I imagined going into debt and spending the rest of my life paying that debt off like my parents have. A miracle came about, however, in the form of a teacher (of course) who advised me to consider the TEACH grant. This grant has allowed me to make it through most of my schooling with little to no loans at all, and my plan now is to have all of my schooling paid off within four years (if not less) of graduating! The truth is that I am terrified of going into debt, because I have seen the effects it has on a person, a family, and their future. I have not had to worry about this, however, due to this grant. The money has been used to pay for books, some of tuition, transportation, and a computer to do my work. I still work two jobs, and I am barely making ends meet... But the big expenses have been taken care of, and that has made all the difference! I appreciate this help to no end, and know that I can only do my best to pay it forward by teaching children to become the people they are meant to be, so they can one day lead our great nation well in the future!"

— Alecia Alford, Northwestern State University, Natchitoches, LA

DESCRIPTION

A mandatory spending program subject to sequestration, the TEACH grant program provides up to $4,000 annually for a maximum total of $16,000 in grant aid to undergraduate and post-baccalaureate students who plan to become teachers of high-need subjects (e.g., 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-need subjects. Students must maintain a 3.25 GPA to remain eligible to receive TEACH grants. 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 to be repaid with interest. For budget and financial management purposes, the TEACH grant program is operated as a loan program with 100 percent forgiveness of outstanding principal and interest upon completion of the service component.

FUNDING HISTORY (aid available in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$92.00</td>
<td>$85.50</td>
<td>$92.00</td>
<td>$93.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

President Trump’s budget maintains funding for the TEACH Grant program in support of an estimated 32,000 recipients. The TEACH grant program will continue to increase the number of profession-ready educators teaching high-need subjects in high-need schools.
For the 2019-20 academic year, the maximum award has been reduced by 5.9 percent to a cap of $3,764 due to sequestration. This reduction in grant aid transfers the financial burden to students on the path to becoming educators and may result in increased need of financial aid assistance, such as loans, to obtain their degree.

Currently enrollment in teacher preparation programs is declining while teacher shortages are on the rise. TEACH grants represent a vital federal commitment to the future of the teaching profession. With the ever-increasing costs of higher education and a concern about debt for professionals in a field with historically lower salaries, TEACH grants assist candidates in managing their debt load and pursuing their teaching careers. Over the last five award years, grants have been distributed to more than 150,000 teacher candidates in high-need subject areas who maintain at least a 3.25 GPA and commit to four-year service obligations in high-need schools. The TEACH grant program has been successful in attracting teachers to work in the highest need classrooms across the nation and have assisted students in all 50 states, Puerto Rico, and Guam during the 2018-19 academic year.

Deborah Koolbeck
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
(202) 478-4506 | dkoolbeck@aacte.org
High School Equivalency Program (HEP) and College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP)

Title IV, Part A, Subpart 5, Higher Education Act

Kimberly Luna began her educational journey with CAMP at Boise State University. While in the CAMP program, Kimberly applied for the National HEP/CAMP Association Internship and was one of four interns selected for a congressional internship. As an intern in the office of U.S. Representative Ruben Hinojosa, Kimberly quickly learned she wanted to pursue a degree in public service. While at Boise State, Kimberly was able to complete additional internships and get involved with local nonprofits. Her desire and motivation to continue into graduate studies led her to become a Ronald E. McNair scholar where she completed a research study on Idaho’s farmworkers. Kimberly received a Bachelor of Science in Political Science with an emphasis in public policy and international relations. After graduating from Boise State, Kimberly went on to complete a Master’s in Public Policy from the University of California, Riverside where she focused her studies on Urban Regional Policy. Kimberly is the first in her household to receive a graduate degree. She has set a precedent in her household of making college degrees attainable. Her long-term goals are to continue her education by pursuing an additional degree and to one day become a City Manager for a local municipality. Kimberly is thankful for the critical support CAMP provided during her undergraduate journey, because without CAMP’s initial guidance and support, this journey would not have been possible.

DESCRIPTION

For nearly five decades, the High School Equivalency Program (HEP) and College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) projects have successfully closed the access and completion gaps for children of agricultural workers. HEP and CAMP are the only federal programs that provide this student population with the educational opportunities and supports to succeed in higher education. HEP recruits children of agricultural workers ages 16 and over, providing academic and comprehensive support services to help them obtain a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) and gain employment or admission to postsecondary institutions or training programs. CAMP assists students in their first year of college with academic and personal counseling, stipends, and other support services, and helps students obtain financial aid for their remaining undergraduate education. Currently there are approximately 100 HEP and CAMP programs at institutions of higher education throughout the United States.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$44.62</td>
<td>$44.62</td>
<td>$45.62</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates the HEP program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding. The CAMP program funding is also eliminated and consolidated into the TRIO Student Supports Block Grant.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2021 budget defunds the HEP and CAMP programs and consolidates activities into two new block grants. This would leave decisions to individual states regarding how much, if any, funding would be allocated for HEP and CAMP programs. Funding for HEP and CAMP is needed for academic support and other support services critical to helping students succeed. The HEP and CAMP programs are in high demand, and more funding is required to meet the needs of children of agricultural workers to ensure they have access to greater educational and job opportunities. HEP and CAMP support a unique population of students with a unique set of challenges that cannot be adequately addressed with a one-size-fits-all program.
Current funding supports more than 100 HEP and CAMP projects. HEP services are available to 5,700 students, and 2,500 students receive 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 an equal opportunity to receive a quality education.

Children of agricultural workers are among the most disadvantaged and 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 children of agricultural workers 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 is able to provide services in flexible locations at times that meet the needs of this working population, and CAMP supports students during their first year of college.

**CONTACT INFO**

Irene Bueno  
National HEP/CAMP Association  
(202) 540-1070 | ibueno@nvgllc.com
Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU)

**Title III, Parts B, C, D, and F, Higher Education Act**

“Coming from my hometown of Portland, Oregon, living in the South and going to an HBCU was a huge culture shock! But ultimately what I learned about myself – acceptance, pride, history – I could not have learned nor appreciated as much from a PWI (predominantly white institution).

Bennett’s nurturing environment inspired my confidence and sharpened my academic skills and gave me the opportunity to explore the vast possibilities for my life alongside women who encouraged me and inspired me to make bold choices. Attending Bennett reminded me that black people, especially black women, have paved the way for scholarship, creative arts, activism and progress in this country. By attending Bennett, I was essentially charged with not only educating myself but educating others. I am a veteran teacher and librarian and took my activism and sense of justice and equity I learned at Bennett and have used it to create educational opportunities for my students here in L.A. I proudly display my Bennett pennant in my office and on Fridays wear my Bennett sweater for college awareness day.

Black college alumni are resilient and resourceful. Attending an HBCU cultivated confidence both personally and professionally. What I learned stepping on campus for the first time as a young and insecure 17-year-old transformed me into the courageous woman I am today.”

— Cynthia Benin Lemus, Bennett College, Class of 1994

**DESCRIPTION**

HBCUs represent only 3 percent of all colleges and universities, but enroll 10 percent of African American undergraduates, produce 16 percent of the nation’s African American college graduates with bachelor’s degrees, and award 21 percent of African Americans with bachelor degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields. In addition, these institutions well exceed the return on the nation’s investment: While they comprise only 8.5 percent of four-year institutions in their states, they enroll 24 percent of all black undergraduates pursuing a bachelor’s degree, award on average 26 percent of all black bachelor’s degrees, and award on average 32 percent of STEM degrees earned by black students.

Today nearly 300,000 students attend HBCUs which include two- and four-year, public and private, and single-sex and coed institutions, located primarily in Southern states. HBCUs disproportionately enroll low-income, first-generation college students – precisely the students the country should support to obtain college degrees.

The HEA authorizes the following programs that benefit HBCUs:

**Strengthening HBCUs (Title III, Parts B and C)**

Strengthening HBCUs (Section 323) provides foundational institutional support to accredited HBCUs. Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions (Section 326) provides support to HBCU post-baccalaureate and professional programs in medicine, law, veterinary medicine, and other disciplines.

**Endowment Challenge Grants (Title III, Part C)**

Endowment Challenge Grants provide matching grants to increase HBCU endowment funds. Title III programs are the cornerstone of federal support to HBCUs, providing critical operating and capital resources for institutions. Title III discretionary funding provides support for undergraduate and graduate education programs and support services essential for student success. Title III mandatory funding supplements and works in conjunction with the discretionary formula program to enhance academic instruction at HBCUs, especially in the STEM fields.
HBCU Capital Financing Program (Title III, Part D)

The HBCU Capital Financing Program provides HBCUs with access to low-interest loans not available elsewhere to support the repair, renovation, and construction or acquisition of educational facilities, instructional equipment, and physical infrastructure. As a result of these investments, HBCUs are able to provide students with enhanced learning and living environments, rebuild and restore historic buildings, and provide jobs in communities still feeling the effects of the Great Recession.

Minority Science and Engineering Improvement Program (Title III, Part E)

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 eligible to receive funding under Title III and V of the HEA are able to receive assistance under MSEIP.

Master’s Degree Programs at HBCUs (Title VII, Subpart 4)

The Master’s Degree Program at HBCUs (Section 723) provides funding to 18 HBCUs to improve graduate education opportunities at the master’s level in mathematics, engineering, physical or natural sciences, computer science, information technology, nursing, allied health, or other scientific disciplines where African American students are underrepresented.

**FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening HBCUs (discretionary)</td>
<td>$ 279.62</td>
<td>$ 282.42</td>
<td>$ 324.79</td>
<td>$ 324.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(mandatory)*</td>
<td>$ 79.39</td>
<td>$ 79.73</td>
<td>$ 79.99</td>
<td>$ 85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening HBGIs</td>
<td>$ 72.31</td>
<td>$ 73.04</td>
<td>$ 84.00</td>
<td>$ 84.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree Programs at HBCUs and PBIs</td>
<td>$ 8.57</td>
<td>$ 8.66</td>
<td>$ 9.96</td>
<td>$ 9.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEIP</td>
<td>$ 11.03</td>
<td>$ 11.14</td>
<td>$ 12.64</td>
<td>$ 150.00</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 of the HEA. Amounts include sequester reductions of 6.9 percent in 2017, 6.6 percent in 2018, and 6.2 percent in 2019.

**IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET**

The Administration’s budget freezes funding for most programs in title III, but significantly increases funding for the MSEIP to fund STEM-based projects led by HBCUs and MSIs located in Opportunity Zones. The Department of Education notes the FY 2021 budget is “consistent with the President’s Executive Order on HBCUs, which calls for efforts to strengthen the capacity of HBCUs to provide the highest-quality education and to provide opportunities for HBCU participation in Federal programs.” HBCUs enroll nearly 300,000 students and need greater resources to allow more students to avail themselves of high-quality postsecondary education opportunities. Collectively, these institutions yield nearly $15 billion in annual economic impact for the nation. It is highly recommended that Congress fully fund these vital institutions and not freeze funding in FY 2021.
PROGRAM NEED

HBCUs are an important strategy in closing the college attainment gap between minority and low-income students and their more advantaged peers. Despite the need, a wave of cutbacks beginning in FY 2011 have undermined the important work of HBCUs in giving students of color a strong postsecondary education. Increased federal investments are required to strengthen the capacity of HBCUs to prepare first-generation, low-income students of color for careers of success and service.

