

**Department of Education**  
**ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY**  
**Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Request**

**CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language.....	B-1
Amounts Available for Obligation.....	B-2
Obligations by Object Classification.....	B-4
Summary of Changes.....	B-5
Authorizing Legislation.....	B-7
Appropriations History.....	B-8
Significant Items in FY 2011 Appropriations Reports.....	B-10
Account Summary Table.....	B-11
Activities:.....	B-15
College- and career-ready students.....	B-15
School turnaround grants.....	B-33
Evaluation.....	B-41
Early learning challenge fund.....	B-44
State agency programs:.....	B-48
Migrant student education.....	B-48
Neglected and delinquent children and youth education.....	B-55
Homeless children and youth education.....	B-62
State tables.....	B-66

## **ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY**

### NOTE

A regular 2011 appropriation for this account had not been enacted at the time the budget was prepared; therefore, this account is operating under a continuing resolution (P.L. 111-322, Dec. 22, 2010; 124 Stat 3518) that provides funding through March 4, 2011. No new language is included for this account. All programs are authorized under the expired Elementary and Secondary Education Act; when new authorizing legislation for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is enacted, a budget request for these programs will be proposed.

**Amounts Available for Obligation**  
(\$000s)

	2010	2011 CR	2012
<b>Discretionary authority:</b>			
Annual appropriation.....	\$15,914,666	0	\$16,253,026
Rescission (PL 111-226).....	50,000	0	0
Annualized CR (PL 111-322).....	<u>0</u>	<u>\$15,914,666</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, appropriation.....	15,864,666	15,914,666	16,253,026
<b>Comparative transfers to <u>Education Improvement Programs</u> for:</b>			
Striving Readers.....	-200,000	-250,000	0
Even Start.....	-66,454	-66,454	0
Literacy Through School Libraries.....	-19,145	-19,145	0
High School Graduation Initiative.....	-50,000	-50,000	0
<b>Comparative transfers to <u>Higher Education</u> for</b>			
Special Programs for Migrant Students.....	-36,668	-36,668	0
<b>Comparative transfers from <u>Education Improvement Programs</u> for Homeless</b>			
Children and Youth Education.....	<u>65,427</u>	<u>65,427</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, comparable discretionary appropriation.....	15,557,826	15,557,826	16,253,026
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	-10,841,176	-10,841,176	-11,681,897
Advance from prior year.....	<u>10,841,176</u>	<u>10,841,176</u>	<u>10,841,176</u>
Subtotal, comparable budget authority.....	15,557,826	15,557,826	15,412,305
Unobligated balance, start of year.....	637,527	768,705	0
Unobligated balance, start of year, Recovery Act.....	3,063,843	0	0
Recovery of prior-year obligations.....	0	0	0
Unobligated balance, expiring.....	-25	0	0

**ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY**

**Amounts Available for Obligation  
(\$000s)**

	2010	2011 CR	2012
Unobligated balance, end of year.....	-\$768,705	0	0
Comparative transfers:			
Unobligated balance, start of year to Education Improvement Programs for:			
Striving Readers.....	-35,148	-\$200,000	0
Even Start .....	-3,323	-4,267	0
Unobligated balance, start of year from Education Improvement Programs for Homeless Children and Youth Education .....	65	65	0
Unobligated balance, start of year from Education Improvement Programs for Homeless Children and Youth Education, Recovery Act .....	70	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year to Education Improvement Programs for:			
Striving Readers.....	200,000	0	0
Even Start .....	4,267	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year from Education Improvement Programs for Homeless Children and Youth Education .....	<u>-65</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
 Total, direct obligations .....	 18,656,333	 16,122,329	 \$15,412,305

NOTE: The Administration is proposing to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. FY 2012 funds for affected programs are proposed for later transmittal and will be requested once the legislation is reauthorized.

**ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY**

**Obligations by Object Classification**  
(\$000s)

	2010	2011 CR	2012
Printing and reproduction .....	\$8	\$7	0
Other contractual services and supplies:			
Advisory and assistance services .....	4,965	663	\$1,035
Other services .....	18,483	22,747	16,437
Peer review .....	504	501	2
Purchases of good and services from other government accounts .....	4,000	400	400
Research development contracts .....	0	0	0
Operation and maintenance of equipment .....	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, other contractual services.....	32,683	24,311	17,874
Grants, subsidies, and contributions .....	15,564,530	16,098,011	15,394,431
Grants, subsidies, and contributions, Recovery Act .....	3,063,843	0	0
Interest and dividends .....	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations .....	18,656,333	16,122,329	15,412,305

NOTE: The Administration is proposing to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. FY 2012 funds for affected programs are proposed for later transmittal and will be requested once the legislation is reauthorized.

**ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY**

**Summary of Changes**  
(\$000s)

---

2011 CR .....	\$15,557,826
2012 .....	<u>16,253,026</u>
Net change .....	+695,200

NOTE: The Administration is proposing to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. FY 2012 funds for affected programs are proposed for later transmittal and will be requested once the legislation is reauthorized.

---

	<u>2011 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<b>Increases:</b>		
<u>Program:</u>		
Increase funding for College- and Career-Ready Students (formerly Title I Grants to LEAs) to provide financial and other rewards to high-performing Title I LEAs and schools.	\$14,492,401	+\$300,000
Increase funding for School Turnaround Grants (formerly School Improvement Grants) to support the Administration's commitment to help States and LEAs turn around the Nation's lowest-performing schools. The request would fund a reauthorized program that would require States and LEAs to use most funds to implement one of four school specific intervention models in schools that are in the bottom 5 percent of schools in the State in terms of student achievement or, in the case of secondary schools, have graduation rates below 60 percent.	545,633	+54,367
Initial funding for the Early Learning Challenge Fund to improve the quality of early learning programs.	0	<u>+350,000</u>
Subtotal, increases		+704,367

**ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY**

	<u>2011 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<b>Decreases:</b>		
<u>Program:</u>		
Eliminate separate funding for Evaluation. The ESEA reauthorization proposal would include provisions for funding program evaluations through set-asides from program funds.	\$9,167	<u>-\$9,167</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-9,167
Net change		+695,200

**ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY**

**Authorizing Legislation  
(\$000s)**

Activity	2011 Authorized	2011 CR	2012 Authorized	2012 Request
College- and career-ready students ( <i>ESEA-1-A</i> ):				
LEA grants formulas:	0 <sup>1</sup>		To be determined <sup>1</sup>	
Basic grants ( <i>Section 1124</i> )	(2)	\$6,597,946	(2)	\$6,597,946
Concentration grants ( <i>Section 1124A</i> )	(2)	1,365,031	(2)	1,365,031
Targeted grants ( <i>Section 1125</i> )	(2)	3,264,712	(2)	3,264,712
Education finance incentive grants ( <i>Section 1125A</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	3,264,712	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	3,264,712
Title I rewards ( <i>Proposed legislation</i> )	--	--	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	300,000
School turnaround grants ( <i>ESEA Section 1003(g)</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	545,633	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	900,000
Evaluation ( <i>ESEA I-E-1501 and 1503</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	9,167	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	0
Early learning challenge fund ( <i>Proposed legislation</i> )	--	--	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	350,000
State agency programs:				
Migrant ( <i>ESEA I-C</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	394,771	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	394,771
Neglected and delinquent ( <i>ESEA I-D</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	50,927	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	50,927
Homeless children and youth education ( <i>McKinney-Vento Act, Title VII-B</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	65,427	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	65,427
<b>Total appropriation</b>		<b>15,557,826</b>		<b>15,912,193</b>
Portion of request subject to reauthorization				15,912,193

B-7

NOTE: The Administration is proposing to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. FY 2012 funds for affected programs are proposed for later transmittal and will be requested once the legislation is reauthorized.

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 20, 2008. Reauthorizing language is sought for FY 2012.

<sup>2</sup> Of the total funds appropriated for Grants to LEAs, an amount equal to the fiscal year 2001 appropriation of \$7,397,690 thousand is to be distributed through the Basic Grants formula. An amount equal to the fiscal year 2001 appropriation of \$1,365,031 thousand is to be distributed through the Concentration Grants formula. Amounts appropriated in excess of the fiscal year 2001 appropriation are to be distributed through the Targeted Grants formula. However, Congress specifies the actual amounts to be distributed through each formula in annual appropriations, including the Education Finance Incentive Grants formula.

**ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY**

**Appropriations History**  
(\$000s)

	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2003	\$13,388,330	\$12,936,900	\$18,178,400	\$13,774,039
(2003 Advance for 2004)	(7,383,301)	(6,883,301)	(8,627,301)	(9,027,301)
2003 Amended	0	0	0	2,244,000
(2003 Amended Advance for 2004)	0	0	0	(-2,444,000)
2003 Supplemental	0	0	0	4,353
2004	14,184,000	14,507,000	14,107,356	14,446,343
(2004 Advance for 2005)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)
2005	15,205,168	15,515,735	15,500,684	14,843,974
(2005 Advance for 2006)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)
2006	16,431,473	14,728,735	14,532,785	14,481,161
(2006 Advance for 2007)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)
2007	16,469,541	N/A <sup>1</sup>	N/A <sup>1</sup>	14,725,593 <sup>1</sup>
(2007 Advance for 2008)	(7,383,301)			(7,383,301) <sup>1</sup>
2008	16,689,090	15,969,818	15,867,778	15,489,476
(2008 Advance for 2009)	(7,383,301)	(8,136,218)	(8,867,301)	(7,934,756)
2009	16,917,059	15,788,285 <sup>2</sup>	15,735,884 <sup>2</sup>	15,760,086
(2009 Advance for 2010)	(7,934,756)	(10,841,176)	(8,893,756)	(10,841,176)
Recovery Act Supplemental (PL 111-5)	0	13,000,000	12,400,000	13,000,000
2010	16,431,632	15,938,215	15,891,132 <sup>3</sup>	15,914,666
(2010 Advance for 2011)	(10,841,176)	(10,841,176)	(10,841,176)	(10,841,176)

<sup>1</sup> This account operated under a full-year continuing resolution (P.L. 110-5). House and Senate Allowance amounts are shown as N/A (Not Available) because neither body passed a separate appropriations bill.

<sup>2</sup> The levels for the House and Senate allowances reflect action on the regular annual 2009 appropriations bill, which proceeded in the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress only through the House Subcommittee and the Senate Committee.

<sup>3</sup> The level for the Senate allowance reflects Committee action only.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Appropriations History-continued (\$000s)

	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2011 (2011 Advance for 2012)	\$15,912,193 (11,681,897)	\$15,914,666 <sup>1</sup> (10,841,176)	\$16,726,579 <sup>2</sup> (10,841,176)	\$15,914,666 <sup>3</sup> (10,841,176)
2012 (2012 Advance for 2013)	16,253,026 (11,681,897)			

<sup>1</sup> The level for the House allowance reflects the House-passed full-year continuing resolution.

<sup>2</sup> The level for the Senate allowance reflects Committee action only.

<sup>3</sup> The level for appropriation reflects the continuing resolution (P.L. 111-322) passed December 22, 2010.

## **ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY**

### **Significant Items in FY 2011 Appropriations Reports**

#### **School Improvement Grants**

Senate: The Committee requests that the Department assist States in encouraging and supporting LEAs in their use of school improvement funds, including those made available through the 4 percent set aside established in section 1003(a) of the ESEA, on those activities with evidence bases rated strong or moderate as defined in the regulations for the Investing in Innovation program. While the Committee acknowledges that the state of research on school improvement and school turnaround is not as strong as it needs to be, every effort should be made to utilize the knowledge base that does exist while additional research is conducted that will inform future activities. The Committee expects the Department to describe in the fiscal year 2012 congressional budget justification specific actions taken or planned to address this request.

Response: The Department has undertaken a number of activities to provide research-based support to States and LEAs that are implementing School Improvement Grants under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, as well as other school improvement funds available through the 4-percent set-aside under section 1003(a) of the ESEA. First, in April 2010 the Department released its Handbook on Effective Implementation of School Improvement Grants, a comprehensive, 200-page guide that includes a summary of the research base as well as practical suggestions in areas such as leadership and decision-making, scheduling and learning time, and human capital management. In addition, in summer 2010 the Department launched a quarterly newsletter aimed at providing assistance to SEAs and LEAs as they work on school improvement and related turnaround issues. Each newsletter provides examples of effective practices, highlights successful turnarounds around the Nation, publicizes forthcoming conferences and webinars on school turnaround, and includes links to recently published research and technical assistance materials. Finally, the Department has worked extensively with the Comprehensive Centers to develop and host webinars and regional conferences on such topics as supporting systemic change in high schools and supporting rural districts and schools.

#### **Early Learning Challenge Fund**

Senate: The Secretary of Education shall jointly develop policy for and administer these grants with the Secretary of Health and Human Services. The Committee directs the Departments of Education and HHS to provide a joint briefing to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives within 30 days of issuing the grant announcement for this program.

