



CEC Action Plan for Promoting & Defending Special Education Research Funding

Summary

- Special education research impacts all children and youth with disabilities, their families and the educators who work on their behalf. The entire CEC membership benefits from having a high-quality, well-funded National Center for Special Education Research within the U.S. Department of Education.
- Funding for special education research suffered a \$20 million cut in FY 2011 during an atypical appropriations process influenced by the 2010 Congressional elections and President's 2012 budget proposal.
- CEC has pursued a two pronged advocacy approach focused on the U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Congress and has spearheaded efforts to engage the larger disability and education communities through its coalition work¹.
- CEC seeks to intensify its advocacy by developing a coordinated, strategic action plan with the special education research community to restore funding for NCSER through outreach to the U.S. Department of Education, U.S. Congress, and media outlets/strategic partnerships.

Action Plan

CEC seeks to intensify its advocacy strategy for restoring funding for the National Center for Special Education Research within the Institute for Education Sciences by pursuing a three-pronged approach focused on the U.S. Congress, U.S. Department of Education, and media outlets/strategic partnerships. To develop and execute this action plan, CEC hopes to work closely with the special education research community, among others.

Outreach to the U.S. Congress: CEC will undertake a short and long term strategy to better inform members of Congress about the critical role of special education research in the education of children and youth with disabilities. Strategies include:

- Identifying members of Congress who want to champion special education research funding and cultivating such relationships through coordinated, strategic outreach by CEC in collaboration with the special education research community;

¹ See Attachment A.

- Developing advocacy materials to illustrate the contributions of current and past NCSER investments in the development of effective policies and practices in general and special education (i.e. how findings from grants have scaled up and have had wide-spread impact), and to demonstrate the impact the funding cut has had on the ability to award new grants and maintain current investments;
- Congressional briefing hosted by CEC this spring/summer to inform Congressional offices about how special education research and development is impacting school practices and educational outcomes and the necessity to restore funding for NCSER. This briefing would include presentations from researchers and those that research has impacted (i.e. teachers, administrators, etc.)
- Targeted outreach to key Congressional offices to educate and increase understanding of NCSER investments and impact of cutting funding.

Outreach to the U.S. Department of Education CEC will undertake a short and long term strategy to engage in a dialogue about the need to sustain special education research investments at a level that ensures the needs of the field are adequately addressed. Strategies include:

- Continuing to meet with IES Director, John Easton, and NCSER Commissioner Debbie Speece, to share the special education research needs of the field and encourage the Administration to restore funding for the Fiscal Year 2014 President's budget proposal to Congress;
- Continuing to meet with officials within the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services and Office of Special Education Programs to explore and understand special education research needs within the U.S. Department of Education;
- Continuing to meet with officials within the Secretary's office to highlight the contributions of NCSER funded research to improved student outcomes in both special and general education, priority needs for continued investments in both research and research training, and the short and long term implications of cuts to NCSER funding;
- Promoting the continued need for and importance of the NCSER Center;
- Advocating for nominations to the National Board for Education Sciences of individuals with special education expertise;

- Advocating for CEC recommendations to the Education Sciences Reform Act reauthorization to better address children and youth with exceptionalities.

Outreach to Media Outlets/Strategic Partnerships CEC believes that it is important to elevate the cut to special education research funding and its detrimental impact on children and youth with disabilities by initiating a coordinated media outreach strategy and strengthening strategic partnerships to support other aligned advocacy efforts. Strategies include:

- An open letter/letter to the editor by prominent special education researchers outlining the impact funding cuts to NCSER will have on the important contributions of special education research to the educational outcomes of children and youth with disabilities;
- Organizing a small group of prominent special education researchers who are willing to act as CEC's Rapid Response Team to participate in media briefing, interviews with reporters, etc;
- Strengthening and developing strategic partnerships by increasing outreach to other organizations and coalitions, such as the LEARN Coalition, Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities, and AERA.