CONTACT INFO

Emmanuel A. Guillory
UNCF (United Negro College Fund, Inc.)
(202) 810-0173 | emmanuel.guillory@uncf.org

Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSI)

Title III, Part F; Title V, Parts A-B, Higher Education Act

Title V, Part A: As a direct result of receiving a Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions grant, California State University–San Marcos (CSUSM) created the Pathways to Academic Success and Opportunities (PASO) Center. The Center is dedicated to increasing retention and graduation rates amongst PASO Scholars by infusing culturally relevant curriculum, enhancing existing student support services, introducing innovative technological approaches, and striving to promote educational equity at the institutional level. The PASO Center helped increase overall Latino enrollment from 29 percent in Fall 2017 to 45 percent in Fall 2018 and Latino retention from 70 to 78 percent. PASO also helped increase financial aid application completion by Latinos and the number of applicants awarded financial aid. Eighty-three percent, or 421 of 509, PASO Scholars were selected for financial aid verification, and over 90 percent of the 421 completed the verification process. Overall, 88 percent of all PASO Scholars were awarded financial aid, a 30 percent improvement for Latino students.

Title V, Part B: The EPOCHS program was created at California State University-Fullerton (CSUF) using a Promoting Post Baccalaureate Opportunities for Hispanic Americans grant. EPOCH’s goal was to increase the number of Hispanic students who achieve a master’s degree at CSUF by increasing enrollment and improving persistence and graduation rates. This goal was approached through campus-wide student support services (new graduate student orientation, tutoring, workshops, handbook) and engagement activities (faculty mentoring, graduate assistantships, research grants, newsletter), plus improved campus culture through faculty training on cultural competency, equity, and inclusion in higher education.

Because of EPOCHS, enrollment of Hispanics in CSUF graduate degree programs increased by 80 percent (552 students) between 2010 and 2016, from 691 Hispanic students to 1,243. This increase occurred despite an overall decline in graduate student enrollment at California State Universities by all ethnicities. Hispanic graduate student representation improved from 15 percent to 23 percent (2010-16). Graduation rates increased, with a two-year graduation rate of 30 percent of Hispanic students in the 2010 entering class and 44 percent of Hispanic students in the 2013 entering class.

Title III, Part F With an HSI STEM grant, Laredo Community College, a Texas Hispanic-Serving Institution, created a summer bridge program to introduce students to STEM disciplines and careers. It incorporated a Summer Bridge experience for incoming college freshmen, focused on academic preparedness, hands on STEM activities, and developing interpersonal skills needed to succeed in college. Throughout the year, students received academic advising, tutoring, and mentoring, academic
assistance in bridging the transition to college, and progressing to a seamless transfer to a four-year university with an undergraduate research component. STEM student participants graduated at an average of 3.31 semesters (1-2 years) faster than non-STEM articulation students. Of 546 students participating in the STEM Program, 43.8 percent of students have graduated with an Associate in Science, Associate in Arts or an Associates in Applied Science Degree.

DESCRIPTION

Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions (Title V, Part A) provides 161 competitive grants to HSIs (31 percent of eligible schools), defined as nonprofit higher education institutions with enrollment of undergraduate full-time equivalent students at least 25 percent Hispanic. HSIs enroll and educate a disproportionate number of minority, low-income, and professional students. Program purposes are to expand educational opportunities for and improve academic attainment of Hispanic students and to expand and enhance academic offerings, program quality, and institutional stability of the institutions.

Funds may be used to purchase laboratory equipment and construct instructional facilities, support faculty development, and provide academic tutoring/counseling programs and student support services, such as outreach, mentoring, and fellowships. Other uses of funds include provision of administrative management, articulation agreements, program facilitation and education, and financial information to improve students’ financial and economic literacy. Five-year individual development grants and five-year cooperative arrangement development grants may be awarded under Title V, Part A.

Promoting Postbaccalaureate Opportunities for Hispanic Americans Program (Title V, Part B) funds 19 competitive grants to HSIs (41 percent of eligible schools) to provide graduate school opportunities and improved academic attainment for Hispanic students. Funds also support expanded postbaccalaureate academic offerings and enhanced program quality in postsecondary institutions educating the majority of Hispanic college students, helping large numbers of Hispanic and low-income students complete postsecondary degrees. To receive a PPOHA grant, a higher education institution must offer a postbaccalaureate certificate or program, 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) grants are competitively awarded to postsecondary institutions designated as HSIs. Grantees focus on increasing the number of Hispanic and other low-income students who attain degrees in STEM fields and developing model transfer and articulation agreements between two-year Hispanic-serving institutions and four-year institutions.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title III—Part F** (mandatory)</td>
<td>$ 93.40</td>
<td>$ 93.80</td>
<td>$ 94.10</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title V—Part A</td>
<td>$123.18</td>
<td>$124.42</td>
<td>$143.08</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title V—Part B</td>
<td>$11.05</td>
<td>$11.16</td>
<td>$12.84</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title V—Part B*** (mandatory)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$227.64</td>
<td>$229.38</td>
<td>$250.02</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* President’s budget eliminates both current HSI grant programs and consolidates them with most other Title III grant programs into one Title III/V Institutional Formula Grant.

** 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. Most recently, Title III, Part F was permanently extended with the enactment of the FUTURE Act on December 17, 2019.

*** $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.
The number of HSIs continues to grow as a larger number of Hispanic students access higher education, with recent year-to-year increases in HSIs of 30 institutions on average. President Trump’s FY 2021 budget for HSIs is shortsighted and fails yet again to accomplish the stated goal of the overall education budget to protect our nation’s most vulnerable students. For the third consecutive year, the budget consolidates most institutional development grant programs in HEA, Title III, and all HEA, Title V, grant programs into a single formula-based allocation. Such a drastic change, while also freezing funding at the FY 2020 levels, would negatively impact the way these critical grant programs serve their multiple purposes and does not take into account the annual growth of HSIs. This approach is counterproductive and will not help the 3.6 million Hispanic and other low-income and first-generation students achieve their dream of attaining higher education success.

In FY 2020 there will be a competition for Title V, Part A and Part B programs. Only 32 percent of HSIs currently have a Title V, Part A, grant, and only 6.8 percent have a Title V, Part B, grant. The FY 2021 budget would negatively affect HSIs by reducing Title V funds, used in serving the largest percentage of low-income, first-generation, and minority students who are 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 the 550 eligible institutions, an estimated 2.2 million Hispanic students, and the 4.5 million students of all races/ethnicities currently enrolled in HSIs.

Enrollments for 2017-2020 are National Center for Statistics estimates.

The number of HSIs is determined by institutional reporting to the Department of Education of yearly enrollments that includes data on student self-identified race and ethnicity. There are 550 HSIs according to the latest data from the 2018-19 academic year. Totals also include funding for the Hispanic-Serving Institutions Education Grants Program at the Department of Agriculture, $11.20 million in FY 2020; and the National Science Foundation HSI Program, funded at $45 million in FY 2020. Department of Education Grants include: STEM and Articulation Grant Program (HEA Title III-Part F) funded at $94.10 million in FY 2020; Developing Institutions (Title V-Part A) funded at $143.1 million in FY 2019; and, Promoting Postbaccalaureate Opportunities (Title V-Part B) funded at $12.84 million in FY 2020.
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 2011, HSIs received almost a third less federal funding on a per student basis as other institutions of higher education. The Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities advocates for a FY 2021 funding level for Title V, Part A, of $170 million and $35 million for Title V, Part B.

CONTACT INFO

John Aguilar
Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU)
(202) 261-2091 | john.aguilar@hacu.net

Tribal Colleges and Universities and Other Title III Programs

Title III, Parts A and F, Higher Education Act

“You are blessed with education right at home. Use it! Don’t ever give up learning Iñupiaq along the way too. It is who we are as people and how we have survived all these years. Someday, we will not be here anymore, and you all will have to carry on our traditions, our values, our way of life…”

— Iñupiaq Elder

On the expansive and isolated North Slope of Alaska, the Title III-TCU program has been essential in helping Ilisaġvik College meet its mission of providing academic and career/technical education in ways that strengthen Iñupiaq culture and language. With support from Title III-TCU, Ilisaġvik has been able to equip all classrooms with state-of-the-art interactive projectors and upgrade its technology infrastructure — including installing satellite internet, improving IT at village sites, acquiring smartboards, and enhancing its teleconference center. They have also hired an interdisciplinary faculty member to help transform teaching. To help students succeed, Ilisaġvik developed a tutoring program and an at-risk student task force, enhanced foundational studies, and launched new summer camps for future students.

DESCRIPTION

The goal of the Title III, Strengthening Institutions program is “to improve the academic quality, institutional management, and fiscal stability of eligible institutions, to increase their self-sufficiency and strengthen their capacity to make a substantial contribution to the higher education resources of the Nation.” The Title III program is vital to TCUs — geographically isolated, small, open-access institutions chartered by federally recognized Indian tribes or the federal government. The program is designed to address the critical, unmet needs of American Indian and Alaska Native students in order to effectively prepare them to succeed in a globally competitive workforce. The Title III-TCU program has two parts: Part A (discretionary, appropriated annually) and Part F (mandatory funding). Funding from both Parts A and F is distributed to the 35 accredited TCUs by formula.
FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTALLY CONTROLLED COLLEGES &amp; UNIVERSITIES</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary (Part A)</td>
<td>$31.54</td>
<td>$31.85</td>
<td>$36.63</td>
<td>$36.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory* (Part F)</td>
<td>$28.02</td>
<td>$28.14</td>
<td>$28.23</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

Under the president’s FY 2021 budget, Title III-TCU Part A (discretionary) would be frozen at the FY 2020 level. However, other complementary TCU programs within the U.S. Department of the Interior would be dramatically cut, further compounding decades of insufficient funding. Another year of inadequate funding would stifle the ability of TCUs to meet the changing needs of students seeking 21st century job skills, recruit and retain faculty, provide adequate student housing, and meet growing accreditation requirements. Because the number of TCUs continues to grow, each year of inadequate funding results in a cut to existing colleges. Four new TCUs have joined the Title III-TCU program since the funding high-water mark of FY 2010, resulting in a funding cut to the program since that year of more than $5 million.
As a nation, it is critical we make it easier for more Americans, including the first Americans, to access, affordably pay for, and complete a college degree or pursue a trade through a vocational/technical education program. This is a key part of the mission of each TCU, along with the goal of strengthening and preserving tribal culture, language, and homelands. TCUs provide access to quality, low-cost education to students from more than 30 states and more than 230 federally recognized tribes. An average annual tuition of $2,964 makes a TCU education the most affordable in the nation, critically important since 80 percent of TCU students receive federal financial aid. Because of the Title III program, TCUs are able to keep costs low, while continuing to innovate, serve more students, and meet extensive reporting and administrative requirements. These funds have been instrumental in advancing tribal colleges’ capacity to serve rural, isolated, and often impoverished communities by helping to build new classrooms and labs, provide safer campuses, develop new certificate and credentialing programs in key areas, train faculty in emerging best practices, and upgrade IT infrastructure.

**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, Sec. 317, if, at the time of application, it has an enrollment of undergraduate students of whom at least 20 percent are Alaska Native. A Native Hawaiian-serving institution may receive a grant under Sec. 317 if, at the time of application, its enrollment of undergraduate students is at least 10 percent Native Hawaiian students.

**Funding History (in millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>$15.77</td>
<td>$15.93</td>
<td>$18.32</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>$14.01</td>
<td>$14.07</td>
<td>$14.12</td>
<td>$0</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, Sec. 320, if, at the time of application, it has an enrollment of undergraduate students of whom at least 10 percent are Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander.

