Department of Education

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>raye</u>
Appropriations Language	G-1
Amounts Available for Obligation	
Obligations by Object Classification	
Summary of Changes	
Authorizing Legislation	
Appropriations History	
Significant Items in FY 2011 Appropriations Reports	
Summary of request	
Activities:	
Promise neighborhoods	G-14
Successful, safe, and healthy students	
Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities	G-26
Elementary and secondary school counseling	
Physical education program	
Foundations for learning	G-51
Mental health integration in schools	
Alcohol abuse reduction	
21 st Century community learning centers	G-61
State table	G-70

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
Discretionary authority: Annual appropriationAnnualized CR (PL 111-322)	\$393,053 0	0 <u>\$393,053</u>	\$1,781,132 0
Subtotal, appropriation	393,053	393,053	1,781,132
Comparative transfer to Education Improvement Programs for: Civic education: We the People	-21,617	-21,617	0
Civic education: cooperative education exchange	-13,383	-13,383	0
Comparative transfer from Innovation and Instructional Teams for: Promise neighborhoods Foundations for learning. Mental health integration in schools	10,000 1,000 5,913	10,000 1,000 5,913	0 0 0
Comparative transfer from <u>Education Improvement Programs</u> for: 21 st Century community learning centers	<u>1,166,166</u>	<u>1,166,166</u>	0
Subtotal, comparable appropriation	1,541,132	1,541,132	1,781,132
Unobligated balance, start of year	10,016	6,225	0
Recovery of prior-year obligations	11,837	0	0
Unobligated balance, expiring	-3	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year	-6,225	0	0
Comparative transfers: Unobligated balance, start of year from: Education Improvement Programs for 21st century community learning centers	14,461	14,890	14,890

Amounts Available for Obligation (\$000s)

2010	2011 CR	2012
-\$14,890	\$14,890	0
1,556,328	1,547,357	\$1,796,022
	-\$14,890	\$14,890\$14,890

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.

Obligations by Object Classification (\$000s)

	2010	2011 CR	2012
Printing and reproduction	\$8	\$11	\$16
Other contractual services:			
Advisory and assistance services	1,554	2,220	3,067
Peer review	1,540	1,455	3,961
Other services	16,483	24,066	31,605
Purchases of goods and services from			
other government accounts	2,803	3,969	9,651
Subtotal	22,380	31,690	48,284
Grants, subsidies, and contributions	<u>1,533,940</u>	<u>1,515,656</u>	<u>1,747,722</u>
Total abbretions	4 550 000	4 5 4 7 0 5 7	4 700 000
Total, obligations	1,556,328	1,547,357	1,796,022

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.

Summary of Changes (\$000s)

2011 CR2012		
Net change		
NOTE: The Administration is proposing to reauthorize the Elementary a funds for affected programs are proposed for later transmittal and will be requestionized.		
	2011 CR base	Change from base
Increases: Program:		
Increase for Promise Neighborhoods to provide competitive grants to community-based organizations for the development of comprehensive neighborhood programs designed to combat the effects of poverty and improve educational and life outcomes for children and youth, from birth through college and to career.	\$10,000	+\$140,000
Increase to initiate the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program to support student achievement to high standards and to help ensure that students are mentally and physically healthy and ready to learn by strengthening efforts to improve school climate and improve students' physical and mental health and well-being.	0	+364,966
Increase for 21 st Century Community Learning Centers to enable States and eligible local entities to use program funds to support expanded-learning-time programs as well as full-service community schools, in addition to continuing to support before- and after-school programs, summer enrichment programs, and summer school programs.	1,166,166	+100,000
Subtotal, increases	.,,	+604,966

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

	2011 CR base	Change from base
Decreases:		
Elimination of funds for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities because the Administration's reauthorization proposal would consolidate this program into the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program.	\$191,341	-\$191,341
Elimination of funds for Elementary and Secondary School Counseling because the Administration's reauthorization proposal would consolidate this program into the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program.	55,000	-55,000
Elimination of funds for Physical Education because the Administration's reauthorization proposal would consolidate this program into the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program.	79,000	-79,000
Elimination of funds for Foundations for Learning because the Administration's reauthorization proposal would consolidate this program into the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program.	1,000	-1,000
Elimination of funds for Mental Health Integration in Schools because the Administration's reauthorization proposal would consolidate this program into the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program.	5,913	-5,913
Elimination of funds for Alcohol Abuse Reduction because the Administration's reauthorization proposal would consolidate this program into the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program.	32,712	<u>-32,712</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-364,966
Net change		+240,000

Authorizing Legislation (\$000s)

Activity	2011 Authorized	2011 CR	2012 Authorized	2012 Request
Promise neighborhoods (ESEA-V-D, Subpart 1) Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students (proposed	01	\$10,000	To be determined ¹	\$140,000
legislation) Safe and drug-free schools and communities national	0	0	To be determined	364,966
activities (ESEA IV-A, Subpart 2, Sections 4121 and 4122)	0 ^{2, 3}	191,341	0 ²	0
Elementary and secondary school counseling (ESEA-V-D, Subpart 2)	0 ^{2, 4}	55,000	O ²	0
Physical education program (ESEA-V-D, Subpart 10) Foundations for learning (ESEA-V-D, Subpart 14,	0 ^{2, 4}	79,000	02	0
Section 5542) Mental health integration in schools (ESEA-V-D,	0 ^{2, 4}	1,000	02	0
Subpart 14, Section 5541) Alcohol abuse reduction (ESEA-IV-A, Subpart 2,	0 ^{2, 4}	5,913	02	0
Section 4129) 21 st century community learning centers (ESEA-IV-B)	$0^{2, 3}$ 0^{5}	32,712 1,166,166	0 ² To be determined ⁵	0 1,266,166
<u>Unfunded authorizations</u>				
Safe and drug-free schools and communities State	0.6			
grants (ESEA IV-A, Subpart 1) Character education (ESEA V-D, Subpart 3)	0 ⁶	0	0 ⁶	0
Mentoring program (ESEA section 4130)	06	0	06	0

Authorizing Legislation—continued

Activity	2011 Authorized	2011 CR	2012 Authorized	2012 Request
<u>Unfunded authorizations</u> (continued)				
Grants directed at preventing and reducing alcohol abuse at institutions of higher education (Section 2(e)(2) of P.L. 109-422)	\$ <u>5,000</u>	0	0^7	0
Total definite authorization	5,000		0	
Total appropriation Portion of the request subject to reauthorization		\$1,541,132		\$1,781,132 1,781,132

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.

² The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

⁷ The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2011.

¹ The program is funded in FY 2011 through the Fund for the Improvement of Education: Programs of National Significance (ESEA Title V, Part D, Subpart 1), which is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. Authorizing legislation is sought for FY 2012.

³ Funds appropriated for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs (inclusive of funds appropriated for the Alcohol Abuse Reduction program) in fiscal year 2011 may not be increased above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2010 unless the amount appropriated for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants in fiscal year 2011 is at least 10 percent greater than the amount appropriated in 2010.

⁴ A total of \$675,000 thousand is authorized to carry out all Title V, Part D activities.

⁵ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2012.

⁶ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The Administration is not seeking reauthorizing legislation.

Appropriations History

(\$000s)

	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2004 (2004 Advance for 2005)	\$756,250 (330,000)	\$825,068 (330,000)	\$818,547	\$855,775
2005	838,897	801,369	891,460	860,771
2006	396,767	763,870	697,300	729,517
2007 Supplemental (P.L. 110-28	266,627	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	729,518 8,594
2008	324,248	760,575	697,112	693,404
2009	281,963	714,481 ²	666,384 ²	690,370
2010	413,608	395,753	438,061 ³	393,053
2011	1,786,166	384,8414	426,0535	393,053 ⁶
2012	1,781,132			

¹ 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.

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

The level for the Senate allowance reflects Committee action only.
 The level for the House allowance reflects the House-passed full-year continuing resolution
 The level for the Senate allowance reflects Committee action only.
 The level for appropriation reflects the continuing resolution (P.L. 111-332) passed on December 22, 2010.

Significant Items in FY 2011 Appropriations Reports

<u>Coordination and Integration of Mental Health Services among Programs Funded in this Account</u>

Senate: The Committee requested that the Department report to the House and Senate

Appropriations Committees within 30 days of enactment of the appropriation on

how resources available within this account will be used to address the Committee's interest in funding for the coordination and integration of mental

health services within the activities funded in the account.

Response: The Department will report to the Committees as requested.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2012 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(in thousands of dollars)	Category	2010	2011 CR	2012 President's	2012 Presider Compared to	
Account, Program and Activity	<u>Code</u>	Appropriation	Annualized	Budget	Amount	Percent
Supporting Student Success						
1. Promise Neighborhoods (ESEA V-D, subpart 1) ¹	D	10,000	10,000	150,000	140,000	1400.0%
2. Successful, safe, and healthy students:						
(a) Successful, safe, and healthy students (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	364,966	364,966	
(b) Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities						
(ESEA IV-A, Subpart 2, sections 4121 and 4122) 2	D	191,341	191,341	0	(191,341)	-100.0%
(c) Elementary and secondary school counseling (ESEA V-D, subpart 2)	D	55,000	55,000	0	(55,000)	-100.0%
(d) Physical education program (ESEA V-D, subpart 10)	D	79,000	79,000	0	(79,000)	-100.0%
(e) Foundations for learning (ESEA V-D, subpart 14, section 5542) 1	D	1,000	1,000	0	(1,000)	-100.0%
(f) Mental health integration in schools) ESEA V-D, subpart 14, section 5541) 1	D	5,913	5,913	0	(5,913)	-100.0%
(g) Alcohol abuse reduction (ESEA IV-A, Subpart 2, section 4129)	D	32,712	32,712	0	(32,712)	-100.0%
Subtotal		364,966	364,966	364,966	0	0.0%
3. 21st century community learning centers (ESEA IV-B)	D	1,166,166	1,166,166	1,266,166	100,000	8.6%
Total	D	1,541,132	1,541,132	1,781,132	240,000	15.6%

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.

¹ Adjusted for comparability. FY 2010 funds were appropriated in the Innovation and Improvement account (proposed in FY 2012 as the Innovation and Instructional Teams account) under the Fund for the Improvement of Education/Programs of National Significance.

² FY 2010 amount for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities includes \$8,212 thousand to cover the 2 years of remaining continuation costs of Character Education awards. FY 2011 is the final year of activity for these projects.

Summary of Request

The programs in the Supporting Student Success account assist States, local educational agencies, schools, and other organizations in developing and implementing programs and activities that increase the extent to which students are physically and emotionally safe and healthy; students have regular access to adults, either formally or informally, who care about their success and have opportunities to engage with them; schools are environments where students have the opportunity to access comprehensive supports along the birth-through-college-and-to-career continuum that promote social and emotional development and responsible citizenship; and students and teachers have the time and supports they need to focus on teaching and learning.