Background

What the U.S. Department of Education's Budget Proposals Have Said About Special Education Research

- "The capacity of the field to conduct rigorous and relevant research on topics specific to the education of individuals with disabilities is still developing." – *Administration's FY 2012 Budget Request, Institute for Education Sciences*²
- "The 2012 request would allow the Department to fund all research grant applications that meet IES research quality standards." – *Administration's FY 2012 Budget Request, Institute for Education Sciences*³
- "Since fiscal year 2008, IES has awarded and fully funded the out-year costs for all special education research grant applications that met high standards for quality and still carried over between \$6.8 and \$8.9 million to the next fiscal year. The requested funds [\$58 million] would be sufficient to increase our investment in high quality research on special education by funding all research grant applications that meet IES

² U.S. Department of Education. Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Request: <http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/budget12/justifications/x-ies.pdf>

³ Ibid.

research quality standards.” – *Administration’s FY 2012 Budget Request, Institute for Education Sciences*⁴

- “A 2003 PART review rates this program [research in special education] Results Not Demonstrated.” – *Administration’s FY 2009 Budget Request, Institute for Education Sciences*⁵
- “Continued investment in the long-term programs of research administered by NCSEER is necessary to accumulate empirical knowledge and develop theories that will ultimately result in improved academic achievement.” – *Administration’s FY 2013 Budget Request, Institute for Education Sciences*⁶ (With Commissioner Speece in Position)

Funding Background

Over the last ten years, funding for special education research has decreased from \$78.8 million in Fiscal Year 2002 to \$49.9 million in Fiscal Year 2012, a reduction of over 36%. The most drastic cut came in FY 2011 when special education research was cut by \$20 million.

To understand why Congress and the Administration chose to cut this program, it is important to reflect on the atypical FY 2011 appropriations process. Although the 2011 fiscal year began on October 1, 2010 – at which point Congress *should* have completed all of its appropriations bills so that federal agencies could have funding to administer programs – Congress did not finalize FY 2011 appropriations levels until April 2011, six months into the federal fiscal year. To keep the federal government running from October 2010 through April 2011, Congress passed nine Continuing Resolutions (CRs).

Importantly, in November 2010, Americans voted Republicans into the majority in the House and significantly cut into the Democrat’s majority in the Senate. Furthermore, many new and incumbent members of Congress either ran as Tea Party candidates or adopted fiscally conservative positions to adapt to this political climate. As a result of the November 2010 elections, the political pressure to make significant budget cuts, and the fact that many FY 2011 appropriations decisions were made by the newly elected, fiscally conservative Congress, the Continuing Resolutions that were passed from November – April were atypical in that they contained major cuts to federal programs, a negotiating requirement made by Republican leaders. See Attachment B for a list of all education programs that were cut or eliminated.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ U.S. Department of Education Fiscal Year 2009 Budget Request:
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/budget09/justifications/w-ies.pdf>

⁶U.S. Department of Education. Fiscal Year 2013 Budget Request:
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/budget13/justifications/x-ies.pdf>

In February 2011, President Obama released the Administration's budget request for FY 2012, in the midst of the FY 2011 appropriations process. The President's budget request proposed to decrease funding for special education research from \$71.1 million to \$58.1 million, stating his, "2012 request would allow the Department to fund all research grant applications that meet IES research quality standards⁷." With Congress looking to cut funding for programs to meet the Republican's conditions to pass a Continuing Resolution, the Administration's request to decrease funding for special education research allowed Congress to view this cut as a bi-partisan agreement. As a result, Congress reduced funding for special education research from \$71 million to \$51 million for FY 2011. Subsequent funding for FY 2012 has largely remained level funded by Congress and the Administration requested \$49.9 for FY 2013.

Protecting Special Education Funding: Current Efforts to Slash Funding

At this time, CEC is actively advocating to prevent deep cuts to special education programs. Congress is beginning the FY 2013 appropriations process which, if it follows the established timeline, funding for federal programs should be completed by September 30, 2011. Due to the highly contentious, partisan gridlock within Congress which is expected to continue as the Presidential election nears, more cuts to education programs are expected.

There are currently two direct legislative threats to education funding: first, the House budget resolution and its implications for the FY 2013 appropriations process; and second, an 8% automatic cut to all education programs, known as sequestration.

Budget Resolution

To officially begin the annual appropriations process, Congress typically passes a budget resolution. The budget resolution establishes "caps" (a fixed dollar amount) on how much Congress can spend for large areas of the federal budget (i.e. all education programs, all health programs, all defense programs, etc.). These "caps" provide the Appropriations Subcommittees with an overall amount that they then can allocate to specific programs, such as IDEA and NCSER.

