Which Students and Staff Positions Might Be Most at Risk with Changes to Federal Spending on K–12 Education?

Kristin Blagg

April 2026

Overview

Several policy proposals and changes have created uncertainty for federal revenue for K–12 schools. This essay looks at school-district-level data on specific federal funding streams—including title revenue, revenue for students with disabilities, and school-based nutrition revenue—to understand how these funding sources are correlated with district characteristics and staffing per pupil. I relate these results to previous research on how districts spend specific federal funding streams.

My results affirm that uncertainty in federal K–12 funding is more likely to affect districts serving high shares of students from low-income families, as these districts will be more vulnerable to uncertainty and cuts to funding. My analysis also demonstrates that different federal funding streams are correlated with different per pupil staffing patterns. Each revenue stream has a unique pattern of staffing correlations, which is likely related to specific programs' rules and goals. Federal revenue is generally associated with higher levels of nonteaching staff members per pupil at the district level, which seems in line with the role of federal revenue to support and supplement classroom instruction. Although my analysis is not causal, these results, combined with other literature, indicate how changes to specific federal revenue streams might affect staffing positions and programming.

Introduction

In the past year, several federal policy changes and policy proposals have directly and indirectly threatened federal revenue streams for public K–12 education. For example, federal K–12 revenue streams have faced direct threats in terms of budget proposals. Although ultimately not enacted, the fiscal year 2026 House funding bill proposed reducing Title I spending by about a quarter and zeroing out Title II and Title III funding, and the president's budget request for fiscal year 2026 proposed eliminating several small programs in favor of a smaller, consolidated funding stream.[1] Another direct threat to federal funding for school districts was the temporary withholding of nearly $6.8 billion in funds for Title I, Part C; Title II, Part A; Title III, Part A; and Title IV, Parts A and B in summer 2025.[2]

Indirect threats to federal education programs may not change the total amount of funding allocated but could change how these funds are distributed to school districts. For example, changes to social safety net programs in the One Big Beautiful Bill Act would likely reduce the number of children who are directly certified for school meal programs through participation in social safety net programs such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and Medicaid (Guttierez 2026). This change would affect reimbursements for school meals and could indirectly affect within-state allocations of federal funding where the formula depends on estimates of students who come from low-income families derived from school meals data. Further, the US Department of Education has encouraged states to submit waiver requests that would provide additional flexibility over the use of federal dollars, which could threaten the implementation of programming for specific students as funded through

title programs (Carter 2026; Hyslop and Powell 2025). Finally, the Department of Education has designated administration of several federal K–12 revenue sources as being under the purview of other agencies (e.g., the US Department of Labor and the US Department of Health and Human Services), though the timing of those transitions is unclear.[3]

These threats to the amount and allocation of federal funding are set against a backdrop of increasing evidence on the importance of federal revenue for student achievement, particularly among students from low-income families. In aggregate, across the US in 2018–19, children from households below the federal poverty threshold receive roughly 30 percent more federal funding than children from households above the federal poverty threshold.[4] And recent analysis demonstrates that school-level spending for students below the federal poverty level increased in the wake of the pandemic, likely in part because of additional federal support for students' academic recovery (Blagg and Gutierrez 2026).

Empirical evidence shows that increases in federal educational funding can affect student outcomes. Studies of Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) funding show that a $1,000 increase in federal revenue per pupil was associated with increases in math scores (0.007 to 0.009 standard deviations) and in reading scores (0.002 to 0.005 standard deviations) (Dewey et al. 2024; Goldhaber and Falken 2025). And Title I spending is associated with various positive outcomes, including on educational attainment and adult earnings, with students from lower-income families benefiting more (Johnson 2015).

Methodology

For this analysis, I focus on how student demographics and school characteristics are associated with federal revenue and how district-level staffing per pupil is correlated with different funding streams. I conduct this analysis because expenses for staff salaries and benefits make up roughly 80 percent of current K–12 expenditures.[5] Further, there is empirical evidence that additional staffing is positively correlated with student outcomes. For example, increasing access to school counselors is linked to increased high school graduation and college enrollment, and the support of teaching assistants and teaching coaches can support improved reading and math test scores (Hemelt et al. 2021, Hurwitz and Howell 2014; Kraft et al. 2018; Sparks and Mulhern 2026).

