
THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, DC

Counting for Dollars 2020

16 Large Federal Assistance Programs that Distribute Funds on Basis of Decennial Census-derived Statistics (Fiscal Year 2015)

#8: Special Education Grants (IDEA)

The [first report](#) of the Counting for Dollars Project examines 16 large federal financial assistance programs that use Decennial Census-derived data to geographically distribute funds. This fact sheet describes the *Special Education Grants Program (IDEA)*, its reliance on Census-derived data, and funds distribution by state.

Objective: Assist States in providing special education and related services to all children with disabilities.

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) #: [84.027](#)

Applicant eligibility: State education agencies. Local educational agencies (LEAs) apply to their State education agency for subgrants.

Type of assistance: Formula grants

Allocation formulas: According to [20 USC Section 1411](#), the Special Education Grants Program makes grants to states based in part on each state's share of children and children in poverty. States in turn make subgrants to LEAs based in part on each LEA's share of children enrolled in school and the number of children living in poverty.

Primary Census-derived data sources: Grants to states and subgrants to LEAs are determined in part through the direct use of four Census Bureau datasets: Population Estimates, Current Population Survey, American Community Survey, and the model-based Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE).

Relation to accuracy of state and local Decennial Census: Positive

A Decennial Census undercount of children, particularly poor children, would increase the likelihood of lower estimates of the number of children and children in poverty, which in turn would result in reduced special education funding for a state and its LEAs.

**Special Education Grants to Local Education Agencies
Obligations – U.S. and States, FY2015**

United States	\$11,233,112,681		
Alabama	\$179,592,125	Montana	\$37,233,707
Alaska	\$36,202,040	Nebraska	\$73,900,220
Arizona	\$188,817,764	Nevada	\$70,908,863
Arkansas	\$110,616,966	New Hampshire	\$46,962,343
California	\$1,208,390,002	New Jersey	\$357,731,550
Colorado	\$154,827,292	New Mexico	\$90,766,161
Connecticut	\$131,407,447	New York	\$750,705,898
Delaware	\$34,466,998	North Carolina	\$327,610,503
District of Columbia	\$17,233,091	North Dakota	\$29,266,979
Florida	\$635,914,958	Ohio	\$431,610,949
Georgia	\$329,101,551	Oklahoma	\$146,767,356
Hawaii	\$39,333,116	Oregon	\$127,162,431
Idaho	\$55,475,534	Pennsylvania	\$421,314,492
Illinois	\$500,355,613	Rhode Island	\$43,279,307
Indiana	\$255,783,230	South Carolina	\$174,639,906
Iowa	\$120,827,538	South Dakota	\$35,461,822
Kansas	\$105,521,388	Tennessee	\$234,841,720
Kentucky	\$156,245,922	Texas	\$984,945,560
Louisiana	\$186,359,442	Utah	\$109,964,955
Maine	\$54,155,988	Vermont	\$27,076,591
Maryland	\$197,855,393	Virginia	\$281,019,975
Massachusetts	\$280,924,057	Washington	\$219,509,831
Michigan	\$394,847,404	West Virginia	\$75,161,973
Minnesota	\$187,400,949	Wisconsin	\$201,812,086
Mississippi	\$118,407,033	Wyoming	\$28,612,321
Missouri	\$224,782,341		

Source: USASpending.gov

Prepared by Andrew Reamer, Research Professor, GWIPP, with data provided by Sean Moulton, Open Government Program Manager, Project on Government Oversight

August 18, 2017