All of the programs in this account that would be funded in 2011 under the CR annualized level are authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and are, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that the programs in this account will be implemented in fiscal year 2012 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal. Funding in the account is requested for the following three programs that respond to the concerns described above:

- \$150 million for the Promise Neighborhoods initiative, a \$140 million increase over the 2011 annualized CR level, to provide competitive 1-year planning grants and 5-year implementation grants to community-based organizations for the development and implementation of comprehensive neighborhood programs designed to combat the effects of poverty and improve educational and life outcomes for children and youth;
- \$365 million for a new Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program that would support student achievement to high standards and help ensure that students are mentally and physically healthy and ready to learn, by strengthening efforts to: improve school climate by reducing drug use, violence, bullying, and harassment, and by improving school safety; improve students' physical health and well-being through the use of, or provision of access to, comprehensive services that improve student nutrition, physical activity, and fitness; and improve student's mental health and well-being through the use of, or provision of access to, comprehensive services, such as counseling, health, and mental health services, social services, and innovative family engagement programs or supports; and
- \$1.3 billion for the reauthorized 21st Century Community Learning Centers to support State and local efforts to implement in-school and out-of-school strategies for providing students (and, where appropriate, teachers and family members), particularly those in high-need schools, the additional time, support, and enrichment activities needed to improve student achievement. The Administration's reauthorization proposal would continue to allow funds to be used for before- and after-school programs, summer enrichment programs, and summer school programs, and would also permit States and eligible local entities to use funds support expanded-learning-time programs as well as full-service community schools.

The fiscal year 2010 appropriation funded, as would a full-year 2011 CR continue to fund, numerous separate, narrowly targeted programs focused on students' safety, health, and drug-prevention with different purposes, requirements, and authorized activities. While each of these

Summary of Request

programs has worthy goals, the result of these fragmented funding streams has been inefficiencies at the Federal, State, and local levels. To compete for funds, eligible entities have had to deal with numerous small grant competitions with different applications and requirements, rather than focusing on improving outcomes for students. To manage programs, the Department has focused on running separate grant competitions and monitoring compliance, rather than providing strong support and directing funding to the most proven or promising practices. The new Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program constitutes a major consolidation of these existing programs, and would provide increased flexibility to States and districts in designing strategies that best reflect the needs of their students, schools, and communities, and allow the Department to focus funding on strategies that improve student achievement, especially for students in high-need schools. Accordingly, no funds are requested in the budget for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities, Elementary and Secondary School Counseling, Physical Education, Foundations for Learning, Mental Health Integration in Schools, and Alcohol Abuse Reduction programs, all of which would be subsumed under the proposed consolidation.

Promise neighborhoods

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined ¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$10,000 ²	\$150,000	+\$140,000

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

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

In fiscal year 2010, the Congress provided initial funding for Promise Neighborhoods under the Fund for the Improvement of Education: Programs of National Significance. The Administration proposes to authorize Promise Neighborhoods in the Supporting Student Success account as part of its reauthorization proposal for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in fiscal year 2012. Promise Neighborhoods provides competitive grants to eligible nonprofit organizations, institutions of higher education, and Indian tribes to support the development or implementation of a feasible, sustainable plan that combines a continuum of effective family and community services, strong family supports, and ambitious, comprehensive education reforms – with high-quality schools at the center – to improve the educational and life outcomes for children and youth, from birth through college. The core belief behind this initiative is that providing both effective, achievement-oriented schools and strong systems of support will offer children the best hope for a better life.

The purpose of the Promise Neighborhoods program is to improve significantly the educational and developmental outcomes of children and youth in our most distressed communities and to transform those communities by (1) increasing the capacity of organizations that are focused on achieving results for children and youth throughout an entire neighborhood; (2) building a continuum of academic programs and community supports with great schools at the center; (3) integrating programs so that solutions are implemented effectively and efficiently across agencies; (4) developing the local infrastructure of policies, practices, systems, and resources to sustain and "scale up" proven, effective solutions across the broader region, beyond the initial neighborhood; and (5) learning about the overall impact of the program and the relationship between particular strategies implemented with Promise Neighborhoods grants and student outcomes.

Each Promise Neighborhood grantee serves a high-need geographic area, as demonstrated by multiple signs of distress. Each grantee has as a goal attaining a dramatic increase in the number of children and youth from the service area who successfully enter college, though

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

Promise neighborhoods

grantees will pursue a range of comprehensive supports to reach that goal and other intermediate goals. The Department encourages grantees to coordinate with other Federal agencies, notably the Departments of Housing and Urban Development, Health and Human Services, and Justice, in order to leverage additional resources and address additional community needs that limit the ability of children and youth to succeed educationally. The Department requires applicants for planning and implementation grants to have a demonstrated, positive track record in direct service work, specifically work that improves outcomes for families in poverty.

Program funds support 1-year planning grants that enable grantees to conduct activities to facilitate the development of a feasible plan for providing a continuum of services and supports appropriate to the needs of children and youth within the target neighborhood, as well as implementation grants to support the implementation of a well-conceived plan. Required activities for planning grantees include: (1) conducting a comprehensive needs assessment and "segmentation analysis" of children and youth in the neighborhood to be served; (2) developing a plan to deliver a continuum of solutions with the potential to drive results; (3) establishing effective partnerships to provide solutions and to commit the resources needed to sustain and scale up what works; (4) planning, building, adapting, or expanding a longitudinal data system that will provide information that the grantee will use for learning, continuous improvement, and accountability; and (5) participating in a community of practice.

Planning grantees and other qualified entities with a feasible plan can apply for implementation grants. In order to demonstrate successful completion of a plan, grantees must document their ability to build effective partnerships. Grantees must operate or propose to work with at least one public elementary or secondary school in the geographic area to be served and show the ability to work effectively with a variety of other organizations, such as nonprofit organizations, foundations, local agencies, and State agencies and, through those partnerships, bring a variety of resources to the program, including matching funds. Required activities for implementation grantees include: (1) implementation of a continuum of solutions that addresses neighborhood challenges, as identified in a needs assessment and segmentation analysis, and that will improve results for children and youth in the neighborhood; (2) building and strengthening partnerships that provide solutions along the continuum of solutions and that will commit resources to sustain and scale up what works; (3) collecting data on indicators at least annually, and using and improving a data system for learning, continuous improvement, and accountability; (4) demonstrating progress on goals for improving systems, such as by making changes in policies and organizations, and by leveraging resources to sustain and scale up what works; and (5) participating in a community of practice.

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

	(\$000s)
2007	0
2008	
2009	0
2010	
2011 CR	10.000

Promise neighborhoods

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$150 million in fiscal year 2012 for Promise Neighborhoods, an increase of \$140 million compared to the fiscal year 2011 CR level. Fiscal year 2012 funds would support a new cohort of planning grants and implementation grants as well as continuation awards for implementation grants made in fiscal year 2011. Eligible entities would include non-profit organizations, institutions of higher education, and Indian tribes that partner with one or more public schools.

Promise Neighborhoods supports the goal of all children and youth having access to a continuum of ambitious, rigorous, and comprehensive education reforms, effective community services, and strong systems of family and community support—with high-quality schools at the center—necessary to address participants' fundamental needs so that they succeed in school, college, and beyond. Research studies and data have shown that children in poverty are more likely than their more wealthy counterparts to face mental health and physical health challenges; to have poor nutrition and exercise habits; to move homes and change schools; to attend high-poverty, low-performing schools; and to live in neighborhoods where safety is a concern. These are factors known to lead to negative behaviors or that by themselves provide additional challenges for children in attaining a high-quality education. Surmounting these challenges requires a more concentrated and comprehensive approach than Federal, State, and local programs have historically taken.

In its first year, Promise Neighborhoods has benefited from the experiences of the Harlem Children's Zone (HCZ) project, a comprehensive, place-based, anti-poverty program, begun in the 1990s, that is achieving impressive results for disadvantaged children and youth who live in a 97-block zone in New York City. The HCZ model espouses five principles for success: (1) serving an entire neighborhood comprehensively and at a large enough scale to have an impact on all children in the region; (2) creating a pipeline of high-quality programs for children, from birth through college, that includes parenting education, early childhood programs, effective schools and after-school programs, and supports before and during college; (3) building community among residents, institutions, and stakeholders, who help to create the environment necessary for children's healthy development; (4) evaluating program outcomes and use the data for program improvement; and (5) cultivating a culture of success rooted in passion, accountability, leadership, and teamwork.¹

Evidence suggests that students in HCZ schools are achieving at significantly higher levels in reading and math than other similarly situated students. Harvard University economics professor Roland Fryer, Jr. and Harvard graduate student Will Dobbie's 2009 assessment found that the HCZ produced significant gains for the students in the zone; the "HCZ is enormously successful at boosting achievement in math and ELA [English/Language Arts] in elementary school and math in middle school." The HCZ reports that its students are also showing

¹Whatever it Takes: A White Paper on the Harlem Children's Zone, http://www.hcz.org/images/stories/HCZ%20White%20Paper.pdf.

²Will Dobbie and Roland G. Fryer, Jr., "Are High-Quality Schools Enough to Close the Achievement Gap?

Promise neighborhoods

success in their college-acceptance and college-going rates, as well as their abilities to obtain financial aid in the form of full scholarships and grants.

Since the President announced his goal of establishing Promise Neighborhoods, the Department has received significant interest in the program. For the fiscal year 2010 planning grant competition, the Department received 339 applications, but was only able to fund 21 1-year planning grant projects, including 1 project that supports a tribal community and 2 projects that support rural communities. In fiscal year 2011, the Department expects to award a small number of 3-year implementation grants, with the possibility of extending them to 5 years. While the demand for grants will likely continue to far exceed the available funding, the Administration's goal is to make significant investments in a small number of communities that are able to demonstrate their capacity to plan and implement comprehensive high-quality education reforms and family and community supports for all children and youth in an identified geographic region, improve academic outcomes, and sustain their efforts and partner commitments. The Secretary may give priority to applicants that propose to implement comprehensive local early learning programs and services, as part of the applicant's cradlethrough-college-to-career continuum. In FY 2012, the Department anticipates making implementation awards averaging \$6-8 million. Though this amount would serve as only part of the annual funding needed to implement a Promise Neighborhood project, the Department believes that the Federal investment will help leverage additional financial support from non-Federal sources like philanthropies, private sources, and other governmental entities.

The proposed legislation would also authorize the Department to reserve up to 5 percent of the Promise Neighborhoods appropriation for national leadership activities, such as research, data collection, outreach, dissemination, technical assistance, including the development of and support for "communities of practice," and peer review. The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) will fund a national evaluation of the Promise Neighborhoods program to commence in fiscal year 2012, with funding requested in the IES account. Funds for technical assistance activities would support communities of practice, the development of a web site that will include a data dashboard for data management and reporting, direct assistance and coaching for grantees, and annual project directors' meetings.

In addition, the Department's participation in the Neighborhood Revitalization Working Group (NRWG), part of the Domestic Policy Council's broader urban affairs agenda, may provide grantees with an additional approach to technical assistance through the interagency technical assistance project (ITTAP). The NRWG is developing and executing the Administration's place-based strategy¹ for providing local communities with the tools they need to change neighborhoods of concentrated poverty into neighborhoods of opportunity. The NRWG is comprised of representatives from the Departments of Housing and Urban Development, Health and Human Services, Justice, Treasury, and Education. The group will work jointly to fund

Evidence from a Bold Social Experiment in Harlem" (working paper, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, Massachusetts, April 2009).

