The mission of the Office of Migrant Education is to provide excellent leadership, technical assistance, and financial support to improve the educational opportunities and academic success of migratory children, youth, agricultural workers, fishers, and their families.
REFERENCES

• Statute
  Sections 1004, 1303, 1304, and 1306 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015

• Code of Federal Regulations (CFR)
  34 CFR Part 76 and 200.82, 200.88, 200.100(b); 2 CFR Part 200 (Uniform Guidance)

• Guidance
  Chapters I (State Application and Funding), X (Fiscal Requirements), and XI (State Administration) of the Non-Regulatory Guidance for the Title I, Part C Education of Migratory Children
OBJECTIVES

• Develop a basic understanding of the following:
  o How MEP funds are allocated to State educational agencies (SEAs);
  o How SEAs may use MEP funds for program administration;
  o What factors an SEA must take into account in determining the amount of subgrants and options available to the SEA for carryover funds; and
  o Key considerations for determining whether an activity or service is an allowable use of MEP funds

• Reflect on your State’s processes and learn about other State’s approaches
REFLECT AND SHARE: PREVIEW

1. **State-level program administration:** How does your SEA use MEP funds at the State level for administrative functions that are unique to the MEP? How do you budget for administrative functions that vary from year to year?

2. **Administrative costs:** What are some ways your State has effectively reduced administrative costs and made more funds available for direct services to migratory children—at the State or local level?

3. **Subgranting:** What are the additional factors (if any) your State has included in its subgrant process, other than those required by statute? How have you incorporated the additional factors into your subgrant process (e.g., specific data point added to funding formula, narrative in application)?

4. **Carryover:** How has your State addressed significant carryover or a pattern of carryover for specific subgrantees?

5. **“Supplemental” aspect of the program:** What are some challenges you have encountered in ensuring that MEP funds are used for services in addition to, and not in place of, services available to migratory children from other sources? How have you addressed those challenges?
STATE ALLOCATIONS
CHILD COUNTS

• “Category 1”: identified eligible migratory children aged 3 through 21 residing in the State during the performance reporting period (September 1 – August 31)

• “Category 2”: identified eligible migratory children, aged 3 through 21, who received MEP services in summer or intersession programs provided by the State during the performance reporting period

• Category 2 is a subset of Category 1

• Child counts are reported by States to the Department (ED) on an annual basis through the EDFacts reporting system (populates the Consolidated State Performance Report, or CSPR).
FUNDING FORMULA

[Category 1 Child Count: average from preceding three years +

Category 2 Child Count: preceding year] x

[State’s average per pupil expenditure x 40%*]

= State Allocation

*may not be less than 32% or more than 48% of the U.S. average per pupil expenditure

(see section 1303(a) of the ESEA)
FY 2020 AWARDS

• Category 1 Child Counts: 2018-19, 2017-18, and 2016-17 (average)

• Category 2 Child Count: 2018-19 (summer 2019)

• State per pupil expenditures: preliminary data reported to National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in spring 2020

• Apply any necessary adjustments from previous year’s allocation
ESTIMATED FUTURE ALLOCATIONS

https://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/tables.html
PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY

• ED awards MEP funds to SEAs for a 15-month period, beginning on July 1\textsuperscript{st} of the fiscal year.

• “Tydings amendment”: If funds are not obligated by the end of the 15-month period, States may \textit{carry over} unobligated funds for an additional 12 months, giving the SEA up to 27 months to obligate the funds.

• After the obligation period ends, States have an additional 90 days to \textit{draw down} the obligated funds.

(see section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) and 34 CFR 76.137)
PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY: FY 2020 AWARDS EXAMPLE

• FY 2020 MEP award is issued **July 1, 2020**.

• Generally, the SEA will allocate funds it receives July 1, 2020 to its subgrantees for use during the 2020-21 program year.

• Grant Award Notice (GAN) will show the budget period as July 1, 2020 – September 30, 2021. With the tydings period, those funds are available for obligation through **September 30, 2022**.

• The SEA has until **December 30, 2022** to draw down the obligated funds.
PROGRAM
ADMINISTRATION
GENERAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION: ALLOWABLE AMOUNT

• SEAs may reserve for general administrative activities necessary to carry out the MEP, the greater of:
  o 1% from each of the amounts allocated to the State under Title I, Parts A, C, and D or
  o $400,000 ($50,000 in the case of outlying areas).

• Exception: If the sum of the amounts appropriated for Title I, parts A, C, and D is $14 billion or more, the reservation may not exceed 1 percent of the amount the State would receive if $14 billion were allocated among all States for parts A, C, and D.

• SEAs may combine the reserved amounts into a general Title I account for administration of any or all Title I, parts A, C, and D programs; or may keep MEP funds separate and administer the MEP with those funds.