In March, the House voted to approve a budget resolution put forward by Congressman Paul Ryan (R-WI) which, if signed into law, would spend 33% less on education and other social programs than that put forth by President Obama's budget request. Based on this much lower "cap", the U.S. Department of Education projects a \$2.2 billion decrease in funding for IDEA Part B.

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) has said he will not pass a budget resolution in the Senate this year, and instead will follow the "caps" that Congress and the Administration already agreed to in the Budget Control Act of 2011. These "caps" are much higher than that

⁷ U.S. Department of Education. Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Request:
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/budget12/justifications/x-ies.pdf>

just approved by the House – as such, CEC expects another summer where the parties will again struggle to find agreement.

CEC – in collaboration with its coalition partners – have been advocating against the House budget resolution through strategic lobbying visits and activating its grassroots advocacy network. In the coming months, as the appropriations process gets underway, CEC will continue to advocate for the highest possible funding amounts for all special education programs, including restoring funding for NCSEER and the Javits Gifted and Talented Program.

Preventing an 8% Automatic Cut to Education Programs

Additionally, CEC is currently advocating with its coalition partners to prevent an 8% automatic cut to education programs, which would result in a reduction of \$4 million for special education research. These automatic cuts – known as sequestration – will take place on January 1, 2013, unless Congress acts to change the current law.

On August 2, 2011, President Obama signed into law the Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA), increasing our nation’s debt limit and imposing a series of measures to limit spending and decrease the nation’s debt.

The BCA calls for \$900 million in cuts to discretionary programs, including education, over the next decade. It also created a Joint Select Committee (referred to as the “Supercommittee”) made up of members from the House and Senate, Democrats and Republicans charged with finding \$1.2 trillion more in cuts over the next decade. If the Supercommittee failed to identify this savings, or Congress failed to approve the Supercommittee’s recommendation, automatic cuts would impact every federal program not specifically excluded on January 1, 2013.

Programs Excluded from BCA’s Across the Board Cuts (Sequestration):

Social Security, Medicaid, CHIP, Food Stamps, Child Nutrition, Veterans Benefits, certain tax credits, Federal retirement benefits, and Medicare up to a capped amount.

The Supercommittee failed, and now sequestration will begin, unless Congress and the Administration change the law. At the time of publication, several members of the House of Representatives have proposed a bill that would prohibit sequestration from impacting Department of Defense programs, but there has not been any similar legislation proposed to address education.

The Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan office that advises Congress on the implications of its proposals has estimated that sequestration will mean a cut of approximately 8% to all education programs. This means that the entire U.S. Department of Education’s budget will be reduced by approximately \$3.5 billion.

These cuts will be felt by every single school in the nation and will impact educators' abilities to serve children and youth with disabilities appropriately. Furthermore, they come at a time when other cuts have made it impossible to not reduce essential services.

CEC is working with its coalition partners and activating its grassroots network to urge Congress to avoid a sequester by passing a balanced deficit reduction measure.

Expected National Cuts Starting January 1, 2013:

IDEA Part B Grants to States CUT by **\$903 Million**

IDEA Part B Section 619 Program CUT by **\$29 Million**

IDEA Part C Infants & Toddlers CUT by **\$35 Million**

IDEA Part D National Programs CUT by **\$19 Million**

Special Education Research CUT by **\$4 Million**

Attachment A

CEC Advocacy to Promote & Defend Funding for

Special Education Research

Strategic Advocacy Outreach to Capitol Hill, U.S. Department of Education

2005-2011 CEC Children and Youth Action Network (CAN) Meetings: Provided Congressional staff with CEC funding recommendations for special education research via CAN Coordinator appointments on Capitol Hill.

2005-2012 CEC Federal Outlook for Exceptional Children – CEC’s annual funding recommendations and rational distributed to all 535 members of Congress -- includes a chapter on the important investment in special education research and urges for a significant increase in funding.

2005-2012 Direct lobbying activities by CEC staff: Numerous visits to key Congressional staff to lobby for increased funding for special education research including key members of Congress on the Appropriations Committees in the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate.

2005-2012: Coordinated lobbying with the Committee for Education Funding and Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities among other groups to advocate for increased funding for special education programs, including special education research.