¹ See also Memorandum from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), *Developing Place-Based Policies for the FY 2011 Budget*, August 11, 2009, available online at http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/memoranda fy2009/m09-28.pdf

Promise neighborhoods

integrated technical assistance to help high-need neighborhoods develop comprehensive, collaborative approaches to neighborhood revitalization.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Planning Grants Number of new awards	21	0	18-20
Funding for new awards	\$10,000	0	\$10,000
Implementation Grants			
Number of new awards	0	3	16-19
Funding for new awards	0	\$9,750	\$120,500
Number of continuing awards	0	0	3
Funding for continuing awards	0	0	\$12,000
National Activities			
Technical Assistance	0	0	\$7,000
ITTAP	0	\$250	\$350
Peer review of new award applications	0 ¹	0 ¹	\$150

¹ Peer review costs in FY 2010 and FY 2011 are provided through the Fund for the Improvement of Education: Programs of National Significance (ESEA Title V, Part D, Subpart 1).

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

The Department has established the following performance measure for planning grantees: the percentage of planning grantees that produce a high-quality plan as measured by their receiving at least 90 percent of 100 possible points in the subsequent competition for an implementation grant. The Department's reauthorization proposal for Promise Neighborhoods and Notice of Proposed Priorities for FY 2011 and subsequent years includes education and family and community support indicators to measure the results of implementation grantees.

Successful, safe, and healthy students

(Proposed legislation)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
0	\$364,966	+\$364,966

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Under the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students (SSHS) program, which would build on competitions the Department is conducting in 2010 and 2011 under Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs, the Department would award competitive grants to increase the capacity of State educational agencies (SEAs), high-need local educational agencies (LEAs), and their partners to develop and implement programs and activities that improve conditions for learning so that students are safe, healthy, and successful. Programs and activities supported by this program would include those that reduce or prevent drug use, alcohol use, bullying, harassment, or violence and promote and support the physical and mental well-being of students.

From the SSHS appropriation, the Department would be authorized to fund <u>continuation awards</u> for grants and contracts made under the following programs prior to enactment of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs; Elementary and Secondary School Counseling; Physical Education; and Alcohol Abuse Reduction. The Department would also be authorized to reserve up to 1.5 percent of the SSHS appropriation for program evaluation. From the remainder the Department would: (1) set aside up to 1 percent for programs for Indian youth administered by the Department of the Interior; (2) set aside up to 1 percent for the Outlying Areas; (3) reserve the amount the Secretary determines is needed for National Activities; and (4) allocate the remainder to State and local grants.

Under the <u>State and Local Grants</u> portion of the program the Department may award competitive grants to SEAs, high-need LEAs, and their partners for development and implementation of comprehensive strategies designed to continuously improve conditions for learning and student outcomes, including activities aimed at preventing and reducing substance use, violence, harassment or bullying; promoting student mental, behavioral, and emotional health; strengthening family and student engagement in school; reducing out-of-school suspensions; implementing positive behavioral interventions and supports; and implementing programs designed to improve students' physical health and well-being, including their physical activity, nutrition, and fitness.

Grantees would be required to develop, adapt, or adopt and implement a State- or district-wide school climate measurement system that would consist of incident data (such as data on

Successful, safe, and healthy students

suspensions and expulsions) and information on the conditions for learning collected through a comprehensive needs assessment (which may include surveys) of students, staff, and families. The school climate measurement system would be used to identify school and student needs and implement activities that meet those needs. Additionally, this information would be aggregated at the school-building level and reported to the public, including parents, in a timely and accessible manner.

States would be permitted to reserve a portion of their funds for State activities and would be required to subgrant the remainder of their grant funds to high-need LEAs and their partners. Priority for grants and subgrants would be provided (1) to grantees that would focus the use of funds on high-need schools or on schools with the greatest needs as identified by the school climate measurement system, (2) partnerships between LEAs and other eligible entities, and (3) applicants proposing a comprehensive strategy to ensure that schools provide the conditions for learning.

The Department would use funds reserved for <u>National Activities</u> to carry out national leadership activities that support safe, healthy, and drug-free students, including research, dissemination and outreach, and technical assistance, as well as for activities to help ensure that college campuses are safe and healthy environments.

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$365 million in 2012 for the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program. The program is included in the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal and would consolidate several existing, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that seek to help schools provide the programs and activities that support student success (including programs that support drug and violence prevention, alcohol abuse reduction, physical education, and mental health and school counseling).

The new program, which builds on the Safe and Supportive Schools grant competition the Department created in 2010 under Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities, would increase the capacity of States, high-need districts, and their partners to provide the resources and supports necessary to ensure that students are safe, healthy, and successful. Further, the program would also provide increased flexibility for States and districts to design and implement strategies that best reflect the needs of their students and communities.

The Administration recognizes the need for continued support of efforts to ensure that schools provide a safe and supportive environment. However, the existing array of Federal programs in this area is too fragmented to provide school officials with the tools they need to provide the conditions for learning. Nor are the current programs well-structured to enable educators and policymakers to identify the districts with the greatest needs or to determine the most effective practices and "scale them up" through wider replication. The Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students State and Local Grants program would address these problems by consolidating the existing funding streams into a single comprehensive program that generates information to

Successful, safe, and healthy students

drive resources to where they are most needed and in a manner that will address local needs more effectively, encourage continuous improvement, and generate information on what works.

Within the \$365 million requested for the first year of this program, the Department would use \$44.8 million for State grants and would reserve \$79.7 million for the following National Activities:

- \$44.9 million for new Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative grant awards for comprehensive projects to help LEAs and communities create safe, disciplined, and drug-free learning environments, promote healthy childhood development, and provide needed mental health services for youth. The Department of Education funds this initiative jointly with the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and administers it in collaboration with both HHS and the Department of Justice (DOJ). To be eligible for Safe Schools/Healthy Students funding, an LEA must demonstrate agreement in the form of a partnership among the major community systems serving students – schools, an early childhood agency, the local public mental health authority, law enforcement, and juvenile justice - to work collaboratively in assessing needs and providing programs and services in the following five areas: (1) promoting early childhood social and emotional learning and development; (2) promoting mental. emotional, and behavioral health; (3) connecting families, schools, and communities; (4) preventing and reducing alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use; and (5) creating safe and violence-free schools. Education, HHS, and DOJ plan to redesign the 2011 competition based on their experience implementing this initiative, the results of an ongoing evaluation of Safe Schools/Healthy Students projects, and input from grantee focus groups.
- \$8.3 million for grants to SEAs and related technical assistance for <u>helping LEAs prevent</u> and mitigate, prepare for, respond to, and recover from emergencies and crisis events.
- \$5.0 million for <u>Project SERV</u> (School Emergency Response to Violence), which provides education-related services, including increased safety and security, to LEAs and IHEs in which the learning environment has been disrupted by a violent or traumatic crisis. The \$5 million request should ensure that funds are available to provide crisis response services in the event that the Department is called upon to do so.
- \$10.0 million for <u>healthy college campuses</u> activities (grants and technical assistance to IHEs) to help support drug and violence prevention programs, including alcohol and other drug recovery and relapse prevention programs, and other efforts to prevent under-age, binge, and high-risk drinking, drug use, and violent behavior by college students.
- \$5.0 million for a <u>truancy prevention initiative</u> to be funded jointly by the Department of
 Education and the Department of Justice. Funds would be used to develop and
 implement a rigorous multi-site test, using random assignment, of one or more promising
 program models or interventions to prevent truancy, enhance educational achievement,
 and reduce delinquency. The findings will help Federal and other agencies and
 organizations to maximize limited resources by directing funds to programs and

Successful, safe, and healthy students

strategies demonstrated to work, and will identify models and interventions that have the greatest potential to be successful when taken to scale.

• \$6.5 million for other activities that promote safe and healthy students, such as research and development, data collection, dissemination, outreach, developing and implementing programs to improve conditions for learning, and related forms of technical and financial assistance to States, LEAs, non-profit organizations, and IHEs.

The fiscal year 2012 request for Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students would provide approximately \$234.9 million for continuation awards for projects originally funded under Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs (\$122.8 million), Alcohol Abuse Reduction (\$27.2 million), Elementary and Secondary School Counseling (\$33.7 million), and Physical Education programs (\$51.1 million).

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

State Grants	<u>2012</u>
State grant award funds (new) Peer review of new award applications Total budget authority	\$44,560 <u>211</u> 44,771
Number of SEA awards Average SEA award	8 \$5,570
National Activities	
Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative	
Grant award funding (new) Peer review of new award applications Total budget authority	\$44,498 400 44,898 ¹
Number of new awards Average award	70 \$636

¹ Inclusive of continuation costs the request for Safe Schools/Healthy Students is \$75,412 thousand.

Successful, safe, and healthy students

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) (Continued)	2042
National Activities (continued)	<u>2012</u>
School Emergency Preparedness	
SEA grant award funds (new) Other school safety initiatives Peer review of new award applications Total budget authority	\$6,000 2,201 100 8,301
Number of new awards Average award	12 \$500
Project SERV (School Emergency Response to Violence)	\$5,000
Healthy College Campuses	
Statewide Coalition Grants Grant award funding (new) Number of new awards Model Prevention Grants Grant award funding (new)	\$5,414 13 \$1,250
Number of new awards Recovery and Relapse Prevention Grants Grant award funds (new)	5 \$3,250
Number of new awards Peer review of new award applications Total budget authority	10 <u>\$100</u> \$10,014 ²
Truancy Prevention Initiative	\$5,000
Other Activities	\$6,526 ³
Set-Asides for DOI Schools and Outlying Areas	\$2,603

² Inclusive of continuation costs the request for Healthy College Campuses is \$12,000 thousand. ³ Inclusive of continuation costs the request for Other Activities is \$9,989 thousand.

Successful, safe, and healthy students

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) (Continued)	
,	<u>2012</u>
Continuation Awards for Programs Consolidated into Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students:	
SDFSC National Activities Safe and Supportive Schools Safe Schools/Healthy Students Healthy College Campuses Other Activities Subtotal, SDFSC National Activities	\$86,837 30,515 ¹ 1,986 ² 3,463 ³ 122,801
Alcohol Abuse Reduction Elementary and Secondary School Counseling Physical Education	27,244 33,687 <u>51,122</u>
Total continuation costs	234,853

\$3,000

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Evaluation

The Department has not yet developed performance measures for this proposed program, but they will likely resemble the following measures that the Department is using for the Safe and Supportive Schools Grant competition funded under SDFSC National Programs in 2010. The 2010 Safe and Supportive Schools grants performance measures are:

- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience a decrease in the percentage of students who report current (30-day) alcohol use;
- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience an increase in the percentage of students who report current (30-day) alcohol use;
- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience a decrease in the percentage of students who

¹ Inclusive of continuation costs the request for Safe Schools/Healthy Students is \$75,412 thousand. ² Inclusive of continuation costs the request for Healthy College Campuses is \$12,000 thousand.

³ Inclusive of continuation costs the request for Other Activities is \$9,989 thousand.

Successful, safe, and healthy students

report personal harassment or bullying on school property during the current school year;

- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience an increase in the percentage of students who report personal harassment or bullying on school property during the current school year;
- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience an improvement in their school safety score;
- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience a worsening in their school safety score;
- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience a decrease in the number of suspensions for violent incidents without physical injury; and
- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience an increase in the number of suspensions for violent incidents without physical injury.