Response: If Congress provides funding for the Early Learning Challenge Fund in the final FY 2011 appropriation, the Department will jointly administer the program with the Department of Health and Human Services and will provide a joint briefing to the Appropriations Committees within 30 days of publishing the Notice Inviting Applications.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2012 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(in thousands of dollars)		Category Code	2010 Appropriation	2011 CR Annualized	2012 President's Budget	2012 President's Budget Compared to 2011 CR	
Account, Program and Activity						Amount	Percent
<b>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity</b>							
1. College- and career-ready students (ESEA I-A):							
(a) Basic grants (section 1124)							
	Annual appropriation	D	3,149,801	3,149,801	2,810,504	(339,297)	-10.8%
	Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	3,448,145	3,448,145	3,787,442	339,297	9.8%
	Subtotal		6,597,946	6,597,946	6,597,946	0	0.0%
(b) Concentration grants (section 1124A)							
	Annual appropriation	D	0	0	0	0	---
	Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	1,365,031	1,365,031	1,365,031	0	0.0%
	Subtotal		1,365,031	1,365,031	1,365,031	0	0.0%
(c) Targeted grants (section 1125)							
	Annual appropriation	D	250,712	250,712	0	(250,712)	-100.0%
	Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	3,014,000	3,014,000	3,264,712	250,712	8.3%
	Subtotal		3,264,712	3,264,712	3,264,712	0	0.0%
(d) Education finance incentive grants (section 1125A)							
	Annual appropriation	D	250,712	250,712	0	(250,712)	-100.0%
	Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	3,014,000	3,014,000	3,264,712	250,712	8.3%
	Subtotal		3,264,712	3,264,712	3,264,712	0	0.0%
(e) Title I rewards (proposed legislation)							
	Subtotal	D	0	0	300,000	300,000	---
	Annual appropriation	D	14,492,401	14,492,401	14,792,401	300,000	2.1%
	Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	3,651,225	3,651,225	3,110,504	(540,721)	-14.8%
	Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	10,841,176	10,841,176	11,681,897	840,721	7.8%
2. School turnaround grants (ESEA section 1003(g))							
	Subtotal	D	545,633	545,633	600,000	54,367	10.0%
3. Evaluation (ESEA sections 1501 and 1503)							
	Subtotal	D	9,167	9,167	0	(9,167)	-100.0%
4. Early learning challenge fund (proposed legislation)							
	Subtotal	D	0	0	350,000	350,000	---
5. State agency programs:							
(a) Migrant student education (ESEA I-C)							
	Subtotal	D	394,771	394,771	394,771	0	0.0%
(b) Neglected and delinquent children and youth education (ESEA I-D)							
	Subtotal	D	50,427	50,427	50,427	0	0.0%
	Subtotal		445,198	445,198	445,198	0	0.0%

NOTES: -Category Codes are as follows: D = discretionary program; M = mandatory program.

-The FY 2011 level for appropriated funds is an annualized amount provided under the fourth Continuing Resolution (P.L. 111-322).

-Programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for which funds are requested in 2012 or that are shown as consolidated in 2012 are proposed under new authorizing legislation.

-Multiple programs affected by the proposed ESEA reauthorization have been renamed and moved among accounts, some of which have also been renamed.

-Account totals and programs shown within accounts for fiscal years 2010 and 2011 have been adjusted to be comparable to the fiscal year 2012 request.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2012 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(in thousands of dollars)

Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	2010 Appropriation	2011 CR Annualized	2012 President's Budget	2012 President's Budget Compared to 2011 CR	
					Amount	Percent
<b>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity (continued)</b>						
6. Homeless children and youth education (MVHAA Title VII-B)	D	65,427	65,427	65,427	0	0.0%
Total, Appropriation	D	15,557,826	15,557,826	16,253,026	695,200	4.5%
Total, Budget authority	D	15,557,826	15,557,826	15,412,305	(145,521)	-0.9%
Current <sup>1</sup>		4,716,650	4,716,650	4,571,129	(145,521)	-3.1%
Prior year's advance		10,841,176	10,841,176	10,841,176	0	0.0%

NOTES: Category Codes are as follows: D = discretionary program; M = mandatory program.

-The FY 2011 level for appropriated funds is an annualized amount provided under the fourth Continuing Resolution (P.L. 111-322).

-Programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for which funds are requested in 2012 or that are shown as consolidated in 2012 are proposed under new authorizing legislation.

-Multiple programs affected by the proposed ESEA reauthorization have been renamed and moved among accounts, some of which have also been renamed.

-Account totals and programs shown within accounts for fiscal years 2010 and 2011 have been adjusted to be comparable to the fiscal year 2012 request.

<sup>1</sup> Excludes advance appropriations that become available on October 1 of the following fiscal year. Advance appropriations are \$10,841,176 thousand in fiscal years 2010 and under the 2011 CR, and \$11,681,897 thousand in the fiscal year 2012 President's Budget.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Summary of Request

The programs in the Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity (formerly Education for the Disadvantaged) account provide the foundation for school improvement efforts needed to ensure that all children receive a high-quality education authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Administration is requesting a total of \$16.25 billion in fiscal year 2012 for the programs in this account.

Most of the programs in the account are authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and are, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The Early Learning Challenge Fund would be a new program created through the reauthorization. The budget request assumes that these programs will be implemented in fiscal year 2012 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal.

The \$14.5 billion request for the reauthorized **College- and Career-Ready Students** program (currently Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)) would support local programs aimed at helping more than 20 million students in high-poverty schools make progress toward the new college- and career-ready standards that States would implement under the Administration's reauthorization proposal. The reauthorized program also would support a more differentiated approach to measuring school progress and identifying schools in need of improvement, reward highly effective schools and LEAs, require implementation of rigorous school intervention models in the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I schools, strengthen LEA improvement, and help ensure an equitable distribution of effective teachers across high- and low-poverty schools.

In addition to the \$14.5 billion request for College- and Career-Ready Students grants to LEAs, the request includes \$300 million for a new **Title I Rewards** program, which would make available additional Title I funds to States to provide financial and other rewards to high-performing Title I LEAs and schools.

The 2012 request also includes \$600 million for the **School Turnaround Grants** program (currently School Improvement Grants), an increase of \$54.4 million for a reauthorized program that would require States and LEAs to use most funds to implement one of four school intervention models (Turnaround, Restart, School Closure, and Transformation) in each of the schools that (1) are in the bottom 5 percent of schools in the State in terms of student achievement or (2) in the case of secondary schools, have graduation rates below 60 percent. The reauthorized program also would include a national activities authority that would allow the Department to build nationwide school turnaround capacity by awarding funds to outside entities with a demonstrated ability to turn around low-performing schools.

The request for \$350 million for the **Early Learning Challenge Fund** reflects the Administration's commitment to investing in activities that improve the school readiness of young children across a range of domains and lay the foundation for success for children in kindergarten through third grade. This new program would support competitive grants to States to establish model systems of early learning for children, from birth to kindergarten entry, that promote high standards of quality and a focus on outcomes across settings in order to ensure that more children enter school ready to succeed. This program would be a central component

## **ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY**

of the President's early learning agenda and would complement existing and proposed Federal investments in Head Start and Early Head Start, home visitation, the Child Care Development Fund, and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

The request would level-fund the other programs in this account, including \$394.8 million for **Migrant Student Education**, \$50.4 million for **Neglected and Delinquent Children and Youth Education**, and \$65.4 for **Homeless Children and Youth Education**.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

---

### College- and career-ready students

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I, Part A)

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget authority (\$000s):

	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
Basic grants	\$6,597,946	\$6,597,946	0
Concentration grants	1,365,031	1,365,031	0
Targeted grants	3,264,712	3,264,712	0
Education finance incentive grants	3,264,712	3,264,712	0
Title I rewards	<u>0</u>	<u>300,000</u>	<u>+\$300,000</u>
 Total	 14,492,401 <sup>2</sup>	 14,792,401	 +300,000
 Annual appropriation	 3,651,225	 3,110,504	 -540,721
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	10,841,176	11,681,897	+840,721

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2012.

<sup>2</sup> Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) provide supplemental education funding, especially in high-poverty areas, for local programs that provide extra academic support to help raise the achievement of students at risk of educational failure or, in the case of schoolwide programs, to help all students in high-poverty schools meet challenging State academic standards. The program serves an estimated 20 million students in more than 90 percent of school districts and more than half of all public schools—including two-thirds of the Nation’s elementary schools. Title I Grants to LEAs were first authorized as part of the original Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) and were most recently reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB).

The ESEA gives school districts and schools considerable flexibility in using Title I dollars to support instructional strategies and methods that best meet local needs. Title I schools help students reach challenging State standards through one of two models: “targeted assistance” that supplements the regular education program for individual children deemed most in need of special assistance, or a “schoolwide” approach that allows schools to use Title I funds—in combination with other Federal, State, and local funds—to improve the overall instructional program for all children in a school. Schools in which poor children account for at least 40 percent of enrollment are eligible to operate schoolwide programs, and an estimated 35,000 schools, or 65 percent of all Title I schools, currently operate these programs. In the 2004-2005

## **ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY**

### **College- and career-ready students**

---

school year, these schoolwide programs accounted for an estimated 87 percent of participating students and received two-thirds of the Title I Grants to LEAs funding allocated to schools.

The ESEA encourages the use of Title I funds for effective educational practices. Both schoolwide and targeted assistance programs must employ effective methods and instructional strategies grounded in scientifically based research. Schools must further ensure that services provided with Title I funds supplement the regular instruction that students would receive in the absence of Title I funds, including by extending the school day, week, or year. Schools also must provide ongoing professional development for staff working with disadvantaged students and carry out activities designed to increase parental involvement. Additionally, Title I funds can be used to support high-quality preschool programs for eligible children and joint professional development for school staff and other early childhood educators.

Title I Grants to LEAs provides the foundation for the ESEA's accountability system, which, as explained below, emphasizes State and local responsibilities in the areas of standards and assessments, measuring progress, supporting school improvement, and improving teacher quality.

#### **Standards and Assessments**

Under Title I, each State was required to create a system of academic standards and aligned assessments, and school districts must integrate these standards into local instruction. The State systems must include challenging content standards that describe what all students should know and be able to do in at least reading (or language arts) and mathematics, and academic achievement standards that describe three levels of proficiency (basic, proficient, and advanced) for meeting the State content standards. In addition, States were required to develop science standards by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

The States also were required to create or adopt academic assessments that measure the achievement of all students against their standards. These assessments must be valid and reliable, include measures that assess higher-order thinking skills and understanding of challenging content, and enable achievement results to be disaggregated by major racial and ethnic group, gender, and poverty, disability, English proficiency, and migrant status.

Beginning with the 2005-2006 school year, States have been required to administer their reading and mathematics assessments annually to all students in grades 3-8 and once in high school in reading and math. States also must assess annually the English proficiency of English learner (EL) students and were required to add science assessments during the 2007-2008 school year (testing once in each of three grade spans specified in the law). Finally, to provide a uniform benchmark for comparing student achievement gains nationwide, the ESEA requires biennial State participation in the reading and mathematics assessments for 4<sup>th</sup>- and 8<sup>th</sup>-graders conducted by the National Assessment of Educational Progress.

#### **Adequate Yearly Progress**

State assessments are used to hold LEAs and schools accountable for making adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward State standards for proficiency in reading and math, with the goal of ensuring that all students are proficient in both subjects by the 2013-2014 school year. For a

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

school to make AYP, all students, as well as those in statutorily specified groups—economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and EL students—must meet the same annual statewide measurable objectives for improved achievement. However, the statute includes a “safe harbor” exception under which a school can be considered to have made AYP if the percentage of students in a group not reaching the proficient level decreases by at least 10 percent from the previous year and the school makes progress on the “other academic indicator” included in the State’s AYP definition.

The Department has made a number of changes, primarily through regulation, to give States additional flexibility in making AYP determinations. For example, in December 2003, the Department announced a final regulation permitting States, school districts, and schools to include in AYP calculations the “proficient” scores of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who take assessments based on alternate achievement standards. The number of those proficient scores included in AYP determinations may not exceed 1 percent of all students in the grades tested (about 9 percent of students with disabilities). Since 2007, the Department also has provided additional flexibility permitting States to count for AYP purposes the “proficient” scores of a limited number of students with disabilities who take assessments based on modified achievement standards. The number of such “proficient” scores is capped at 2 percent of all students tested. These regulations are intended to give schools and teachers credit for raising the achievement of students with disabilities.

In addition, the Department has extended flexibility to States regarding the determination of AYP for EL students, allowing States to exclude from AYP calculations the assessment results for EL students in their first year of enrollment in U.S. schools. States also may include in the EL subgroup for up to 2 years those students who were EL but who have attained English proficiency.

Finally, the Department has taken steps to allow States to incorporate individual academic growth into their AYP systems, beginning with a pilot growth-model initiative in late 2005 and then in a final regulation published in late 2008 permitting all States to apply for approval to add growth models to AYP determinations. Fifteen States currently include growth models in their AYP definitions.

### **Accountability and School Improvement**

Title I accountability and school improvement provisions require escalating improvement measures over time for schools that continue to miss AYP targets. In addition, LEAs must implement specific strategies for students attending schools identified for improvement, including public school choice and supplemental educational services (SES) options.

#### School Improvement

LEAs must identify for school improvement any school that does not make AYP for 2 consecutive years. Identified schools must develop 2-year improvement plans that incorporate strategies from scientifically based research on how to strengthen instruction in the core academic subjects and address the specific issues that caused the school to be identified for improvement. These plans must include the annual reservation of at least 10 percent of the

## **ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY**

### **College- and career-ready students**

---

school's Title I, Part A allocation for professional development that directly addresses the problems that led to identification for improvement.

States must reserve 4 percent of their Title I, Part A allocations to support school improvement activities and are required to distribute 95 percent of these funds to LEAs with schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. In reserving school improvement funds, States are not permitted to reduce an LEA's allocation below its prior-year level, a restriction that may prevent a State from reserving the full 4 percent for school improvement. Additional funding for school improvement is provided through the separately authorized section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants program.

The ESEA also requires annual State and LEA report cards informing parents about how well their child's school is performing against State standards. In addition, LEAs must annually notify parents of their right to receive information on the professional qualifications of their child's teachers.

#### **Corrective Action**

If an identified school does not make AYP for 2 additional years (4 years of not making AYP), the LEA must take corrective action. Corrective actions may include replacing school staff responsible for the continued inability to make AYP, comprehensive implementation of a new curriculum (including professional development), and reorganizing the school internally. LEAs must continue to provide choice and SES options to students in schools identified for corrective action.

#### **Restructuring**

If a school does not increase student achievement in response to corrective action, the LEA must begin planning for restructuring, which involves making a fundamental change such as closing the school and reopening it as a public charter school, replacing all or most of the school's staff, turning operation of the school over to a private management company with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, or any other major restructuring of the school's governance arrangement. The LEA must implement the restructuring plan no later than the beginning of the following school year if the school still does not make AYP (i.e., 6 years of not making AYP), and must continue to provide choice and SES options to its students.

### **Qualifications for Teachers and Paraprofessionals**

The ESEA requires LEAs to ensure that all Title I teachers hired after the beginning of the 2002-2003 school year are "highly qualified." For new teachers, this means being certified by the State (which may be through an alternative route to certification), holding at least a bachelor's degree, and passing a rigorous State test on subject knowledge and teaching skills. Veteran teachers also must possess a bachelor's degree and be fully certified or licensed by the State, and must either pass the State test on subject-matter knowledge or demonstrate subject-matter competency through a "high, objective, uniform State standard of evaluation." LEAs must use at least 5 percent of their Part A allocations to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified. States were required to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that would ensure that all

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

teachers teaching in core academic subjects were highly qualified by the end of the 2005-06 school year, and both States and LEAs must report annually on progress toward this goal.