My analysis of the relationship between a given revenue stream and staffing per pupil is an attempt to provide a descriptive look at the extent to which local education agencies (LEAs) that receive relatively more of a given federal revenue stream have a staff composition that is different than LEAs that receive less funding. I also look at student demographic composition and LEA characteristics. For each staffing, student demographic, and district urbanicity variable, I estimate a set of three regressions, each version weighted and unweighted for LEA student enrollment, to look at the relationship with per pupil revenue from a given federal source.[6] I note a positive correlation in my results when at least five of the six regressions yield a positive, statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) coefficient for the federal revenue stream.

A full explanation of the data I use for this analysis is available in the appendix.

Estimates of Per Pupil Revenue by Federal Funding Source

Title I, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), and the Child Nutrition Act are the largest sources of annual federal revenue for LEAs. Nearly all LEAs receive these funds, and the typical amount for each of these programs is hundreds of dollars per pupil (based on overall enrollment, not per served pupil) (table 1). Programs linked to student economic need—Title I and school meals—have a wider range of allocated amounts across LEAs (a

$322 and $377 per pupil interquartile range, respectively) than revenue allocated under IDEA ($120 per pupil interquartile range).

TABLE 1

Federal Funding Sources and LEA Allocation per Pupil

Federal funding source	Purpose	Share of LEAs receiving funds	Revenue per Pupil, Among LEAs Receiving Funding		
			25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile
Title I	Support students from low-income families	More than 90%	$148	$278	$470
Title II, Part A	Professional development of teachers and school leaders, improve equitable access to effective teachers	More than 90%	$24	$38	$55
Title III, Part A	Support students who are English learners	20% to 30%	$6	$13	$29
Title IV, Part A	Provide well-rounded education, promote safe and healthy students, support effective use of technology	80% to 90%	$14	$25	$44
Title IV, Part B	Support programs outside of school hours that provide academic enrichment opportunities	10% to 20%	$33	$101	$233
Title V, Part B	Support student achievement in rural districts	10% to 20%	$21	$30	$61
IDEA	Support special education for students with disabilities ages 3 to 21	More than 90%[a]	$195	$253	$315
Child Nutrition Act	Support student access to nutrition through school meals programs	More than 90%	$301	$463	$678

Source: Urban Institute analysis of CCD data.

Note: CCD = Common Core of Data; IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; LEA = local education agency.

[a] Although IDEA funds support nearly all LEAs, some IDEA funding may not show up in the CCD district reporting because of the way IDEA funding is distributed by the state. For example, in California, IDEA funding is distributed to Special Education Local Plan Areas.

Title II, Part A and Title IV, Part A are smaller but near-universal sources of federal revenue for LEAs. These programs provide about $38 and $25 per pupil, respectively, at the median. Title III, Part A and Title V, Part B provide revenue to fewer than half of LEAs, in alignment with their targeted purposes of serving English learners and rural districts, respectively. Funding per pupil for these programs is relatively small, about $13 and $30 per pupil. Title IV, Part B serves a small share of districts, likely because it is a competitive grant within states and can be awarded to entities that are not LEAs. Allocation amounts vary substantially, from $33 per pupil at the 25th percentile to $233 per pupil at the 75th percentile.

Correlates of Federal Revenue with Student Populations, School Urbanicity, and Staffing Positions per Pupil

I find that revenue from specific federal programs is correlated with student populations, as well as the composition of staffing positions (table 2). The most common student population correlation is the share of students in the LEA from families below the federal poverty threshold. Except for Title IV, Part B, all the federal revenue programs I

examine tend to have higher revenues per pupil as the share of low-income students increases. This is not surprising, as state-level allocations under many of these programs are tied to poverty or student economic need: Title I; Title II, Part A; Title IV, Part A; Title V, Part B; IDEA; and the Child Nutrition Act.[7]

In some cases, allocations also vary significantly by the demographics of students served or by urbanicity. For example, Title III, Part A grants for English learners are more likely to be allocated to districts serving larger shares of Black, Hispanic, and Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander students. Rural districts are likely to receive more revenue than other districts from Title IV, Part A; Title V, Part B (which is specifically aimed at rural education); and the Child Nutrition Act, and urban (nonrural) districts are more likely to receive revenue from Title I and Title III, Part A.