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2)

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$191,341 ²	0	-\$191,341

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) National Programs statute authorizes the Department to carry out a wide variety of discretionary activities designed to prevent the illegal use of drugs and violence among, and promote safety and discipline for, students. These activities may be carried out through grants to or contracts with public and private organizations and individuals, or through agreements with other Federal agencies, and may include, but are not limited to:

- The development and demonstration of innovative strategies for the training of school personnel, parents, and members of the community;
- The development, demonstration, scientifically based evaluation, and dissemination of innovative and high-quality drug and violence prevention programs and activities;
- The provision of information on drug abuse education and prevention to the Department of Health and Human Services for dissemination;
- The provision of information on violence prevention and education and on school safety to the Department of Justice for dissemination;
- Technical assistance to Governors, State agencies, local educational agencies, and other recipients of SDFSC funding to build capacity to develop and implement high-quality, effective drug and violence prevention programs;
- Assistance to school systems that have particularly severe drug and violence problems, including hiring drug prevention and school safety coordinators, or assistance to support appropriate responses to crisis situations;
- The development of education and training programs, curricula, instructional materials, and professional training and development for preventing and reducing the incidence of crimes and conflicts motivated by hate in localities most directly affected by hate crimes; and

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

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

 Activities in communities designated as empowerment zones or enterprise communities that connect schools to community-wide efforts to reduce drug and violence problems.

(00000)

• The collection of data on the incidence and prevalence of drug use and violence in elementary and secondary schools and in institutions of higher education.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000S)
2007	\$149,706
2008	137,665
2009	139,912
2010	191,341
2011 CR	191,341

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that address students' safety, health, and drug-prevention, the Administration has proposed to create, through the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), a broader Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program that would increase the capacity of States, districts, and their partners to provide the resources and supports necessary for safe, healthy, and successful students. This new program, which builds on the Safe and Supportive Schools grant competition the Department created in 2010 under SDFSC National Activities, would help schools provide conditions for learning, including by implementing activities that reduce or prevent drug use, alcohol use, bullying, harassment, or violence, and promote and support the physical and mental well-being of students.

The Administration's reauthorization proposal recognizes the challenge of attaining high student achievement in schools where students are threatened by drugs, violence, crime, bullying, harassment, or intimidation, all of which continue to be serious problems affecting students. The public also continues to be extremely concerned about school safety, whether because of school shootings, influenza pandemics, natural disasters such as Hurricane Katrina, or the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States. The reauthorization proposal would address these and related issues, but in a much more comprehensive and flexible manner than can be attempted through the current portfolio of fragmented programs.

Under the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program, State educational agencies (SEAs), high-need local educational agencies (LEAs), and their partners would be eligible to apply for competitive grants to develop and implement programs that measure and improve conditions for learning based on local needs. The overall result is that the new program would provide grantees and their partners with the resources necessary to design and implement strategies necessary for safe, healthy, and successful students, which the Administration believes will support improved student academic achievement. Further, this new

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

program would provide increased flexibility for States and districts to design and implement strategies that best reflect the needs of their students and communities (which may include programs that support drug and violence prevention and other aspects of school safety).

The reauthorization proposal would include a National Activities authority under which the Department would carry out activities similar to some of the current Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (such as Project SERV, emergency preparedness grants, the Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative, and assistance to institutions of higher education). In addition, the fiscal year 2012 budget request for Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students includes funds to pay 2012 continuation costs for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities awarded in previous years.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Safe and Supportive Schools			
Grant award funds (new) Grant award funds (continuations) Peer review of new award applications Technical assistance contract Character education grants	\$39,102 0 220 1,760 <u>8,212</u>	\$37,019 46,187 200 1,565	0 0 0
Total budget authority	49,294	84,971	0
Number of new awards Number of continuation awards	11 0	10 11	0
Character education continuation grants Average award (excludes character	7	0	0
education grants)	\$3,555	\$3,962	0
School and Campus Preparedness Initiative	<u>′e</u>		
SEA grant award funds (new) LEA grant award funds (new) IHE grant awards funds (new) Other school safety initiatives Peer review of new award applications Total budget authority	0 \$30,286 7,601 1,813 300 40,000	\$4,000 0 0 2,202 100 6,302	0 0 0 0 0 0
Number of new awards Average award	122 \$311	8 \$500	0 0

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)					
(Continued)	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>		
Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative					
Grant award funds (new) Grant award funds (continuations) Peer review of new award applications Total budget authority	0 \$77,816 <u>0</u> 77,816	\$11,500 63,487 <u>425</u> 75,412	0 0 0 0		
Number of new awards Number of continuation awards Average award	0 116 \$671	30 89 \$630	0 0 0		
Healthy College Campuses					
Statewide Coalition Grants Grant award funds (new) Number of new awards Model Prevention Grants Grant award funds (new)	\$2,499 12 \$751	\$4,730 12 \$1,250	0 0		
Number of new awards	5	\$1,230 5	0		
Recovery and Relapse Prevention Grants Grant award funds (new) Number of awards Drug and Violence Prevention Grants	0 0	\$2,949 10	0 0		
Grant award funds (continuations) Number of awards Training and technical assistance center Peer review of new award applications Total budget authority	\$2,978 23 \$1,621 <u>\$20</u> \$7,869	0 0 \$1,880 <u>\$100</u> \$10,909	0 0 0 0 0		
Building State Capacity for Preventing Youth Drug Use and Violence					
Grant award funds (new) Peer review of new award applications Total budget authority	\$4,062 <u>80</u> 4,142	0 0 0	0 0 0		
Number of new awards Average award	28 145	0 0	0 0		

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)						
(Continued)	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>			
Student Drug Testing						
Grant award funds (continuations) Student Drug Testing Institute Total budget authority	\$5,636 <u>187</u> 5,823	0 0	0 0 0			
Number of continuation awards Average award	49 \$119	0	0 0			
Other Activities	\$6,397	\$13,747	0			

NOTE: FY 2012 continuation costs of approximately \$122,801 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program.

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 fiscal year 2012 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program. Unless stated otherwise the source of these GPRA data are grantee annual and final performance reports.

Safe and Supportive Schools

Goal: To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug-free by developing rigorous measurement systems and using data to implement high-quality drug- and violence-prevention strategies.

Objective: Safe and Supportive Schools grantees will demonstrate substantial progress in improving conditions for learning in targeted schools.

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

The Department will have baseline data by 2013 on the following measures for the 2010 cohort of Safe and Supportive Schools grants (and baseline data by 2014 for the 2011 cohort):

- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience a decrease in the percentage of students who report current (30-day) alcohol use;
- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience an increase in the percentage of students who report current (30-day) alcohol use;
- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience a decrease in the percentage of students who report personal harassment or bullying on school property during the current school year;
- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience an increase in the percentage of students who report personal harassment or bullying on school property during the current school year;
- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience an improvement in their school safety score;
- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience a worsening in their school safety score;
- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience a decrease in the number of suspensions for violent incidents without physical injury; and
- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience an increase in the number of suspensions for violent incidents without physical injury.

Building State Capacity for Preventing Youth Drug Use and Violence

Goal: To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high-quality drug- and violence-prevention strategies.

Objective: Building State Capacity grantees will enhance the capacity of State agencies to support LEAs in their efforts to create and sustain a safe and drug-free school environment.

The Department will have baseline data in 2012 on the following performance measure for the fiscal year 2010 cohort of Building State Capacity for Preventing Youth Drug Use and Violence grants: the percentage of grantees that submit a high-quality plan to create and sustain an

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

effective infrastructure to support the implementation of effective drug and violence prevention activities.

Safe Schools/Healthy Students

Goal: To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high-quality drug- and violence-prevention strategies.

Objective: Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative grantees will demonstrate substantial progress in improving student behaviors and school environments.

The following performance information is for the 2007, 2008, and 2009 cohorts of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grants. (There was no new cohort of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grants in 2010.) A decision will be made later in 2011 on whether to make any changes to the measures for the 2011 cohort.

Measure: The percentage of grantees that experience a decrease in the percentage of their students who did not go to school on one or more days during the past 30 days because they felt unsafe at school, or on their way to and from school.

Year		Target			Actual	
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort
2008				75		
2009	76.5			37.5	30	
2010	78.8	50				
2011	83.3	51.5				
2012	85	54.6				

Measure: The percentage of grantees that experience a decrease in the percentage of their students who have been in a physical fight on school property in the 12 months prior to the survey.

. ,				•	,	
Year		Target			Actual	
	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2009 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2009 Cohort
2008				75.5		
2009	77			54.5	66.7	
2010	79.3	68				
2011	84.1	70				
2012	85	74.2				

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

Measure: The percentage of grantees that report a decrease in the percentage of their students who report current (30-day) marijuana use.

Year	Target			Actual						
	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2009 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2009 Cohort				
2008				53.8						
2009	54.9			42.9	50					
2010	56.5	51								
2011	59.9	52.5								
2012	65.3	55.6								

Measure: The percentage of grantees that report a decrease in students who report current (30-day) alcohol use.

Year		Target		Actual			
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	
	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	
2008				71.4			
2009	72.8			47.8	56		
2010	75	57.1					
2011	79.5	58.8					
2012	85	62.3					

Measure: The percentage of grantees that report an increase in the number of students receiving school-based mental health services.

Year		Target		Actual			
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	
	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	
2008				66.7			
2009	70			90	83.3		
2010	90	87.5					
2011	90	90					
2012	90	90					

Measure: The percentage of grantees that report an increase in the percentage of mental health referrals for students that result in mental health services being provided in the community.

Year		Target		Actual			
	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2009 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2009 Cohort	
2008				75			
2009	78.8			75	60		
2010	86.6	63					
2011	90	69.3					
2012	90	79.7					

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

Additional information: An assessment of progress on certain of the above measures can be made later in 2011 after receipt of 2010 data for the 2007 cohort. Targets for the 2009 cohort will be set after receipt of baseline data later in 2011. Declining performance between 2008 and 2009 for the 2007 cohort has a likely explanation. Due to the lag time in start-up for a majority of projects, only a small proportion of grantees reported data at the end of their first year. Those grantees tended to perform above average for the cohort as a whole. Data for the following (second) year generally represent the entire universe of projects in the cohort, inclusive of the below-average performers.

The following performance information is for the most recent three prior cohorts of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grants.

Measure: The percentage of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites that experience a decrease in the number of violent incidents at schools during the 3-year grant period.

Year	Target			Actual						
	2004	2005 2006		2004	2005	2006				
	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort				
2007	90			55	54.3	50				
2008	90	62.4	57.5	76.5	61.5	68.8				
2009		65.2	60.0			58.8				
2010			62.5							

Measure: The percentage of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites that experience a decrease in substance abuse during the 3-year grant period.

Year	Target			Actual			
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	
2007	90			66.7	43.75	66.7	
2008	90	48.1	73.4	83.3	34.2	66.7	
2009		50.3	76.67			66.7	
2010			80				

Measure: The percentage of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites that improve school attendance during the 3-year grant period.

Year	Target			Actual			
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	
2007	90			64.7	40.5	62.5	
2008	90	44.6	68.8	66.7	44.7	68.4	
2009		46.6	71.9			42.1	
2010			75.0				

Additional information: Data present a mixed picture. Generally they show improvement within cohorts on individual measures across years; but of the 15 targets for which data are

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

available, only 2 targets were met. The data generally show an improvement on the measures for the 2006 cohort compared to the prior cohorts.

Student Drug Testing

Goal: To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high-quality drug- and violence-prevention strategies.

Objective: Student drug testing grantees will make substantial progress in reducing substance abuse incidence among target students.

Measure: The percentage of Student Drug Testing grantees that experience a 5 percent annual reduction in the incidence of past-month drug use by students in the target population.