In 2004, the Department provided additional flexibility to States and school districts working to meet the highly qualified teacher (HQT) requirements. First, rural teachers who teach more than one academic subject and who are highly qualified in at least one subject were given 3 more years to become highly qualified in the additional subjects they teach. Second, States may permit science teachers to demonstrate that they are highly qualified either under a general science certification or in an individual field such as biology or chemistry. And, third, States may develop a single, streamlined process for determining that veteran multi-subject teachers are highly qualified.

### Allocations

Title I, Part A funds are allocated through four separate formulas. All four formulas are based on the number of children from low-income families in each LEA, and each formula also includes such factors as the LEA's poverty rate and State per-pupil expenditures for education. Other children counted for allocation purposes ("formula children") include children in families above the poverty line receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (the main Federal-State income maintenance program), children in foster homes, and children in local institutions for neglected and delinquent children. Eligible LEAs receive funding under one or more of the formulas, but the final outcome of the Federal-State allocation process is a single Title I, Part A award to each qualifying LEA.

Three formulas are based primarily on the number of poor children in each LEA, weighted by State per-pupil expenditures for education. Basic Grants are awarded to school districts with at least 10 poor children who make up more than 2 percent of enrollment and, thus, spread funds thinly across nearly all LEAs. Concentration Grants provide additional funds to LEAs in which the number of poor children exceeds 6,500 or 15 percent of the total school-age population. The Targeted Grants formula weights child counts to make higher payments to school districts with high numbers or percentages of poor students. To be eligible for Targeted Grants, an LEA must have at least 10 formula children counted for Basic Grant purposes, and the count of formula children must equal at least 5 percent of the population aged 5-17.

In addition, the statute includes a separately authorized and funded Education Finance Incentive Grants (EFIG) formula. This formula uses State-level "equity" and "effort" factors to make allocations to States that are intended to encourage States to spend more on education and to improve the equity of State funding systems. Once State allocations are determined, suballocations to the LEA level are based on a modified version of the Targeted Grants formula.

In determining allocations under each of the four formulas, the statute requires the use of annually updated Census Bureau estimates of the number of children from low-income families in each local educational agency. There is roughly a 2-year lag between the income year used for LEA poverty estimates and the fiscal year in which those estimates are used to make Title I allocations. For example, the fiscal year 2010 allocations were based on LEA poverty estimates for 2008. The Department transfers a small amount of funding from the annual Title I

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

appropriation (\$4.0 million in 2010) to the Census Bureau to finance the preparation of these LEA poverty estimates.

LEAs also use poverty data—generally the number of students eligible for free- or reduced-price lunch—to make within-district allocations to schools. LEAs with more than 1,000 students must serve all schools with a poverty rate above 75 percent, including middle and high schools, before serving schools with less needy student populations.

One percent of the total appropriation for Title I Grants to LEAs is reserved for the Department of the Interior’s Bureau of Indian Education and the Outlying Areas (the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands). In addition, States are permitted to reserve up to 1 percent, or \$400,000, whichever is greater, to cover SEA costs of administering Title I programs, except that such amounts may not exceed the level that is provided if the total appropriation for Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA equals \$14 billion, a threshold that was exceeded in fiscal years 2009, 2010, and 2011.

Title I Grants to LEAs is a forward-funded program that includes advance appropriations. A portion of funds becomes available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated, and remains available for Federal obligation for 15 months. The remaining funds become available on October 1 of the following fiscal year, and remain available for Federal obligation for 12 months, expiring at the same time as the forward-funded portion.

### American Recovery and Reinvestment Act

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) provided an additional \$10 billion for supplemental fiscal year 2009 formula grant awards under the Title I Grants to LEAs program. The Act divided the \$10 billion equally between the Targeted Grants and EFIG formulas. The Administration awarded half of the Title I Recovery Act funds (\$2.5 billion for Targeted Grants and \$2.5 billion for EFIG) on April 1, 2009, under each State’s existing Consolidated State Application. The remaining \$5 billion was made available on September 4, 2009. In the absence of a waiver from the SEA, LEAs have been required to obligate at least 85 percent of these funds by September 30, 2010, and any remaining funds by September 30, 2011.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were as follows:

	<u>Basic Grants</u> (\$000s)	Concentration <u>Grants</u> (\$000s)	Targeted <u>Grants</u> (\$000s)	Education Finance <u>Incentive Grants</u> (\$000s)
2007.....	\$6,808,408	\$1,365,031	\$2,332,343	\$2,332,343
2008.....	6,597,946	1,365,031	2,967,949	2,967,949
2009.....	6,597,946	1,365,031	3,264,712	3,264,712
Recovery Act .....	0	0	5,000,000	5,000,000
2010.....	6,597,946	1,365,031	3,264,712	3,264,712
2011 CR.....	6,597,946	1,365,031	3,264,712	3,264,712

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

#### **FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration's 2012 budget request for the College- and Career-Ready Students (CCRS) program (currently Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies) is \$14.8 billion, \$300 million more than the 2011 CR level. The request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2012 under a reauthorized ESEA that is consistent with the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal. This proposal would make key changes in the areas of standards and assessments; accountability and support for schools, LEAs and States; and teacher and leader effectiveness and equity.

The 2012 request would maintain funding for formula grants to LEAs and also would provide \$300 million for a new Title I Rewards program. States would use the Reward funds, which would be allocated to States in proportion to their relative shares of Title I Grants to LEAs, to provide financial and other rewards to high-poverty LEAs and schools that are highest-achieving and making the most progress. The reauthorization proposal also would permit the Department to reserve up to 0.5 percent of Title I formula grant funds for ESEA program evaluation and performance measurement.

#### **New College- and Career-Ready Standards and High-Quality Assessments**

While the current Title I program has succeeded in firmly establishing standards-based accountability systems in all 50 States, NCLB's emphasis on punitive sanctions for not making lock-step progress toward meeting the goal of 100 percent proficiency in reading/language arts and mathematics inadvertently encouraged States to lower the quality of their standards as well as the levels of proficiency needed to meet them. The net result has been wide divergence in most States in student performance on State assessments compared to student performance on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). For example, the October 2009 report from the National Center for Education Statistics, *Mapping State Proficiency Standards Onto NAEP Scales: 2005-2007*, found that 31 States set grade 4 standards for the Proficient level in reading that were lower than the Basic level on NAEP.

In response to this problem, the Administration's Title I reauthorization proposal would ask States to adopt State-developed standards in reading/language arts and mathematics that build toward college- and career-readiness by the time students graduate from high school, and high-quality statewide assessments aligned with these standards. Forty States and the District of Columbia already have adopted rigorous common, college- and career-ready standards in reading and math, and the Administration's reauthorization proposal would provide additional incentives and resources for States seeking to implement these standards and aligned assessments.

The proposed new standards and assessments would give families and communities the information they need to determine whether their students are on track to college- and career-readiness and to evaluate their schools' effectiveness. States would continue to implement statewide science standards and aligned assessments in specific grade spans, and could include those assessments—as well as statewide assessments in other subjects, such as history—in their Title I accountability system so long as they meet the same “college- and

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

career-ready” requirements as the reading and mathematics standards. Finally, States would develop and adopt statewide English language proficiency standards for English Learners, as well as aligned English language proficiency assessments, that reflect the academic language necessary to master each State’s content standards.

### Rigor, Rewards, and Flexibility in State Accountability Systems

Building on these statewide standards and aligned assessments, the Administration’s Title I reauthorization proposal would require every State to ensure that its statewide system of accountability rewards schools and districts for progress and success, requires rigorous interventions in the lowest-performing schools and districts, and gives local officials flexibility to determine the appropriate improvement and support strategies for most schools.

The foundation of these new, more rigorous and fair accountability systems would be comprehensive data systems that gather information that is critical to determining how schools and districts are progressing in preparing students to graduate from high school college- and career-ready. States and districts would collect and make public data relating to student academic achievement and growth in reading and mathematics, student academic achievement in science, and, if States choose, student academic achievement and growth in other subjects, such as history. At the high school level, States also would collect and report graduation rates and, over time, college enrollment rates and college persistence rates. All of these data would be disaggregated by race, gender, ethnicity, disability status, English learner status, status as connected to the active-duty military, and family income. States and districts also would collect other key information about teaching and learning conditions, including information on school climate, such as student, teacher and school leader attendance; disciplinary incidents; or student, parent, or school staff surveys about their school experience.

The reauthorization proposal would replace the adequate yearly progress (AYP) measure in current law, which is based primarily on a single, static snapshot of student proficiency on academic assessments, with a broader, more accurate measure of school performance that looks at student achievement, student growth, and school progress. Performance targets would be aligned with the objective of ensuring that by 2020 all students are graduating or on track to graduate from high school ready for college and a career.

The schools, districts, and States that are successful in reaching performance targets, significantly increasing student performance for all students, closing achievement gaps, or turning around the lowest-performing schools (at the district and State levels) would be eligible for rewards, which could include financial rewards for the staff and students in high-poverty schools and flexibility for LEAs and schools in the use of ESEA funds.

School improvement assistance would be focused on three categories of schools. First, States and LEAs would be required to implement one of four school turnaround models in the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools in each State, based on student academic achievement, student growth, graduation rates, and a lack of progress on these measures. An LEA that has been identified for rewards would have flexibility to implement its own research-based intervention model in those schools.

## **ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY**

### **College- and career-ready students**

---

Second, schools that fall between the fifth and tenth percentiles based on student academic achievement, student growth, and graduation rates would be placed in a warning category, and States and LEAs would implement research-based, locally determined strategies to help them improve. And third, in schools that are not closing significant, persistent achievement gaps, LEAs would be required to implement data-driven interventions—which could include expanded learning time, supplemental educational services, or other strategies—to support those students who are farthest behind and help close those achievement gaps.

The Administration’s reauthorization proposal also would require identification of and intervention in low-performing States and LEAs. Such interventions could include governance or staffing changes, restrictions on the use of ESEA funds, or partnering with an outside organization to improve student academic achievement.

### **Equitable Distribution of Effective Teachers and Leaders**

Strong teachers and leaders are the heart of educational improvement, yet current law focuses too little on the effectiveness of teachers in improving student learning and does little to recognize the importance of and support the development of effective school leaders. The Administration’s reauthorization proposal would require States to develop definitions of “effective” and “highly effective” teachers and principals, based in significant part on student academic growth, that would be used in the development of State and local teacher and principal evaluation systems. In addition, both States and LEAs would be required to develop meaningful plans to achieve the equitable distribution of effective teachers and leaders. As noted below, at the local level most LEAs would be allowed to spend Title I, Part A funds on activities to achieve such equitable distribution across their schools.

### **Resources for Reform**

The Title I reauthorization proposal also would give States and LEAs greater flexibility in using Title I, Part A funds to build State and local capacity to improve student achievement. For example, States would be permitted to reserve up to 5 percent of their Title I, Part A allocations to carry out such activities as: (1) supporting and complementing the adoption of rigorous standards and high-quality assessments, and supporting teachers in teaching to those standards; (2) using data more effectively to identify local needs and improve student outcomes; (3) improving capacity at the State and district levels to use technology effectively to improve instruction; (4) coordinating with early learning programs to improve school readiness; or (5) carrying out effective family engagement strategies. States also would be permitted to set aside up to 1 percent of their Title I, Part A allocations to fund programs that support family engagement and to identify and disseminate best practices in this area.

In addition, the Administration’s reauthorization proposal would broaden the requirement in current law for LEAs with schools in improvement to spend an amount equal to 20 percent of their Title I, Part A allocations on public school choice and/or supplemental educational services. LEAs would instead be required to use an identical amount to improve student performance in high-need schools by implementing effective school improvement strategies and carrying out strategies designed to ensure the equitable distribution of effective teachers and

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

school leaders. LEAs would also be required to reserve at least 2 percent of their Title I, Part A allocations to develop and implement comprehensive family engagement plans. LEAs would continue to have flexibility to use Title I, Part A funds to serve eligible preschool students and, in particular, to support activities designed to improve the school readiness of young children across a range of domains and lay the foundation for success in the early grades.

The ESEA proposal also would encourage increased resource equity by (1) strengthening “comparability” requirements to ensure that the high-poverty schools in each LEA receive State and local funding (for personnel and relevant non-personnel expenditures) comparable to those received by the LEA’s low-poverty schools; and (2) requiring States to measure and report on resource disparities and to develop a plan to reduce those disparities.

### Title I Rewards Program

The Administration’s request includes \$300 million for a new Title I Rewards program that would provide each State a separate formula grant allocation based on its share of funding under the four CCRS formulas. States could use up to 10 percent of their allocations to identify and promote effective practices that are used by high-performing schools and LEAs; support mentoring partnerships involving high-performing LEAs and schools and other LEAs and schools; and create communities of practice among high-performing LEAs and schools. States would use the remaining funds to make subgrants to high-poverty LEAs and schools that are highest-achieving or making the most progress, and would be encouraged to develop innovative strategies to reward these schools and LEAs, including (1) financial rewards for principals, teachers, and other staff; (2) college scholarships for students in high-performing schools; and (3) school-level financial rewards.

The Title I Rewards proposal would help ensure that State accountability systems provide meaningful positive incentives and rewards that recognize and encourage improved student outcomes. Encouraging, recognizing, and rewarding outstanding performance by high-poverty schools and LEAs would bring a much-needed corrective balance to the emphasis of current law on what often are perceived as punitive sanctions for low performance. The \$300 million request—about 2 percent of total Title I funding—would allow States to begin creating meaningful, positive material incentives for high performance and would provide sufficient resources for States to establish mechanisms for expanding the use of effective practices that improve student outcomes.

### Evaluation

The Administration’s ESEA reauthorization proposal also would authorize the Department to reserve up to 0.5 percent of Title I, Part A formula grant funds under a broad ESEA evaluation authority aimed at supporting the comprehensive evaluation of the implementation, outcomes, impact, and cost effectiveness of ESEA programs, including the Title I, Part A CCRS program. Title I evaluation activities would be included in a biennial evaluation plan that the Department would develop and submit to Congress. The Administration’s reauthorization proposal also would permit the Department to use funds reserved for ESEA evaluation to carry out and complete evaluations that were initiated before the completion of ESEA reauthorization.

**ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY**

**College- and career-ready students**

**PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s, except per-child amounts)**

		<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
<u>Formula Grant Allocations by LEA Poverty Rate</u>				
0-15%	# of LEAs	6,570	5,836	5,835
	Dollars	\$2,938,594	\$2,231,876	\$2,266,764
	% of Total \$	20.70	15.71	15.95
	\$ Per Formula Child	\$1,288	\$1,146	\$1,164
15<25%	# of LEAs	4,344	4,515	4,514
	Dollars	\$4,978,481	\$5,024,501	\$5,067,587
	% of Total \$	35.07	35.38	35.66
	\$ Per Formula Child	\$1,478	\$1,313	\$1,324
>25%	# of LEAs	2,198	2,740	2,740
	Dollars	\$6,278,572	\$6,946,623	\$6,874,913
	% of Total \$	44.23	48.91	48.39
	\$ Per Formula Child	\$1,760	\$1,579	\$1,563
LEA Allocation Subtotal		\$14,195,647	\$14,203,000	\$14,209,264
BIA/Outlying Areas		144,884	144,884	144,884
Part D, Subpart 2		147,870	140,517	134,253
Census Updates		<u>4,000</u>	<u>4,000</u>	<u>4,000</u>
Grants to LEAs Total		14,492,401	14,492,401	14,492,401
Schools receiving Title I funds		53,850	53,850	53,850
Schoolwide programs		35,068	35,068	35,068
Targeted assistance programs		18,782	18,782	18,782
Students served (in millions)				
In schoolwide programs		17.2	17.2	17.2
In targeted assistance programs		2.5	2.5	2.5
In other programs (non-public, N&D)		<u>0.3</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>0.3</u>
Total		20.0	20.0	20.0
<u>Title I Rewards</u>				
Number of State grant awards		0	0	53
Range of awards		0	0	\$682-\$33,708
Average award		0	0	\$5,660

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents selected program performance information for the Title I Grants to LEAs program, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results.

Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested for fiscal year 2012 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The performance measures and targets for the Title I Grants to LEAs program rely on data submitted annually through the ESEA Consolidated State Performance Reports, which include State and local performance information specified primarily through the annual “report card” requirements described in Section 1111(h) of the ESEA.

These measures are focused on three areas: progress of economically disadvantaged students toward the current statutory goal of ensuring that all students are proficient in reading and mathematics by 2014, closing the achievement gaps in reading and mathematics between economically disadvantaged students and the “all students” group, and improving the efficiency of the Department’s monitoring process for Title I Grants to LEAs.

**Goal:** At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.

**Objective:** *The performance of low-income students will increase substantially in reading and mathematics.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	60.9	57.4
2008	66.5	58.1
2009	72.1	61.1
2010	77.7	
2011	83.2	
2012	88.8	

**Additional information:** The 2009 assessment results show that the average proficiency rate in reading/language arts for economically disadvantaged students is improving, but far too slowly to reach the ESEA’s current goal of 100-percent proficiency by 2014. For example, if the 2009 rate of improvement is sustained through 2014, only three-quarters of economically disadvantaged students would be proficient in reading in that year.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State math assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	58.3	55.9
2008	64.2	57.8
2009	70.2	60.7
2010	76.2	
2011	82.1	
2012	88.1	

**Additional information:** The 2009 assessment results show that the average proficiency rate in mathematics for economically disadvantaged students is improving, but far too slowly to reach the ESEA's current goal of 100-percent proficiency by 2014. For example, if the 2009 rate of improvement is sustained through 2014, only three-quarters of economically disadvantaged students would be proficient in mathematics in that year.

<b>Measure:</b> The difference between the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading assessments and the percentage of all students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	11.4	12.8
2008	9.8	12.5
2009	8.1	11.5
2010	6.5	
2011	4.9	
2012	3.3	

**Additional information:** The 2009 results show that the reading achievement gap is closing, but far too slowly to eliminate this gap by 2014, the year by which the current ESEA calls for all student groups to be proficient in reading/language arts (thus reducing the gap to zero).

<b>Measure:</b> The difference between the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State math assessments and the percentage of all students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State math assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	11.1	12.2
2008	9.5	11.8
2009	7.9	10.8
2010	6.4	
2011	4.8	
2012	3.2	

**Additional information:** The 2009 results show that the mathematics gap is closing, but far too slowly to eliminate this gap by 2014, the year by which the ESEA calls for all student groups to be proficient in reading/language arts (thus reducing the gap to zero).

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

#### Efficiency Measure

Measure: Average time to complete State monitoring reports, in days, following the completion of a site visit.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	40.3	59.9
2008	40.0	41.3
2009	40.0	25.5
2010	40.0	30.9
2011	40.0	
2012	40.0	

**Assessment of progress:** In 2010, the Department continued to perform well below its target of completing State monitoring reports within 40 days of the conclusion of a site visit. The average time-to-completion for 2010 rose to 30.9 days, up from 25.5 days in 2009, primarily due to the implementation of a new risk-analysis process for selecting States for monitoring. The Department now is identifying, and selecting for monitoring, those States with the greatest number of and most complex monitoring issues. As a result of this new selection process, monitoring reports tend to be more lengthy and complex and, thus, require more days to complete. The Department expects to review its monitoring efficiency targets for 2011 and future years once Congress completes ESEA reauthorization.

#### Other Performance Information

##### National Assessment of Title I: Final Report

The current ESEA required a comprehensive, multi-year national assessment on the implementation and impact of the Title I Grants to LEAs. The most recent data from this assessment are included in two reports. The first, a 2009 report entitled *Title I Implementation: Update on Recent Evaluation Findings*, provides a summary of findings from Title I evaluation studies that have become available after the publication of the National Assessment of Title I final report in 2007. The second report, *State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, Volume IX-Accountability Under NCLB: Final Report*, provides updated information on State, district, and school implementation of NCLB provisions concerning accountability and school improvement. Both reports, as well as other related Title I evaluation reports, are available in full on the Department of Education's web site at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/opepd/ppss/reports.html#title>. Highlights of key findings follow, with updates reflecting more recent ED or State-reported data where noted:

#### Trends in Student Achievement

- In 30 States that had State assessment trend data available from 2004–05 to 2006–07, the percentage of students achieving at or above the proficient level rose for most student groups in a majority of the States. However, none of the 30 States would meet the goal of 100 percent proficiency by 2013–14 unless the percentage of students achieving at the proficient level increased at a faster rate.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

- Looking across eight different student groups (low-income, Black, Hispanic, White, English learner, migrant, students with disabilities, and the “all students” group) and four assessments (reading and mathematics in fourth grade and eighth grade), an average of 16 percent of the student groups within the 30 States would be predicted to reach 100 percent proficiency if recent growth rates were to continue.
- States that set higher performance standards tended to have a lower percentage of students scoring at the proficient level and therefore needed to make greater progress in student achievement to reach the 2013–14 goal. Put simply, States with higher standards are likely to face more challenges in reaching 100 percent proficiency.
- Trends on the main NAEP assessment from 2002 to 2007 showed gains for fourth-grade students in reading, mathematics, and science, overall and for minority students and students in high-poverty schools. However, NAEP trends for middle and high school students were mixed, with eighth-grade students making significant gains in mathematics but not in reading or science and 12th-grade scores either flat or, over the longer term, declining in reading and science. Trend data for 12th-grade mathematics were not available for this study.
- Data from both State assessments and NAEP provided some indications that achievement gaps between disadvantaged students and other students may be narrowing.

### Implementation of State Assessment and Accountability Systems

- As of January 2011, 26 States had fully approved assessment systems for reading/language arts, mathematics, and science. In addition, 13 States had approved assessments for reading/language arts and mathematics but had not yet received approval for their science assessments (science assessments were not required to be in place until the end of the 2007-2008 school year). Thirteen States had submitted evidence to the Department for their alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards (the “2 percent rule”) and 4 of these States had received approval of their alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards. [Updated January 2011]
- By 2006–07, nearly all States reported that they had implemented English language proficiency (ELP) assessments aligned with state ELP standards; almost half the States developed their ELP assessments in collaboration with a multi-state consortium.
- In 2005–06, two-thirds of the States (36) met the requirement to annually assess 95 percent or more of their students, including major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, English Learners, and low-income students. The remaining 16 States did not meet the minimum test participation requirement for one or more student subgroups.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

- Overall, three-quarters of the Nation's schools made AYP in 2005–06, a nearly identical proportion as in 2003–04 and 2004–05. In fact, four-fifths of schools had the same AYP designation from one year to the next. Sixty-five percent of schools made AYP in both years, and 16 percent missed AYP in both years. Ten percent of schools' designations worsened (i.e., moved from making AYP in 2004–05 to missing AYP in 2005–06) and 9 percent of schools' designations improved. In the 2008-2009 school year, two-thirds of all public schools made AYP, likely reflecting the greater difficulty of making AYP as each State's annual targets rise toward the 100-percent proficiency goal in the 2013-2014 school year. [Updated January 2011]
- Based on data from 43 States, schools most commonly missed AYP for the achievement of the "all students" group or for multiple targets. Only one-fourth (24 percent) missed AYP solely due to the achievement of a single subgroup.
- The number of Title I schools that were identified for improvement rose to 10,781 in 2006–07, an 11 percent increase over the 9,694 identified Title I schools in 2005–06. Twenty percent of all Title I schools were identified in 2006–07. The number and percentage of schools identified for improvement varied considerably across States: 9 States had identified 5 percent or fewer of their Title I schools, while 12 States had identified more than one-third of their Title I schools. In the 2009-2010 school year, the number of schools identified for improvement was 14,561, or about 27 percent of all Title I schools. [Updated January 2011]
- Most schools that were identified for improvement in 2004–05 remained in improvement status 2 years later, in 2006–07. Nearly three-fourths of identified schools in 2004–05 continued to be identified schools in 2006–07, while 28 percent had exited school improvement status. About half of the 2004–05 cohort of identified schools had moved into corrective action (25 percent) or restructuring status (22 percent) by 2006–07.
- Almost half of identified Title I schools were in the more advanced stages of identification status. Forty-six percent of all identified Title I schools in 2006–07 were in either corrective action or restructuring.
- Schools with high concentrations of poor and minority students were much more likely to be identified than other schools, as were schools located in urban areas. Over one-third of high-poverty schools (37 percent) and schools with high percentages of minority students (38 percent) were identified schools in 2006–07, compared with 4 to 5 percent of schools with low concentrations of these students. Schools in urban areas were more likely to be identified (25 percent) than were suburban and rural schools (12 percent and 9 percent, respectively). Middle schools were more likely to be identified (22 percent of middle schools) than were high schools (13 percent) or elementary schools (14 percent).
- The most common improvement strategies reported by identified schools involved using achievement data to inform instruction (88 percent) and providing additional instruction to low-achieving students (77 percent). Other common strategies included a major focus on aligning curricula and instruction with standards and assessments (81 percent),

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

new instructional approaches or curricula in reading and mathematics (66 percent and 64 percent, respectively), and increasing the intensity, focus, and effectiveness of professional development (63 percent).

### Title I School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

- In the 2008-2009 school year, 5.8 million students were eligible to exercise a Title I public school choice option, down from 6.4 million in the 2007-2008 school year, but up slightly from 5.6 million in the 2006-2007 school year. Participation rates (the proportion of eligible students exercising a choice option) have risen steadily, but remain modest, growing from approximately 1 percent (31,907 students) in the 2003-2004 school year to 2.65 percent (154,615 students) in the 2008-2009 school year. School districts spent \$122 million on public school choice (primarily transportation) in the 2008-2009 school year. [Updated January 2011]
- The number of students eligible for supplemental educational services (SES) rose to 4.3 million in the 2008-2009 school year, up from 1.7 million in the 2003-2004 school year. The number of students receiving SES rose to 672,101 in 2008-2009, an increase of almost 92,000 students, or nearly 16 percent, over the 580,500 students who received SES in the 2007-2008 school year. SES participation rates have remained steady over the past 5 years, averaging about 15 percent of eligible students. School districts spent \$772 million on SES in the 2008-2009 school year. [Updated January 2011]
- Districts reported spending an average of \$836 per SES participant in 2005–06, 26 percent less than the maximum per-child amount they reported allocating for such services in that year (\$1,134).
- The timeliness of parental notification about the school choice option improved from 2004–05 to 2006–07, but still was often too late to enable parents to choose a new school before the start of the 2006–07 school year.
- Although nearly all districts required to offer school choice and SES reported (in a nationally representative survey) that they notified parents about these options, a survey of eligible parents in eight large urban school districts found that many parents were unaware of these choice options.
- Across a sample of seven districts, SES participants experienced gains in achievement in both reading and mathematics that were greater than the gains for nonparticipating students. On average, the effect sizes measured were 0.08 of a standard deviation unit in both reading and math for students who participated in SES during one school year and 0.15 to 0.17 for students who received SES during two or more years. Looking at the districts individually, positive effects were found in five of the seven districts.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

- For Title I school choice, the same study did not find a statistically significant relationship between participation and student achievement. However, sample sizes for the school choice analysis were substantially smaller, due to the relatively small number of participants.

### Teacher Quality and Professional Development

- States vary considerably in their criteria for teachers to demonstrate content knowledge in the subjects they teach. For example, among the 36 States that used the Praxis II Mathematics Content Knowledge assessment to test new teachers' content knowledge in mathematics, as of November 2007, 9 States had set their cut scores below the 25th percentile of all scores attained by test takers, while 3 States had set the cut score above the national median.
- For veteran teachers, most States were phasing out the use of HOUSSE (High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation) for most teachers. In early 2007, 8 States indicated that they were discontinuing HOUSSE entirely, and another 11 States were discontinuing HOUSSE except for certain categories of teachers. However, 30 States reported that, while they were working to discontinue HOUSSE, they had identified specific groups of teachers for whom they anticipated that HOUSSE would be necessary (e.g., for foreign language teachers).
- The large majority of teachers across the country have been designated as “highly qualified” under NCLB. According to State-reported data for 50 States, 92 percent of classes were taught by highly qualified teachers in 2005–06. Special education teachers were more likely to report that they were considered not highly qualified than were general education teachers.
- Although most teachers reported that they participated in some professional development that focused on instructional strategies for teaching reading or mathematics, relatively few participated for an extended period of time. For example, 79 percent of elementary teachers participated in at least one hour of professional development focused on instructional strategies for teaching mathematics during the 2005–06 school year and summer, but only 44 percent participated for 6 or more hours and only 11 percent participated for more than 24 hours.