To dive deeper into how each revenue stream is correlated with staffing per pupil, I look at each program in turn, drawing on both my own analysis and external evaluations of how these programs are used to support K–12 education.

TABLE 2

Correlation Between Federal Funding Sources and Student Populations and Staffing Per Pupil

LEA federal funding source	Purpose	Positively Correlated With	
		Student population	Staffing per pupil
Title I	Support students from low-income families	▪ **Share of students from families below the federal poverty threshold** ▪ Share of Black students ▪ **Urban school districts**	▪ Other support staff ▪ **Student support services staff (without psychology)** ▪ Ungraded teachers
Title II, Part A	Professional development of teachers and school leaders, improve equitable access to effective teachers	▪ **Share of students from families below the federal poverty threshold** ▪ **Share of Black students** ▪ **Share of Hispanic students**	▪ No national staffing trends
Title III, Part A	Support students who are English learners	▪ **Share of students from families below the federal poverty threshold** ▪ **Share of Black students** ▪ **Share of Hispanic students** ▪ **Share of Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander students** ▪ **Urban school districts**	▪ No national staffing trends
Title IV, Part A	Provide well-rounded education, promote safe and healthy students, support effective use of technology	▪ **Share of students from families below the federal poverty threshold** ▪ **Rural school districts**	▪ **Elementary school teachers** ▪ **Paraprofessional staff**
Title IV, Part B	Support programs outside of school hours that provide academic enrichment opportunities	▪ No national student population trends	▪ LEA administrators ▪ School administrative support
Title V, Part B	Support student achievement in rural districts	▪ **Share of students from families below the federal poverty threshold** ▪ **Share of white students** ▪ **Rural school districts**	▪ **Elementary school teachers** ▪ **Kindergarten teachers** ▪ School administrators ▪ **LEA administrative support** ▪ **Other support staff** ▪ **Paraprofessional staff**
IDEA	Support special education for students with disabilities ages 3 to 21	▪ Share of students from families below the federal poverty threshold	▪ Instructional coordinators ▪ School psychologists ▪ Student support services staff (without psychology) ▪ Ungraded teachers
Child Nutrition Act	Support student access to nutrition through school meals programs	▪ **Share of students from families below the federal poverty threshold** ▪ **Share of Black students** ▪ Share of Hispanic students ▪ Share of Native American and Alaska Native students	▪ **Elementary school teachers** ▪ Instructional coordinators ▪ Other support staff ▪ Paraprofessional staff

Source: Urban Institute analysis of data from the Common Core of Data and Model Estimates of Poverty in Schools.

Notes: IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; LEA = local education agency. Rural is defined as a school district that is categorized as rural (fringe, distant, remote) using the National Center for Education Statistics locale variable. Bold text indicates that a $1,000 increase in that funding stream is associated with a more than 0.10 standard deviation increase in the variable in at least four of six tested regressions.

Title I

Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the 2015 Every Student Succeeds Act, Title I, Part A allocations are intended to supplement state and local education spending for students from low-income families.[8] Allocations to school districts are made using four funding formulas, based primarily on student poverty levels but also on state size, historical Title I allocations, and other state spending data (Gordon 2016). Previous research on Title I spending indicates that most dollars tend to be allocated toward personnel, such as teachers, instructional coaches, specialists, paraprofessionals, and administrative staff (GAO 2011; Gordon and Reber 2015). A study of Title I in elementary schools showed that principals reported that the funding is most frequently used to support professional development and schoolwide reforms and is less frequently used for family literacy, extended day or summer programs, and class size reductions (Dynarski and Kainz 2015). Less money is spent on purchased services or on materials and supplies (GAO 2011).