							<u> </u>			
Year			Targets		Actual					
	2003	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2005	2006	2007	2008
	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort
2007	50	33				25				
2008		50	50	33				67	33	
2009			70	50	33			13	42	49
2010			70	60	50			57	50	65
2011					70					

Measure: The percentage of Student Drug Testing grantees that experience a 5 percent annual reduction in the incidence of past-year drug use by students in the target population.

Year			Targets			Actual				
	2003	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2005	2006	2007	2008
	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort
2007	50	25				0				
2008		50	50	33				56	33	
2009			60	50	33			13	33	58
2010			60	60	60			57	54	58
2011					65					

Additional information: Data for the 2006 cohort were collected as part of the Institute for Education Sciences evaluation of the 2006 cohort of student drug testing projects. The survey instrument for the evaluation collected data about student drug use for the past 6 months, rather than for the past year. Data for the 2005 cohort of grantees are not provided because the data reported by grantees were not sufficiently comparable across sites to be aggregated meaningfully for the cohort.

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

Readiness and Emergency Management for Schools (REMS)

Goal: To help develop and implement comprehensive emergency management processes for schools.

Objective: REMS grantees will demonstrate substantial progress in improving emergency mitigation/prevention, preparedness, response and recovery efforts at their schools.

Note: REMS corresponds to the LEA grants activity under "School and Campus Emergency Preparedness" in the program output measures.

Measure: The percentage of grant sites that demonstrate they have increased the number of hazards addressed by the improved school emergency response plan as compared to the baseline plan.

Year	Target		Actual			
	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort
2009				97.6		
2010		98			88.5	
2011			98			

Measure: The percentage of grant sites that have a plan for, and commitment to, the sustainability and continuous improvement of a school emergency management plan by the district and community partners beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

Year	Target			Actual		
	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2009
	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort
2009				98		
2010		98			93.8	
2011			98			

Measure: The percentage of grant sites that demonstrate improved knowledge of school/and or district emergency management policies and procedures, or both, by school staff with responsibility for emergency management functions.

Year		Target			Actual	
	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008
	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort
2009				97.6		
2010		98			91.6	
2011			98			

Additional information: For the 2006 cohort only, this last measure was instead the percentage of grant sites that demonstrate improved response time and quality of response to practice drills and simulated crises. For the 2007 and 2008 cohorts that measure was dropped in lieu of the measure described above. Data for the 2007 cohort will be available later in 2011.

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

Beginning with the 2009 cohort of grants, the Department discontinued all three of the above measures and replaced them with the following new measure, for which baseline data will become available beginning in 2012: the average number of National Incident Management System (NIMS) course completions by key personnel at the start of the grant compared to the average number of NIMS course completions by key personnel at the end of the grant.

Emergency Management for Higher Education (EMHE)

Note: EMHE corresponds to the IHE grants activity under "School and Campus Emergency Preparedness" in the program output measures.

Goal: To help develop and implement comprehensive emergency management and violence prevention processes for institutions of higher education.

Objective: EMHE grantees will demonstrate substantial progress in improving emergency mitigation/prevention, preparedness, response and recovery efforts on their campuses.

Later in 2011, the Department will have baseline data for the first (2008) cohort of EMHE grants. The performance measure for the 2008 and 2009 EMHE grant cohorts was: demonstration of a 50 percent increase at the end of the project period in the number of course completions by their higher education institution key personnel in key National Incident Management System (NIMS) courses compared to the number of such courses completed at the start of the grant project period.

Beginning with the 2010 cohort, the Department discontinued that measure and replaced it with the following, for which baseline data will become available beginning in 2013: the average number of NIMS training course completions by key personnel at the start of the grant compared to the average number of NIMS course completions by key personnel at the end of the grant.

<u>Postsecondary Prevention:</u> Grants to Prevent High-Risk Drinking or Violent Behavior Among College Students

Note: the following corresponds to the drug and violence prevention grants activity under "Healthy College Campuses" in the program output measures.

Goal: To reduce alcohol abuse and violent behavior among postsecondary students at institutions of higher education, on campuses, and/or in surrounding communities.

Objective: Support the implementation of research-based alcohol abuse and violence prevention programs at institutions of higher education.

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

Measure: At the end of these 2-year projects, the percentage of grantees that achieve a 5 percent decrease in high-risk drinking among students served by the project.

		<u> </u>	<u> </u>			
Year	Target			Actual		
	2005 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2009 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2009 Cohort
2007				81		
2009		85			73.3	
2011			85			

Measure: At the end of these 2-year projects, the percentage of grantees that achieve a 5 percent decrease in violent behavior among students served by the project.

Year	Target		Actual			
	2005 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2009 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2009 Cohort
2007				67		
2009		70.4			100	
2011			75			

Additional information: The Department last made new grant awards under this competition in 2009. A further assessment of progress can be made in 2012 after the Department compiles 2011 data from the 2009 cohort of grantees.

<u>Postsecondary Prevention: Grants for Coalitions to Prevent and Reduce Alcohol Abuse at Institutions of Higher Education</u>

Note: the following corresponds to the statewide coalitions grants activity under "Healthy College Campuses" in the program output measures.

Goal: To prevent and reduce the rate of under-age alcohol consumption, including binge drinking, among students.

Objective: Support statewide coalitions that implement underage drinking prevention programs at institutions of higher education and in surrounding communities

The Department will have baseline data in 2012 on the following performance measures for the fiscal year 2009 cohort of Grants for Coalitions to Prevent and Reduce Alcohol Abuse at IHEs: (1) the percentage of grantees that demonstrate a reduction in 30-day alcohol use among under-age students at participating IHEs; and (2) the percentage of grantees that demonstrate a reduction in 30-day binge drinking among under-age students at participating IHEs.

Other Performance Information

In addition to collecting data on the above performance measures directly from grantees, the Department has conducted (and is conducting) several evaluations to assess the impact of programs and interventions supported with SDFSC National Activities funds. Each of the following evaluations has been funded by SDFSC National Activities, except for the Safe

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

Schools/Healthy Students evaluation, which is being funded by the Department of Health and Human Services.

Safe Schools/Healthy Students Evaluation

Two national evaluations of the Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative have been conducted, the first under a cooperative agreement with the Department of Justice and the second under contract with the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration in the Department of Health and Human Services. Both were jointly managed by the Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, and Justice. The evaluations sought, overall, to document the effectiveness of collaborative community efforts to promote safe schools and provide opportunities for healthy childhood development.

The first evaluation focused on the fiscal year 1999, 2000, and 2001 cohorts under the initiative, a total of 97 sites. Three waves of data were collected from each of the 97 sites, with data collection spanning 2001-2004. (Data collection was conducted three times over the life of each 3-year grant cohort.) The evaluation collected data from principals and teachers in schools served by these sites, as well as from middle and high school students in a more limited subset of "sentinel" sites representing various regions of the country and a variety of population densities. The sentinel sites included a total of 410 schools. (Surveying students in all 3,932 schools among the 97 sites would have been cost prohibitive.)

Changes were calculated between wave one and wave three data collection for each of the three grant cohorts. Some of the data from this first evaluation are already available, and some statistically significant changes (at the p=<.05 level) in student outcomes related to alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use and incidents of violence have been identified. For example:

- Student self-report data for high school students indicated decreases in 30-day alcohol and tobacco use, cigarette sales on school property, and perceived disapproval of peer substance use. Current alcohol use was down 10 percent, and current tobacco use declined 13 percent. Middle and high school students also reported feeling less unsafe at school (a 7 percent reduction for middle school students and a 6 percent reduction for high school students).
- Teachers in elementary schools reported a 5 percent reduction in classroom bullying, a
 21 percent reduction in feeling threatened by a student, and an 11 percent reduction in
 being verbally abused by a student. Finally, although not statistically significant, elementary
 school principals reported a 33 percent reduction in current-year tobacco infractions and a
 36 percent reduction in total alcohol infractions, and elementary school teachers reported an
 8 percent reduction in classroom fighting.

The second evaluation examined activities implemented by 86 sites in the fiscal year 2005, 2006, and 2007 cohorts. It found that over a 3-year period the school districts participating in the Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant program reported fewer students involved in violent incidents, decreased levels of experienced and witnessed violence, and improvements in overall school safety and violence prevention. Key findings from the second evaluation, for the 2005

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

cohort of grants (the cohort for which data collection and analysis are completed), include the following:

- A 15 percent decrease in the number of students involved in violent incidents during the grant period (from 17,800 in year 1 to 15,163 in year 3).
- A 12 percent decrease in the number of students reporting that they had experienced or witnessed violence from year 1 of the grant period to year 3.
- Most staff at grantee schools reporting that the initiative had made their schools safer. By year 3 of the grant, 84 percent said the initiative had improved school safety, 77 percent said it had reduced violence on campus, and 75 percent said it had reduced violence in the community.

Further findings from the second evaluation are expected to be available later in 2011.

Drug Testing Evaluation

In 2006, the Department launched an impact evaluation to assess the effectiveness of random mandatory student drug testing. The evaluation was designed to address the following research questions: (1) Do high school students who are subject to mandatory-random drug testing (e.g., athletes, participants in competitive extra-curricular activities) report less use of tobacco, alcohol, and illicit substances compared to students in high schools without drug testing policies?; (2) Do students in high schools with mandatory-random drug testing policies, but who are not subject to drug testing, report less use of tobacco, alcohol, and illicit substances compared to students in high schools without drug testing policies?; and (3) What are the characteristics of the drug testing policies implemented by participating treatment schools, and what types of other strategies are treatment or control schools using to reduce substance use among students?

This 4-year evaluation involved 36 schools from 7 grantees that received awards under the Department's student drug testing grant competition in 2006. (Because these districts committed to adopting drug testing programs and they were clustered in mostly southern States, the study results cannot be generalized to all high schools nationally.) About half of the schools were randomly assigned to begin implementing drug testing immediately (treatment schools), and the other half were assigned to implement drug testing only at the conclusion of the 1-year experimental period (control schools). Data collection included student surveys of reported drug use, interviews with staff at grantee schools, and school records.

Results of the evaluation include the following:

- Students involved in extracurricular activities and subject to in-school drug testing
 reported less substance use than comparable students in high schools without drug
 testing, but for certain of these drugs the differences were not statistically significant.
- There was no statistically significant evidence of any "spillover effects" to students who
 were not subject to testing the percentage of nonparticipating students who reported

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

using substances in the past month was effectively the same at both treatment and control schools.

Violence Prevention Program Evaluation

The Department also conducted a longitudinal impact evaluation of a school-based violence prevention program. Specifically, the evaluation assessed the overall impact of combining "Responding in Peaceful and Positive Ways," a curriculum-based (instructional) program, with "Best Behavior," a whole-school program that aims to increase the clarity, fairness, and consistency of school enforcement policies and to improve teachers' classroom management skills. Approximately 40 middle schools took part in this evaluation, half of which were randomly assigned to receive the hybrid program, which was implemented over 3 consecutive school years (2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09). Within each middle school, students were sampled and their violent and aggressive behaviors measured. Student and teacher surveys, observations of intervention activities, interviews with school administrators, and school records were used to assess student outcomes in both treatment and control schools as well as to assess the quality of program implementation.

After 1 year of implementation, there were no statistically significant differences in on how often students reported that they were victimized by or committed violence against their peers. In addition, there were no statistically significant impacts of the program on a number of other outcomes such as how often students' reported positive behavior toward their peers or on their perceptions of school safety. Findings from the evaluation after the second and third years of implementation are expected to become available later in 2011.

