



**Congressional  
Research Service**

Informing the legislative debate since 1914

---

# **FY2022 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)**

June 14, 2023

**Congressional Research Service**

<https://crsreports.congress.gov>

R47598



## **FY2022 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)**

**R47598**

June 14, 2023

**Rebecca R. Skinner**  
Acting Section Research  
Manager

**Isobel Sorenson**  
Research Assistant

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), most recently comprehensively amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA; P.L. 114-95), is the primary source of federal aid to support elementary and secondary education. The Title I-A program is the largest grant program authorized under the ESEA and was funded at \$17.5 billion for FY2022. It is designed to provide supplementary educational and related services to low-achieving and other students attending elementary and secondary schools with relatively high concentrations of students from low-income families.

Under current law, the U.S. Department of Education (ED) determines Title I-A allocations to local educational agencies (LEAs) based on four separate funding formulas: Basic Grants, Concentration Grants, Targeted Grants, and Education Finance Incentive Grants (EFIG). State grants are the total of the allocations for all LEAs in the state under all four formulas. The four Title I-A formulas have somewhat distinct allocation patterns, providing varying shares of allocated funds to different types of LEAs and states. Thus, for some states, certain formulas are more favorable than others.

This report provides FY2022 state grant amounts under each of the four formulas used to determine Title I-A grants. Overall, California received the largest FY2022 Title I-A grant amount (\$2.1 billion, or 11.98% of total Title I-A grants to states). Vermont received the smallest FY2022 Title I-A grant amount (\$40.1 million, or 0.23% of total Title I-A grants to states).

## Contents

Introduction .....	1
Methodology for Determining Title I-A Grants .....	1
FY2022 Title I-A Grants.....	3

## Figures

Figure 1. FY2022 Title I-A State Grants by Amount and Share of Funds Provided Under Each Formula .....	5
---	---

## Tables

Table 1. FY2022 Title I-A State Grants, and Percentage Shares of Funds Received Under Each Title I-A Formula Relative to All States .....	9
--	---

## Contacts

Author Information.....	12
-------------------------	----

## Introduction

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), most recently comprehensively amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA; P.L. 114-95), is the primary source of federal aid to support elementary and secondary education. Title I-A<sup>1</sup> is the largest program in the ESEA, funded at \$17.5 billion for FY2022. Title I-A is designed to provide supplementary educational and related services to low-achieving and other students attending elementary and secondary schools with relatively high concentrations of students from low-income families. The U.S. Department of Education (ED) determines Title I-A allocations to local educational agencies (LEAs) based on four separate funding formulas: Basic Grants, Concentration Grants, Targeted Grants, and Education Finance Incentive Grants (EFIG). Grants to states<sup>2</sup> are the total of the allocations for all LEAs in the state under all four formulas.

This report provides FY2022 state grant amounts under each of the four formulas used to determine Title I-A grants.<sup>3</sup> For a general overview of the Title I-A formulas, see CRS Report R44164, *ESEA Title I-A Formulas: In Brief*. For a more detailed discussion of the Title I-A formulas, see CRS Report R44461, *Allocation of Funds Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act*.

## Methodology for Determining Title I-A Grants

Under Title I-A, ED allocates funds to LEAs via state educational agencies (SEAs) using the four Title I-A formulas.<sup>4</sup> Annual appropriations acts specify portions of each year's Title I-A appropriation to be allocated under each of the formulas. In FY2022, the appropriations act designated 36.83% (\$6.5 billion) of Title I-A appropriations for the Basic Grant formula, 7.77% (\$1.4 billion) for the Concentration Grant formula, 27.70% (\$4.9 billion) for the Targeted Grant formula, and 27.70% (\$4.9 billion) for the EFIG formula.<sup>5</sup> After reserving funds for the U.S. Census Bureau, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas as required under Title I-A, \$17.3 billion was actually available for FY2022 Title I-A grants to LEAs.<sup>6</sup> Once states allocate funds received from ED to LEAs, the amounts allocated under the four formulas are combined and used jointly by each LEA.

---

<sup>1</sup> Title I-A is officially titled "Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies" in the ESEA, but it is commonly referred to as Title I-A.