My analysis of national data indicates that higher per pupil amounts of Title I revenue in districts are correlated with having relatively more other support staff (e.g., maintenance workers, bus drivers, security officers, and food service workers); student support services staff, excluding psychology (e.g., attendance officers, speech pathologists, and social services staff); and ungraded teachers (e.g., teachers that support students with special needs or who teach in classes with multiple grade levels). The correlation with noninstructional support staff is likely a reflection of the fact that LEAs with higher allocations of Title I revenue (and thus, within state, more student economic need) typically have other personnel needs, such as additional social services staff members or food service workers, relative to LEAs with smaller allocations. Further, a portion of Title I, Part A funding must be reserved for meeting the needs of students experiencing homelessness ("homeless set aside"), such as transportation to school and providing support services (SchoolHouse Connection, n.d.). My analysis could be picking up on noninstructional spending for these students. The lack of a district pattern in instructional staffing among Title I schools (beyond for ungraded teachers) could reflect the range of initiatives that may be funded with this revenue and the fact that Title I revenue must supplement, not supplant, regular instruction.

Title II, Part A

Title II, Part A funds for LEAs may be used for professional development activities, including teacher, principal, and school leadership recruitment; preparation programs; induction; training; professional development; and retention strategies (US Department of Education 2024b). Analysis of survey data from LEAs in 2022–23 indicates that 78 percent of LEAs spent Title II, Part A revenue on professional development (Webber et al. 2024). Thirty-four percent of districts used the money to support recruiting, hiring, and retaining staff members, 17 percent used it for class size reduction, 8 percent used it for evaluation systems, and 26 percent used it for other activities (Webber et al. 2024). In their analysis of Title II, Part A using Every Student Succeeds Act plans, amendments, and US Department of Education documentation, Jang and Bailes (2025) note that states exhibited a wide variation in strategies for using the funding but over time seem to be shifting more funding toward leadership development.

I do not find a substantial correlation between Title II, Part A revenue and differences in per pupil staffing positions. This likely reflects the fact that this revenue typically supports programs that develop and retain current leadership and teaching staff or that develop teachers to fill specific teacher vacancies, rather than hire additional teachers or staff. Although these funds can be used to reduce class sizes, I did not see a substantial correlation between per pupil revenue amount and teachers per pupil, likely reflecting the evidence that only a small share of districts pursue this strategy using Title II, Part A funds.

Title III, Part A

Title III, Part A funding is designed to help English learners attain proficiency and high academic achievement in English. Funds are allocated to LEAs to support activities for these students, including language instruction,

professional development, and other activities that support language instruction, including parent, family, and community engagement (Tannenbaum et al. 2012; US Department of Education, n.d.). An evaluation of Title III in 2009–10 indicated that nearly half of Title III funds were spent on instructional staff; 25 percent were spent on materials, equipment, and technology; and 18 percent were spent on professional development (Tanenbaum et al. 2012).

I do not find that the per pupil allocation of Title III, Part A funding is correlated with staffing per pupil. This is likely because Title III, Part A spending is small on a per pupil basis.

Title IV, Part A

Revenue from Title IV, Part A is intended to support access to a well-rounded education, improve conditions for learning, and facilitate access to technology (T4PA Center, n.d.). Funding is distributed in a similar proportion to Title I, with a minimum allocation of $10,000, and LEAs cannot spend more than 15 percent of funds on technology infrastructure (T4PA Center, n.d.). States and districts can transfer some or all of the funding to certain other programs under Titles I through V. An analysis of fiscal year 2018 spending indicates that 26 percent of districts transferred all their funding, while most districts retained some or all the Title IV, Part A funding for the specified purposes (Boyle and Wilkinson-Flicker 2020). Districts that retained the funding were most likely to use it for STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) and music and arts activities; mental health services, bullying prevention, and school climate initiatives; and professional development on the use of technology (Boyle and Wilkinson-Flicker 2020).

In my analysis, higher levels of reported Title IV, Part A funding per pupil are positively correlated with elementary school teachers and paraprofessional staff members per pupil. This result seems logical, given the purposes set out for the revenue, as increased elementary school teacher staffing could be aligned with additional STEM or arts teacher positions, and as paraprofessionals could help support classroom management and school culture.