Elementary and secondary school counseling

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 2)

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$55,000 ²	0	-\$55,000

(\$000s)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Elementary and Secondary School Counseling (ESSC) program provides grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to establish or expand elementary school and secondary school counseling programs. In awarding grants, the Department must give consideration to applications that demonstrate the greatest need for services, propose the most promising and innovative approaches, and show the greatest potential for replication and dissemination. The Department awards grants for up to 3 years that may not exceed \$400,000 and must be used to supplement, not supplant, existing counseling and mental health services. The statute requires that any amount appropriated up to \$40 million for this program in any fiscal year be used for elementary school counseling programs. If the appropriation exceeds \$40 million, the Department must use at least \$40 million to support elementary school counseling programs.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(ψοσοσ)
2007	\$34,650
2008	48,617
2009	52,000
2010	55,000
2011 CR	55,000

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the ESSC program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that address students' safety, health, and drug-prevention, the Administration has proposed to create, through the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), a broader Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program that would increase the capacity of States,

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

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

Elementary and secondary school counseling

districts, and their partners to provide the resources and supports necessary for safe, healthy, and successful students. This new program would help schools provide conditions for learning, including by implementing activities that reduce or prevent drug use, alcohol use, bullying, harassment, or violence, and promote and support the physical and mental well-being of students.

Under the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program, State educational agencies (SEAs), high-need local educational agencies (LEAs), and their partners would be eligible to apply for competitive grants to develop and implement programs that measure and improve conditions for learning based on local needs. The overall result is that the new program would provide grantees and their partners with the resources necessary to design and implement strategies necessary for safe, healthy, and successful students, which the Administration believes will support improved student academic achievement. Further, this new program would provide increased flexibility for States and districts to design and implement strategies that best reflect the needs of their students and communities (which may include programs that support school counseling).

The Administration recognizes the importance of and need for continued support of efforts to address student mental health issues. The need for such efforts is clear. Recent estimates show that more than 20 percent of American children and adolescents between the ages of 9 and 17 years experience mental health problems or addictive disorders severe enough to impair their daily functioning and that only 25 percent of these children receive appropriate treatment.

The presence of counselors in schools provides benefits for both students and teachers by helping to create a safe school environment, improve teacher effectiveness and classroom management, increase academic achievement, and promote student well-being and healthy development. In a recent review of school counseling research, Whinston and Quinby (2009) found that students who participated in school counseling interventions tended to score on various outcome measures about one-third of a standard deviation above those students who did not receive interventions. These interventions were also shown to have a large effect in reducing student disciplinary problems, enhancing problem-solving skills, and increasing career knowledge. In terms of achievement, counseling interventions were found to have a small but significant impact on improving students' academic achievement. For these reasons, the Administration's reauthorization proposal recognizes the need for continued support of efforts to ensure that schools provide a safe and supportive environment, which may include supporting school counseling services. The Administration believes that school-based counseling programs offer great promise for improving prevention, diagnosis, and access to treatment for children and adolescents with mental health problems.

The fiscal year 2012 request for the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program would include funds to pay 2012 continuation costs for ESSC grants made in previous years.

Elementary and secondary school counseling

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Grant award funding (new)	\$15,038	\$18,328	0
Grant award funding (continuations)	\$39,662	\$36,672	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$300	0 ¹	0
Number of new awards	42	54	0
Number of continuation awards	117	107	0

NOTE: FY 2012 continuation costs of approximately \$33,687 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

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 fiscal year 2012 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Goal: To increase the availability of counseling programs and services in elementary schools.

Objective: Support the hiring of qualified personnel to expand available counseling services for elementary school students.

Measure: The percentage of grantees closing the gap between their student/mental health professional ratios and the student/mental health professional ratios recommended by the statute.

Year	Target		Actual			
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort
2008				100		
2009	100			100	100	
2010	100	100		100	94	100
2011		100	100			
2012			100			

¹ The Department plans to fund new applications in FY 2011 from the FY 2010 slate.

Elementary and secondary school counseling

Measure: The average number of referrals per grant site for disciplinary reasons in schools participating in the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling program.

Year		Target		Actual			
	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2009 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2009 Cohort	
2008	1,132			1,192			
2009	781			822	1,720		
2010	740	1,634		790	1,403	1,220	
2011		1,548	1,159				
2012			1,037				

Additional information: Performance data are collected through annual grantee reports. Because the first measure does not appear to be effective in measuring program progress, the Department is considering whether it should be replaced.

Additionally, the Department has posted grantee-level data on its website at www.ed.gov/programs/elseccounseling/performance.html.

Physical education program

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 10)

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

2011 CR	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$79,000 ²	0	-\$79,000

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Physical Education program (PEP) provides grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) and community-based organizations to pay the Federal share of the costs of initiating, expanding, and improving physical education (PE) programs (including after-school programs) for students in kindergarten through 12th grade, in order to help those entities make progress toward meeting State standards for physical education. Funds may be used to provide equipment and support to enable students to participate actively in physical education activities and for training and education for teachers and staff. Awards are competitive, typically for 3 years, and the Federal share may not exceed 90 percent of the total program cost for the first year of the project and 75 percent for each subsequent year. Funds must be used to supplement, and may not supplant, other Federal, State, and local funding for PE activities.

For the fiscal year 2010 competition, the Department developed priorities and requirements that should enhance the impact of PEP and support a broader, strategic vision for encouraging the development of lifelong healthy habits and improving physical and nutrition education programming and policies in schools and communities. Historically, the program has funded projects that often focused heavily on the purchase of equipment without strong integration of that equipment into curriculum; did not take a comprehensive approach that recognizes the interdependency of physical, nutrition, and health education; did not use research-based curricula; or did not take into account local wellness policies or other community efforts in physical education and activity. The Department issued rules that address these deficiencies by, for example, requiring that grantees include a nutrition component in their projects, undertake a local needs assessment, update nutrition- and physical activity-related policies and link them with local wellness policies, and update physical education and nutrition instruction curricula and encouraging grantees to take a multi-sector, comprehensive approach by working with community partners.

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

(\$000s)

Physical education program

Funding levels for the past 5 years were:

	(+)
2007	\$72,674
2008	75,655
2009	78,000
2010	79,000
2011 CR	79.000

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Physical Education program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that address students' safety, health, and drug-prevention, the Administration has proposed to create, through the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a broader Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program that would increase the capacity of States, districts, and their partners to provide the resources and supports necessary for safe, healthy, and successful students. This new program would help schools provide conditions for learning, including by implementing activities that reduce or prevent drug use, alcohol use, bullying, harassment, or violence, and promote and support the physical and mental well-being of students.

Under the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program, State educational agencies (SEAs), high-need local educational agencies (LEAs), and their partners would be eligible to apply for competitive grants to develop and implement programs that measure and improve conditions for learning based on local needs. The overall result is that the new program would provide grantees and their partners with the resources necessary to design and implement strategies necessary for safe, healthy, and successful students, which the Administration believes will support improved student academic achievement. Further, this new program would provide increased flexibility for States and districts to design and implement strategies that best reflect the needs of their students and communities (which may include programs that support physical education).

The Administration recognizes the importance of and need for continued support of physical education, improved nutrition, and fitness. The need for continued and improved efforts in this area is clear. In the past 30 years, the prevalence of unhealthy body weight among children has increased dramatically. Data from the *National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey* (NHANES) conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) show that, between the 1976-1980 and 2003-2006 collection periods, the percentage of children who were overweight increased from 5 percent to 12 percent for children ages 2 to 5, from 7 percent to 17 percent for ages 6 to 11, and from 5 percent to 18 percent for ages 12 to 19. This has, in part, resulted from a lack of physical activity among youth. According to the 2007 National Survey of Children's Health conducted by CDC, 36 percent of children ages 6-17 were engaged in vigorous physical activity 3 or fewer days per week.

Physical education program

Additionally, the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program would address the need to strengthen instruction and increase student achievement, across content areas, which would include, but not be limited to, health education and physical education.

The fiscal year 2012 request for the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program would include funds to pay 2012 continuation costs for PEP grants made in previous years.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Grant award funding (new)	\$36,864	\$36,989	0
Grant award funding (continuations) Peer review of new award applications	41,291 450	41,166 450	0
Evaluation	395	395	0
Number of new grant awards	77	77	0
Number of continuation grant awards	176	150	0
Average grant award	\$309	\$343	0

NOTE: FY 2012 continuation costs of approximately \$51,122 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program.

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.

As part of a multi-agency effort in the last year to improve the effectiveness of programs supporting child health and fitness, the Department reviewed the performance measures for this program. The Department published revised performance measures in the Notice Inviting Applications for fiscal year 2010. These measures are: (1) the percentage of students served by the grant who engage in 60 minutes of daily physical activity; (2) the percentage of students served by the grant who achieve age-appropriate cardiovascular fitness levels; (3) the percentage of students served by the grant who consume fruit two or more times per day and vegetables three or more times per day; (4) the cost (based on the amount of the grant award) per student who achieves the level of physical activity required to meet the physical activity measures above (percentage of students who engage in 60 minutes of daily physical activity). Baseline and year 1 data for these measures will be available in late 2011.

Physical education program

Existing grantees from cohorts first funded prior to fiscal year 2010 still report on the previous performance measures shown on the tables that follow. The Department adopted these standards based on input from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Goal: To promote physical activity and healthy lifestyles for students.

Objective: Support the implementation of effective physical education programs and strategies.

Measure: The percentage of elementary students served by the grant who engage in 150 minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity per week.

Year	<u> </u>	Target			Actual	
	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort
2007				55		
2008	55			69	43	
2009	72	45			72	61
2010		76	64			
2011			67			

Measure: The percentage of secondary students served by the grant who engage in 225 minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity per week.

Year	Target		Actual			
	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008
	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort
2007				57		
2008	55			59	55	
2009	60	58			57	54
2010		61	57			
2011			59			

Additional information: Data are currently available for the first 2 years of the 2006 and 2007 cohorts, while only baseline data are available for the 2008 cohort. The 2006 cohort does not yet have 2009 data because many of grantees exercised a 1-year, no-cost extension to complete the implementation of their projects. Grantees from both the 2006 and 2007 cohorts reported an increase in student physical activity at both the elementary and secondary levels and generally met their targets.

The Department established only two targets for each of the 2006, 2007, and 2008 cohorts, with the data collected at the end of year one considered the baseline. Beginning with the 2009 cohort, grantees are conducting an additional data collection at the start of the grant in order to establish a baseline that more accurately reflects the participants' initial activity levels. This will lead to three targets, corresponding to the subsequent data collections at the end of grant years one, two, and three. Baseline data for the 2009 cohort will be available early in 2011, at which

Physical education program

point the Department will establish targets for 2011 through 2013. Therefore, no existing cohorts have 2012 targets at this time.

Efficiency Measure

The Department developed and is implementing the following efficiency measure that includes the mandatory non-federal expenditures.

Measure: The cost per student who achieves the level of physical activity required to meet the physical activity measures for the program (150 minutes of moderate to vigorous activity for elementary students and 225 minutes of moderate to vigorous activity for middle and high school students).