2005-2012: Direct advocacy within the U.S. Department of Education: Numerous meetings with officials from the U.S. Department of Education – both within the Office of Special Education Programs and Institute for Education Sciences – to advocate for additional funding for the National Center for Special Education Research.

CEC’s Online Legislative Action Center: Connecting Constituents to Congress

(Below is a selected list of CEC’s Legislative Action Center correspondence regarding special education research funding to highlight CEC member efforts)

March 2009: 98 Advocacy messages sent through CEC’s Legislative Action Center re: Increasing Funding for Special/Gifted Education Programs (including research)

July 2009: 119 Advocacy messages sent through CEC’s Legislative Action Center re: Supporting Additional Funding for Special/Gifted Programs (including research)

July 2010: 160 Advocacy messages sent through CEC’s Legislative Action Center re: Increase Funding for Special Education and Research

November 2010: 228 Advocacy messages sent through CEC’s Legislative Action Center re: Increase funding for Special Education Programs (including research)

March 2011: 90 Advocacy messages sent through CEC's Legislative Action Center re: Increase Funding for Special Education and Research

December 2011: 235 Activists wrote to their entire Congressional Delegation, authoring over 700 letters to the U.S. House and Senate, urging restoring funds for special education research.

Letters to Congress Regarding Increased Funding for Special Education Research/Media Outreach

June 24, 2009 letter to all 535 members of the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate re: Increase Funding for IDEA programs and the National Center for Special Education Research

July 21, 2010 letter to all 535 members of the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate re: Increase Funding for IDEA programs and the National Center for Special Education Research

September 24, 2010 letter to Robert Gordon, Associate Director of Education, Income Maintenance, and Labor, Office of Management and Budget re: increased funding for special education research and IDEA programs.

May 24, 2011 letter to every U.S. Senator re: Vote No on House Passed Budget Resolution

September 6, 2011 letter to U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan re: Request for Increased Funding in President's FY 2013 Budget For Students with Disabilities and/or Gifts and Talents

September 6, 2011 letter to all 535 members of the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate re: Increase Funding for the National Center for Special Education Research

September 7, 2011 letter to U.S. Representative Rosa DeLauro, Ranking Member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education

September 7, 2011 letter to U.S. Representative Denny Rehberg, Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education

September 16, 2011 letter to U.S. Senator Patty Murray and U.S. Congressman Jeb Henslerling, co-chairs of the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction

November 28, 2011 letter to all 535 members of the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate re: Increase Funding for the National Center for Special Education Research

December 2011, letter to all 535 members of the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate re: Increase Funding for the National Center for Special Education Research from 15 member groups of the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities

December 2011, Article in Education Daily titled *Disability Groups Push to Restore Funding for Special Ed Research*, quoted CEC letter opposing cuts to NCSER.

Education Programs Cut or Eliminated in FY 2011 & FY 2012

69 Education Programs Eliminated in FY 2011 & 2012

1. Striving Readers = -\$200 million but no rescission of FY 10 funds
2. Even Start = -\$66.5 million
3. Literacy Through School Libraries = -\$19.1 million
4. Education technology state grants = -\$100 million
5. Javits gifted and talented = -\$7.5 million
6. Troops-to-teachers = -\$14.4 million
7. National Writing Project = -\$25.6 million
8. Academies for American history and civics = -\$1.8 million
9. Advanced Credentialing (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards) = -\$10.6 million
10. Teach for America = -\$18 million
11. Close-up Fellowships = -\$1.9 million
12. Reading is Fundamental = -\$24.8 million
13. Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners = -\$8.8 million
14. Mental health integration in schools = -\$5.9 million
15. Foundations for learning = -\$1.0 million
16. Parental information and resource centers = -\$39.3 million
17. Women's educational equity = -\$2.4 million
18. Civic education – We the People = -\$21.6 million
19. Vocational rehabilitation Recreational programs = -\$2.5 million
20. Vocational rehabilitation Projects with industry = -\$19.2 million
21. Vocational rehabilitation Program improvement = -\$0.9 million
22. Vocational rehabilitation Evaluation = -\$1.2 million
23. Tech prep education = -\$103 million
24. Smaller Learning Communities = -\$88 million
25. State grants for workplace and community transition training for incarcerated individuals = -\$17.2 million
26. LEAP = -\$63.9 million
27. Emma Byrd Scholarships = -\$1.5 million
28. Course material rental program = -\$10.0 million
29. Centers for excellence for veteran student success = -\$6.0 million
30. Off-campus community service program = -\$0.8 million
31. Higher Education Demonstration projects to support postsecondary faculty, staff, and administrators n educating students with disabilities= -\$6.8 million
32. Byrd honors scholarships = -\$42 million
33. Thurgood Marshall Legal Scholarships = -\$3 million
34. B.J. Stupak Olympic Scholarships = -\$1 million
35. BA STEM and foreign language teacher training = -\$1.1 million
36. Masters STEM and foreign language teacher training = -\$1.1 million