**Funding History (in millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>$3.83</td>
<td>$3.86</td>
<td>$4.44</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>$4.67</td>
<td>$4.69</td>
<td>$4.71</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Native American-Serving, Nontribal Institutions**
A Native American-serving, nontribal institution (NASNTI) may receive a grant under Title III, Sec. 319, if, at the time of application, it has an enrollment of undergraduate students of whom at least 10 percent are 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 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>$3.83</td>
<td>$3.86</td>
<td>$4.44</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>$4.67</td>
<td>$4.67</td>
<td>$4.71</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s budget eliminates funding for these programs and consolidates them with others into one Minority-Serving Institutions (MSI) Grant.
IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

Under the president’s FY 2021 budget, discretionary and mandatory funding for Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions (sections 317), Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions (section 319), and Native American-Serving, Nontribal Institutions (section 320), as well as Predominantly Black Institutions and Hispanic-Serving Institutions, is combined into one consolidated MSI Grant program. Under the current program, discretionary and mandatory funding is designated and distributed to institutions serving specific populations, and this consolidation would effectively eliminate targeted funding streams to critically underserved populations. It is unclear how the funding would be distributed under the president’s new program. For more on the impact, please see the Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSI) article in this publication on page 132.

CONTACT INFO

Patrese Atine  
American Indian Higher Education Consortium  
(703) 838-0400   |  patine@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**

The National Heritage Language Resource Center at UCLA is a federally funded center whose mission is to develop effective pedagogical approaches to teaching heritage language learners, both by creating a research base and by pursuing curriculum design, materials development, and teacher education. Over 57 million people in the United States speak a language other than English at home. Individuals exposed to a language other than English at home but educated primarily in English are heritage speakers of the home language. The creation of a national center dedicated to heritage language education attests to the importance of this field to the nation.

The NHLRC hosts professional conferences and workshops, publishes journals and white papers, conducts programming for heritage language speakers and the local community, and provides Americans with insights to the experience of heritage language speakers. Diminishing funding for the NHLRC and other Centers that depend on Title VI support threatens to erode our understanding of the experiences of those Americans who speak heritage languages at home and the path that brought them and their families to our country.

DESCRIPTION

The International Education and Foreign Language Studies (IEFLS) Domestic Programs support comprehensive language training, academic research and programming, intensive study of world areas and cultures, and extensive outreach to K-12 classrooms. In addition, funds support collaborations between four-year postsecondary institutions and community colleges and strong ties between U.S. 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. Programs also facilitate university collaborations on international issues with federal, state, and local agencies, business and industry, and the military.

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.

Title VI programs fund collaborations and partnerships among educational entities, businesses, governments, 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 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 that support academic year and summer fellowships for graduate and undergraduate level training at universities offering programs of excellence.
- Centers for International Business Education (CIBE) that focus comprehensive university expertise on improving international business education across disciplines.
- Language Resource Centers (LRCs) that support improvements in teaching and learning of less commonly taught foreign languages.

### FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Programs</td>
<td>$65.10</td>
<td>$65.10</td>
<td>$68.10</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Programs</td>
<td>$ 7.06</td>
<td>$ 7.06</td>
<td>$ 8.06</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The Administration’s FY 2021 budget eliminates funding for the Title VI Domestic and Overseas (Fulbright-Hays) Programs. The budget justification asserts the programs are “duplicative, ineffective, or more appropriately supported with State, local or private funds,” and claims that activities supported under Title VI “are better advanced by other agencies whose primary mission is national security.”

### PROGRAM NEED

Title VI programs are not duplicative and, in fact, serve as a national resource. For example, the National Resource Centers (NRC) program trains students, specialists, and scholars across the country and ensures the United States is ready to address vital demands in government, education, business, economics, foreign affairs, and defense, particularly in relation to less commonly taught languages and regions in America’s strategic interests. All Title VI programs expand access to international studies and language programs and help deliver global opportunities to a broader population. While maintaining a robust national security and intelligence apparatus focused on foreign languages and regions is vitally important, such programs serve dramatically different purposes than the programs targeted for elimination.

If funding for these programs is eliminated, the nation’s knowledge and expertise developed over the past 60 years with Title VI funding are at risk. A strong federal investment in Title VI is necessary to expand the nation’s capacity in international education, research, and foreign language studies. In an increasingly global economy, additional funds are needed to address the severe shortage of Americans with proficiency in less commonly taught languages and to strengthen the nation’s competitive advantage.

### CONTACT INFO

Crystal Martinez and Carl Welliver  
University of California  
(202) 974-6308 | crystal.martinez@ucdc.edu  
(202) 974-6302  | carl.welliver@ucdc.edu
Federal TRIO Programs

Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2, Higher Education Act

“My experience with TRIO was very remarkable. It really helped motivate me to pursue a doctorate degree. Coming from a small village, it was very meaningful because I would have never imagined that I would obtain the highest degree and become the first in my family to do so. The best impact that TRIO had in my life was that the program not only prepared me to be scholar practitioner, but also to be a change agent.”

– Dr. John Paul Abenojar, Arlington County

DESCRIPTION

The TRIO programs provide a pipeline of educational outreach and supportive services to more than 800,000 low-income students ranging from sixth graders to doctoral candidates, 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>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,010.00</td>
<td>$1,060.00</td>
<td>$1,090.00</td>
<td>$950.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget cuts funding for TRIO and consolidates it with GEAR UP and the CAMP program into the Student Supports Block Grant.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget for FY 2021 slashes TRIO funding by $140 million. The budget converts the Federal TRIO Programs from a set of federal competitive grant programs into a single state formula administered through a block grant that also includes the GEAR UP and CAMP programs. In addition to the consolidation of these programs, the Administration cuts overall funding, in effective eliminating TRIO. Through the creation of TRIO, the federal government assumed the role of ensuring that all students – regardless of background – have equal access to a college education. The general stagnation of higher education funding at the state level threatens the likelihood of such funds continuing to serve the needs of the least advantaged students. Without the intervention of the Federal TRIO Programs, students from low-income families, students who will be the first in their families to earn college degrees, students with disabilities, and other targeted categories of students would not receive the supportive
services necessary even to consider the possibility of college.

**PROGRAM NEED**

TRIO programs often make the difference in a student’s ability to attend and complete a college program. For low-income youth who would be the first members of their family to attend college, TRIO provides college coaching, experiential learning, and assistance in applying to and paying for college. For low-income, first-generation college students, TRIO offers academic tutoring, personal mentoring and advising, assistance with college transfer, and other retention services to ensure higher graduation rates. TRIO also provides adult learners with the opportunity to reorient themselves to the classroom and the supports necessary to balance higher education with the responsibilities of career and family.

**CONTACT INFO**

Stephanie Salvador  
Council for Opportunity in Education  
(202) 347-7430 | stephanie.salvador@coenet.org
Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP)

Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2, Higher Education Act

“I was born into a low-income, single-parent household in Las Vegas, Nevada and, because of this, opportunities such as receiving a college education seemed unattainable for me. This rang especially true for me in high school when I lost my parent to health complications and, subsequently, my home. During that time the odds of my success in life weren’t favorable, but my GEAR UP counselors saw me as a person rather than a statistic. They gave me community support and access to resources I needed to help me take a step beyond the life I knew.

With GEAR UP behind me, I became the only person in my family to attend and graduate college. I earned my bachelor’s degree in environmental engineering and have since become a productive member of my community. Beyond my engineering work, I lead the local professional chapter of the Society of Women Engineers where we provide STEM opportunities to young women. My experience with GEAR UP has changed the trajectory of my life and helped me create my own sense of purpose and independence. I navigate the world now with my head held high, and I could never express the depth of my gratitude to GEAR UP.”

— Alexes Garrett, GEAR UP alumna

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 over 560,000 students in FY 2020. 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 literacy education, parental engagement, scholarships, and professional development for educators. GEAR UP fosters partnerships among K-12 schools, institutions of higher education, local school districts, state departments of education, businesses, and community-based organizations to strengthen local pathways to college. These partnerships are required to match federal funding dollar for dollar, effectively doubling the investment to improve low-income students’ college readiness and completion.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td>$360.00</td>
<td>$365.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates funding for GEAR UP and consolidates it with TRIO and the CAMP program into the Student Supports Block Grant.
The president’s budget eliminates the GEAR UP program and directs affected communities and states to the Administration’s new line item that combines the TRIO programs into a state formula grant program. If enacted, the president’s elimination of GEAR UP would have a disastrous impact on students, their families, and the educators that serve them. In addition to closing educational and economic opportunities for students, the president’s budget dismantles a highly effective infrastructure that includes over 3,500 secondary schools across 45 states. For low-income communities, the GEAR UP program is a lifeline to opportunity, bringing research-based practices to build schools’ capacity to improve the college and career readiness of students long after grant awards have concluded. Eliminating the program would close the doors at 38 state and 118 partnership grant programs, negatively impacting state agencies, institutions of higher education, community-based organizations, and K-12 systems deeply committed to strengthening pathways to college and career success for low-income students. The impact would be felt in cities and rural communities in nearly every state in the nation.

In its justification, the Department of Education points to the limited national evaluations of GEAR UP. The Department is the agency mandated by legislation to lead those evaluations, a process which has not been undertaken since 2008. In fact, in the Administration’s FY 2019 budget, the Department of Education acknowledged that, while the scope of the evaluation was limited, they found a positive association between GEAR UP participation and some legislatively mandated goals, including increasing students’ and parents’ knowledge of postsecondary opportunities and increasing the percentage of students taking rigorous courses in secondary school. The limitations on the evaluation design relative to other key outcomes are a result of the Department of Education’s unwillingness to evaluate the program systematically.
**PROGRAM NEED**

For the most recent year in which there is a substantial sample, the Department of Education reports 77.3 percent of the GEAR UP class of 2014 enrolled in a postsecondary institution immediately following high school graduation. Considering that nationally only 45.5 percent of low-income students did the same over the prior year, GEAR UP is clearly a catalyst for results. Achieving these outcomes at a modest annual federal investment of just under $530 per GEAR UP student speaks to the power of these highly flexible, locally led programs. In addition, an independent study from the New America Foundation, *Rebalancing Resources and Incentives in Federal Student Aid*, cites GEAR UP as “the most promising of these [college outreach] programs.” The study recommends tripling GEAR UP funding to expand grantees’ capacity to serve multiple cohorts.

Despite GEAR UP’s demonstrated success increasing high school graduation and college enrollment rates for students from low-income and working-class backgrounds, only a fraction of eligible students and communities benefit from the program. Without increased funding, an open competition for new grant awards may not be possible and no new students will be able to benefit from research-driven GEAR UP services. Modestly increasing GEAR UP to $400 million in FY 2021 would propel the program’s momentum to strengthen the pathway to postsecondary education and allow an additional 70,000 new students into the program.

**CONTACT INFO**

Emily Jeffries  
National Council for Community and Education Partnerships  
(202) 530-1135, ext. 2120  |  emily_jeffries@edpartnerships.org

**Graduate Education**

**Title VII, Part A, Subpart 2, Higher Education Act**

*Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN)* programs at University of California Riverside are designed to recruit, retain, and matriculate top graduate students—especially those from underrepresented backgrounds—to pursue research, teaching, and mentorship that will contribute to sustainability, infrastructure, national security, and workforce development. The program aims to fill labor shortages of highly trained scholars in these fields.

**In late 2018, the Marlan and Rosemary Bourns College of Engineering at UC Riverside received five GAANN awards totaling $4.5 million, providing support for up to 90 engineering graduate students to continue studies in areas of vital national interest for three years. Each proposal team will receive sufficient funding to support six graduate students per year in important fields of study—chemical and environmental engineering, materials science and engineering, electrical and computer science, and mechanical engineering. Currently in its second year, the grants continue to support technological advancement and innovation, and provide underrepresented students with new opportunities to conduct novel research and make vital contributions to their fields.**
DESCRIPTION

The only U.S. Department of Education scholarship assistance for graduate students is provided through the GAANN program. Through highly 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 social and academic supports, and provide an institutional match of 25 percent. After consultation with appropriate federal agencies including the National Science Foundation, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Education designates certain academic fields as "areas of national need" for the awards competition. In recent years, these areas 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 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$23.05</td>
<td>$23.05</td>
<td>$23.05</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The Administration’s FY 2021 budget eliminates funding for GAANN. The Trump Administration asserts that GAANN fellowships are “more appropriately supported through other Federal programs, as well as through institutional and other non-Federal resources,” despite funds allocated through GAANN being competitively awarded and designated as specific areas of need for further investment at the national level.