Year		Target			Actual	
	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008
	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort
2007				\$287		
2008	\$272			190	\$191	
2009	181	\$181			168	\$560
2010		160	\$532			
2011			504			

Additional information: The program has established a baseline for the 2006, 2007, and 2008 cohorts. The 2006 and 2007 cohorts showed an improvement in their second year of reporting, decreasing the cost per successful outcome by more than 10 percent in each cohort.

Foundations for learning

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 14, Section 5542)

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$1,000 ²	0	-\$1,000

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Foundations for Learning program authorizes grants to local educational agencies (LEAs), local councils, community-based organizations, and other public or nonprofit entities to enhance young children's development so that they are ready to begin school.

Funds may be used to provide services to children and their families that foster children's emotional, behavioral, and social development, and to facilitate access to and coordination with mental health, welfare, and other social services for children and their families. In addition, funds may be used to develop or enhance early childhood community partnerships that provide individualized supports for eligible children and their families.

To be eligible for services, a child must be under 7 years of age and must have experienced two or more of the following: (1) abuse, maltreatment, or neglect; (2) exposure to violence; (3) homelessness; (4) removal from child care, Head Start, or preschool for behavioral reasons or a risk of being so removed; (5) exposure to parental depression or other mental illness; (6) family income that is below 200 percent of the poverty line; (7) exposure to parental substance abuse; (8) low birth weight; or (9) cognitive deficit or developmental disability.

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

Foundations for learning

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2007	\$982
2008	929
2009	1,000
2010	1,000
2011 CR	1.000

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Foundations for Learning program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that address students' safety, health, and drug-prevention, the Administration has proposed to create, through the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), a broader Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program that would increase the capacity of States, districts, and their partners to provide the resources and supports necessary for safe, healthy, and successful students. This new program would help schools provide conditions for learning, including by implementing activities that reduce or prevent drug use, alcohol use, bullying, harassment, or violence, and promote and support the physical and mental well-being of students.

Under the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program, State educational agencies (SEAs), high-need local educational agencies (LEAs), and their partners would be eligible to apply for competitive grants to develop and implement programs that measure and improve conditions for learning based on local needs. The overall result is that the new program would provide grantees and their partners with the resources necessary to design and implement strategies necessary for safe, healthy, and successful students, which the Administration believes will support improved student academic achievement. Further, this new program would provide increased flexibility for States and districts to design and implement strategies that best reflect the needs of their students and communities (which may include programs that support early learning).

While, the Administration strongly supports the objective of providing high-quality early learning programs and services that foster children's emotional, behavioral, and social development, the activities carried out under Foundations for Learning overlap with those of other programs that support early learning for which funds are requested for in 2012, such as Special Education Preschool Grants and Special Education Grants for Infants and Families. In addition, the Administration is requesting \$350 million for a proposed Early Learning Challenge Fund (ELCF) in fiscal year 2012 to support States that are ready to take dramatic steps to improve the quality of their early childhood programs. The ELCF would provide competitive grants to States for the development of a statewide infrastructure of integrated high-quality early learning supports and services for children from birth through age 5 and help improve children's school readiness.

Foundations for learning

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Grant award funds (new)	\$1,000	\$990	0
Peer review of new award applications	0 ¹	\$10	0
Number of new awards	3	4	0
Number of supplemental awards	1	0	0
Average new award	\$248	\$248	0

¹ The Department funded new applications in FY 2010 from the FY 2009 slate.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

The Department established the following two performance measures for the Foundations for Learning program: (1) the percentage of eligible children served by the grant attaining measurable gains in emotional, behavioral, and social development; and (2) the percentage of eligible children and their families served by the grant receiving individualized support from child-serving agencies or organizations. The final performance data for the 2008 cohort show that approximately 83 percent of children served by the grants attained measurable gains in emotional, behavioral, and social development, and approximately 35 percent of children and their families served by the grants received individualized support from child-serving agencies or organizations. These data should be viewed with caution because only two of three grantees reported data for these measures. The Department expects to have performance data for the 2009 cohort this spring.

Mental health integration in schools

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 14, Section 5541)

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 01

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>	
\$5,913 ²	0	-\$5,913	

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Mental Health Integration in Schools program provides competitive grants to, or contracts with, State educational agencies (SEAs), local educational agencies (LEAs), or Indian tribes for the purpose of increasing student access to mental health services by supporting programs that link school systems with the local mental health system.

Specifically, an SEA, LEA or Indian tribe may use funds under this program to deliver prevention, diagnosis, and treatment services to students through collaborative efforts between school-based systems and mental health service systems; enhance the availability of crisis intervention services and referrals for students potentially in need of mental health services; provide related training for school personnel and mental health professionals; provide technical assistance and consultation to school systems, mental health agencies, and families; and evaluate their projects supported with these funds.

Funding levels for the past 5 years were:

	(\$000s)
2007	\$4,910
2008	4,913
2009	4,913
2010	5,913
2011 CR	5,913

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Mental Health Integration in Schools program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that address students' safety, health, and drug-prevention, the Administration has proposed to create, through the reauthorization of the Elementary and

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

Mental health integration in schools

Secondary Education Act (ESEA), a broader Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program that would increase the capacity of States, districts, and their partners to provide the resources and supports necessary for safe, healthy, and successful students. This new program would help schools provide conditions for learning, including by implementing activities that reduce or prevent drug use, alcohol use, bullying, harassment, or violence, and promote and support the physical and mental well-being of students.

Under the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program, SEAs, high-need LEAs, and their partners would be eligible to apply for competitive grants to develop and implement programs that measure and improve conditions for learning based on local needs. The overall result is that the new program would provide grantees and their partners with the resources necessary to design and implement strategies necessary for safe, healthy, and successful students, which the Administration believes will support improved student academic achievement. Further, this new program would provide increased flexibility for States and districts to design and implement strategies that best reflect the needs of their students and communities (which may include programs that support establishing or expanding systems to increase student access to high-quality mental health services).

The Administration remains committed to promoting efforts to address student mental health issues. The need for such efforts is clear. The 2010 National Comorbidity Study-Adolescent Supplement survey, conducted by the National Institutes of Mental Health, found that approximately 20 percent of American adolescents between the ages of 13 and 18 years experience symptoms of a diagnosable mental health or addictive disorder that impairs their daily functioning, including their ability to learn and perform academically. Analysis of these data confirms previous findings that a substantial proportion of youth with diagnosable mental or emotional disorders do not receive appropriate mental health treatment. The most prevalent mental health problems seen in children and adolescents include attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, anxiety disorders, and conduct and disruptive disorders, as well as depression and other mood disorders that can increase a child's risk for academic and social problems and may eventually result in suicide. Further, if left untreated, mental health problems can persist into adulthood and can affect the development of relationships, family dynamics, educational outcomes, and employment opportunities. The proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program would provide LEAs and other eligible applicants with resources to address these problems in a comprehensive manner.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Grant award funds (new)	\$5,738	\$5,893	0
Grant award funds (supplement)	\$155	0	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$20	\$20	0
Number of new awards	16	16-18	0
Average award	\$359	\$347	0

Mental health integration in schools

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

The Department established the following performance measures for assessing the effectiveness of the Mental Health Integration in Schools program: (1) the percentage of schools served by the grant that have in place comprehensive "linkage protocols" (describing, in detail, the roles and responsibilities of the various partners collaborating on the project); and (2) the percentage of school personnel served by the grant who are trained to make appropriate referrals to mental health services.

The final performance data for the 2006 and 2007 cohorts show that approximately 89 and 93 percent respectively of schools served by the grants had in place comprehensive "linkage protocols" at the end of the grants and approximately 79 and 70 percent, respectively, of school personnel served by the grants had been trained to make appropriate referrals to mental health services. These data should be viewed with caution because only about half of the grantees reported valid data. The Department expects to have additional performance data available in spring 2011.

Alcohol abuse reduction

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2, Section 4129)

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$32,712 ²	0	-\$32,712

(#AAA)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Under the Alcohol Abuse Reduction program, the Department, in consultation with the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) in the Department of Health and Human Services, awards competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to develop and implement innovative and effective programs to reduce alcohol abuse in secondary schools. The Department may reserve up to 20 percent of the appropriation to enable SAMHSA to provide alcohol abuse resources and start-up assistance to the LEAs receiving these grants. The Department may also reserve up to 25 percent of the funds to award program grants to low-income and rural LEAs. As a condition of funding, all grantees are required to implement one or more strategies for reducing under-age alcohol abuse that SAMHSA has determined are effective.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000S)
2007	\$32,409
2008	32,423
2009	33,348
2010	32,712
2011 CR	32,712

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Alcohol Abuse Reduction program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that address students' safety, health, and drug-prevention, the Administration has proposed to create, through the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), a broader Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program that would increase the capacity of

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

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

Alcohol abuse reduction

States, districts, and their partners to provide the resources and supports necessary for safe, healthy, and successful students. This new program would help schools provide conditions for learning, including by implementing activities that reduce or prevent drug use, alcohol use, bullying, harassment, or violence, and promote and support the physical and mental well-being of students.

Under the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program, State educational agencies (SEAs), high-need local educational agencies (LEAs), and their partners would be eligible to apply for competitive grants to develop and implement programs that measure and improve conditions for learning based on local needs. The overall result is that the new program would provide grantees and their partners with the resources necessary to design and implement strategies necessary for safe, healthy, and successful students, which the Administration believes will support improved student academic achievement. Further, this new program would provide increased flexibility for States and districts to design and implement strategies that best reflect the needs of their students and communities (which may include programs that support alcohol abuse prevention).

The Administration's proposal recognizes the continuing need for efforts to reduce under-age alcohol abuse. According to the *Surgeon General's Call to Action to Prevent and Reduce Underage Drinking* (2007),

Alcohol is the most widely used substance of abuse among America's youth. A higher percentage of young people between the ages of 12 and 20 use alcohol than use tobacco or illicit drugs. The physical consequences of underage alcohol use range from medical problems to death by alcohol poisoning, and alcohol plays a significant role in risky sexual behavior, physical and sexual assaults, various types of injuries, and suicide. Underage drinking also creates secondhand effects for others, drinkers and nondrinkers alike, including car crashes from drunk driving, that put every child at risk.

Indeed, under-age drinking has serious social costs and often tragic personal consequences. The Administration's reauthorization proposal would continue the Federal focus on the problem of under-age drinking, but in a more comprehensive and flexible manner than can be attempted through the current portfolio of programs. The overall result is that the new program will promote and continuously improve conditions for learning, and thereby foster students' well-being and improved academic performance.

The fiscal year 2012 budget request for the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program includes funds to pay 2012 continuation costs for Alcohol Abuse Reduction grants made in previous years.

Alcohol abuse reduction

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Grant award funding (new) Grant award funding (continuations)	\$2,992 27,966	\$24,322 6,607	0
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)	1,604	1,633	0
Peer review of new award applications Total budget authority	<u>150</u> 32,712	<u>150</u> 32,712	0
Number of new awards	8	75 17	0
Number of continuation awards Average award	85 \$333	17 \$336	0

NOTE: FY 2012 continuation costs of approximately \$27,244 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program.

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 fiscal year 2012 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Goal: To help reduce alcohol abuse among secondary school students.

Objective: Support the implementation of research-based alcohol abuse prevention programs in secondary schools.

Alcohol abuse reduction

Measure: The percentage of Alcohol Abuse Reduction grantees whose target students show a measurable decrease in binge drinking.