Teachers in schools identified for improvement were often more likely to report that they participated in professional development focused on reading and mathematics than were teachers in non-identified schools. For example, elementary teachers in identified schools were more likely than teachers in non-identified schools to report receiving at least 6 hours of professional development in instructional strategies for teaching reading (77 percent vs. 67 percent) and mathematics (52 percent vs. 43 percent).

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

---

### School turnaround grants

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Section 1003(g))

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$545,633 <sup>2</sup>	\$600,000	+\$54,367

---

<sup>1</sup>The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for fiscal year 2012.

<sup>2</sup> Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) authorizes the Department to award School Improvement Grants (SIGs) to each State educational agency (SEA) based on the SEA's proportionate share of the funds it receives under Title I, Parts A, C, and D of the ESEA. In turn, each SEA must subgrant 95 percent of its allocation to local educational agencies (LEAs) that apply for those funds to assist their Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 of the ESEA. SEAs may use up to 5 percent of their SIG allocations for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance activities.

Under the ESEA, a Title I school that, for 2 consecutive years, does not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward the goal of all students achieving at the proficient level in reading/language arts and in mathematics by 2014 is identified for improvement and must develop and implement a 2-year improvement plan that addresses the reasons it missed AYP. Also, in the first year of improvement, the LEA must offer public school choice options to all students enrolled in the school. If the school misses AYP for a third year, the LEA must make available, in addition to public school choice options, supplemental educational services (SES) to students from low-income families who are enrolled in the identified school.

If a school misses AYP for 4 years (including 2 years of implementing its initial improvement plan), the LEA must take corrective action, such as replacing school staff responsible for the continued inability to make AYP, implementing a new curriculum, or reorganizing the school internally. If corrective action does not result in the school making AYP, the LEA is required to begin planning for restructuring, which involves making a fundamental change such as closing the school and reopening it as a public charter school, replacing all or most of the school's staff, or turning operation of the school over to a private management company with a demonstrated record of effectiveness. If the school does not make AYP for a 6<sup>th</sup> year, the LEA must carry out the restructuring plan. The LEA must continue to offer public school choice and SES options to eligible students during corrective action or restructuring.

## **ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY**

### **School turnaround grants**

---

An SEA must allocate at least 95 percent of its school improvement funds to LEAs. The statute requires States to give priority in making awards to LEAs demonstrating the greatest need for school improvement funding and the strongest commitment to providing the resources needed to help their lowest-performing schools successfully implement their improvement plans. Subgrants to LEAs must be of sufficient size and scope to support the activities required under section 1116 of the ESEA, and are renewable for two additional 1-year periods.

#### **Rapid Funding Growth**

The School Improvement Grants program received initial funding of \$125 million in fiscal year 2007, growing rapidly to \$491 million in fiscal year 2008. In fiscal year 2009, Congress appropriated a total of \$3.5 billion for the SIG program, including \$545.6 million in the regular 2009 appropriations act and \$3 billion in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act). In response to this unprecedented increase in SIG funding, and as part of a comprehensive effort to maximize the impact of education programs in the Recovery Act on improving America's system of elementary and secondary education, the Administration developed and issued new regulations governing the SIG program. These regulations, which were coordinated with regulations published for two other major education programs in the Recovery Act—the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund and the Race to the Top Fund—were aimed primarily at ensuring that the historic, one-time investment in the SIG program made by the Recovery Act was used to implement rigorous school intervention models in the Nation's very worst schools, including many of the high school “dropout factories” with graduation rates below 60 percent.

#### **New Regulations**

The new SIG regulations were issued in two parts. First, the Department published SIG final requirements in the Federal Register on December 10, 2009 (74 FR 65618). Second, in response to the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010, which was signed into law on December 16, 2009, and which included new provisions applicable to the SIG program for fiscal years 2009 and 2010, the Department published additional interim final regulations in January 2010. The January 2010 interim final regulations incorporated language in the Consolidated Appropriations Act that expanded eligibility for the SIG program, while continuing to target funds on the lowest-performing schools. At the option of SEAs and LEAs, certain Title I schools that are not in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring and certain schools that are eligible for, but that do not receive, Title I, Part A funds may participate in the SIG program. The interim final regulations also raised the maximum annual amount an LEA may receive under the SIG program from \$500,000 to \$2 million per participating school. The December 2009 and January 2010 regulations were consolidated in a final rule published in the Federal Register on October 8, 2010 (75 FR 66363).

#### **Defining Greatest Need**

A key purpose of the SIG regulations was to define more closely the statutory priorities on awarding SIG funds to LEAs that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to ensuring that the funds are used to provide adequate resources that enable the lowest-performing schools to raise substantially the achievement of their students. To drive

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### School turnaround grants

---

school improvement funds to LEAs with the greatest need for those funds, the SIG regulations build on the common definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools developed for use in the reporting required by the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund, in State plans for turning around their lowest-performing schools under the Race to the Top Fund, and in the SIG program. Persistently lowest-achieving schools are defined generally as: (1) the bottom 5 percent, in terms of academic achievement, of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; (2) the bottom 5 percent, in terms of academic achievement, of secondary schools in each State that are eligible for, but that do not receive, Title I, Part A funds; and (3) Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with graduation rates below 60 percent and other Title I-eligible secondary schools with graduation rates below 60 percent. In identifying schools in categories (1) and (2), States must take into account the academic achievement of the “all students” group in each school in terms of proficiency on their ESEA reading/language arts and mathematics assessments combined, as well as that group’s lack of progress on those assessments. The “bottom 5 percent” as used in the definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools must include at least five schools.

To determine greatest need for the purposes of the SIG program, the SIG final requirements established three tiers of schools based on a combination of the definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools, the eligibility requirements of section 1003(g), and the optional expanded eligibility requirements included in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. That Act allows SEAs and LEAs to use SIG funds to serve—in addition to Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring—schools that are eligible for (but might or might not receive) Title I, Part A funds and that either: (1) have not made AYP for at least 2 years, or (2) are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates.

Under the regulations, States have some flexibility in assigning schools to the three tiers, but in general must adhere to the following guidelines:

- Tier I schools are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are in the bottom 5 percent of such schools in achievement and are not improving or that have graduation rates below 60 percent.
- Tier II schools are secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds and that either (1) are in the State’s bottom 5 percent of such schools in terms of achievement and are not improving or (2) have graduation rates below 60 percent.
- Tier III schools are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I.

States that choose to add schools that are newly eligible for SIG under the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010 must ensure that these schools are no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school in the tiers to which they are added. The Department also has provided flexibility, available through a waiver, for States to include low-achieving Title I secondary schools in their lists of Tier II schools (which, absent this waiver, would include only secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds). State applications for

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### School turnaround grants

---

SIG funds must include their lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, and States must use these lists to determine which LEAs have the greatest need for SIG funds.

Preliminary data from 50 States and the District of Columbia show that for their fiscal year 2009 SIG competitions, which were conducted in the spring and summer of calendar year 2010, States identified a total of 1,104 Tier I schools, 1,034 Tier II schools, and 13,229 Tier III schools. Of the total of 15,367 schools identified, 55 percent were elementary schools, 20 percent were middle schools, 19 percent were high schools, and 6 percent were “non-standard.”

Under the final requirements, States are required to develop new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools reflecting updated achievement and graduation rate data for their fiscal year 2010 SIG competitions, which will be conducted early in calendar year 2011. States also are permitted to make changes to the definitions of persistently lowest-achieving schools that are used to develop their lists of schools in each tier. Any State with at least five unserved Tier I schools remaining on its fiscal year 2009 list may request a waiver from the requirement to update its lists of schools for its fiscal year 2010 SIG competition (i.e., a State receiving such a waiver would be permitted to use its existing fiscal year 2009 lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its fiscal year 2010 SIG competition).

### Defining Strongest Commitment

States also must determine which LEAs have the strongest commitment to using SIG funds for interventions that are most likely to turn around their lowest-performing schools and produce improved student outcomes. The SIG final requirements define “strongest commitment” by an LEA as a commitment to use SIG funds to implement fully and effectively one of the following four school intervention models in each of its Tier I and Tier II schools:

- The Turnaround model, which involves, among other things, replacing the principal and retaining no more than 50 percent of a school’s staff, adopting a new governance structure, and implementing an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with a State’s academic standards.
- The Restart model, which requires an LEA to convert a school to a charter school or close and reopen it under the management of a charter school operator, a charter management organization, or an education management organization that has been selected through a rigorous review process.
- School Closure, which involves closing a school and enrolling its students in other, higher-achieving schools in the LEA.
- The Transformation model, which addresses four specific areas critical to transforming the lowest-performing schools, including replacing the principal and ineffective teachers, comprehensive instructional reform, increasing learning time, and expanding operational flexibility.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### School turnaround grants

---

LEAs must serve each of their Tier I schools unless they lack the capacity to implement fully and effectively one of these 4 models. They may serve Tier I and Tier II schools only by implementing one of the models. LEAs with 9 or more Tier I or Tier II schools may not implement the Transformation model in more than half of those schools. LEAs may apply for up to \$2 million annually over 3 years to implement the Turnaround, Restart, or Transformation models; School Closure generally requires only modest funding (e.g., \$50,000 to \$100,000) and is implemented in just 1 year. Beginning in fiscal year 2010, LEAs may request funding in their first-year budgets for “pre-implementation activities” conducted in the spring and summer prior to the beginning of the school year in which the LEA will fully implement a model in a Tier I or Tier II school. LEAs that serve high-need Tier III schools are encouraged to use SIG funds to implement one of the 4 models; otherwise, such schools must use SIG funds to carry out the school improvement activities described in section 1116 of the ESEA.

LEAs must establish annual goals, subject to SEA approval, for student achievement and must report progress on certain leading indicators for their Tier I and Tier II schools. Tier III schools must meet goals established by the LEA and approved by the SEA; for Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, these may be the goals in their improvement plans required by section 1116 of the ESEA. SEAs must review progress toward these goals prior to renewing the second and third years of an LEA’s SIG award.

### SEA Priorities in Awarding SIG Funds

In awarding School Improvement Grants to an eligible LEA, an SEA must provide sufficient funding to the LEA, consistent with the LEA’s proposed budget and its capacity to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA applies to serve, to close schools, and to serve participating Tier III schools. More broadly, an SEA must award funds to serve each Tier I and Tier II school that its LEAs apply to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have the capacity to serve, before it awards funding to its LEAs to serve Tier III schools. SEAs that did not serve all of their Tier I schools in fiscal year 2009 were required, absent a waiver, to carry over at least 25 percent of their fiscal year 2009 SIG allocations and award these funds through their fiscal year 2010 SIG competitions.

Preliminary data from 44 States show that in their fiscal year 2009 SIG competitions, which were conducted in the spring and summer of calendar year 2010, States served a total of 432 Tier I schools, 298 Tier II schools, and 342 Tier III schools. Of the total of 1,072 schools served in fiscal year 2009, 33 percent were elementary schools, 23 percent were middle schools, and 39 percent were high schools. (Five percent were “non-standard.”) States made just over half of SIG awards to urban schools, about one-quarter to suburban schools, and about one-quarter to rural schools. High schools fared particularly well, receiving 39 percent of SIG awards despite constituting just 19 percent of eligible schools. Rural schools also competed successfully, receiving almost a quarter of awards despite constituting only one-fifth of eligible schools. The following table compares SIG-eligible and SIG-awarded schools by grade range and school locale:

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### School turnaround grants

---

<b>Comparison of FY 2009 SIG-Eligible and SIG-Awarded Schools by School Level and Locale</b>		
	<b>SIG-eligible schools</b>	<b>SIG-awarded schools</b>
<b>Grade range</b>		
% Elementary	55.2%	32.7%
% Middle	20.1%	23.0%
% High	19.1%	39.1%
% Non-standard	5.5%	5.2%
<b>Locale Type</b>		
% Central City	44.7%	52.5%
% Urban Fringe	35.4%	24.3%
% Rural	19.9%	23.2%

In fiscal year 2009, the Department offered a waiver (which all States applied for and were approved to implement) of the period of availability of fiscal year 2009 SIG funds beyond September 30, 2011. These waivers allowed SEAs to use fiscal year 2009 funds to make “frontloaded” awards to eligible LEAs that provided the full amount of an LEA’s 3-year SIG award and thus do not entail continuation costs in subsequent years. For fiscal year 2010, the Department is encouraging SEAs to continue to “frontload” any awards made with fiscal year 2009 carryover funds, while providing only the first year of 3-year SIG awards made with fiscal year 2010 SIG funds. This hybrid funding model reflects the goal of serving the maximum number of Tier I and Tier II schools with the smaller allocations available from the fiscal year 2010 SIG appropriation. For example, a State that has \$3 million in fiscal year 2010 funding available for SIG awards could “frontload” \$1 million annually to a single Tier I or Tier II school, or provide the first year of a 3-year SIG award to three Tier I and Tier II schools, with continuation costs coming from SIG appropriations in subsequent fiscal years.

This is a forward-funded program. Funds become available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available through September 30 of the following year.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were as follows:

	(\$000s)
2007 .....	\$125,000
2008 .....	491,265
2009 .....	545,633
Recovery Act.....	3,000,000
2010 .....	545,633
2011CR.....	545,633

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### School turnaround grants

---

#### **FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration is requesting \$600 million for the School Turnaround Grants (currently School Improvement Grants) program in fiscal year 2012, an increase of \$54.4 million over the 2011 CR level. The program would be reauthorized for fiscal year 2012 as part of the Administration's proposed reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), and would play a critical role in the new Title I statewide accountability systems that would be created under that reauthorization plan.