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

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

<sup>4</sup> The analysis presented in this report is based on unpublished data provided to CRS by ED on November 2, 2022. As such, CRS is unable to present the specific underlying data used to determine Title I-A grants for a given state.

<sup>5</sup> Individual grant formula appropriations may not add to \$17.5 billion due to rounding.

<sup>6</sup> From the appropriation for Basic Grants, \$5 million was reserved for the U.S. Census Bureau. From the remaining funds, 1.1% was reserved from the appropriations for each of the four formulas for the Bureau of Indian Education and the outlying areas. For the purposes of Title I-A, the outlying areas include American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

For each formula, grants are calculated using a *formula child count*, a *formula child rate*, and an *expenditure factor*. The EFIG formula has two additional factors that are used to calculate grant amounts.<sup>7</sup>

Formula child counts used to determine Title I-A grants for the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico include children who are ages 5-17 and meet at least one of the following criteria: (1) living in families in poverty, according to estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program<sup>8</sup>; (2) in institutions for neglected or delinquent children or in foster homes; or (3) in families with income above the federal poverty level receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) payments.<sup>9</sup> To obtain the percentage of children in an LEA that are formula children (also referred to as the *formula child rate*), the formula child count is divided by the total number of children ages 5-17 living in the LEA's geographic boundaries. The data on the total number of children also are based on SAIPE estimates. In FY2022, children in poor families accounted for 96.8% of the total formula child count, aligning with the first criterion listed above. Each element of the formula child count and formula child rate factors is updated annually.

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

For LEAs in a given state, the *expenditure factor* for all four Title I-A formulas is equal to state average per pupil expenditures (APPE) for public elementary and secondary education, subject to a minimum and a maximum percentage of the national average, further multiplied by 0.40. State APPE is subject to a minimum of 80% and a maximum of 120% of the national APPE for Basic Grants, Concentration Grants, and Targeted Grants. That is, if a state's APPE is less than 80% of the national APPE, the state's APPE is automatically raised to 80% of the national APPE. If a state's APPE is more than 120% of the national APPE, the state's APPE is automatically reduced to 120% of the national APPE. For EFIG, the minimum and maximum thresholds for state APPE relative to national APPE are 85% and 115%, respectively. After adjustments, should they be needed, a state's APPE is multiplied by 0.40 as specified in statute.

After calculating LEA grant amounts, ED provides these amounts to each state. States need to make adjustments to these LEA grant amounts to account for LEAs for which ED is unable to estimate Title I-A grant amounts, such as charter schools that operate as independent LEAs or newly formed LEAs.<sup>10</sup> In addition, each state must reserve Title I-A funds for school improvement and may also reserve Title I-A funds for administration and direct student services. Thus, the LEA grant amounts calculated by ED will likely be higher than what an LEA will actually receive after state adjustments and reservations are made.

---

<sup>7</sup> The two factors are the *equity* and *effort* factors. For more information about these factors, see CRS Report R44461, *Allocation of Funds Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act*.

<sup>8</sup> SAIPE produces single-year estimates of income and poverty for all U.S. states and counties as well as estimates of school-age children in poverty for all 13,000+ school districts.

<sup>9</sup> For a description of the TANF program, see CRS In Focus IF10036, *The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant*.

<sup>10</sup> For example, during the 2019-2020 school year, there were 4,047 independent charter districts in the United States (ED, National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics*, April 2022, Table 214.30, [https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d21/tables/dt21\\_214.30.asp?current=yes](https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d21/tables/dt21_214.30.asp?current=yes)). Independent charter districts are not included in the SAIPE dataset used by ED to calculate Title I-A grants, so ED is unable to calculate grant amounts for these LEAs.

## FY2022 Title I-A Grants

**Figure 1** details the composition of each state’s Title I-A grant based on the share of total state funds received under each of the formulas. The figure also provides the amount of funding each state received under each of the formulas.