Title IV, Part B

Title IV, Part B authorizes the Nita M. Lowey 21st Century Community Learning Centers program, which allows states to provide competitive grants to LEAs, community-based organizations, tribal organizations, and other public or private entities or combination of entities (US Department of Education 2024a). Entities that receive these funds must use them for out-of-school activities (e.g., before or after school or summer programming) and provide activities that improve student achievement and overall well-being (US Department of Education 2024a).

My analysis suggests that per pupil Title IV, Part B funds are positively correlated with the number of LEA administrators and school administrative support staff members per pupil. This correlation could indicate that districts that engage in out-of-school programming funded by this revenue are more likely to employ additional LEA or school staff to oversee the program and any contracted entities.

Title V, Part B

The Rural Education Achievement Program is authorized by Title V, Part B and consists of two programs: the Small, Rural School Achievement program and the Rural and Low-Income School program.[9] The Small, Rural School Achievement program provides funds for small and rural LEAs, while the Rural and Low-Income School program awards funds to rural LEAs that serve high shares of students from households below the federal poverty level.[10] LEAs that receive these funds may use them to support activities carried out under other federal title revenue streams (Titles I through IV).

Title V, Part B funds per pupil are correlated with higher numbers of kindergarten and elementary school teachers and LEA and support staff members per pupil. This correlation is likely a reflection of the fact that rural

districts are more likely to be elementary-only districts and that rural districts may be more likely have more staff members relative to students because of the lower numbers of students enrolled in the LEA (Guiterrez and Terrones 2023; McLaughlin et al. 1997).

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

IDEA, while not a program authorized under ESEA, is a substantial source of federal revenue for LEAs, as the funding helps students with disabilities access a free appropriate public education. IDEA funds must be used to support the excess costs associated with the education of students with disabilities and must not supplement other funding (Dragoo 2026).

My analysis finds that increased per pupil IDEA revenue is positively correlated with the number of instructional coordinators, student support services staff members, and ungraded (typically, special education) teachers per pupil. These roles generally align with the goal of IDEA, providing additional well-being and academic support for students with disabilities.

Child Nutrition Act

The Child Nutrition Act and the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act authorize federal school meal programs, another source of federal revenue for LEAs. Revenue is in the form of meal reimbursements for each breakfast and lunch served, with larger reimbursements for meals served to students eligible for free and reduced-price meals (Dragoo 2026). Once schools receive reimbursement, they may use the funds for most aspects of the school food service operation, but the funds may not be spent on nonfood services (Dragoo 2026).

Revenue for child nutrition per pupil is positively associated with the number of elementary school teachers, instructional coordinators, other support staff (which includes food workers), and paraprofessional staff. Because reimbursement is closely associated with student economic need and because funds cannot directly pay for nonfood services, these correlations may also be a reflection of broader spending patterns by schools serving high shares of low-income students. In addition, research suggests that elementary school students are more likely to participate in school meal programs than older students. The correlation of nutrition funds with elementary school teachers per pupil may reflect this trend (Martinelli et al. 2020).

Conclusion

Federal revenue streams for K–12 education are diverse in amount, goals, and purposes. My analysis attempts to show, in broad strokes, how per pupil revenue from these different programs are correlated with LEA and student characteristics, as well as with district staffing ratios. Three distinct themes emerge:

Federal revenue is more likely to be allocated to LEAs serving high shares of students from households below the federal poverty level. Although Title I is often thought of as the federal revenue stream that supports students from low-income families, most other federal programs contain programmatic or formulaic elements that direct relatively more funding to LEAs serving higher shares of economically disadvantaged students.

Federal revenue flows differently to rural versus urban districts. Although Title V, Part B funding is specifically allocated for rural districts, other federal revenue streams are correlated with LEA urbanicity status (whether primarily rural or primarily urban). This correlation may be attributable to the populations served (e.g., English learners may be more likely to live in urban areas) and to programmatic rules that deliver relatively higher per pupil amounts to rural districts (e.g., Title IV, Part A has a minimum allocation of $10,000, which might yield higher per pupil revenue in low-enrollment districts).