PROGRAM NEED

GAANN is the only source of grant support for graduate students in the Department of Education. Recipients of these highly competitive awards are academically talented, financially needy students who are pursuing graduate degrees in critical scientific and technical fields identified by the federal government as areas of national need. In fact, a stronger national commitment to graduate education through GAANN and other programs 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.

Further, a Department of Education study found that GAANN fellows had better degree completion rates and faster time to degree than graduate students overall. Unfortunately, elimination of the program ignores the critical role graduate education plays in the advancement of national prosperity and backs away from the federal commitment to supporting access to graduate students with financial need and from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds.

CONTACT INFO

Crystal Martinez and Carl Welliver
University of California
(202) 974-6308 | crystal.martinez@ucdc.edu
(202) 974-6302 | carl.welliver@ucdc.edu
Child Care Access Means Parents in School (CCAMPIS)

Title IV, Part A, Subpart 7, Higher Education Act

At Portland Community College (PCC) in Oregon, the Child Care Access Means Parents in School (CCAMPIS) program directly assists low-income, Pell-eligible college students with financial support to help meet their child care needs. Students in the CCAMPIS cohort are required to attend an initial interview and PCC orientations and meet regularly with a college advisor to develop an academic pathway to completion. The PCC CCAMPIS program supports academic success by providing individual case management that helps identify the strengths and needs of the students and connects them to college and community resources. Student academic progress is tracked through their grad plan, and referrals are made to tutoring and study groups as needed. Data have shown that participation in these activities increases student retention and completion rates. The full time child care offered to CCAMPIS participants allows parents the necessary time to study. It also connects the parent with the child’s experience in the Child Development Centers by requiring parents to attend center and classroom events and parent conferences.

DESCRIPTION

Created in the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, the CCAMPIS program supports the participation of low-income parents in postsecondary education through campus-based child care 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 child care for infants and toddlers, the program funds parenting classes and before- and afterschool care for older children.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$53.00</td>
<td>$15.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget for FY 2021 includes $15.13 million for CCAMPIS—a cut of more than 70 percent below the FY 2020 level.

PROGRAM NEED

While there are hundreds of campus child care centers in the United States, they are only able to meet a small percentage of the demand for services. Expanding access to on-campus child care helps increase access to higher education for low-income students, and it increases retention, especially for single parents. Without an increased investment, thousands of low-income students across the country continue to lack access to quality child care, and this is often cited as the reason why students with young children withdraw prior to completing a certificate or degree.

The CCAMPIS program needs an increasing and stable investment to demonstrate a commitment to this program and help institutions plan child care centers and parent-support services.
Teacher Quality Partnership Grants

**Title II, Part A, Higher Education Act**

As a University of New Hampshire Teacher Residency for Rural Education (TRRE) graduate, Kim Dorman earned teacher certification in both elementary education and secondary life science. As a mom and small business manager, Dorman held a bachelor’s degree in biology, and she worked for nine years as a speech and language assistant in the local school district prior to enrolling in the TRRE program. TRRE provided Dorman the means to become a teacher advocate for rural students and communities.

“The program made sense for me,” Dorman said. “It is a rigorous program, but...I’ve never had such support. They (faculty) cared about my success the whole way.” In her second year as a science teacher in Colebrook, NH, Dorman is an emerging teacher leader.

— Kim Dorman (M.Ed., 2018)

**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 transform and strengthen educator preparation. At the heart of the TQP program is a focus on deepening the partnership between preK-12 and higher education as they collaborate to prepare profession-ready educators in high-need fields. The program extends the clinical practice and includes the option of a residency for master’s level programs, 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 residency programs agree to serve in a high-need school for three years, ensuring profession-ready teachers are serving where they are needed most.

**FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$43.09</td>
<td>$43.09</td>
<td>$50.09</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by the Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant with a total 20% cut in funding.*
The teaching profession is facing critical challenges, including shortages in high-need fields, declining enrollment in preparation programs, a persistent diversity gap between teachers and students, and the attrition of educators out of the profession. Removing this program as a competitive grant program for institutions of higher education means little or no funding to meet the purposes of TQP: strengthening and transforming educator preparation at institutions of higher education while meeting the critical need of more profession-ready teachers in high-needs fields in high-need schools.

TQP grants support preparation programs to produce graduates prepared to teach in high-need fields and to serve in high-need schools. The grants require strong partnerships among higher education, high-need school districts, and other key education stakeholders. Research shows extensive clinical and induction components of a preparation program — both requirements of TQP — are key elements of teacher quality and retention. With a growing teacher shortage across the nation, this program is vital to ensure well-qualified teachers serve and stay in high-need schools. Since the program was authorized in 2009, more than 116 grants have been disbursed throughout the country. Four current grantees have a focus on serving schools in rural areas. In addition, in 2019 the Department awarded 31 TQP grants, showing the growing desire of institutions of higher education to participate in this program that requires a 100 percent match. It is critical Congress continues to invest in the TQP program, so new grantees have opportunities for full five-year grant cycles to transform their educator preparation programs and train a new cohort of teachers.

President’s FY 2021 budget eliminates this program and 28 others, replaced by a new block grant with a total 20% cut in funding. Prior to FY 2008, funds were provided under the antecedent Teacher Quality Enhancement program.
Student Aid Administration

Title I, Part D, and Title IV, Part D, Higher Education Act

2019 was a great year for Tracey Cook: she moved to Washington, DC, started her dream job working for a national security think tank, and got engaged. But all those exciting life changes meant her finances were in upheaval. In the process of certifying her new income, Tracey realized she was in the wrong income-driven repayment plan to qualify for Public Service Loan Forgiveness. With help from guides on the Federal Student Aid website, Tracey was able to get back on track for loan forgiveness and learned about options to help her fiancé consolidate his loans before they tie the knot (and their finances). The Student Aid Administration is not only responsible for managing loans for millions of students like Tracey, but also for getting them the information they need to make informed borrowing and repayment decisions.

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 Department of Education, is the largest provider of student financial aid for postsecondary students in the nation. In FY 2018, FSA processed just over 19.7 million student financial aid applications, dispersing more than $181 billion in federal grants, loans, and work-study funds to help millions of students pursue postsecondary education. FSA administers a loan portfolio of more than $1.5 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. These dollars also underwrite functions such as enforcement, data collection, analysis, and public dissemination of information.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,678.94</td>
<td>$1,678.94</td>
<td>$1,768.94</td>
<td>$1,883.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2021 budget includes $1.8 billion for the Student Aid Administration, which is an additional $114 million (6.5 percent increase) compared to the final FY 2020 appropriation. According to the president’s budget, these funds are needed to manage and service the student loan portfolio, including anticipated increases in loan volume and costs associated with transitioning to the Next Generation Financial Services Environment, maintaining operations for student aid application processing, origination and disbursement functions, student aid information technology (IT) system hosting, and enhancing IT security.
The president’s budget supports the Secretary of Education’s efforts to streamline student borrowers’ relationships with Federal Student Aid. In FY 2020, the Department of Education rolled out a new StudentAid.gov and developed a chatbot to answer common questions, after revamping the site last year to be more mobile-friendly. Additionally, the Department of Education supported the FUTURE Act, which created a data-sharing agreement with the Internal Revenue Service to streamline FAFSA and income-driven repayment, which will go into effect in the coming months.

The president’s budget supports and Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos has proposed splitting Federal Student Aid into a separate agency, among other efforts to change how student aid is accessed and managed. Before making any changes to the Student Aid Administration and Federal Student Aid as a whole, these offices need stable, annually increased funding so they can carry out the core mission of dispersing aid. The difficulties setting biennial spending caps and freezes in Department of Education funding make it harder for the Student Aid Administration to manage its huge loan portfolio over the long term. Increased and stable investment is needed to educate students and families better about the process for obtaining and repaying loans, to ensure enforcement and oversight of Title IV programs, and to improve the customer service experience.

**CONTACT INFO**

Kaitlyn Vitez  
U. S. Public Interest Research Group (PIRG)  
(908) 894-0642 | kvitez@pirg.org
Federally Funded Research

When Hurricane Harvey slammed into the Texas coast in 2017, displaced residents flocked inland, trying to rebuild their lives in the disaster’s aftermath. Within decades, the same thing could happen at a much larger scale due to rising sea levels, caused by added water from melting ice sheets and glaciers and the expansion of sea water as it warms. In the U.S. alone, 13 million people could be forced to relocate due to rising sea levels by 2100. As a result, cities throughout the country will grapple with changes in population. Effects could include more competition for jobs, increased housing prices, and more pressure on infrastructure networks. Research led by two women from the University of Southern California’s (USC) Viterbi School of Engineering Computer Science Department and Center for AI for Society is the first to use machine learning to project migration patterns resulting from sea level rise. To predict the trajectory of sea level rise migration, the researchers took existing projections of rising sea levels and combined them with population projections. Based on migration patterns after Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita, the team trained machine learning models — a subset of artificial intelligence — to predict where people would relocate. As expected, the researchers found the greatest effects of sea level rise migration will be felt by inland areas immediately adjacent to the coasts, as well as urban areas in the southeast U.S. But their model also showed more incoming migrants to Houston and Dallas than previous studies, which flagged Austin as the top destination for climate migrants from the southeastern coast. This result shows that population movement under climate change will not necessarily follow previously established patterns. In other words, it is not business as usual. USC Viterbi, the National Science Foundation, and Microsoft AI for Earth supported this work.

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), the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the National Endowment for the Humanities, and others. In addition to spurring new discoveries, these research investments are central to educating 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 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$77.32</td>
<td>$82.28</td>
<td>$87.39</td>
<td>$79.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2021 budget would decrease basic and applied research accounts across the federal research landscape overall by almost $8 billion relative to FY 2020. The Department of Energy’s Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy would be eliminated. The NSF budget is decreased 6.5 percent below FY 2020 for a total of $7.7 billion, while the NIH budget would be cut almost $3.4 billion below current year funding. The Department of Defense’s science and technology programs are decreased by 12 percent. Under the president’s budget, funding for artificial intelligence (AI) would increase to $830 million, an approximately 70 percent increase over President Trump’s FY 2020 proposal. The Agriculture and Food Research Initiative (AFRI), the Department of Agriculture’s flagship competitive research grant program, would receive a $175 million increase above the FY 2020 level.

PROGRAM NEED

The low discretionary spending caps have had a negative effect 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 a 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. For FY 2021, higher education groups support an additional $3 billion for NIH, at least $9 billion total for NSF and $675 million for AFRI, and funding at least above inflationary growth for all agencies.

CONTACT INFO

Flannery Geoghegan
University of Southern California
(202) 824-5874  |  fgeogheg@usc.edu
Segal AmeriCorps Education Award

"Martin Luther King Jr. once said 'the function of education is to teach one to think intensively and to think critically' and 'intelligence plus character...is the goal of true education.' These words made me decide to join the fight to help eliminate educational inequity. In 2017, I joined Teach For America Alabama as a 7th grade science teacher in Birmingham City Schools. An AmeriCorps program, Teach For America Alabama gave me the opportunity to pursue equity by working tirelessly to change practices and structures to make a quality education attainable for my children.

During my service as an AmeriCorps educator, I received the Segal AmeriCorps Education Award. The Award funded my teacher certification courses to ensure I was receiving the educational training to implement best instructional practices within the classroom. I was able to reach my goal to become a highly qualified educator at no cost through the education award. In addition, AmeriCorps allowed me to have my loans deferred until I completed my two years of service. The loan deferment allowed me to focus on my students without the worries and frustrations of paying back student debt.