State grant amounts can also be examined based on each state’s share of the amount of funds available overall and under each of the formulas relative to other states. **Table 1** provides each state’s grant amount and relative percentage share of funds allocated under each of the Title I-A formulas for FY2022. The latter was determined for each state by dividing the state’s grant amount under that formula by the total amount of funding allocated to states for a given Title I-A formula. Total Title I-A grants, calculated by summing the state level grant for each of the four formulas, also are shown in **Table 1**, along with each state’s relative percentage shares of total Title I-A grants.

In general, grant amounts for states vary across the Title I-A formulas due to the different allocation amounts for the formulas provided through the appropriations process and the characteristics of the formulas themselves. For example, with respect to appropriations for each of the formulas, the Basic Grant formula receives a greater share of overall Title I-A appropriations than the Concentration Grant formula, so states generally receive higher grant amounts and a greater share of their total Title I-A funds under the Basic Grant formula than under the Concentration Grant formula (**Figure 1**). With respect to formula characteristics,<sup>11</sup> the amount of funding received under each formula is related, in part, to an LEA’s, and by extension a state’s, number or percentage of formula children. For example, while Texas and Tennessee have similar percentages of formula children and identical expenditure factors, Texas has a larger population of children included in the formula calculations than Tennessee and, therefore, received a higher grant amount and larger share of Title I-A funds in FY2022 (**Table 1**).

It is also possible for states to have similar numbers of formula children but have different expenditure factors, contributing to a lower Title I-A grant amount for the state with the lower expenditure factor. For example, Washington and Oklahoma have similar numbers of formula children, but Washington has a higher expenditure factor. This difference contributes to Washington receiving a Title I-A grant that is \$70.5 million (about 30%) higher than the grant amount provided to Oklahoma (**Table 1**).

Different Title I-A formulas also have different eligibility requirements for LEAs to receive a grant (e.g., minimum number of formula children or minimum formula child rate), which affects which LEAs receive funds under a particular Title I-A grant formula, thereby affecting the total amount of funding received by a state under a specific Title I-A formula. In addition, the Targeted Grant and EFIG formulas use weighted formula child counts<sup>12</sup> in determining LEA grant amounts. These differences can also affect total state grant amounts.

<sup>11</sup> For more information about the characteristics of the Title I-A formulas and how they affect grant amounts, see CRS Report R45141, *Analysis of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I-A Allocation Formulas: Factors, Design Elements, and Allocation Patterns*.

<sup>12</sup> Under the Targeted Grant and EFIG formulas, weights are applied to formula child counts on the basis of (1) each LEA’s formula child rate (commonly referred to as *percentage weighting*), and (2) each LEA’s number of formula children (commonly referred to as *number weighting*). Under both percentage weighting and number weighting, a weighted formula child count is produced. The higher of the two weighted formula child counts for a given LEA is then used in the formula for determining grants. For more information about the Title I-A formulas, see CRS Report R44461, *Allocation of Funds Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act*.

Overall, California received the largest total Title I-A grant amount (\$2.1 billion) and, as a result, the largest percentage share (11.98%) of Title I-A grants. Vermont received the smallest total Title I-A grant amount (\$40.1 million) and, as a result, the smallest percentage share (0.23%) of Title I-A grants (**Table 1**).

Within a state, the relative percentage share of funds received from each formula may vary by formula, as certain formulas are more favorable to certain types of states. For example, in addition to the formula features discussed above, EFIG is generally more favorable to states with comparatively equal levels of spending per pupil among their LEAs.<sup>13</sup> If a state's share of a given Title I-A formula exceeds its share of overall Title I-A funds, this is generally an indication that this particular formula was more favorable to the state than formulas for which the state's share of funds is below its overall share of Title I-A funds for the fiscal year being examined. For example, in FY2022 Florida received a higher percentage share of Concentration Grants and Targeted Grants than its overall share of Title I-A funds, indicating that the Concentration Grant and Targeted Grant formulas were more favorable to Florida than the Basic Grant or EFIG formulas. Utah, on the other hand, received a higher percentage share of Basic Grants and EFIG than its overall share of Title I-A funds in FY2022, indicating that the Basic Grant and EFIG formulas are more favorable to Utah than the Concentration Grant or Targeted Grant formulas may be (**Table 1**).