37. Underground Railroad program = -\$1.9 million
38. Legal Assistance Loan Repayment Program = -\$5.0 million
39. *School Improvement Grants = -\$534.6 million*
40. *High School Graduation Initiative = -\$48.9 million*
41. *Mathematics and Science Partnerships = -\$175.1 million*
42. *Foreign Language Assistance = -\$26.9 million – also eliminated in Senate bill*
43. *Race to the Top = -\$698.6 million*
44. *Investing in Innovation Fund = -\$149.7 million*
45. *Teaching of Traditional American History = -\$45.9 million*
46. *School Leadership = -\$29.2 million*
47. *Arts in Education = -\$27.4 million*
48. *Excellence in economic education = -\$1.4 million – also eliminated in Senate bill*
49. *FIE programs of national Significance = -\$12 million*
50. *Ready-to-Learn television = -\$27.2 million*
51. *Advanced Placement = -\$43.3 million*
52. *Promise Neighborhoods = -\$29.9 million*
53. *Alcohol Abuse Reduction = -\$6.9 million – also eliminated in Senate bill*
54. *Elementary and Secondary School Counseling = -\$52.4 million*
55. *Carol M. White Physical Education Program = -\$78.8 million*
56. *Civic Education = -\$1.2 million – also eliminated in Senate bill*
57. *Special Olympics Education programs = -\$8.1 million*
58. *Vocational rehabilitation Demonstration and Training programs = – \$6.5 million*
59. *Vocational rehabilitation Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers = -\$1.9 million*
60. *Strengthening Predominantly Black Institutions = -\$9.6 million*
61. *Strengthening Asian American Pacific Islander Institutions = -\$3.2 million*
62. *Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions = -\$13.4 million*
63. *Strengthening Native American-Serving Nontribal Institutions = -\$3.2 million*
64. *Strengthening Tribal Colleges = -\$26.8 million*
65. *International Education and Foreign Language Overseas Programs = -\$7.5 million*
66. *Institute for International Public Policy = -\$1.6 million*
67. *Fund for the Improvement of Postsec. Ed. (FIPSE) = -\$18.6 million*
68. *Postsecondary Program for Students with Intellectual = -\$11 million*
69. *Javits Fellowships = -\$8.1 million*

(Typical font indicates programs eliminated in FY 2011; *Italics* indicates programs eliminated in FY 2012)

56 Education Programs Cut in FY 2011 & 2012

1. School Improvement grants = -\$11.1 million (-2.0%)
2. ESEA evaluation = -\$1.02 million (-11.1%)
3. High school graduation initiative = -\$1.1 million (-2.2%)
4. Teacher Quality State Grants = -\$479.7 million (-16.3%)
 [There will be a new 1 percent competitive set-aside (\$24.7 million) within the Teacher Quality State Grants program; groups such TFA, NWP and the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards will be eligible to compete for this funding.]
5. Mathematics and science partnerships = -\$5.4 million (-3.0%)