More specifically, the reauthorized School Turnaround Grants program would make available formula grants to States, to help States and LEAs implement rigorous interventions in their persistently lowest-performing schools, which would be identified through the reauthorized Title I accountability system rather than the three-tiered system established by the SIG final requirements under current law. In general, these would be schools that are in the bottom 5 percent of schools in each State based on student achievement and, at the high school level, graduation rates, and that are not improving. States would be permitted to reserve funds to build their capacity to improve low-performing schools, including by developing and implementing effective school quality review teams to assist schools in identifying school needs and in supporting school improvement, and by reviewing and ensuring the effectiveness of external partners. States would subgrant most funds through competitive awards to LEAs or partnerships of LEAs and nonprofit organizations to implement one of the locally-selected intervention models described in the Program Description section.

LEAs and their partners would receive 3-year awards to implement fully and effectively one of these intervention models, and would be eligible for 2 additional years of funding to support a school's ongoing improvement if the school is showing progress. With the exception of the closure model, each of these models allows flexibility for locally designed plans that recognize and meet a broad range of student needs from preschool through grade 12, and that support investments across the continuum from improving the school readiness of young children to helping dropouts return to school and graduate ready for college or a career.

In addition, the Department would be authorized to reserve funds to carry out activities designed to enhance State, district, and nonprofit capacity to improve schools, such as investing in model school quality review teams to identify school needs and support school improvement.

The \$54.4 million increase proposed for fiscal year 2012 would help ensure that States and LEAs have sufficient funds to fully and effectively implement the school intervention models in more of their persistently low-performing schools while also supporting capacity building at the State level. The proposed increase reflects the high costs of and growing demand for rigorous school turnarounds, which would be supported at a per-school level of up to \$2 million annually over the potential 5-year award period. Assuming a per-school award range of \$1 million to \$2 million (depending on such factors as the size of participating schools and the intervention selected), the requested increase would allow States to make first-year awards to an estimated additional 27-54 persistently low-performing schools.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### School turnaround grants

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Number of State grant awards	57	57	57
Range of awards	\$134-69,096	\$137-64,384	\$155-67,241
Average award	\$9,573	\$9,573	\$10,526
BIE and outlying areas	\$3,682	\$3,740	\$4,235

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The final requirements for the School Improvement Grants (SIG) program included reporting metrics intended to help the Department, States, and LEAs evaluate the effectiveness of the required interventions and to inform technical assistance activities. States must report to the Department on the LEAs that received SIG awards, the size of the award, and the schools served by the LEA with SIG funds (including the level of support provided to each participating school). States also must report school-level information, such as the type of intervention, adequate yearly progress (AYP) data and ESEA school improvement status, student achievement levels, graduation and dropout rates, and data on teacher performance and school climate. The Department collects much of these data through existing *EDFacts* data collections and is adding newly required data elements to forthcoming collections. For example, the Department currently plans to collect baseline data for the SIG program as part of the Consolidated State Performance Reports that States will submit in late 2010 and early 2011. The Department also will develop indicators to measure its own performance in administering the SIG program.

In addition, in 2010 the Department began an evaluation of selected school-wide strategies and models supported through the SIG program (including staffing, governance, instructional and student supports) to determine their impact on student achievement, teacher and school leader effectiveness, and school climate. The evaluation also will examine the extent to which SEA and LEA capacity is related to improvements in these areas. The study is scheduled for completion in 2014.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

---

### Evaluation

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Sections 1501 and 1503)

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$9,167 <sup>2</sup>	0	-\$9,167

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The Administration is not seeking reauthorization legislation.

<sup>2</sup> Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) authorizes a separate appropriation for the evaluation of Title I programs. The Department uses these funds to carry out objective measurement and systematic analyses of Title I, the Federal Government's largest investment in elementary and secondary education. These evaluations compare actual results with program objectives and provide the data needed to make sound decisions on program policies and resources and to guide program improvement in the field.

Mandated evaluation activities include a National Assessment of Title I that examines how well schools, school districts, and States are implementing the Title I Grants to LEAs program, as well as the program's impact on improving student achievement. A longitudinal study to track the progress of schools is a major component of this National Assessment.

Section 1501 of the ESEA includes detailed requirements for the current scope of the National Assessment, particularly in the areas of accountability and school improvement. For example, the statute requires the National Assessment to examine the following:

- The impact of Title I programs on student academic achievement;
- The implementation of the standards and assessments required by the law, including the development of assessments for students in grades 3 through 8;
- Each State's definition of adequate yearly progress, and the impact of applying these definitions at the State, LEA, and school levels; and
- The implementation of the school improvement provisions under Section 1116, including the impact of the public school choice and supplemental educational services provisions for students enrolled in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Evaluation

---

Major studies planned for 2011 include the following:

- \$5.4 million for a Study of Early Childhood Language Development. This national study of 100 Title I schools is designed to identify school programs and teacher instructional practices associated with improved language development, background knowledge, and comprehension outcomes for children in pre–K through grade 3. The results will inform a new early childhood impact study which will use observation forms developed by the current study.
- \$3 million for a new study of the implementation of state and district accountability provisions and the equitable distribution of effective teachers and leaders under a reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This new study would collect data from all States and a random sample of districts and schools. It would complement the ongoing study of State capacity and school turnaround models under Race to the Top and School Improvement Grants.

In addition, fiscal year 2011 Title I Evaluation funds are used to provide quick-turnaround support and other analyses related to the implementation and effectiveness of Title I.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were as follows:

	(\$000s)
2007 .....	\$9,330
2008 .....	9,167
2009 .....	9,167
2010 .....	9,167
2011 CR.....	9,167

### **FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Department is not requesting separate funding for Title I Evaluation in fiscal year 2012. The Administration’s reauthorization proposal for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) would consolidate this activity into a broader ESEA evaluation authority aimed at supporting comprehensive evaluation of the implementation, outcomes, impact, and cost-effectiveness of ESEA programs. Funding would be made available through a statutorily authorized reservation of up to 0.5 percent of the funds appropriated each year for programs authorized by Title I of the ESEA and up to 1.5 percent of the funds appropriated each year for all other ESEA programs.

Education improvement is an on-going process of building our knowledge about what is working in improving practice and results for students. Understanding how ESEA programs are being implemented and whether they are achieving their intended outcomes is essential for improvement. However, the current fragmentation of evaluation authorities and funding hampers effective evaluation and the development of effective performance management strategies. The proposed cross-cutting reservation of funds would provide resources to conduct rigorous, objective evaluations of ESEA programs, policies, and practices, while also supporting

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Evaluation

---

performance measurement essential for management improvement. In addition, the new authority would enable the Department to provide increased technical assistance on evaluation to States and LEAs in order to promote quality and comparability of evaluation results.

Under the reauthorization proposal, the Department would be required to develop and submit to Congress an evaluation plan every 2 years describing proposed evaluation activities and its plan for reserving and allocating funds to support the evaluation plan. The evaluation plan would identify the Department's key priorities for evaluations and related knowledge-building activities, such as strengthening performance measures and strengthening grantee evaluations, within and across program offices. The plan would support appropriate resource allocation and help ensure that evaluations generate usable knowledge that informs program improvement, policy development, and budget decision-making for Federal, State and local decision-makers. The Department would be required to use at least 30 percent of any funds reserved for evaluation to conduct impact studies that employ experimental designs and other methodologies that support causal inferences.

The Administration's reauthorization proposal also would permit the Department to use funds reserved for ESEA evaluation to carry out and complete evaluations that were initiated before the completion of ESEA reauthorization.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
<u>National Assessment of Title I</u>			
Implementation of Title I	0	\$3,000	0
<u>Implementation Studies</u>			
Study of Early Childhood Language Development	\$5,256	5,377	0
School Turnaround Study	2,874	0	0
Data Analysis and Support	1,000	790	0
Printing	37	0	0

---

NOTE: Reflects preliminary estimates for fiscal year 2011 pending final approval of evaluation spending plans.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

---

### Early learning challenge fund (Proposed legislation)

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
0 <sup>1</sup>	\$350,000	+\$350,000

---

<sup>1</sup>Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Early Learning Challenge Fund (ELCF) would provide competitive grants to States for development of a statewide infrastructure of integrated high-quality early learning supports and services for children from birth to kindergarten entry. This infrastructure would provide a pathway to a high standard of quality across early learning programs in the State. Early learning programs that would benefit from this initiative include center-based and family child care; preschool programs; Head Start; Early Head Start; Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) programs funded under Part B, Section 619 and Part C; early intervention; home visitation; and other programs that support healthy development and education of children birth through age 5.

States receiving an award would establish and implement rigorous systems that promote healthy child development, positive child outcomes, and school readiness across a range of domains for early learning programs serving all children, including children with disabilities or developmental delays and English learners. These models would include the following components: (1) birth-to-kindergarten-entry State early learning standards that are evidence-based, address multiple domains, are aligned with K-3 standards, and are developmentally appropriate; (2) a quality rating and improvement system across early learning programs that provides the basis for measuring, monitoring, and supporting improvements in program quality; (3) a comprehensive assessment system that collects information from multiple sources about young children's learning and development in order to inform instructional and programmatic decisions; (4) a process to ensure that early learning standards are integrated into program practices; (5) a coordinated early learning workforce system; (6) a strategy to engage parents, families, and communities in children's early learning and development; (7) provisions that focus on health promotion, nutrition, and safety for young children; and (8) a coordinated data infrastructure that is aligned with preschool-through-12<sup>th</sup>-grade data systems.

The Department of Education would administer the Early Learning Challenge Fund program with the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). The Department would award grants through a rigorous peer review process through which reviewers would assess States' proposed infrastructure and plans. Grantees would be required to report data for the

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Early learning challenge fund

---

performance measures the Department would establish under the Government Performance and Results Act.

The Department would reserve 3 percent of the appropriation for national activities, including evidence-based technical assistance to States and rigorous evaluation activities that would inform ELCF implementation.

### **FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST**

For fiscal year 2012, the Administration requests \$350 million for the first year of the Early Learning Challenge Fund under the reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act. These funds would support awards that enable States to establish new or raise existing early learning standards, build coordinated systems that promote quality and ensure the effectiveness of their early learning programs, and monitor early learning programs' performance against the States' standards. This program, a central component of the President's early learning agenda, will complement, leverage, and streamline the operations of other Federal and State investments in such programs as Head Start and Early Head Start, home visitation, the Child Care Development Fund, the IDEA, and State-funded preschool.

Research shows that children, particularly those from low-income families, have many challenges to overcome during the course of their education and development. For example, the size of the working vocabulary of 4-year old children from low-income families is approximately one-third that of children from middle-income families (Hart & Risley, 1995). We also know that these early differences in children's development persist over time. The NCES Early Childhood Longitudinal Study – Kindergarten Cohort, which follows the academic progress of children from kindergarten through 5<sup>th</sup> grade, has found, for example, that differences in children's reading skills and knowledge that are usually seen in later grades appear to be present as children begin school and continue to persist after 1 or 2 years of school. In addition, research shows that students who fail to read well by fourth grade have a greater likelihood of dropping out of high school and of a lifetime of diminished success. Further, the National Research Council report, *Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children* (1998), concluded that the majority of reading problems faced by adolescents and adults could have been avoided or resolved in the early years of childhood. New research also suggests that high-quality early learning programs can have a significant impact on participants' outcomes as adults, including on earnings.<sup>1</sup> Taken together, these findings demonstrate the importance of high-quality early learning programs, particularly those that improve cognitive, health, and social-emotional outcomes. Providing children with high-quality early learning programs before gaps in learning develop can reduce the need for more costly and difficult interventions, including referrals to special education, later on, and can pay off for the individual participants who experience improved circumstances later in life and for society as a whole.

---

<sup>1</sup>Initial findings from a recent study conducted by researchers at Harvard University, the University of California at Berkeley, and Northwestern University connected results from the Tennessee STAR experiment to participating children's tax returns as adults. See [http://obs.rc.fas.harvard.edu/chetty/STAR\\_slides.pdf](http://obs.rc.fas.harvard.edu/chetty/STAR_slides.pdf) for more information about these initial findings.

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Early learning challenge fund

---

The Administration strongly believes that, to be of high quality, an early learning program must include a developmentally appropriate educational component that is inclusive of students with disabilities or developmental delays and effectively addresses the needs of English learners. According to the influential National Academy of Sciences publication, *Eager to Learn: Educating Our Preschoolers*, “care and education cannot be thought of as separate entities in dealing with young children.” This report also underscores the fact that the “early childhood system is fragmented, lacks uniform standards, and provides uneven access to all children.” A statewide coordinated system of early learning and support that applies a standard set of expectations in all educational domains, including cognitive and social-emotional development, will provide children with the preparation they need to enter kindergarten ready for success, while empowering families to seek and select the best care for their children.

Available evidence suggests that many States do have some mechanism in place to address early childhood issues across programs at the State level. In September 2010, HHS awarded grants to 45 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa for State Advisory Councils on Early Care and Education lead the development or enhancement of a high-quality, comprehensive system of early childhood development and care. And according to HHS, as of September 2010, 23 States have in place a quality rating system that includes standards, accountability measures, program and practitioner outreach and support, financing incentives, and parent/consumer education efforts (<http://nccic.acf.hhs.gov/pubs/qrs-defsystems.html>).<sup>1</sup> It is important to note, however, that the same report indicated that States vary in the level of their monitoring of early learning programs. States are grappling with how to do this work well, and report having a need for guidance and support; over half (56 percent) of all of the respondents to a study by the National Governors Association (NGA) Center for Best Practices, reported that they needed technical assistance on quality improvement efforts, and an even greater share (61 percent) reported needing guidance on early childhood assessments. The national activities supported by the Early Learning Challenge Fund initiative would address these needs. The peer review process for making awards would also add to the knowledge of the field by identifying States that are undertaking and planning to implement strong quality improvement efforts.

In addition, other Federal programs, such as Head Start and the Child Care Development Fund provide funds for quality improvement. For example, as mentioned above, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act provided funds to the Head Start program for Governors to carry out activities of the State Advisory Councils on Early Childhood Education and Care. These Councils will play a key role in planning better-coordinated systems, facilitating coordination among partners and moving towards seamless delivery of services to young children and families. The Early Learning Challenge Fund program will further encourage States to leverage existing local, State, and Federal investments in quality by supporting the establishment of cross-sector standards that can be applied across early learning programs in the State.