Another factor affecting state grant amounts is the state minimum grant provision included in each of the four Title I-A formulas. The minimum grant provisions applicable to each of the Title I-A formulas provide states with different minimum shares of the funds allocated under the respective formulas. The highest minimum state grant shares are provided under Targeted Grants and EFIG and lower minimum state grant shares are provided under Basic Grants and Concentration Grants. This is evident in the shares of each Title I-A formula grant provided to the states that received a minimum grant under all four formulas (Alaska, Montana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming).<sup>14</sup> Each of these states received a higher share of the total available funds under the Targeted Grant and EFIG formulas than under the Basic Grant or Concentration Grant formulas. As a state may receive a state minimum grant amount under any or all of the formulas, **Table 1** indicates which states received a minimum grant under each of the Title I-A formulas.

---


<sup>13</sup> This is due to the equity factor used in the EFIG formula. For more information about this factor, see CRS Report R44461, *Allocation of Funds Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act*.


<sup>14</sup> Each of the minimum grant provisions included in the four Title I-A formulas have multiple minimum grant calculation formulas. By law, the calculation option that produces the lowest grant is chosen for each state, resulting in states that benefit from the minimum state grant provisions receiving different shares of the same Title I-A formula appropriation.


**Figure I. FY2022 Title I-A State Grants by Amount and Share of Funds Provided Under Each Formula**  
(dollars in thousands)











**Source:** Figure prepared by CRS based on unpublished data provided by the U.S. Department of Education (ED), Budget Service. FY2022 Title I-A grant amounts were calculated by ED using the most current data available. Percentage shares of state grant FY2022 allocation amounts from each formula were calculated by CRS.

**Notes:** States are listed alphabetically based on the full spelling of their names. The percentages represented by the bars for each state show the share of a state’s total Title I-A funding being provided under each of the four Title I-A formulas. Thus, across states the same percentage of funds being provided by a particular Title I-A formula may not correspond to an identical dollar amount of funds being provided by that formula to the relevant states. Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Percentages were calculated based on unrounded numbers. Amounts shown in the figure only reflect Title I-A funds provided to states. These amounts are determined after funds have been reserved from the total Title I-A appropriation (\$17.5 billion) for the Census Bureau, Bureau of Indian Education, and outlying areas. For the purposes of Title I-A, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico are considered states.

**Table I. FY2022 Title I-A State Grants, and Percentage Shares of Funds Received Under Each Title I-A Formula Relative to All States**

(dollars in thousands)

	Basic Grants		Concentration Grants		Targeted Grants		EFIG		Total Title I-A Grants	
State	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation
<b>Total, All States</b>	\$6,383,403	100.00%	\$1,347,316	100.00%	\$4,804,117	100.00%	\$4,804,117	100.00%	\$17,338,952	100.00%
Alabama	\$102,724	1.61%	\$24,390	1.81%	\$73,227	1.52%	\$78,800	1.64%	\$279,142	1.61%
Alaska	\$17,744 <sup>a</sup>	0.28%	\$2,459 <sup>a</sup>	0.18%	\$15,266 <sup>a</sup>	0.32%	\$15,134 <sup>a</sup>	0.32%	\$50,604	0.29%
Arizona	\$137,339	2.15%	\$28,861	2.14%	\$101,620	2.12%	\$102,565	2.13%	\$370,385	2.14%
Arkansas	\$65,320	1.02%	\$14,733	1.09%	\$41,745	0.87%	\$52,510	1.09%	\$174,307	1.01%
California	\$775,255	12.14%	\$161,781	12.01%	\$596,285	12.41%	\$543,385	11.31%	\$2,076,706	11.98%
Colorado	\$68,334	1.07%	\$11,430	0.85%	\$45,302	0.94%	\$48,957	1.02%	\$174,023	1.00%
Connecticut	\$62,517	0.98%	\$10,847	0.81%	\$34,853	0.73%	\$45,484	0.95%	\$153,701	0.89%
Delaware	\$20,113	0.32%	\$3,482	0.26%	\$16,814 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$16,814 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$57,224	0.33%
District of Columbia	\$18,919	0.30%	\$4,919	0.37%	\$19,141	0.40%	\$16,814 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$59,793	0.34%
Florida	\$333,440	5.22%	\$83,614	6.21%	\$323,618	6.74%	\$265,881	5.53%	\$1,006,554	5.81%
Georgia	\$234,617	3.68%	\$55,339	4.11%	\$189,196	3.94%	\$175,933	3.66%	\$655,086	3.78%
Hawaii	\$20,035	0.31%	\$4,257	0.32%	\$16,814 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$17,087	0.36%	\$58,193	0.34%
Idaho	\$23,312	0.37%	\$3,333	0.25%	\$16,814 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$16,814 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$60,274	0.35%
Illinois	\$269,803	4.23%	\$52,601	3.90%	\$196,544	4.09%	\$182,713	3.80%	\$701,661	4.05%
Indiana	\$105,554	1.65%	\$20,715	1.54%	\$65,559	1.36%	\$81,513	1.70%	\$273,340	1.58%
Iowa	\$44,515	0.70%	\$6,941	0.52%	\$23,648	0.49%	\$35,654	0.74%	\$110,758	0.64%
Kansas	\$46,546	0.73%	\$8,901	0.66%	\$27,905	0.58%	\$34,176	0.71%	\$117,527	0.68%
Kentucky	\$100,725	1.58%	\$23,576	1.75%	\$68,939	1.43%	\$78,781	1.64%	\$272,020	1.57%