Currently, I teach 8th grade science at Ossie Ware Mitchell Middle School in Birmingham, Alabama. Thanks to the award, I am able to further achieve impact in the classroom and pursue meaningful outcomes that lead to access and opportunity for my children. The Segal AmeriCorps Education Award has allowed me to learn continuously while becoming a better educator and champion for children. Children are indeed the future, and it is through programs like AmeriCorps that they are provided with the best support and instruction. Through AmeriCorps’s continued support for great teachers, children will power the future and achieve greatness!"

—Shelton Brown, 2017 Teach For America Alabama Corps Member and science teacher at Ossie Ware Mitchell Middle School, Birmingham, AL

DESCRIPTION

The Segal AmeriCorps Education Award is a benefit given to participants who complete service in an approved AmeriCorps program — 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 records of achievement and provide intensive training, support, and career development to help these exceptional people increase their impact in low-income communities.

The maximum amount of a full-time Segal AmeriCorps Education Award ($6,345 in FY 2020) 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. 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 awards to obtain teaching certification. AmeriCorps also provides a loan forbearance benefit, allowing 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 served as an AmeriCorps member.
FUNDING HISTORY *(in millions)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>$1,060.00</td>
<td>1,082.96</td>
<td>$1,100.00</td>
<td>$82.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

President Trump’s FY 2021 budget eliminates the Corporation for National and Community Service. The president’s budget includes $82 million for an “orderly shutdown” of operations.

PROGRAM NEED

Record numbers of Americans are stepping forward to serve. At the same time, more communities are looking for innovative ways to address local challenges, including placing effective teachers in our lowest performing schools. This reality makes a strong investment in national service even more important. A recent Columbia University economics study found for every dollar invested in national service, the returns to society equal $3.95 in higher earnings, increased output, and other community-wide benefits. If adopted, the president’s budget would be the death knell of our nation’s 80-year investment in national service, including programs like AmeriCorps, and would spell elimination for the Segal AmeriCorps Education Award. Continuing funding for CNCS and providing Segal AmeriCorps Education Awards will engage millions of Americans in service and especially help 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

Title I, Education Sciences Reform Act

Each of the centers in the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) work together to support research, report data, and produce evidence-based resources to help improve educational outcomes for all students. In postsecondary education, IES has provided funding for the Center for the Analysis of Postsecondary Readiness, which has produced findings on improving developmental education. The National Postsecondary Student Aid Study, a survey conducted by the National Center on Education Statistics, provides insight on the types and amount of financial aid students receive. The National Center for Special Education Research has supported the National Longitudinal Transition Study, which has served as the basis for understanding transition outcomes to college and career for students with disabilities. A recent REL Midwest report included analysis of data on the pathways of high school graduates in Minnesota to understand gaps in postsecondary and employment outcomes in the state.

DESCRIPTION

The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) is a semi-independent agency within the Department of Education that houses major federal education research programs, including 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. IES supports activities across all four centers to establish an evidence base for education policy and practice and to communicate research-based findings and disseminate resources to policymakers, school and district leaders, and educators.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$613.46</td>
<td>$615.46</td>
<td>$623.46</td>
<td>$565.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The Administration includes $565.44 million for IES in the president’s FY 2021 budget. This funding level reflects the elimination of two critical programs — the Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) program and the Regional Educational Laboratories. The Department of Education budget justification for eliminating these programs notes, “States would be able to support similar activities through the Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant,” which already has 20 percent less funding than the underlying programs currently receive. Eliminating these programs undermines the ability of IES to most effectively support the research, statistics, evaluation, and dissemination activities essential to understand student achievement, identify effective program and instructional practices, and assess the impact of education reform. All other programs, with the exception of Statistics and Assessment, would be frozen at FY 2020 levels.

Funding for IES is particularly important in FY 2021. School districts are implementing school improvement plans for their lowest performing schools under the new framework provided under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The investment in IES for evidence-based resources and strategies helps school districts make smart decisions about what plan elements will positively impact student and school performance. In addition, IES will have additional responsibility for evaluations of Department programs for learning agendas developed in the implementation of the Foundations for Evidence-based Policymaking Act.
The program’s need for research and evidence to improve education has always been substantial. IES has prioritized making supported research findings and data more accessible to educators and school leaders, while states continue to implement evidence-based practices aligned with requirements in ESSA. States’ capacity and support for education research range widely, making IES an even more critical resource. States and districts continue to seek research to address continuing challenges in cultivating positive school climates, improving low-performing schools, increasing engagement in STEM education, and preparing students to succeed in postsecondary education and the workforce.

**CONTACT INFO**

Christy Talbot  
American Educational Research Association  
(202) 238-3200 | ctalbot@aera.net

**Regional Educational Laboratories (RELs)**

**Title I, Education Sciences Reform Act**

Many early warning systems identify at-risk students at the end of their first year of high school, even though school disengagement can begin well before. To identify students sooner — specifically in their last year of middle school — REL West worked very closely with the Clark County School District (CCSD) in Nevada to develop a digital tool with five early warning indicators: attendance, grade point average, number of credits earned, number of “F” grades, and behavior incidents. Together these five indicators helped CCSD staff identify 76 percent of the district’s eighth grade students who will be off track by the end of ninth grade. Now CCSD has moved on to the next phase of this work by engaging with REL staff to identify and implement the appropriate supports these students will need to improve their attendance and academic achievement, and, ultimately, their chances of graduating from high school on time and well prepared.

**DESCRIPTION**

The Regional Educational Laboratory program (REL) is comprised of a national network of ten regional “labs” that help states and districts systematically use data and research to improve student outcomes. Created in 1966 and currently authorized under the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, RELs conduct rigorous applied research and help stakeholders use data to inform decisions. The current REL contracts were awarded in FY 2017 and include an explicit focus on supporting sustained, ongoing partnerships with stakeholders at the state and district levels. Much of the proposed work is conducted through REL research-practitioner partnerships where researchers and educators work together on a problem and generate solutions that improve student outcomes.

**FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$55.42</td>
<td>$55.42</td>
<td>$56.02</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2021 budget eliminates funding for the REL program. The budget justification states that the RELs’ activities are “duplicative of other investments and that states and districts should instead use funding under the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant to meet their research needs.”

RELs carry out three broad types of work: applied research, dissemination of findings from rigorous research, and technical support for use of research. The 2017 REL contracts focus on developing research-practitioner partnerships with state and local entities that share the goal of increasing the use of evidence in education. Without these funds, states and local school districts will no longer receive capacity-building, evidence-based training and research to improve student outcomes through the REL program. In addition, the REL program will be unable to continue to serve as the primary dissemination partner for the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) practice guides through virtual and in-person events or support the U.S. Department of Education by developing webinars and tools to help applicants and grantees understand and meet evidence requirements in discretionary grant competitions.

PROGRAM NEED

The REL program is a comprehensive system to help state and local school districts use up-to-date, credible, and rigorous education research to improve student outcomes, particularly crucial as states and local school districts implement the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). ESSA requires that state, local district, and school-level activities, strategies, or interventions are evidence-based under some programs. Given these new evidence provisions in ESSA, the partnerships among the RELs, states, and districts are even more important as evidence-based activities are identified and implemented to meet specific local needs.

CONTACT INFO

Michele McLaughlin
Knowledge Alliance
(202) 770-2218  |  michele@knowledgeall.net
Title I, Education Sciences Reform Act

The What Works Clearinghouse produces reviews of research on education curriculum and practice guides with evidence-based recommendations to support teaching and learning. According to the Jefferson Education Exchange, nearly a third of educators surveyed used resources from the What Works Clearinghouse. The Friday Institute for Educational Innovation, housed at North Carolina State University, incorporated the recommendations of two IES practice guides, Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 3rd Grade and Developing Effective Fractions Instruction for Kindergarten through 8th Grade, in MOOC-Ed courses. These online courses provide professional development for teachers and award continuing education credentials.

DESCRIPTION

The Research, Development, and Dissemination appropriation provides support for IES core education research topic areas, including reading and writing, early learning, mathematics and science education, teacher effectiveness and pedagogy, and education systems and policies. 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. Professional development and fellowship grants help build the capacity for early career researchers to conduct rigorous research.
FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$192.70</td>
<td>$192.70</td>
<td>$195.88</td>
<td>$195.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

Funding for Research, Development, and Dissemination (RDD) in FY 2021 would support the National Center for Education Research (NCER) and contribute to the National Center for Educational Evaluation and Technical Assistance (NCEE). However, at current funding levels, NCER is only able to fund one out of every ten grant proposals it receives. The funding rate may decrease without additional investment to account for more expensive research plans incorporating the Standards for Excellence in Education Research. Increasing funding for these centers would enable IES to continue to produce and support the development and use of research and evidence at the Department of Education and in the field.

PROGRAM NEED

These programs within IES provide structure and leadership for research, development, and dissemination. However, all of these critical activities to improve effectiveness and efficiency of education policy and practice suffer due to inadequate funding. IES grants provide a consistent source of support for building a high-quality evidence base for what works in education. For many universities, IES funding is an essential source of support for education research. As IES seeks to increase its focus on cost-effectiveness analysis, adequate funding for RDD is necessary to be able to support this important work, continue awarding grants in emerging research topics, and to test, scale up, and replicate promising interventions.

CONTACT INFO

Christy Talbot
American Educational Research Association
(202) 238-3200 | ctalbot@aera.net
National Center for Education Statistics

Title I, Education Sciences Reform Act

The National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS) provides information on teacher and principal preparation, salaries, and workforce demographics. NTPS also asks questions on teachers’ professional development and perceptions of their engagement with the profession, as well as on principals’ influence on decision making. These data are particularly relevant with recent news highlighting teacher shortages and discussions on teacher pay across the United States. NTPS had been administered on a two-year cycle since the 2015-16 school year. However, the 2019-20 survey is being delayed by a year to account for attrition in staff at the National Center for Education Statistics.

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 student achievement between America and other nations, high school dropout rates, preparation for higher education, and college costs. With this information, NCES provides objective 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 state data needs from NCES.

Statistics in millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$88</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td></td>
<td>$109</td>
<td>$108</td>
<td>$109</td>
<td>$103</td>
<td>$103</td>
<td>$103</td>
<td>$112</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$111</td>
<td>$114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FUNDING HISTORY *(in millions)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$109.50</td>
<td>$109.50</td>
<td>$110.50</td>
<td>$113.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The small increase for NCES in the president’s budget reflects funding for the Privacy Technical Assistance Center, which would be transferred to NCES with the proposed elimination of the Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems program. The president’s budget would support collection, analysis, and dissemination of education-related statistics in response to legislative requirements and the needs of data providers, data users, and education policy analysts. Education statistics collected by NCES enable policymakers and practitioners to identify challenges and policy priorities in education, develop new systems, and evaluate and refine current systems.

PROGRAM NEED

NCES data provide critical information to policymakers and various audiences on the current state of education. The annual Condition of Education report provides information on educational outcomes, public school finances, and characteristics of students, teachers, and school leaders. NCES survey data sets also are a vital, cost-effective tool for researchers who would otherwise spend considerable resources on data collection. In addition, NCES facilitates United States participation in important international assessments such as the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study and Program for International Student Assessment. Funding for NCES has remained relatively flat since FY 2017, even as the statistical expertise of NCES is needed for evidence-building activities under the Foundations of Evidence-based Policymaking Act.