More federal revenue is generally associated with higher levels of nonteaching staff members per pupil, though staffing profiles vary by type of revenue stream. My analysis cannot say definitively that funding from a given federal revenue stream is supporting certain staffing positions. Broadly, LEAs that receive higher levels of federal revenue tend to spend more on staffing positions per pupil, particularly nonteaching staff positions such as paraprofessionals, student support staff, and LEA administrators. Spending on nonteaching staff seems aligned with the goal of many of the revenue streams to "supplement, not supplant" regular instructional activities. Further, some revenue streams—particularly IDEA and child nutrition—have specific aims that are often met by staff members who are not the teacher of record.

Because of the flexibility that LEAs have under most federal revenue funding streams in terms of what the funding can be used for and the options to transfer to other title revenue streams, it is difficult to make sweeping statements about how specific programming would be affected by the reduction or elimination of a given funding source. But individual states and LEAs would likely be able to demonstrate how they are using different federal revenue streams when asked by stakeholders. This brief provides a high-level overview of the services that might be threatened and should prompt policymakers to further probe how changes in federal revenue might affect educational services for students.

Appendix. Methodology

For this analysis, I use the most recent available national data on school district finances, from the 2022–23 school year, along with data on district enrollment and characteristics. These data are sourced from the National Center for Education Statistics' Common Core of Data (CCD). To measure poverty in a consistent way across LEAs, including LEAs that might not have a geographic footprint, I use data from the Urban Institute's Model Estimates of Poverty in Schools dataset for 2022–23, aggregated to the LEA level with a student weight.

During 2022–23, LEAs received federal funding to support K–12 education recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic through the ESSER fund. Research indicates that LEAs used these funds for various expenditures, including HVAC (heating, ventilation, and air conditioning) and facilities, supports for social-emotional learning, continuity of operations, and vendors.[11] It is possible my analysis could be affected by ESSER expenditures during this period. Conflation of specific federal revenue streams with ESSER expenditures is more likely for Title I revenue (as LEAs received ESSER funding according to the Title I allocation) or for funding that aligns with Title I allocations (e.g., Title IV, Part A).

Not all states report revenue at the individual federal program level. When states report $0 revenue for a given program across all LEAs, I assume that reporting in that state was not available, and I exclude the state from subsequent analysis on that funding stream. In a few cases, a much smaller share of LEAs within a state report revenue from a given federal program than would be expected. In some cases, I can trace this omission to a given policy choice (e.g., distributing IDEA funding through special non-LEA districts rather than directly to LEAs), but in other cases, I cannot easily find a reason for underreporting, either in the CCD documentation or from other sources. Because of this, it is difficult to identify when a given revenue value is truly $0 or whether the revenue is captured in a different way in the data. To account for this, I focus on reporting per pupil spending within LEAs that report a given revenue stream and provide range estimates of the share of districts that receive each type of funding in the CCD.

The costs of providing an education can vary across different LEAs, but for this analysis, I do not adjust federal revenue amounts for local costs (e.g., using the Comparable Wage Index for Teachers). I also note that in some states, some amount of revenue is "passed through" an LEA to other districts, such as charter or private schools. Because I cannot determine whether this happens for specific federal funding streams, I do not account for

pass-throughs in my analyses, which may slightly bias my results. As a check on this bias, I ran a version of my analysis assessing correlation between all federal revenue allocated to a district and the demographic and staffing factors. I compared this analysis with results using a revised federal revenue metric that accounts for the share of revenue that might be allocated to a pass-through. Accounting for the pass-through in overall federal revenue does not meaningfully change my results.

Notes

[1] Kristin Blagg and Maggie Reeves, "How Would Proposed Changes to Federal K–12 Title Spending Affect Your School District?" Urban Institute, September 25, 2025, https://www.urban.org/research/publication/how-would-proposed-changes-federal-k-12-title-spending-affect-your-school.

[2] Mark Lieberman, "Trump Tells States He's Holding Back $6.8 Billion for Schools," *Education Week*, June 30, 2025. https://www.edweek.org/policy-politics/trump-tells-states-hes-holding-back-6-8-billion-for-schools/2025/06.