	Basic Grants		Concentration Grants		Targeted Grants		EFIG		Total Title I-A Grants	
State	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation
Louisiana	\$129,441	2.03%	\$32,011	2.38%	\$101,936	2.12%	\$95,566	1.99%	\$358,954	2.07%
Maine	\$22,080	0.35%	\$3,784	0.28%	\$16,814 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$16,814 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$59,492	0.34%
Maryland	\$101,910	1.60%	\$21,560	1.60%	\$87,659	1.82%	\$81,658	1.70%	\$292,787	1.69%
Massachusetts	\$106,762	1.67%	\$17,988	1.34%	\$62,575	1.30%	\$75,393	1.57%	\$262,718	1.52%
Michigan	\$191,941	3.01%	\$38,863	2.88%	\$133,648	2.78%	\$150,151	3.13%	\$514,603	2.97%
Minnesota	\$72,821	1.14%	\$9,352	0.69%	\$39,889	0.83%	\$52,677	1.10%	\$174,738	1.01%
Mississippi	\$85,187	1.33%	\$20,513	1.52%	\$63,215	1.32%	\$65,644	1.37%	\$234,558	1.35%
Missouri	\$104,580	1.64%	\$21,733	1.61%	\$63,593	1.32%	\$75,682	1.58%	\$265,588	1.53%
Montana	\$17,744 <sup>a</sup>	0.28%	\$3,378 <sup>a</sup>	0.25%	\$16,814 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$16,814 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$54,751	0.32%
Nebraska	\$28,040	0.44%	\$3,859	0.29%	\$16,814 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$21,349	0.44%	\$70,063	0.40%
Nevada	\$50,173	0.79%	\$12,642	0.94%	\$54,943	1.14%	\$39,504	0.82%	\$157,263	0.91%
New Hampshire	\$17,618 <sup>a</sup>	0.28%	\$2,296 <sup>a</sup>	0.17%	\$14,207 <sup>a</sup>	0.30%	\$15,072 <sup>a</sup>	0.31%	\$49,194	0.28%
New Jersey	\$165,025	2.59%	\$28,496	2.12%	\$99,847	2.08%	\$124,559	2.59%	\$417,927	2.41%
New Mexico	\$48,388	0.76%	\$12,159	0.90%	\$37,035	0.77%	\$38,118	0.79%	\$135,700	0.78%
New York	\$463,818	7.27%	\$102,935	7.64%	\$416,018	8.66%	\$336,983	7.01%	\$1,319,754	7.61%
North Carolina	\$190,316	2.98%	\$46,639	3.46%	\$147,878	3.08%	\$148,049	3.08%	\$532,882	3.07%
North Dakota	\$16,006 <sup>a</sup>	0.25%	\$2,158 <sup>a</sup>	0.16%	\$13,832 <sup>a</sup>	0.29%	\$13,828 <sup>a</sup>	0.29%	\$45,823	0.26%
Ohio	\$235,760	3.69%	\$47,154	3.50%	\$155,587	3.24%	\$180,031	3.75%	\$618,532	3.57%
Oklahoma	\$80,369	1.26%	\$17,686	1.31%	\$53,416	1.11%	\$60,479	1.26%	\$211,951	1.22%
Oregon	\$58,298	0.91%	\$10,837	0.80%	\$32,739	0.68%	\$43,151	0.90%	\$145,025	0.84%
Pennsylvania	\$269,010	4.21%	\$52,055	3.86%	\$186,706	3.89%	\$189,908	3.95%	\$697,679	4.02%