6. 21st Community Learning Centers = -\$12.3 million (-1.1%)
7. State Assessments = -\$20.8 million (-5.1%)
8. Comprehensive Centers = -\$5.1 million (-9.1%)
9. Transition to Teaching = -\$2.5 million (-5.9%)
10. Teaching of Traditional American History = -\$73 million (-61.5%)
11. Advanced Placement = -\$2.6 million (-5.6%)
12. FIE projects (earmarks) = -\$113.5 million (90.4%)
 [Most of the remaining \$12 million is for Full Service Community Schools (\$9.7 million) and continuations of about \$1 million each for the Data Quality Initiative and Education Facility Clearinghouse.]
13. Arts in Education = -\$12.6 million (-31.4%)
14. Safe and Drug-Free Schools National programs = -\$72.1 million (-37.7%)
 [The \$119 million provided for Safe and Drug-Free Schools national programs is mostly for continuation grants for "Safe and Supportive Schools" and "Safe Schools, Healthy Students Initiative" and other continuations.]
15. Alcohol Abuse Reduction = -\$28.8 million (78.9%)
16. Elementary and secondary school counseling = -\$2.6 million (-4.7%)
17. Civic education – Cooperative education exchange = -\$12.2 million (-91.4%)
18. English Language Acquisition State Grants = -\$16.5 million (-2.2%)
19. IDEA State personnel development = -\$1.2 million (-2.4%)
20. IDEA Technical assistance and dissemination == -\$0.7 million (-1.5%)
21. IDEA Personnel preparation = -\$2.2 million (-2.4%)
22. IDEA Technology and media services = -\$15.3 million (-34.9%)
23. Vocational rehabilitation Training = -\$2.2 million (-5.8%)
24. Vocational rehabilitation Demonstration and training programs = -\$5.1 million (-44.3%)
25. Vocational rehabilitation Migrant and seasonal farmworkers = -\$0.4 million (-17.1%)
26. National Technical Institute for the Deaf = -\$2.9 million (-4.2%)
27. Career and technical education State grants = -\$37.3 million (-3.2%)
28. Adult Education state grants = -\$32.1 million (-5.1%)
29. Federal Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants = -\$21.5 million (-2.8%)
30. Strengthening tribally controlled colleges and universities = -\$3.3 million (-11.1%)
31. Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-serving institutions = -\$1.7 million (-11.1%)
32. Strengthening HBCUs = -\$29.6 million (-11.1%)
33. Strengthening predominately Black institutions = -\$1.2 million (-11.1%)
34. Strengthening Asian American- and Native American Pacific Islander-serving institutions = -\$0.4 million (-11.1%)
35. Strengthening Native American-serving nontribal institutions = -\$0.4 million (-11.1%)
36. Developing Hispanic-serving institutions = -\$13.0 million (-11.1%)
37. Promoting postbaccalaureate opportunities for Hispanic Americans = -\$1.2 million (-11.1%)
38. International Education and Foreign Language Domestic programs = -\$41.6 million (-38.4%)
39. International Education and Foreign Language Overseas programs = -\$8.1 million (-52.1%)
40. International Education and Foreign Language Institute for International Public Policy = -\$0.4 million (-20.2%)

41. Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (mostly earmarks) = -\$121.5 million (-86.7%)
 [FIPSE is funded at \$18.6 million. The biggest piece is \$14 million for International Consortia which include the U.S./European Community (Atlantis) Program, the North American Mobility Program, the U.S./Brazil Program, and the US/Russia program.]
42. TRIO = -\$26.6 million (-3.1%)
43. GEAR UP = -\$20.4 million (-6.3%)
44. Javits Fellowships = -\$1.6 million (-16.5%)
45. Regional Education Labs = -\$13.1 million (-18.6%)
46. Research in special education = -\$20.1 million (-28.3%)
47. Statewide data systems = -\$16.1 million (-27.6%)
48. *Title I Evaluation = -\$3.2 million (-38.7%)*
49. *State Grants for Improving Teacher Quality = -\$24.7 million (-1%)*
50. *Education for Native Hawaiians = -\$14.2 million (-41.6%)*
51. *Alaska Native Education Equity = -\$6.2 million (-18.8%)*
52. *Comprehensive Centers = -\$43.2 million (-84.4%)*
53. *Safe and Drug-Free Schools National Programs = -\$54.2 million (-45.5%)*
54. *Pell Grants = -\$2.303 billion (-10.0%), but maintains the \$5,550 maximum award. Note there are several amendments to the HEA concerning Pell grants included the bill that result in this cost reduction.*
55. *Hispanic Serving Institutions = -\$87 million (-83.3%)*
56. *Strengthening Historically Black Colleges (HBCUs) = -\$85 million (-35.9%)*

(Typical font indicates programs cut in FY 2011; *Italics* indicates programs cut in FY 2012)

***Information provided courtesy of the Committee for Education Funding; retrieved April 4, 2012 from: <http://cef.org/category/charts-and-factsheets/>**