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Early learning challenge fund

---

#### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)**

	<u>2012</u>
Funding for new awards	\$338,000
Peer review of new award applications	\$1,500
National activities, including technical assistance and evaluation	\$10,500

#### **PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

##### **Performance Measures**

The Department will establish consistent program performance measures for all grants to ensure the collection of high-quality, comparable data that will inform the assessment of the effectiveness of this program.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

---

### Migrant student education

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I, Part C)

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$394,771 <sup>2</sup>	\$394,771	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2012.

<sup>2</sup> Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4<sup>th</sup> Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Migrant Education program (MEP) provides financial assistance to State educational agencies (SEAs) to establish and improve programs of education for children of migratory farmworkers and fishers. The goal of the MEP is to enable migrant children: (1) to meet the same academic standards as other children; and (2) to graduate from high school or a GED program with an education that prepares them for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment. To help achieve this objective, program services help migratory children overcome the educational disruption and other challenges that result from repeated moves. The program statute encourages activities to promote coordination of needed services across States and encourage greater access for migratory children to services available under the Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) and other programs authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), so that MEP funds can be used for services not already available from those programs to meet the unique needs of migrant students. Migratory children who have made a "qualifying move" within the last 3 years are generally eligible to be counted and served by the program. A move is considered to be a qualifying move if it: (1) is a change of residence due to economic necessity; (2) involves crossing school district boundaries; (3) is made in order to obtain temporary or seasonal work in agriculture or fishing; and (4) was made in the preceding 36 months.

Under the authorizing statute, every State first receives at least 100 percent of the amount that it received through the program in fiscal year 2002. All funds in excess of \$396 million (the fiscal year 2002 appropriation) are allocated through a statutory formula based on each State's per-pupil expenditure for education, its count of eligible migratory students aged 3 through 21 residing within the State in the previous year, and its count of students who received services in summer or intersession programs provided by the State.

The Department may set aside up to \$10 million from the annual appropriation for contracts and grants to improve inter- and intra-State migrant coordination activities, including academic credit accrual and exchange programs for migrant students. The Department is required to consult with States receiving allocations of \$1 million or less about whether they can increase the cost-

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Migrant student education

---

effectiveness of their programs by entering into inter-state consortium arrangements. By law, the Department may reserve up to \$3 million a year from coordination funds for incentive grants of not more than \$250,000 to such consortia.

The Department developed the Migrant Student Information Exchange System (MSIX) in response to a statutory requirement that the Department assist States in developing effective methods for the electronic transfer of migrant student records. MSIX enables States to exchange migrant student data records efficiently and expeditiously and provide an accurate, unduplicated count of the number of migrant students on a national and Statewide basis. All States have access to MSIX, and the Department is working with them to ensure that they can transmit data from their own databases to the system.

This is a forward-funded program. Funds become available for obligation from July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available through September 30 of the following year.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were as follows:

	(\$000s)
2007 .....	\$386,524
2008 .....	379,771
2009 .....	394,771
2010 .....	394,771
2011CR .....	394,771

### FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2012, the Administration requests \$394.8 million for the Title I Migrant Student Education program, the same amount as the 2011 CR level. The fiscal year 2012 appropriation would support a reauthorized program that would continue to fund activities that identify highly mobile migratory children and youth, provide them comprehensive services that address their specific needs, and promote coordination of the Federal resources available to serve this population.

Migrant children, by definition, move across school district and State boundaries, and this movement, in combination with the fact that no single school district or State has ongoing responsibility for the education of these students due to their high rate of mobility across district and State lines, creates a need for Federal support. Migrant students also represent an especially disadvantaged, hard-to-serve group due to a multitude of risk factors present in the population. In addition to being highly mobile, they tend live in poverty, have limited English proficiency, and belong to families that are likely to experience food and job insecurity, and poor health and housing conditions.

Migrant children and youth may also help their families perform agricultural work, and a growing number of migrant "emancipated youth" travel without a parent or guardian to obtain migratory work in the fields and in processing plants. These children and youth are particularly at risk for poor educational outcomes. The 2002-03 National Agricultural Workers Survey, administered by the U.S. Department of Labor, found that 87 percent of school-aged migrant workers had

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Migrant student education

---

dropped out of school in either the U.S. or their country of origin. Of the remaining 13 percent, 10 percent were behind in school and only 3 percent were in school and performing at grade level. The characteristics of the migrant population create a need for educational services that go well beyond services traditionally supported with State and local education budgets.

Data for 2008-09 indicate that the program provided services to 246,846 migrant students during the regular school year and 156,141 during the summer or intersessions. Program funds supported 3,685 projects that operated during the school day, 871 projects that operated during the regular school year and included an extended school day, 766 summer or intersession projects, and 1,718 year-round projects. Services provided that year included supplemental instruction in reading, math, and other academic areas, and high school credit accrual. Program funds were also used to provide such support services as counseling, health and nutrition services, and (especially in the summer) transportation. The number of migrant students identified as eligible for the program has declined over the last few years, most likely due to the Department's efforts to identify discrepancies in student counts and because of implementation of the 2008 regulations requiring States to establish quality control procedures that ensure the accuracy of the counts of eligible migratory children.

The schools that serve concentrations of migrant students are among the Nation's highest-need schools. The Department's 2002 report, *The Same High Standards for Migrant Students: Holding Title I Schools Accountable*, found that Title I schools serving medium or high numbers of migrant students were more likely to serve concentrations of poor and minority children than were schools with no or few migrant students. Schools serving medium or high numbers of migrant students were also more likely to serve large concentrations of limited English proficient students, according to the Department's report, *A Snapshot of Title I Schools Serving Migrant Students: 2000-2001*. Thus, these schools are likely to depend heavily on the receipt of Title I and other Federal funds to ensure that their students, including their migrant students, receive the services they need. The Migrant program pays costs not usually covered by regular Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies.

The Department would reserve approximately \$10 million from the fiscal year 2012 appropriation for migrant coordination and national activities, including \$3 million for consortium incentive grants and the remainder for activities related to inter- and intra-State coordination, primarily for maintenance and operation of the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX), including for technical assistance to States as they continue to implement their data systems to collect and exchange data on migrant students.

The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2012 under reauthorized legislation. The Administration's reauthorization proposal would revise the funding formula to address the problems identified in program reviews and audit findings. The current formula includes provisions that are cumbersome, difficult to interpret, and based on child counts from fiscal year 2001. The reauthorization proposal would simplify the formula and ensure that allocations respond to shifts in State counts of migrant students. The proposal would also improve targeting of services to migrant students by strengthening the program purpose language and sharpening the provisions that determine which students receive priority for program services. State and local recipients would continue to have wide flexibility in how

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Migrant student education

---

they spend program funds so long as they track and report on the academic achievement of migratory students in the State.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Number of eligible children	462,892	462,892	462,892
SEA program:			
Amount for State grants	\$384,771	\$384,771	\$384,771
Range of awards	\$69-\$135,300	\$69-\$135,300	\$69-\$135,300
Coordination activities:			
Consortium incentive grants	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000
Migrant student information exchange and related coordination activities	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

#### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years, and in FY 2012 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Goal: To assist all migrant students in meeting challenging academic standards and achieving graduation from high school (or a GED program) with an education that prepares them for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.**

**Objective:** *Along with other Federal programs and State and local reform efforts, the Migrant Education Program (MEP) will contribute to improved school performance of migrant children.*

<b>Measure:</b> The number of States meeting an annually set performance target in reading at the elementary school level for migrant students.		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2007</b>	20	30
<b>2008</b>	22	27
<b>2009</b>	31	27
<b>2010</b>	33	
<b>2011</b>	35	
<b>2012</b>	36	

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Migrant student education

---

<b>Measure:</b> The number of States meeting an annually set performance target in reading at the middle school level for migrant students.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	21	24
2008	23	21
2009	25	25
2010	27	
2011	29	
2012	31	

<b>Measure:</b> The number of States meeting an annually set performance target in mathematics at the elementary school level for migrant students.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	24	31
2008	26	35
2009	31	36
2010	33	
2011	35	
2012	37	

<b>Measure:</b> The number of States meeting an annually set performance target in mathematics for middle school migrant students.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	18	23
2008	20	23
2009	23	27
2010	25	
2011	27	
2012	29	

**Additional information:** The measures call for States to reach annually set performance targets; the Department set the current target, which calls for 50 percent of migrant students performing at the proficient or above level on State reading and mathematics assessments. As more States reach the initial target level, the Department will raise the target accordingly. Thirty-eight out of 48 participating States reported dropout data in 2008, and 31 States reported graduation data. Forty-eight States currently participate in the program, and 49 States reported data for these measures. The source of the data is the Consolidated State Performance Reports that States submit to the Department. Data for 2010 will be available in summer 2011.

Based on State data, 48.6 percent of migrant 4<sup>th</sup>-grade students were proficient in reading and 54.9 percent in math in 2009, an increase from 43.6 percent in reading and 51.7 percent in math in 2008. For 8<sup>th</sup>-grade migrant students, 42.7 percent were proficient in reading in 2009 and 41.4 percent in math, an increase from 40.6 percent in reading and 38.3 percent in math in 2008. Data for 2010 will be available in summer 2011.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Migrant student education

<b>Measure:</b> The number of States meeting an annually set performance target for dropout rate for migrant students.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	18	32
2008	19	38
2009	27	
2010	29	
2011	31	
2012	33	

<b>Measure:</b> The number of States meeting an annually set performance target for high school graduation of migrant students.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	16	27
2008	17	23
2009	18	
2010	19	
2011	20	
2012	21	

**Additional information:** The measures call for States to reach annually set performance targets; the Department set the current target, which calls for 50 percent or fewer migrant students dropping out of school and 50 percent or more migrant students graduating from high school. Thirty-eight out of 48 participating States reported dropout data in 2008 and 31 States reported graduation data. Note that variation in States' calculation of dropout rates limits the validity of comparisons across the States. This measure will have greater validity and reliability over time as State procedures for calculating and reporting dropout and graduation rates stabilize, and as they include all migrant students appropriately in the calculations and properly disaggregate and report results. The source of the data is the Consolidated State Performance Reports that States submit to the Department. Data for 2010 will be available in summer 2011.

### Efficiency Measures

The Department established an efficiency measure associated with the transfer of migrant student records. This measure assesses annual changes in the percentage of actively migrating students for which the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) system has consolidated records that reflect a complete history of school and health information. The MSIX integrates procedures designed to achieve efficiencies and cost reductions by linking separate State and local efforts to transfer health and education records into a single system that can be used within and across all States.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Migrant student education

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of consolidated records for migrant students that have been entered into MSIX.		
Year	Target	Actual
2009	50	26.5
2010	75	87.0
2011	100	
2012	100	

**Additional information:** The system began collecting data from a number of States in December 2007, but not every State had access to the system at that time. The Department continues to work with States to ensure that their data systems meet the appropriate technical standards needed to connect to MSIX. In addition, the Department has developed a 3-phase plan to ensure that States collect all the required student data elements and make them available to other States through MSIX. Under phase 1, the Department will set a deadline for when States will be required to collect and make available all data elements for basic student information; under phase 2, States will be required to add student assessment data; and under phase 3, States will be required to add credit accrual information for secondary students. The Department plans to issue regulations to establish deadlines for collecting and transmitting data to MSIX under each phase. The data reported in this table represent the percentage of consolidated records for migrant students entered into MSIX under phase 1. This measure will have greater validity and reliability over time as State procedures for collecting and providing the data elements improve.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

---

### **Neglected and delinquent children and youth education**

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I, Part D, Subpart 1)

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$50,427 <sup>2</sup>	\$50,427	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2012.

<sup>2</sup> Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

---

### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The Neglected and Delinquent (N and D) program provides financial assistance to State educational agencies (SEAs) for provision of education services to neglected and delinquent children and youth in State-run institutions, attending community day programs, and in correctional facilities. Funds are allocated to States through a formula based on the number of children in State-operated institutions and per-pupil education expenditures for the State. Each State's N and D allocation is generated by child counts in State institutions that provide at least 20 hours of instruction from non-Federal funds; adult correctional institutions must provide 15 hours a week. State institutions serving children with an average length of stay of at least 30 days are eligible to receive funds. Adult correctional institutions must give priority for services to youth who are likely to be released within a 2-year period.

Like other Title I programs, the N and D program requires institutions receiving funds to gear their services to the State academic content and achievement standards that all children are expected to meet. All juvenile facilities may operate institution-wide education programs in which they use Title I funds in combination with other available Federal and State funds; the institution-wide option allows juvenile institutions to serve a larger proportion of their eligible population and also to align their programs more closely with other education services in order to meet participants' educational and occupational preparation needs. States are required to reserve between 15 and 30 percent of their allocations for projects to help N and D participants make the transition from State institutions to locally operated programs or to support the successful entry of youth offenders into postsecondary and career and technical education programs.

The Department may reserve up to 2.5 percent of the appropriation for national activities, including the development of a uniform model to evaluate Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs, and technical assistance to help build the capacity of State agency programs.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Neglected and delinquent children and youth education

---

This is a forward-funded program. Funds become available for obligation from July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available through September 30 of the following year.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were as follows:

	(\$000s)
2007 .....	\$49,797
2008 .....	48,927
2009 .....	50,427
2010 .....	50,427
2011 CR.....	50,427

### **FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST**

For 2012, the Administration requests \$50.4 million, the same as the 2011 CR level, for the Neglected and Delinquent (N and D) program. The activities supported with this funding would help an estimated 132,000 N and D students return to and complete school and obtain employment after they are released from State institutions.

The N and D program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2012 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal. The reauthorization proposal would support States in helping neglected and delinquent children and youth receive instruction aligned with the State's college- and career-ready standards and in helping them transition into locally operated programs and postsecondary and career and technical education programs.

The Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal would also amend ESEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, under which SEAs currently use funding from the Title I, Part A program to make subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to support the provision of educational services for children and youth in local institutions who are neglected, delinquent, or at risk of dropping out. The reauthorization proposal would target the Subpart 2 program more effectively on institutionalized children and youth, who may not be served adequately by the Title I, Part A program.