CONTACT INFO

Christy Talbot  
American Educational Research Association  
(202) 238-3200  |  ctalbot@aera.net
The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and its Arts Assessment Framework have informed the work of music and arts educators for the past three decades. The Framework created for the 1997 NAEP Arts Assessment was used in the development of the 2014 National Core Arts Standards and have informed revision of arts standards in 32 states. Prior to the National Assessment Governing Board announcing its discontinuation of the Arts Assessment in 2019, the NAEP Arts Assessment collected important data addressing achievement and access to art and music education across student demographics in a variety of school settings. These data revealed significant disparities in arts achievement across racial, socio-economic, and gender groups, as well as between public and private schools. Educators, advocates, and policymakers rely on such data to address inequities in access to a well-rounded education, which includes music and the arts.

DESCRIPTION

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is the only representative and continuing assessment of American students’ achievement. NAEP, the “nation’s report card,” describes the educational achievement of students at grades 4, 8, and 12, and provides information about special subpopulations (e.g., by race/ethnicity, students in urban school districts). It offers an objective national measurement for appraising state-developed achievement standards, critical information for states and school districts as they implement 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>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$149.00</td>
<td>$151.00</td>
<td>$153.00</td>
<td>$181.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The Administration’s FY 2021 budget includes $181 million for the National Assessment of Educational Progress. The additional funding in the request would address increases in costs for developing and administering digital-based assessments. This funding level will enable IES to continue its mandated 4th and 8th grade assessments in math and reading every two years. However, the increased funding would not be used to reinstate previously scheduled assessments in several subjects eliminated in 2019 by the National Assessment Government Board, or to restore the next administration of the writing assessment, originally planned for 2021 but delayed until 2029.
NAEP plays a critical role in benchmarking national education progress, including for the 27 large districts that participate in the Trial Urban District Assessment. Since most states and districts use their own unique assessments, such a benchmark is essential. NAEP is also an important resource for observing long-term trends in student achievement. With the transition to a digital-based assessment, the National Center for Education Statistics is beginning to allow research use of NAEP process data to understand how students approach questions and select responses, with the potential to inform future development of NAEP questions and accommodations.

The investment in NAEP has not kept pace with the increased costs for developing and administering assessments. As a result, the National Assessment Governing Board voted in 2019 to cancel future scheduled assessments in arts, economics, foreign languages, and geography. Assessments in those subjects provide important information on equitable access to coursework and student achievement that are not otherwise measured at the national or state level. States have also cited costs as one reason for declining participation in assessments beyond those required by ESSA.

**CONTACT INFO**

Christy Talbot  
American Educational Research Association  
(202) 238-3200 | ctalbot@aera.net
Research in Special Education/ Special Education Studies and Evaluation

**Title I, Education Sciences Reform Act**

The National Center for Special Education Research (NCSER) is one of the largest sources of funding for research and development on special education and related services. NCSER funds research on the full range of issues facing children with disabilities, from early childhood through transition to adulthood, including research into academic progress and social and behavioral outcomes. Since 2006, NCSER has invested $46 million into research on transition and improving outcomes for students with disabilities in grades 6 through 12. This research aims to find ways to improve employment rates and college enrollment and graduation rates for students with disabilities. Two other projects under NCSER are aimed at improving school readiness and educational outcomes for English Learners who have disabilities and identifying effective strategies for improving the performance of teachers and other school-based service providers to improve the educational outcomes of students.

**DESCRIPTION**

This program supports research to address gaps in scientific knowledge necessary to improve special education and early intervention services and results for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. Special Education Studies and Evaluation funds 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 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research in Special</td>
<td>$56.00</td>
<td>$56.00</td>
<td>$56.50</td>
<td>$56.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Studies</td>
<td>$10.82</td>
<td>$10.82</td>
<td>$10.82</td>
<td>$10.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s budget includes $56.5 million in FY 2021 for Research in Special Education and $10.82 million for Special Education Studies and Evaluation, a freeze in funding at the current level. The budget’s FY 2021 level precludes additional high-quality and rigorous research on special education and related services and the full range of issues facing children with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, school personnel, and more. Findings from research and studies funded by these programs help inform interventions, teaching strategies, and other critical factors in educating children with disabilities. Additional funding could support necessary research to find solutions to special education challenges in school districts across the country.

PROGRAM NEED

Funding for special education research has remained static over the past few fiscal years. Cuts to NCSER since FY 2010, including through sequestration, have prevented the agency from funding a number of the high-quality research proposals submitted. NCSER work, for example, has targeted youth with high functioning autism experiencing high levels of anxiety, individuals with Down syndrome learning to read, and students with learning disabilities studying to master math word problems. NCSER provides special educators and administrators research-based resources that support the provision of a free appropriate public education and early intervention services to children and youth with disabilities.

CONTACT INFO

Meghan C. Whittaker
National Center for Learning Disabilities
(203) 808-2512  |  mwhittaker@ncld.org
**Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems**

**Title I, Education Sciences Reform Act**

The Kansas Individual Data System, funded through an SLDS grant, includes K-12 data incorporated with information from the National Student Clearinghouse in order to better understand postsecondary enrollment and completion in the state. Using these linked data, the Kansas State Department of Education developed the Postsecondary Progress Report to measure districts’ progress toward the Kansas State Board of Education’s vision of leading the world in the success of each student. The report provides a “success rate” for student outcomes on earning a certification or postsecondary enrollment within two years of graduating high school. This is incorporated in a predicted effectiveness rate of postsecondary success for district comparison, based on a five-year average accounting for district cumulative poverty, student mobility, and chronic absenteeism.

**DESCRIPTION**

The Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) program provides competitive grants to states to assist in design, development, and implementation of longitudinal data systems that can follow individual students throughout their school career while protecting their identifiable information. Systems developed through these grants help improve data quality, promote linkages across school levels, encourage the accurate and timely generation of data for reporting and improving student outcomes, and facilitate research to further improve student achievement.

**FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$32.28</td>
<td>$32.28</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET**

The president’s budget eliminates the SLDS program in FY 2021 and states the activities could be accomplished using funds under the budget’s Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED). The congressional justification also includes a proposal to strike the language authorizing the program in the Education Sciences Reform Act (ESRA). Eliminating the program in FY 2021 would prevent states from adding capacity to further develop and use these data systems to improve educational outcomes. Given the functions of 29 education service program specifically consolidated into the ESED Block Grant, SLDS will likely be a lower priority for states’ use of available federal funding. In addition to this critical funding support, SLDS would no longer be able to hold the annual best practices conference, which has given states the opportunity to efficiently learn from each other’s successes and challenges.
PROGRAM NEED

Contrary to the depiction of the program in the budget justification and in the Department’s proposal to reauthorize ESRA, states’ work is far from complete on building and utilizing student data systems, further underscored by continued congressional support for SLDS. Grants for FY 2019 will allow states to support SLDS infrastructure to improve the linking and use of education data in the state, incorporate indicators on school choice, or examine issues of equity, with an additional option to test a school-level poverty measure. Due to essentially frozen funding for SLDS, the maximum amount for the grants awarded during FY 2020 will be lower than in previous competitions. In FY 2015, states had the option to support two priority areas; however, states will receive an award for only one priority area in the FY 2019 grant cycle.

The program has very successfully enabled the vast majority of states to develop a structure for streamlining federal reporting of K-12 information and linking early childhood, K-12, postsecondary, and workforce data. State demand for this program is well established: during the FY 2015 cycle, 27 SLDS grant applications from states went unfunded. In addition, the National Center for Education Research will award grants in FY 2020 to encourage the use of SLDS to examine the longitudinal impact of state policies and programs on student outcomes.

CONTACT INFO

Christy Talbot
American Educational Research Association
(202) 238-3200 | ctalbot@aera.net
PART 5: EDUCATION-RELATED PROGRAMS

Meeting the Human Needs of America’s Children
Head Start

Economic Opportunity Act of 1964

Letter to a Head Start Program Director:

“As we embark on our last week with our little Head Start child, I wanted to thank you for all you have done for her and for our family. I know that people question if Head Start really has an impact, and if it makes a difference... please let everyone know that YES it does. You know how it has changed our family...and look at how it instilled a love of learning in Ariana! Head Start is where she began to love to learn. She began to know how much fun it was to read, and what it meant to show love and compassion for others. Yesterday was her Senior Awards Ceremony. She received: President’s Educational Gold, National Honor Society, Center for Environmental Science Honors, and recognition for her NOYCE full tuition scholarship to Randolph-Macon College. This is in addition to the Growing Our Own Ceremony in which Ariana received her graduation cords for the teacher-prep classes she had taken and the fact that she had passed the ParaPro exam to become a well-qualified Teacher’s Assistant. She will be back in a few years teaching Chemistry to other Prince William County Students. Does Head Start really make a difference in the life of a child? Just look at this one!”

— Courtesy of the Virginia Head Start Association

DESCRIPTION

Administered by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Head Start is a federal grant program created as part of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The program was established to provide comprehensive child development services to 3- to 5-year old children from economically disadvantaged families to prepare them to succeed in school. Serving over 1 million children annually, Head Start provides a comprehensive set of services including education, nutrition, health care, and social services to promote the healthy social, emotional, and cognitive development of young children and emphasizes parents’ engagement in their child’s learning and development.

Congress established Early Head Start in FY 1995 to serve children from birth to age 3. Early Head Start, which serves approximately 151,000 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) program serves approximately 30,000 children of migrant farmworker families, and the American Indian and Alaskan Native Head Start program serves approximately 23,000 children and their families.

In 2014, the Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships (EHS-CCP) grant program was created to foster partnerships between Early Head Start and child care providers to increase the supply of high-quality early care and learning environments, better align early childhood policies, regulations, resources and quality improvement for all children, and improve family and child well-being.

Head Start programs adhere to rigorous program standards and practices and have a demonstrated record of improving child health, development, and school readiness. For more than 50 years, Head Start has served as a laboratory for innovation – generating best practices and research, promoting parent involvement and professional development, and influencing state and local policies to promote and expand high-quality care and education for young children.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018</td>
<td>$9,863.00</td>
<td>$10,083.00</td>
<td>$10,613.10</td>
<td>$10,613.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Allocations include Early Head Start, Migrant and Seasonal Head Start and Native American and
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Alaskan Native Head Start, as well as funds for Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

FY 2019 and FY 2020 increases in Head Start funding supported the expansion of Early Head Start and the Early Head Start-Child Care Partnership programs and the Head Start workforce by enabling a cost of living adjustment. FY 2020 funding also included support to increase services from mental health professionals to provide care and counseling to families and the Head Start workforce. The president’s FY 2021 budget freezes funding for Head Start, which will provide no relief for the continuing large gap between the number of children eligible for the program and those being served. Continued investment in Head Start – which supports families during their children’s most formative years – is necessary to provide ongoing program improvements, transition to full-day and full-year care, implement trauma-informed approaches to care, and retain an experienced workforce.

PROGRAM NEED

Currently, Head Start funding levels support less than half (36 percent) of eligible preschool-aged children and only 11 percent of children eligible for Early Head Start. Increased funding is critical to ensuring that a greater number of children from low-income families have access to Head Start programs and a healthy start to life. Nearly 38 percent of children — 27.6 million — in the United States live in low-income households, and 17.7 percent of children under five live in poverty. Economic insecurity in the early years can create lifelong disadvantages for children, ranging from poor health to low achievement in school. Because the first five years of life are the most critical for learning and development, all young children — regardless of family income — need a strong beginning. Providing ample funding for Head Start will ensure that families have access to quality early care and education.

CONTACT INFO

Elena Rocha
YMCA of the USA
202-688-4750 | elena.rocha@ymca.net
Child Care and Development Fund

Child Care and Development Block Grant Act (CCDBG)
Section 418, Social Security Act

“My name is Teresa. I am a mom that experiences the stress of barely making it from one pay check to the next. I used to worry about my daughter Emmi while I was at work. Thanks to the Y’s affordable child care programs for families in need, I can go to work and be comfortable knowing that Emmi has a safe place to grow, learn, make friends and be happy — everything a parent wants for their child. Without the help to pay for her child care, I don’t know what I would have done.” In Washington State, YMCA child care programs serve 17,000 youth. One-third of those programs are supported by Working Connections Child Care funded by the Child Care and Development Block Grant.