State	Basic Grants		Concentration Grants		Targeted Grants		EFIG		Total Title I-A Grants	
	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation	Grant Amount	Percentage Share of Total Allocation
Puerto Rico	\$160,649	2.52%	\$41,770	3.10%	\$132,893	2.77%	\$137,436	2.86%	\$472,747	2.73%
Rhode Island	\$20,205	0.32%	\$3,378 <sup>a</sup>	0.25%	\$16,814 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$16,814 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$57,212	0.33%
South Carolina	\$103,814	1.63%	\$24,788	1.84%	\$75,896	1.58%	\$80,957	1.69%	\$285,457	1.65%
South Dakota	\$17,744 <sup>a</sup>	0.28%	\$3,227 <sup>a</sup>	0.24%	\$16,814 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$16,814 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$54,600	0.31%
Tennessee	\$127,023	1.99%	\$29,269	2.17%	\$95,493	1.99%	\$97,878	2.04%	\$349,664	2.02%
Texas	\$632,876	9.91%	\$145,396	10.79%	\$514,652	10.71%	\$492,492	10.25%	\$1,785,415	10.30%
Utah	\$32,101	0.50%	\$2,985 <sup>a</sup>	0.22%	\$16,814 <sup>a</sup>	0.35%	\$22,563	0.47%	\$74,465	0.43%
Vermont	\$13,913 <sup>a</sup>	0.22%	\$1,989 <sup>a</sup>	0.15%	\$12,045 <sup>a</sup>	0.25%	\$12,199 <sup>a</sup>	0.25%	\$40,146	0.23%
Virginia	\$119,163	1.87%	\$22,651	1.68%	\$78,525	1.63%	\$80,382	1.67%	\$300,720	1.73%
Washington	\$115,105	1.80%	\$16,814	1.25%	\$64,065	1.33%	\$86,425	1.80%	\$282,409	1.63%
West Virginia	\$40,308	0.63%	\$9,500	0.71%	\$24,912	0.52%	\$32,449	0.68%	\$107,169	0.62%
Wisconsin	\$83,891	1.31%	\$13,313	0.99%	\$54,062	1.13%	\$64,602	1.34%	\$215,867	1.24%
Wyoming	\$14,513 <sup>a</sup>	0.23%	\$1,956 <sup>a</sup>	0.15%	\$12,676 <sup>a</sup>	0.26%	\$12,655 <sup>a</sup>	0.26%	\$41,800	0.24%

**Source:** Table prepared by CRS based on unpublished data provided by the U.S. Department of Education (ED), Budget Service. FY2022 Title I-A grant amounts were calculated by ED using the most current data available. Percentage shares of FY2022 allocation amounts were calculated by CRS.

**Notes:** Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Percentages were calculated based on unrounded numbers. Amounts shown in the table only reflect Title I-A funds provided to states. These amounts are determined after funds have been reserved from the total Title I-A appropriation (\$17.5 billion) for the Census Bureau, Bureau of Indian Education, and outlying areas. For the purposes of Title I-A, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico are considered states.

a. The state received only a minimum state grant under this Title I-A formula.

## Author Information

Rebecca R. Skinner  
Acting Section Research Manager

Isobel Sorenson  
Research Assistant

---

## Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.