The population served by this program is extremely disadvantaged and isolated, and research has shown that the youth served are up to 3 years behind in grade level, on average, and generally lack job skills. Harris, Baltodano, Bal, Jolivet, and Malcahy (2009) found low levels of reading achievement among youth incarcerated in three long-term correctional facilities, and "significant differences by ethnicity and special education status." Balfanz, Spiridakis, Neild, and Legters (2003) noted that incarcerated youths in a large mid-Atlantic city tended to have failed at least half of their classes and had extremely low attendance rates in the year prior to incarceration. Keith and McCray (2002) reported on the special, but underserved, needs of incarcerated youth offenders with reading disabilities. International studies bear similar results; Snowling, Adams, Bowyer-Crane, and Tobin (2000) found that the reading skills of male youths

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### **Neglected and delinquent children and youth education**

---

in a correctional facility in northern England were, on average, approximately one standard deviation below those of a control group of non-incarcerated children. A 1996 study conducted by the Educational Testing Service found that, while most of the inmates in America's prisons would eventually be paroled, two-thirds did not have the literacy skills needed to function in society. The findings of these reports show the importance of educating and preparing neglected and delinquent youth for further education or to enter the workforce.

According to a 2010 report by the Department of Justice's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the number of delinquency cases handled in U.S. juvenile courts increased 44 percent between 1985 and 2007, from fewer than 1.2 million cases to nearly 1.7 million cases. (However, the data show that there was very little growth in the total delinquency caseload since 2000, and from the peak year, 1997, to 2007, the number of cases declined 11 percent.) The data show a similar trend in the delinquency case rate – the number of cases per 1,000 juveniles in the population of children age 10 or older who were under the jurisdiction of a juvenile court. This rate rose from approximately 44.0 cases per 1,000 children in 1985 to 63.1 cases per 1,000 children in 1997, declined through 2002, and then leveled off through 2007 at about 53.5 cases per 1,000 children.

The Department has some evidence that the program is producing positive outcomes. An evaluation of the program (2000) showed that over 80 percent of participating institutions provided reading and math instruction, and data reported by States in ESEA Consolidated State Performance Reports indicate that approximately 70 percent of students enrolled in an N and D program or facility for 90 or more consecutive calendar days showed improved performance on assessments in reading and math. In addition, the percentage of participating students earning high school course credits while in an N and D program appears to be increasing. The Department is continuing to provide technical assistance to States to help ensure that they are providing effective transition services to enable students to continue their schooling or seek employment. The Department is also continuing to develop better means of tracking data on achievement once students leave institutions, including data on high school graduation rates for program participants.

From the 2012 request, the Department would reserve approximately \$1.3 million to continue to provide technical assistance and other services through the National Evaluation and Technical Assistance Center for Children who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk, which the Department established with N and D national activities funds. Some of the center's activities include: (1) developing a national model for evaluating the effectiveness of N and D programs; (2) collecting and disseminating information on tools and effective practices that can be used to support N and D youth; and (3) providing technical assistance, using experts and practitioners, to State agencies.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Neglected and delinquent children and youth education

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Number of participating institutions	786	786	786
Estimated number of students served	131,860	131,860	131,860
Average Federal contribution per child (whole dollars)	\$382	\$382	\$382
Range of awards to States	\$73-2,958	\$73-2,951	\$73-2,951
Average State award	\$946	\$946	\$946
National activities	\$1,261	\$1,261	\$1,261

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2012 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Goal: To ensure that neglected and delinquent children and youth will have the opportunity to meet the challenging State standards needed to further their education and become productive members of society.**

**Objective:** *Neglected or delinquent (N or D) students will improve academic and vocational skills needed to further their education.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of neglected or delinquent students obtaining a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent while in the N and D program.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	11.6	10.3
2008	12.2	11.8
2009	12.8	10.6
2010	13.4	
2011	14.1	
2012	14.8	

**Additional information:** Student counts for this measure are based on the number of long-term N and D students (those enrolled in a participating program or facility for 90 or more

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Neglected and delinquent children and youth education

---

consecutive calendar days). Data collected in 2005 provided the first data collection from all 52 grantees and established a working baseline for subsequent performance targets.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of neglected or delinquent students earning high school course credits.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2007</b>	61.7	50.1
<b>2008</b>	64.8	50.5
<b>2009</b>	55.2	47.9
<b>2010</b>	58.0	
<b>2011</b>	60.9	
<b>2012</b>	63.9	

**Additional information:** In 2007, the Department began using a new data collection methodology for this measure. The revised student count uses the more appropriate count of students between the ages of 13 and 21 in neglected, juvenile detention, and juvenile correctional institutions. Students in adult corrections are not included in the calculation. In 2007, 50.1 percent of N and D students earned high school course credits, less than the target; the 2007 level omits data received from three States, representing about 9 percent of all N and D students, that may have submitted inaccurate information for this performance measure. In 2008, 50.5 percent of N and D students earned high school course credits, showing some progress but falling short of the target. The Department established targets for 2009 and subsequent years based on a 5-percent increase from the 2007 baseline. In 2009, 47.9 percent of N and D students earned high school course credits, missing the target for that year. The 2009 result excludes one State, representing less than 1 percent of all N and D students, that did not report on this measure. Data for 2010 will be available in fall 2011.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of long-term neglected or delinquent students who improve reading skills as measured through State-approved assessments.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2007</b>	80.0	70.3
<b>2008</b>	84.0	71.1
<b>2009</b>	88.2	68.3
<b>2010</b>	92.6	
<b>2011</b>	97.2	
<b>2012</b>	100	

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Neglected and delinquent children and youth education

<b>Measure: The percentage of long-term neglected or delinquent students who improve mathematics skills as measured through State-approved assessments.</b>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2007</b>	72.7	72.9
<b>2008</b>	76.4	72.2
<b>2009</b>	80.2	70.7
<b>2010</b>	84.2	
<b>2011</b>	88.4	
<b>2012</b>	92.8	

**Additional information:** In 2007, the Department developed two new measures to track improvements in the reading and mathematics skills of N and D participants. Student counts are based on the number of long-term students (those enrolled in a participating program or facility for 90 or more consecutive calendar days) who are in N and D institutions and complete pre- and post-testing in reading and mathematics. These are not the same as the State assessments required under ESEA Title I and do not necessarily reflect State proficiency levels. Data collected in 2005 and 2006 provided performance baselines for reading and mathematics targets, respectively. In 2007, 70.3 percent of N and D students demonstrated improved reading skills and 72.9 percent showed improved mathematics skills. However, three States, representing about 11 percent of all the students in the program, did not report on these two performance measures in 2007. The 2009 results exclude one State, representing less than 1 percent of all N and D students, that did not report on academic achievement in reading or math, and a second State, also representing less than 1 percent of all N and D students, that did not report on academic achievement in math. Data for 2010 will be available in fall 2011.

### Efficiency Measure

<b>Measure: The cost per high school diploma or equivalent.</b>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2007</b>	\$4,502	\$4,974
<b>2008</b>	4,232	4,418
<b>2009</b>	3,978	5,013
<b>2010</b>	3,739	
<b>2011</b>	3,515	
<b>2012</b>	3,304	

**Additional information:** The Department developed an efficiency measure for the N and D program: the cost per high school diploma or equivalent. This measure attempts to determine program cost efficiency by tracking the ratio of the number of participating students achieving a high school diploma or its equivalent to the cost of the program. In 2007, the cost per high school diploma or equivalent increased to \$4,974, higher than the target. The 2007 result excludes data from one State, representing less than 2 percent of the total number of N and D students, that may have submitted inaccurate data for this measure. Data for 2010 will be available in fall 2011.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Neglected and delinquent children and youth education

---

#### **Other Performance Information**

A 1998 study, conducted by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, examined data from seven States to gauge the feasibility of collecting data that could be used to estimate the impact of correctional education services on incarcerated youth. The study determined that, with assistance, some States could provide reliable data on dropout rates, recidivism, diploma and degree completions, and employment. According to a Department study in 2001, 46 State agencies maintained data on the number of GEDs earned by Neglected and Delinquent students but only 20 State agencies maintained data on the number of school credits earned.

In addition, the Research Triangle Institute's Study of Local Agency Activities under the Title I, Part D, Program (2000) found that although all districts participating in the study made attempts to collect student achievement data, these data were typically incomplete and, because of high student mobility, measures of student gains on test scores are especially difficult for districts to obtain. States' development of longitudinal student data systems and the Department's collection of future years' N and D data through the *EDFacts* electronic data system should improve the quality and consistency of student data.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

---

### Homeless children and youth education

(McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Title VII, Subtitle B)

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$65,427 <sup>2</sup>	\$65,427	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2012.

<sup>2</sup> Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

To help ensure that all homeless children and youth have equal access to the same free, appropriate public education available to other children, the Homeless Children and Youth Education program provides assistance to States to: (1) establish or designate an Office of Coordinator of Education of Homeless Children and Youth; (2) develop and carry out a State plan for the education of homeless children; and (3) make subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to support the education of those children.

The Department allocates program funds to States through a formula based on each State's share of funds under Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Each State receives an annual allocation that is, at a minimum, the greater of \$150,000, 0.25 percent of the total program appropriation for the fiscal year, or the amount of the State's fiscal year 2001 allocation. Program funds are also reserved for the outlying areas (0.1 percent of a fiscal year's appropriation) and the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) of the Department of the Interior (1 percent). The Department is also authorized to reserve funds to provide technical assistance (if requested by a State) and conduct evaluation and dissemination activities.

A State may reserve up to 25 percent (or in the case of States receiving the minimum award, 50 percent) of its allocation for State-level activities. With the remaining funds, a State must make subgrants to LEAs. LEAs have flexibility in using their subgrant funds and may use them for such activities as providing enriched supplemental instruction, transportation, professional development, referrals to health care, and other services to facilitate the enrollment, attendance, and success in school of homeless children, including preschool-aged children, and youth.

The McKinney-Vento Act explicitly prohibits States that receive program funds from segregating homeless students in separate schools, except for short periods of time for health and safety emergencies or to provide temporary, special, supplementary services. However, it exempts from that prohibition separate schools for homeless children or youth that were operating in fiscal year 2000 in four counties (San Joaquin, Orange, and San Diego counties in California, and Maricopa County in Arizona) if those schools and their districts meet certain requirements.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Homeless children and youth education

---

The Homeless Children and Youth Education program is a forward-funded program. Funds become available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year for which they are appropriated and remain available through September 30 of the following year.

Funding levels for the program for the past 5 fiscal years were as follows:

	(\$000s)
2007 .....	\$61,871
2008 .....	64,067
2009 .....	65,427
Recovery Act .....	70,000
2010 .....	65,427
2011 CR .....	65,427

### FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2012, the Administration requests \$65.4 million for the Homeless Children and Youth Education program, the same as the 2011 CR level. The Administration is proposing to continue and strengthen this program under ESEA reauthorization. The fiscal year 2012 appropriation would fund the first year of operations of a reauthorized program, which would more directly target resources to homeless children and remove barriers to serving them effectively. Under the reauthorization proposal, program funds would be allocated to States based on the most recent State-reported data on the number of homeless children and youth available to the Department rather than on State shares of Title I, Part A funds, a change that would help ensure that program funds flow to States on the basis of need. An additional change would eliminate the exemption to the prohibition against operating separate schools for homeless youth; this change is needed because homeless students are unlikely to receive a high-quality education in a segregated environment and because of the stigma attached to groups of students placed in segregated schools. The reauthorization proposal would also better align the uses of funds under the program with the reforms promoted in general through the ESEA reauthorization.

This program is an important component of the national effort to end the cycle of homelessness. Homeless children face many barriers that impede their educational access and success, such as immunization, transportation, and guardianship requirements. This program helps to reduce and eliminate those barriers and give homeless children access to academic services available to other children, such as preschool programs, special education, gifted and talented programs, and career and technical education.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Homeless children and youth education

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Total budget authority	\$65,427	\$65,427	\$65,427
Amount distributed to grantees	\$64,505	\$64,465	\$64,465
Average State award	\$1,227	\$1,226	\$1,226
Amount to Outlying Areas	\$65	\$65	\$65
Amount to BIE	\$654	\$654	\$654
Evaluation and dissemination	\$922	\$962	\$962

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2012 and future years and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Goal:** To ensure access of homeless children and youth to the same free, appropriate public education as is provided to other children and youth.

**Objective:** Homeless children and youth will have greater access to a free and appropriate public education.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of homeless children and youth, grades three through eight, included in statewide assessments in reading and mathematics, as reported by LEA subgrantees.				
Year	Target – Reading	Actual – Reading	Target – Math	Actual – Math
2007	60	73	60	72
2008	63	74	63	74
2009	66	69	66	69
2010	69		69	
2011	72		72	
2012	75		75	

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Homeless children and youth education

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of assessed homeless students, grades three through eight, who meet or exceed proficiency on State assessments in reading and mathematics.				
Year	Target – Reading	Actual – Reading	Target – Math	Actual – Math
2007	50	45	50	46
2008	52	45	52	45
2009	54.6	50	54.6	50
2010	57		57	
2011	60		60	
2012	63		63	

**Source of data:** Consolidated State Performance Reports

**Additional Information:** Data for these measures for 2010 will be available in the summer of 2011.

The Department has worked to improve performance and reporting for these measures by providing technical assistance and requiring States to report on the measures through the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) and the Education Data Exchange Network. In 2008, Department staff and the program’s technical assistance provider, the National Center for Homeless Education (NCHE), developed an action plan for improving student assessment participation rates. Staff from NCHE convened a task force of State coordinators and local district liaisons to support State coordinators in collecting more complete and reliable data for subsequent data collections. NCHE and Department staff discussed the issue with State coordinators during conference calls and at State coordinators’ meetings, and NCHE revised and expanded its *Guide to the CSPR*. In addition, NCHE and Department staff have provided specific technical assistance to States that have had difficulty providing complete and reliable data.

### Efficiency Measure

The Department has established the following efficiency measure for the Education for Homeless Children and Youth program:

<b>Measure:</b> The average number of days it takes the Department to send a monitoring report to States after monitoring visits.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	41	59.9
2008	40	41.7
2009	40	25.5
2010	40	30.9
2011	40	
2012	40	

### Other Information

The Department initiated a national study of implementation of the Homeless Children and Youth Education program in the fall of 2010. Results from the implementation study are expected in the summer of 2012.