DESCRIPTION

The Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) is the primary source of federal funding assistance for child care and is a block grant to states. CCDF supports low- and moderate-income families by providing access to quality, affordable child care for children 12 years old and younger, including early childhood and afterschool programs. 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 of federal law.

In 2014, Congress reauthorized CCDBG to improve the quality of care, improve the health and safety of children in care, increase access to child care assistance, improve stability for children in child care, and make child care policies more family- and provider-friendly. CCDF is funded through both discretionary (Child Care and Development Block Grant) and mandatory (Child Care Mandatory and Matching Funds) appropriations.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5,226.00</td>
<td>$5,288.00</td>
<td>$5,826.00</td>
<td>$5,826.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These figures represent the discretionary portion of CCDBG.

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2021 budget freezes funding for CCDBG. Continuing the program at the current level of funding inhibits families’ ability to acquire the affordable, high-quality child care they need so that parents can work or attend school or training. Although the president has spoken about the importance of child care, his budget does not do enough to help working families afford quality child care. Additional investment in CCDBG is necessary to serve a greater number of eligible families waiting for access to affordable, quality care.
PROGRAM NEED

The Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 supported a much-needed increase to $5.8 billion for CCDBG for FY 2018 and FY 2019, with funding ultimately negotiated slightly short of this ceiling. This historic increase enabled states to serve more families and decrease waitlists, raise provider reimbursement rates and parental copayments, improve the quality of care, and implement regulations reflecting the 2014 CCDBG reauthorization. FY 2020 resulted in a $538 million increase to help states address gaps in the child care assistance program and continue to implement regulations. It is estimated these new funds will serve an additional 33,600 children.

Despite this investment, the demand for affordable, quality child care remains unmet. Only 1 in 6 eligible children nationwide is served by CCDBG funds. States continue to maintain large backlogs and waitlists of families in need of child care assistance that would allow them to work or pursue training opportunities. When child care is unaffordable and inaccessible, it impacts participation in the workforce and affects the nation’s economy, specifically earnings, productivity, and revenue.

Quality affordable child care is out of reach for far too many of America’s families. Today, child care costs average an estimated $9,100-$9,600 annually nationwide. This is equivalent to in-state tuition at a public college in 33 states. This amount also accounts for more than 11 percent of the median household income for married parents, and 36 percent of household income for single parents. The annual cost of child care for families with two children exceeds annual mortgage payments for homeowners in 40 states and the District of Columbia, and the cost for families with two children in a child care center exceeds annual median rent payments in every state.

CONTACT INFO

Elena Rocha
YMCA of the USA
202-688-4750  |  elena.rocha@ymca.net
Preschool Development Grants

**Dept. of Health and Human Services (Joint administration with Dept. of Education)**
**Title IX, Section 9212, Elementary & Secondary Education Act (ESSA)**

*The Preschool Development Grant (PDG) program has helped Nebraska expand state and local efforts to provide high-quality early education programs. In 2019, the state received PDG funds to conduct an integrated statewide needs assessment, with a focus on enhancing parental engagement and strengthening support for early education teachers and leaders. The needs assessment collected input from families on the barriers to accessing high-quality early education services. The survey data informed the needs assessment, which looked at how programs like Head Start could best serve Nebraska families. The other component of the project — improving parental engagement — focused on expanding preschool initiatives like Learning Begins at Birth, which facilitate family partnerships and provide opportunities for vulnerable populations to track and measure early childhood developmental milestones. PDG funds were also used to boost support and training for early childhood educators, including rethinking Pre-K educator professional development, and to establish an early education school leadership academy to train school leaders and center directors on how best to support developmentally appropriate teaching. In short, the PDG grant has enabled collaboration among the state agencies, improved family engagement, and has accelerated previous initiatives that benefit vulnerable and at-risk children statewide.*

**DESCRIPTION**

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) transitioned the Preschool Development Grant (PDG) program to the Department of Health and Human Services, with joint administration by the Department of Education. The grants help support states in bridging connections across early education programs and with the transition from early learning settings to K-12 systems. In previous years, PDG grants allowed states to conduct statewide needs assessments, engage in strategic planning, and develop initiatives to enhance parental choice. Grants have been used to develop new programs that address the needs of children and families eligible for, but not served by, early learning programs to reach more children with high-quality preschool programs. The FY 2020 grants aim to help states build on their work from FY 2019, coordinate existing early childhood services and funding streams, and serve more children effectively in a mixed delivery system.

**FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT's REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$248.00</td>
<td>$275.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Funded under the Department of Health and Human Services.

**IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET**

The president’s budget eliminates the Preschool Development Grant program. As a result, no federal funding would be available to create or expand high-quality preschool programs in high-need communities, provide state-level infrastructure and quality improvements, or support strong collaboration and partnerships between school districts and early learning providers. States would lose the benefit of these important resources to meet goals related to early learning expansion or for efforts to align preschool programs within a birth through third grade continuum of services, a key component of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).
According to the First Five Years Fund, less than half of low-income children in the United States have access to high-quality early childhood programs. Extensive research indicates investments in high-quality early childhood programs can have an enormous impact on children and families. The early years of a child’s life are a critical window for developing problem-solving skills, advancing socially and emotionally, and strengthening language acquisition. For example, 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. However, providing sufficient funds to improve access to high-quality early childhood education programs can help to close this gap. Additionally, strong investments can yield economic returns, such as increased earnings later in life, as well as reducing the likelihood of future interventions and support services. In short, Preschool Development Grants are critical to improving access to strong early learning opportunities that enable all children to enter school ready to succeed academically and in life.

Danny Carlson
National Association of Elementary School Principals
(703) 518-6245 | dcarlson@naesp.org
Child Nutrition Programs

National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act

Serving afterschool meals benefits not only afterschool programs and the students they reach, but it also supports the school’s bottom line. On an average day, the Austin Independent School District serves afterschool suppers to up to 5,000 students across 70 school-based sites. To receive afterschool meals, the school’s afterschool program coordinator submits a request to the school nutrition department. The school nutrition department provides either hot meals prepared on site or “Fast and Fresh” ready-to-serve meals, which are prepared at a central location and delivered to schools. The “Fast and Fresh” meals offer the flexibility to serve meals based on program needs and meal time preferences. For example, if an afterschool program has scheduled activities from 2:30pm to 5pm, “Fast and Fresh” meals can be served at 5:00 without any additional cafeteria staff time. To make the “Fast and Fresh” model more accessible, the district installed portable refrigerators in some schools. “Fast and Fresh” meals have addressed staffing concerns by freeing up meal preparation and staff time, ensuring a sustainable afterschool supper program across the district.

—Courtesy of Food Research and Action Center

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 programs were last reauthorized in 2010 in the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act. These programs help ensure children have consistent access to nutritious meals throughout the year, critical for healthy development and academic success. The National School Lunch program provides nutritionally balanced, low-cost, or free lunches to children each school day in public and nonprofit private schools. While most child nutrition programs are not susceptible to direct cuts in FY 2021 due to their mandatory structure, administrative changes to eligibility requirements and other program features could reduce their scope and funding.

The Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) is a discretionary initiative providing grants to states for supplemental foods, health care referrals, and nutrition education for low-income pregnant and postpartum women and infants and children up to age five at nutritional risk. Cuts to WIC could limit access for the millions of children who experience positive dietary, health, cognitive, and academic outcomes as a result of participation in the program.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Nutrition</td>
<td>$24,254.14</td>
<td>$23,140.78</td>
<td>$23,620.00</td>
<td>$25,041.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC</td>
<td>$ 5,350.75</td>
<td>$ 6,075.00</td>
<td>$ 6,000.00</td>
<td>$ 5,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

The president’s FY 2021 budget does not cut mandatory spending for the Special Milk, Child and Adult Food Care, or Summer Food Service Programs. However, the budget eliminates the Summer EBT Demonstration Projects. The president’s budget contains harmful legislative changes that would cut Child Nutrition programs by $1.7 billion over 10 years. Of the $1.7 billion, $1.2 billion would come from reducing the number of schools eligible to implement the Community Eligibility Provision (CEP), that decreases the administrative work of operating the school nutrition programs for high poverty schools and school districts and increases student participation in school breakfast and lunch. Another $464 million would come from making changes to the verification process for school meal applications, which will result in eligible students losing access to free and reduced-price school meals and create additional administrative work for school districts. The president’s budget also eliminates funding for the Farmers’ Market Nutrition Program (-$18.5 million), which allows low-income parents to provide nutritious food to their families and children. The budget includes funding for Farm to School initiatives at $9.1 million. These grants ensure continued support of local and regional food systems by facilitating linkages between schools and their local growers.

The president’s FY 2021 budget for WIC calls for a total of $5.5 billion, contrasted with $6 billion in funding for FY 2020. The budget also includes $60 million for the breastfeeding peer counselor program and $14 million for infrastructure and technical assistance. The National WIC Association cautions appropriators that, to ensure adequate funding to meet caseload needs, it will be necessary to fund WIC at the current $6 billion level with $90 million for breastfeeding peer counselor programs, $14 million for infrastructure and technical assistance, and $35 million for program research and evaluation.

PROGRAM NEED

The National School Lunch Program and School Breakfast Program served roughly 29.5 million and 15 million children respectively in FY 2019. Maintaining and increasing participation in these programs is crucial, especially for low-income and food-insecure children who lack consistent access to healthy meals. Requirements and support for school food operators to fully implement healthier school nutrition standards in the School Lunch Program must also continue.

The Child and Adult Food Care Program (CACFP) provides nutritious meals and snacks for over 4.5 million children in day care and child care settings. CACFP would be improved by encouraging more child care providers to participate in the program through increased federal reimbursement to reduce paperwork, resulting in more nutritious meals provided and allowing for an additional daily healthy meal or snack for children in care.

The Summer Meals Program provides critical nutrition for students who receive meals during the school year. However, currently only about 14 percent of eligible children receive summer lunch for every 100 low-income children who rely on school lunch during the school year. Access could be increased in several ways, such as providing Summer Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) cards to families or creation of public-private partnerships to fund transportation grants for children to access summer meals through mobile meal trucks or other means.

CONTACT INFO

Holly Biglow
American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees
(202) 429-5006   |  hbiglow@afscme.org
Medicaid: Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment Programs

Title XIX, Social Security Act

Miami-Dade County Public Schools is the nation’s fourth-largest school district with over 345,000 students in pre-kindergarten to twelfth grade. The student population includes approximately 40,000 students with disabilities who receive a variety of educational support services, including specialized therapies (occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech/language services), behavioral services, counseling services, nursing services, and specialized transportation. In addition, the district provides a plethora of screening and evaluation services intended to identify the varied needs of students and develop appropriate support measures to enable them to fully access and participate in their education. Medicaid partial reimbursement is claimed for services provided for students with disabilities through the district’s participation in the Florida Certified School Match program. This Fee-For-Service billing is completed via the group of Medicaid provider ID numbers assigned solely to Miami-Dade County Public Schools and the category of services claimed. The district also participates in the School District Administrative Claiming (SDAC) program, where a representative sample of service providers are selected every calendar quarter to complete a Random Moment Sample Questionnaire (RMSQ) of the program administrative functions. The SDAC program allows for reimbursement for a small portion of the district’s costs based on the coding of quarterly RMSQ responses and the qualifying cost pool. These two Medicaid reimbursement programs available to Florida school districts are crucial to providing essential supplemental funding for the costs incurred in providing critical services and therapies to students with disabilities. Miami-Dade County Public Schools currently participate in the SDAC program as part of a consortium of more than 20 Florida school districts.