(see section 1004 of the ESEA; 34 CFR 200.100(b); and Chapter XI, A1 of MEP NRG)
GENERAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

Some examples of allowable general administrative activities include:

• Designing and distributing forms required to operate the program (e.g., project applications, performance and financial reports, and evaluation reports);

• Processing of project applications (subgranting process);

• Monitoring of projects for fiscal compliance;

• Maintaining fiscal control and accounting procedures;

• Disseminating program information; and

• Developing state MEP rules, regulations, or policies

(see Chapter XI, A2 of MEP Non-Regulatory Guidance (NRG))
“UNIQUE” PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

In addition to MEP funds set aside for general administrative activities, SEAs may use MEP funds to carry out other administrative activities that are unique to the MEP. These activities include, but are not limited to—

• Statewide identification and recruitment (ID&R);
• Interstate and intrastate coordination of the MEP with other relevant programs and projects;
• Timely transfer of educational and health records, beyond that required generally by State and local agencies;
• Collecting and using information for accurate distribution of subgrants;
• MEP Statewide needs assessment, service delivery plan, and evaluation;
• Supervision of instructional and support staff; and
• State parent advisory council

(see 34 CFR 200.82, and Chapter XI, A4-A5 of MEP NRG)
“UNIQUE” PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION: ALLOWABLE AMOUNT

• There is no specific cap in terms of dollar amount or percentage of the MEP award that may be set aside for these purposes.

• It depends on State-specific factors such as the State size, program design, and activities that vary from year to year (e.g., comprehensive needs assessment, independent prospective re-interviews).

• The State may choose to set limits on the amount subgrantees spend on administrative functions (general and/or MEP-specific).
SUBGRANTING
SUBGRANTING BASICS

• SEAs may choose to deliver MEP services directly, or through local operating agencies (LOAs).

• An LOA is defined as:
  o A local educational agency (LEA),
  o A public or private agency, or
  o The SEA, if the SEA operates the MEP directly.

(see sections 1302 and 1309(1) of the ESEA, as amended)
REQUIRED FACTORS

In determining the amount of any subgrants to LOAs, the State must take into account:

1. **Numbers** of migratory children;
2. **Needs** of migratory children;
3. **Priority for services (PFS)** to migratory children who have made a qualifying move within the previous 1-year period and who are failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet the challenging State academic standards; or have dropped out of school; and
4. **Availability of funds** from other Federal, State, and local programs.

(see sections 1304(b)(5) and (d) of the ESEA)
OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

• In addition to the four required factors, the SEA may also consider additional factors when determining amounts for subgrants.

• SEAs may choose to adopt a strictly formula approach, a negotiation approach, or a combination

• The SEA has the discretion to select subgrantees. We recommend using criteria that are transparent, consistent, and include the required considerations.
CARRYOVER

• Funds not obligated during the initial (15-month) period of availability are considered part of the SEA’s carryover.

• SEAs may choose to allow their subgrantees to use their allotted funds during the carryover period or may reallocate those funds to other LOAs and other allowable program activities.
FIVE CONSIDERATIONS FOR ALLOWABLE USES OF MEP FUNDS
IDENTIFIED NEEDS AND STRATEGIES

1. Does the activity or service address a need identified in the MEP statewide comprehensive needs assessment (CNA)? Is the activity or service aligned to the strategies in the MEP statewide service delivery plan (SDP)?
   - ESEA section 1304(c)(1)(A) requires that funds be used in accordance with the statewide CNA and SDP required in ESEA section 1306.

2. Are the funds being used to meet the identified needs that result from the children’s migratory lifestyle and to permit the children to participate effectively in school?
   - ESEA section 1306(b)(1) requires that MEP funds must first be used to meet the identified needs of migratory children that result from their migratory lifestyle and to permit the children to participate effectively in school.
OTHER AVAILABLE RESOURCES

3. Does the activity or service supplement, and not supplant, non-Federal funds?
   o ESEA section 1304(c)(2) requires that MEP programs and projects be carried out in a manner consistent with the objectives of ESEA section 1118(b).

4. Is the need already addressed by services available from other programs?
   o In general, ESEA section 1306(b)(2) requires that MEP funds be used to address the needs of migratory children not addressed by services available from other Federal and non-Federal programs.
5. Are the costs reasonable and necessary, and allocable (i.e., chargeable) to the MEP relative to the benefit received?
   - See the Uniform Guidance (2 CFR Part 200, subpart E) for information about the cost principles.
REFLECT AND SHARE

1. **State-level program administration:** How does your SEA use MEP funds at the State level for administrative functions that are unique to the MEP? How do you budget for administrative functions that vary from year to year?

2. **Administrative costs:** What are some ways your State has effectively reduced administrative costs and made more funds available for direct services to migratory children—at the State or local level?

3. **Subgranting:** What are the additional factors (if any) your State has included in its subgrant process, other than those required by statute? How have you incorporated the additional factors into your subgrant process (e.g., specific data point added to funding formula, narrative in application)?

4. **Carryover:** How has your State addressed significant carryover or a pattern of carryover for specific subgrantees?

5. **“Supplemental” aspect of the program:** What are some challenges you have encountered in ensuring that MEP funds are used for services in addition to, and not in place of, services available to migratory children from other sources? How have you addressed those challenges?
THANK YOU

Sarah Martinez
Sarah.Martinez@ed.gov