[3] Mark Lieberman, "Federal Funding Disruptions for Schools Are Far from Over," *Education Week*, March 11, 2026, https://www.edweek.org/policy-politics/federal-funding-disruptions-for-schools-are-far-from-over/2026/03.

[4] Kristin Blagg, Emily Gutierrez, Fanny Terrones, and Wesley Jenkins, "Which Students Receive a Greater Share of School Funding?" Urban Institute, April 25, 2022, https://apps.urban.org/features/school-funding-trends/.

[5] "Expenditures: How Much Money Does the United States Spend on Public Elementary and Secondary Schools?" US Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, accessed April 13, 2026, https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=66.

[6] The six regressions, all estimated with robust standard errors, are as follows: (1 and 2) a regression including state fixed effects, weighted and unweighted for LEA student membership; (3 and 4) a regression including state fixed effects and a control for state and local revenue per pupil, weighted and unweighted for LEA student membership; and (5 and 6) a regression including state fixed effects but only for LEAs that report any revenue, weighted and unweighted for LEA student membership.

[7] Christy Wolfe, "U.S. Department of Education 101: Federal Funding in K-12 Education," Bipartisan Policy Center, August 19, 2025, https://bipartisanpolicy.org/explainer/u-s-department-of-education-101-federal-funding-in-k-12-education/.

[8] "Title I: What Is Title I and How Are These Funds Distributed to Different Types of Schools?" US Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, accessed April 13, 2026, https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=158.

[9] "Rural Education Achievement Program," US Department of Education, accessed April 13, 2026, http://www.ed.gov/grants-and-programs/formula-grants/rural-and-insular-areas/rural-education-achievement-program.

[10] "Rural Education Achievement Program," US Department of Education.

[11] Katherine Silberstein and Marguerite Roza, "The Massive ESSER Experiment: Here's What We're Learning," Edunomics Lab, April 4, 2023, https://edunomicslab.org/2023/04/04/the-massive-esser-experiment/.

References

Blagg, Kristin, and Emily Gutierrez. 2026. *How Did School-Level Expenditures Change in the Wake of the Pandemic? An Assessment Using Model Estimates of Poverty in Schools*. Urban Institute.

Boyle, Andrea, and Sidney Wilkinson-Flicker. 2020. *Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants: A First Look at Activities Supported under Title IV, Part A*. US Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development.

Carter, James. 2026. "Evaluating Indiana's ESSA Waiver Request: Flexibility and Its Limits." Urban Institute.

Dewey, Dan C., Erin M. Fahle, Thomas J. Kane, sean f. reardon, and Douglas O. Staiger. 2024. *Federal Pandemic Relief and Academic Recovery*. Working Paper No. 32897. National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w32897.

Dragoo, Kyrie E. 2026. *The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Funding: A Primer*. Congressional Research Service.

Dynarski, Mark, and Kirsten Kainz. 2015. "Why Federal Spending on Disadvantaged Students (Title I) Doesn't Work." Brookings Institution.

GAO (Government Accountability Office). 2011. *Disadvantaged Students: School Districts Have Used Title I Funds Primarily to Support Instruction*. GAO.

Goldhaber, Dan, and Grace Falken. 2025. *ESSER and Student Achievement: Assessing the Impacts of the Largest One-Time Federal Investment in K12 Schools*. Working paper. CALDER, American Institutes for Research.

Gordon, Nora. 2016. *Increasing Targeting, Flexibility, and Transparency in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to Help Disadvantaged Students*. Brookings Institution.

Gordon, Nora, and Sarah Reber. 2015. "The Quest for a Targeted and Effective Title I ESEA: Challenges in Designing and Implementing Fiscal Compliance Rules." *Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences* 1 (3): 129–47. https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2015.1.3.07.

Gutierrez, Emily. 2026. "Federal Changes to the Social Safety Net Are Tightening State Budgets. School Meal Programs Could Pay the Price." Urban Institute.

Gutierrez, Emily, and Fanny Terrones. 2023. *Small and Sparse: Defining Rural School Districts for K–12 Funding*. Urban Institute.

Hanushek, Eric A., and Steven G. Rivkin. 2010. "Generalizations About Using Value-Added Measures of Teacher Quality." *American Economic Review* 100 (2): 267–71.