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, including speech, hearing, vision, dental problems, and physical impairments. Children comprise some 40 percent of all Medicaid recipients but account for less than 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>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$371.90</td>
<td>$386.33</td>
<td>$424.90*</td>
<td>$428.61**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*FY 2020 estimated
**Projected spending
The president’s FY 2021 budget projects $428.61 billion in total federal Medicaid spending. This minimal increase from FY 2020 in the new federal budget obscures the substantial spending reductions over the next ten years assumed through a series of administrative changes, program integrity and managed care improvements, state-determined work requirements for adult beneficiaries, state flexibility to increase eligibility redeterminations, and bipartisan legislation to further control drug costs. The budget projects 28.5 million children receiving Medicaid services in the upcoming year, accounting for 38.5 percent of all individuals enrolled in the Medicaid program. The number of total Medicaid beneficiaries is projected to increase minimally in the upcoming year with no increase in the number of children being served.

The Administration continues to support restructuring the Medicaid program into a state block grant or with a restrictive state per capita payment cap as proposed in the unsuccessful 2017 health care reform legislation. Earlier estimates from 2017 suggest that such a financial restructuring would cut spending by more than $1 trillion over ten years by eliminating federal entitlement status and the guarantee of a federal matching payment for all eligible state medical expenditures for eligible beneficiaries. New controversial guidance from the federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services will allow states to apply for demonstration authority (i.e., waivers) to administratively implement a Medicaid block grant program that otherwise would have required legislative action by Congress.

The block grant approach provides states with the flexibility to reduce some services and costs in exchange for capping federal payments over time. However, the loss of the state’s entitlement to a federal Medicaid matching payment for any eligible services will create substantial financial pressure to continue to reduce currently eligible services and lower or eliminate reimbursements to certain providers, including school districts. Since the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act already mandate that schools provide students with disabilities with certain health, rehabilitation, and specialized support services, a loss of Medicaid funding would shift an even larger share of these costs to state and local education budgets.

Medicaid services have become an essential component of wraparound services provided by school districts serving economically disadvantaged communities. Unfortunately, the Medicaid program has become embroiled in ongoing efforts to reduce federal spending and transform the program into a state block grant. Since more than one in five children in America has health coverage through Medicaid, major changes to the program could severely affect access to essential medical care for low-income children. Medicaid participation provides access to preventive, basic, acute, and specialized health services and prescription medications not otherwise available to low-income children and families. School health personnel are often among the few health professionals to whom low-income children have regular access, and cost-effective school-based health services help reduce the need for more costly medical services later in life. Eligible students with disabilities are the primary recipients of Medicaid-supported services in schools, including physical, occupational, and speech and language, audiology, mental health, and nursing services. Maintaining an effective school-based Medicaid program is critical to securing the health of the nation's medically underserved children.

Jeff Simering
Council of the Great City Schools
(202) 393-2427 | jsimering@cgcs.org
Intra-Agency Programs to Address School Safety and School/Community Violence Prevention

“Comprehensive school safety efforts must balance physical and psychological safety. Reasonable physical security such as locked doors, lighted hallways, and visitor check-in systems are appropriate. But those physical security measures must be combined with efforts that promote student mental and behavioral health, a positive school climate, trust among staff, students, and families, and an environment where students feel empowered to report any safety concerns. Increasing access to school-employed mental health professionals, such as school psychologists, is critical to this effort. These professionals work with administrators to develop comprehensive school crisis prevention and response plans, provide direct services to students and families (such as threat assessment and counseling), and connect those with the most significant needs with resources in the community. Effective engagement in this work requires federal investment so there can be genuine collaboration among federal, state, and local agencies, law enforcement, and schools. These investments will support comprehensive preventive and responsive services, and maximize the opportunity for all children to learn and reach their potential. A balanced approach is needed to address both physical and psychological safety, as well as promote effective communication and collaboration among key stakeholder groups.”

— Kathleen Minke, PhD, NCSP, Executive Director, National Association of School Psychologists

DESCRIPTION

Given the intense focus on school safety, departments and agencies outside the Department of Education administer programs that directly impact students and schools. One such program is the STOP School Violence Act. This competitive grant program aims to prevent or mitigate incidents of school violence by promoting coordinated, evidence-based approaches to school safety that encourage collaboration between schools and local law enforcement. The program supports training for teachers and education for students with the intent to prevent school violence, as well as specialized training for school officials in responding to related mental health crises that may precipitate violent attacks on schools. The program also promotes state, local, and tribal efforts to improve school security through evidence-based school safety programs, making use of physical security measures, technology, and coordination with local law enforcement. In FY 2019, $75 million was appropriated to the Bureau of Justice Administration for school violence prevention and mental health efforts that include education of students and staff on indicators of behavior that may lead to violence and how to identify and respond to student health concerns. In addition, $50 million was allocated for the development of threat assessment procedures and school security initiatives.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive School Safety Program</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOP School Violence Act</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The president’s FY 2021 budget includes a $25 million dollar increase for STOP grants. As noted in its budget justification, the Department of Justice highlights the importance of this program to school hardening efforts, despite the lack of evidence that increased security and hardening improve school safety. It is imperative that any increase in funding for the STOP grants be used to implement evidence-based programs that improve school climate and address school safety in a comprehensive manner. Unfortunately, the president’s budget eliminates funding (consolidated into a large block grant with overall decreased funding) for several large programs, including Safe Schools National Activities and the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grant (see related articles). These targeted programs help schools implement efforts to improve school climate and address school violence prevention in a holistic manner. Simply providing increases for school hardening efforts is not sufficient and can actually decrease school safety.

Improving overall school and community safety requires innovative solutions and collaboration among schools, parents, educators, law enforcement, the community, and the juvenile justice system. Both community and school environments must be physically and psychologically safe to promote student learning and overall positive development. Historically, school, community, and law enforcement efforts 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 have occurred in response to a tragedy. Effective school safety is a daily commitment requiring coordination and integration of existing systems. These systems must be designed to promote a positive, supportive school and community culture, reduce negative behaviors, support student mental and behavioral health, minimize the impact of crises when they occur, and keep students out of the juvenile justice system. Unfortunately, many schools and communities are not able to address safety comprehensively in those environments, due to inadequate financial resources and an insufficient number of school-employed professionals (e.g., school psychologists, school social workers, school counselors) to meet the wide range of student behavioral and mental health needs and coordinate with community services. Unfortunately, the president’s FY 2021 budget eliminates many programs authorized by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) that can help improve school safety, and instead focuses on a program intended primarily to harden schools.

Kelly Vaillancourt Strobach
National Association of School Psychologists
(301) 657-0270 | kvaillancourt@naspweb.org
Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000

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

Stevenson-Carson School District in Washington State serves 900 students living in rural communities. Covering more than 515 miles in bus routes each day, the school district supports one preschool, two elementary schools, a middle school, and a high school. Fifty-four percent of the students qualify for free or reduced-price lunch and about 4 percent are homeless. With the receipt of Secure Rural Schools (SRS) funding for FY 2017 and FY 2018, the Stevenson-Carson School District was able to provide mental health and behavioral supports to its elementary students. However, with no promise of 2019 SRS funding, the school has had to reduce its mental health and behavioral support services. This is particularly significant in a rural district like Stevenson-Carson School District because schools are often the only point of access for families to receive these kinds of services for their children. The Stevenson-Carson School District also relies on SRS Funding to repair and maintain buildings, grounds, and asphalt, and to provide for capital projects.

DESCRIPTION

The Secure Rural Schools (SRS) and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, also known as the “Forest Counties” or “Secure Rural Schools” program, provides assistance to rural counties and school districts impacted by the decline in revenue from timber harvests on federal lands. As forest land management policies changed in the 1980s, the steep decline in revenue-generating activity in the forests decreased the resources available to rural counties and schools. Created in 2000, SRS was intended to stabilize these payments and offset lost revenues, acting as a safety net for forest communities in 41 states. Payments are based on historic precedent and agreements removing federal lands from local tax bases and from full local community economic activity. The expectation is that the federal government and Congress will develop a long-term system based on sustainable active forest management.

The final FY 2020 funding bill did include funding for the Secure Rural School and Communities (Forest Counties) program, as well as retroactive funding for FY 2019.

FUNDING HISTORY (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021 PRESIDENT’s REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$236.00*</td>
<td>$224.20*</td>
<td>$224.20*</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Amounts estimated at 95 percent relative to previous funding level.
IMPACT OF PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

Congress has not consistently included funding for Secure Rural Schools in each year’s appropriations negotiation. Most recently, in FY 2016 and FY 2019, Congress did not provide funding, although ultimately it was restored retroactively. The president FY 2021 budget again eliminates funding. Without these dollars, 775 counties and over 4,400 schools serving 9 million students in 41 states will face the grim financial reality of budget cuts, the loss of county road, fire, and safety services, and reductions in education programs and student services. These cuts will have a profound negative effect on everyone who lives in or visits forest counties.

PROGRAM NEED

Congress must continue the historic national commitment to rural communities and school districts served by the SRS program. Without congressional action on forest management and SRS, forest counties and schools face the loss of irreplaceable educational, fire, police, road and bridge, and community services.

CONTACT INFO

Noelle Ellerson Ng
AASA: The School Superintendents Association
(703) 875-0764 | nellerson@aasa.org
# CEF 2020 Membership Roster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AASA, the School Superintendents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AccessLex Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance CTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afterschool Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance for Excellent Education (All4ed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America's Public Television Stations (APTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Alliance of Museums (AAM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Association of Community Colleges (AACC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Council on Education (ACE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Counseling Association (ACA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Educational Research Association (AERA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Federation of School Administrators (AFSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Federation of Teachers (AFT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Library Association (ALA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Medical Student Association (AMSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American School Counselor Association (ASCA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Student Association of Community Colleges (ASACC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnitaB.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Career and Technical Education (ACTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of American Publishers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of American Universities (AAU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Educational Service Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (AJCU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of School Business Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bose Public Affairs Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference of Educational Administrators of Schools and Programs for the Deaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium for School Networking (CoSN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council for Opportunity in Education (COE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Administrators of Special Education (CASE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of the Great City Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Counsel LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FED ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Management Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Washington University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Consortium for Special Education (HECSE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Policy Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnet Schools of America, Inc. (MSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRM Associates, LLC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Association for College Admission Counseling (NACAC)
National Association for Music Education (NAfME)
National Association of College Stores (NACS)
National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP)
National Association of ESEA State Program Administrators (NAESPA)
National Association of Federally Impacted Schools (NAFIS)
National Association of Graduate-Professional Students (NAGPS)
National Association of Independent Colleges & Universities (NAICU)
National Association of Private Special Education Centers (NAPSEC)
National Association of School Psychologists (NASP)
National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP)
National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE)
National Association of State Student Grant and Aid Programs (NASSGAP)
National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators
National Association Workforce Boards
National Campus Leadership Council
National Center for Learning Disabilities
National Coalition for Literacy
National College Attainment Network
National Council for Community and Education Partnerships (NCCEP)
National Council of State Directors of Adult Education
National Education Association (NEA)
National HEP/CAMP Association
National Indian Education Association (NIEA)
National PTA
National Rural Education Association (NREA)
National School Boards Association (NSBA)
National Student Speech-Language-Hearing Association (NSSLHA)
National Superintendents Roundtable
Northwestern University
Pell Alliance
Rutgers University
Scholarship America
Scholastic, Inc.
Service Employees international Union (SEIU)
Sheridan Group
State University of New York (SUNY)
Stride Policy Solutions
Student Veterans of America
Teach for America
Texas A&M University System
UNCF (United Negro College Fund, Inc.)
United Classified School Employees
University of California
University of Maryland Global Campus
University of Pennsylvania
University of Southern California
University of Wisconsin System
US PIRG
WestED
YMCA of the USA