Hemelt, Steven W., Helen F. Ladd, and Calen R. Clifton. 2021. "Do Teacher Assistants Improve Student Outcomes? Evidence from School Funding Cutbacks in North Carolina." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 43 (2): 280–304. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373721990361.

Hurwitz, Michael, and Jessica Howell. 2014. "Estimating Causal Impacts of School Counselors with Regression Discontinuity Designs." *Journal of Counseling and Development* 92 (3): 316–27. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2014.00159.x.

Hyslop, Anne, and Dave Powell. 2025. "ESEA Waivers 101: Explaining the Secretary of Education's Waiver Authority." All4Ed.

Jang, Yubin, and Lauren P. Bailes. 2025. *From Funds to Frameworks: How States Operationalize Title II Education Funding*. Working Paper 25-1256. Annenberg Institute for School Reform at Brown University.

Johnson, Rucker C. 2015. "Follow the Money: School Spending from Title I to Adult Earnings." *Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences* 1 (3): 50–76. https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2015.1.3.03.

Kraft, Matthew A., David Blazar, and Dylan Hogan. 2018. "The Effect of Teacher Coaching on Instruction and Achievement: A Meta-Analysis of the Causal Evidence." *Review of Educational Research* 88 (4): 547–88. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654318759268.

Martinelli, Sarah, Francesco Acciai, Lauren E. Au, Michael J. Yedidia, and Punam Ohri-Vachaspati. 2020. "Parental Perceptions of the Nutritional Quality of School Meals and Student Meal Participation: Before and After the Healthy Hunger-Free Kids Act." *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior* 52 (11): 1018–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneb.2020.05.003.

McLaughlin, Donald H., Mette B. Huberman, and Evelyn K. Hawkins. 1997. *Characteristics of Small and Rural School Districts*. US Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

SchoolHouse Connection. n.d. *Maximizing the Title I Set-Aside for Homeless Students: An Actionable Guide for Practitioners, Leaders, and Advocates*. SchoolHouse Connection.

Sparks, Daniel, and Christine Mulhern. 2026. "Expanding School Counseling: The Impacts of California Funding Changes." *Economics of Education Review* 110 (February): 102754. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2025.102754.

T4PA Center. n.d. "Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Program Profile." T4PA Center.

Tanenbaum, Courtney, Andrea Boyle, Kay Soga, et al. 2012. *National Evaluation of Title III Implementation: Report on State and Local Implementation*. US Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development, Policy and Program Studies Service.

US Department of Education. 2024a. *Nita M. Lowey 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program Title IV, Part B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 Non-Regulatory Guidance*. US Department of Education.

US Department of Education. 2024b. *Using Title II, Part A Funds to Strategically Support Educator Recruitment, Retention, Professional Learning, and Improved Student Outcomes*. US Department of Education.

US Department of Education. n.d. "Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Students." US Department of Education.

Webber, Ann, Valerie Orellana, Roberta Garrison-Mogren, and Eleanore Spies. 2024. *State and District Use of Title II, Part A Funds in 2022–23.* US Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.

About the Author

Kristin Blagg is a principal research associate in the Work, Education, and Labor Division at the Urban Institute. Her research focuses on K–12 and postsecondary education. Blagg has conducted studies on student transportation and school choice, student loans, and the role of information in higher education. Blagg holds a BA in government from Harvard University, an MSEd from Hunter College, an MPP from Georgetown University, and a PhD in public policy and public administration from the George Washington University.

Acknowledgments

This brief was funded by the Walton Family Foundation. We are grateful to them and to all our funders, who make it possible for Urban to advance its mission. The author thanks Martin West and Maggie Reeves for feedback, Emily Gutierrez for code review, David Hinson for copyediting, and Dashni Sathasivam for project management. The views expressed are those of the author and should not be attributed to the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders. Funders do not determine research findings or the insights and recommendations of Urban experts. Further information on the Urban Institute's funding principles is available at urban.org/fundingprinciples. Copyright © April 2026. Urban Institute. Permission is granted for reproduction of this file, with attribution to the Urban Institute.