<u> </u>										
Year	Targets				Targets Actual					
	2004	2005	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2007	2008	2009
	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort
2007	70						65			
2008		75					59.3	61.5		
2009			76.9	61.5				47	50.7	
2010			49.4	53.2					64	57.1
2011				70	65					

Measure: The percentage of Alcohol Abuse Reduction program grantees that show a measurable increase in the percentage of target students who believe that alcohol abuse is harmful to their health.

Year	Targets				Actual					
	2004	2005	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2007	2008	2009
	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort
2007	76						70			
2008		80					59.3	69.2		
2009			86.5	69.2				76.5	58.6	
2010			80.3	61.5					60	100
2011				65	100					

Measure: The percentage of Alcohol Abuse Reduction program grantees that show a measurable increase in the percentage of target students who disapprove of alcohol abuse.

Year	Targets				Actual					
	2004	2005	2007	2008	2009	2004	2005	2007	2008	2009
	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort
2007	87						71			
2008		87					74.1	69.2		
2009			86.5	69.2				47	49.3	
2010			49.4	51.8					58.3	100
2011				65	100					

Additional information: The source of these data are grantee annual and final performance reports. The Department will establish targets for the 2010 and 2011 cohorts after receipt of baseline data from grantees.

21st Century community learning centers

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part B)

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

2011 CR	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$1,166,166 ²	\$1,266,166	+\$100,000

The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing language is sought for FY 2012.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) program enables communities to establish or expand centers that provide additional student learning opportunities, such as before- and after-school programs and summer school programs, and provide related services to their families. Centers must target their services primarily to students who attend schools eligible to operate a schoolwide program under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (which are schools with at least a 40 percent child poverty rate) or other schools that serve a high percentage of students from low-income families. In addition to activities designed to help students meet State and local student academic achievement standards, program funds may be used to provide art and music education activities, recreational activities, telecommunications and technology education programs, expanded library service hours, family engagement and literacy programs, and drug and violence prevention activities that reinforce and complement the regular school day program of participating students.

Program funds are allocated by formula to States. Of the total appropriation, the Department reserves: (1) up to 1 percent to carry out national activities; and (2) up to 1 percent for grants to the Department of the Interior/Bureau of Indian Education and to the Outlying Areas. The Department allocates the remaining funds to States in proportion to each State's share of funds in the previous fiscal year under Part A of ESEA Title I. However, no State may receive less than one-half of 1 percent of the total amount available for States.

Each State educational agency (SEA) must award at least 95 percent of its allocation competitively to local educational agencies (LEAs), community-based organizations, faith-based organizations, or other public or private entities that can demonstrate experience, or the promise of success, in providing educational and related activities. In making awards, States give priority to applications that: (1) propose to target services to students who attend schools identified as in need of improvement under Title I; and (2) are submitted jointly by at least one LEA that receives funds under Part A of Title I and at least one community-based organization

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

21st Century community learning centers

or other public or private entity. States must make awards of at least \$50,000 per year and for a period of 3 to 5 years.

An SEA may reserve up to 2 percent of its allocation for administrative expenses, including the costs of conducting its grants competition. In addition, an SEA may reserve up to 3 percent of its allocation for: (1) monitoring of programs; (2) providing technical assistance and training; and (3) evaluating the effectiveness of the program.

This program is forward funded. Funds become available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available for 15 months through September 30 of the following year.

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$981,166
2008	1,081,166
2009	1,131,166
2010	1,166,166
2011 CR	1,166,166

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$1.27 billion in fiscal year 2012 funding for the 21st CCLC program, an increase of \$100 million over the 2011 CR level. The 21st CCLC program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization. The request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2012 under reauthorized legislation and is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal. Under this proposal, the Department would make competitive grants to eligible entities (SEAs and LEAs) by themselves or in partnership with nonprofit organizations and local governmental entities) for projects that implement in-school and out-of-school strategies for providing students (and, where appropriate, teachers and family members), particularly those in high-need schools, the additional time, support, and enrichment activities needed to improve student achievement. States that receive awards would subgrant funds to (1) high-need LEAs alone or in partnership with one or more nonprofit organizations or local governmental entities or (2) nonprofit organizations.

The fiscal year 2012 request for the 21st CCLC program would allow local recipients to use program funds to expand learning time by significantly increasing the number of hours in a regular school schedule and comprehensively redesigning the school schedule for all students in a school. The Administration's reauthorization proposal would continue to allow funds to be used for before- and after-school programs, summer enrichment programs, and summer school programs, and would additionally permit States and eligible local entities to use funds to support expanded-learning-time programs and full-service community schools. This enhanced flexibility would allow communities to determine the best strategies for enabling their students and teachers to get the time and support they need. The additional funding requested for fiscal year

21st Century community learning centers

2012 would enable the program to support the expanded menu of programs and strategies and to provide higher-quality programming for students and their families.

All local projects would provide additional time for students, including students with the greatest academic needs and those who are meeting State academic achievement standards, to participate in (1) academic activities that are aligned with the instruction those students receive during the regular school day and are targeted to their academic needs; and (2) enrichment and other activities that complement the academic program. Projects could also provide teachers the time they need to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development within and across grades and subjects. In making awards to eligible local entities, the Department or the SEA would give priority to applications from partnerships between districts and other eligible entities and to applicants that propose to develop and implement expanded-learning-time programs or full-service community schools.

The Administration believes that the reauthorized 21st CCLC program would increase the likelihood for positive student outcomes. Research suggests that programs that significantly increase the total number of hours in a regular school schedule can lead to gains in student academic achievement.¹ Moreover, an emerging field of research suggests that particularly high-quality after-school programs may have a positive impact on desirable student outcomes, such as higher attendance during the regular school day and increased student academic achievement.² Regular participation in high-quality, enriching programs appears to be one factor that has an impact on student outcomes, but data from the current 21st CCLC program demonstrate that student participation rates may be a program quality concern; in 2010, States reported that only about half of the total number of students served (about 750,000 of 1.5 million) attended programs for 30 days or more over the course of 2008 and 2009. By lengthening the school day or year for all students, expanded-learning-time programs are able to improve 21st CCLC program attendance by reaching beyond the students who are inclined to regularly attend voluntary after-school programs.

Program quality should be improved by transforming the program from a formula to a competitive grant program. Within this framework, a new emphasis on increasing the number of instructional hours, together with support for increased attendance in high-quality before- and after-school programs, expanded-learning-time programs, and full-service community schools, should lead to improved results for students, including improved academic outcomes. Among other changes, the reauthorized statute would specify that activities funded under the program should promote a range of improved academic outcomes, and that the academic content in 21st CCLC programs should be targeted to students' academic needs.

At the request level, the Department would reserve a portion of the funds for national activities, including research, data collection, technical assistance, outreach, and dissemination. These activities would focus on the identification and promotion of effective efforts to expand learning

¹For example, see Frazier, Julie A.; Morrison, Frederick J. *The Influence of Extended-year Schooling on Growth of Achievement and Perceived Competence in Early Elementary School.* Child Development. Vol. 69 (2), April 1998, pp.495-517. Note that this study evaluated the impact of lengthening the school year.

² For example, see Reisner, Elizabeth R.; White, Richard N.; Russell, Christina A.; Birmingham, Jennifer. 2004. *Building Quality, Scale, and Effectiveness in After-School Programs: Summary Report of the TASC Evaluation.*

21st Century community learning centers

time, provide comprehensive services, and increase community and parental involvement. In addition, fiscal year 2012 funds would be used to pay the 2012 continuation costs of Full-Service Community Schools grants made (under the Fund for the Improvement of Education) in prior fiscal years.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>				
Formula grant program							
Amount distributed to States Average State award Range of State awards	\$1,142,842 \$21,978 \$5,714-127,444	\$1,142,842 \$21,978 \$5,714-125,773	0 0 0				
Reservation for State activities and Administration (maximum)	\$57,142	\$57,142	0				
National activities and evaluation	\$11,662	\$11,662	0				
Amount for Bureau of Indian Educa and the Outlying Areas	tion \$11,662	\$11,662	0				
Competitive grant program							
Amount awarded to States and eligible local entities	0	0	\$1, 227,842				
Amount for Outlying Areas and the Bureau of Indian Education	0	0	\$12,662				
National activities	0	0	\$12,662				
Peer review of new award application	ons 0	0	\$3,000				
Continuation costs for the Full-Serv Community Schools program	rice 0	0	\$10,000				

21st Century community learning centers

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

(Continued)

	<u>2010</u>	2011 CR	<u>2012</u>
Number of centers supported	9,400 ¹	9,400 ¹	10,000 ¹
Total students served	1,625,000 ¹	1,625,000 ¹	1,750,000 ¹
Students attending 30 days or more	814,000	814,000	895,000
Total adult family members served	230,000	230,000	250,000

¹ Estimates are based on the number of participants and centers in operation during 2008-09 as reported by States in 2010, which are the most recent data available. For FY 2012, the estimated number of centers, students served, and the number of those students who attend programs for 30 days or more may be higher or lower due to various factors, such as: the implementation of programs that would expand the regular school day for all students in participating school; the award of direct grants to local eligible entities as well as to States; and the award of 1-year planning grants (or subgrants) to local eligible entities that intend to implement expanded-learning-time-programs or full-service community schools as part of a community learning center.

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 establish community learning centers that help students in high-poverty, low-performing schools meet academic achievement standards, that offer a broad array of additional services designed to complement the regular academic program, and that offer families of students opportunities for educational development.

Objective: Participants in 21st Century Community Learning Center programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.

21st Century community learning centers

Measure: The percentage of regular program participants whose mathematics grades improve from fall to spring. Year **Target** Actual Middle and Middle and **Elementary** Total **Elementary Total High School** High School Math Math Math Math Math Math 2007 47.0 47.0 41.8 41.4 47.0 39.2 2008 47.5 47.5 47.5 38.7 38.0 40.3 2009 48.0 48.0 48.0 37.0 34.2 36.6 2010 48.5 48.5 48.5 2011 48.5 48.5 48.5 2012 48.5 48.5 48.5

Measure: The percentage of regular program participants whose English grades improve from fall to spring.							
Year		Target		Actual			
	Elementary English	Middle and High School English	Total English	Elementary English	Middle and High School English	Total English	
2007	47.0	47.0	47.0	44.2	40.3	43.2	
2008	47.5	47.5	47.5	40.6	39.2	41.8	
2009	48.0	48.0	48.0	39.1	35.3	38.2	
2010	48.5	48.5	48.5				
2011	48.5	48.5	48.5				
2012	48.5	48.5	48.5				

Additional information: According to data States submitted to the Department, performance in both subjects decreased in 2009, for the second consecutive year, and the program did not meet the targets for both groups and for participants as a whole. A regular participant is defined as a student who attends the program for 30 days or more during the course of the school year. To report data by grade span for this measure, the data system sorts program performance data by analyzing participant demographic information at the center level (as opposed to the individual student level). For this reason, programs that serve youth of all ages are not included in the columns disaggregated by participant age. The methodology used to report for this measure, therefore, partially explains why figures for "Total English" are, in some years, higher than those figures disaggregated by grade level.

21st Century community learning centers

Year	Та	Target Actual		
	Elementary Reading	Middle and High School Math	Elementary Reading	Middle and High School Math
2007	24.0	14.0	22.4	17.2
2008	24.0	16.0	22.8	15.9
2009	26.0	16.0	25.6	16.9
2010	35.0	20.0		
2011	40.0	25.0		
2012	40.0	25.0		

Additional information: In 2009, 25.6 percent of regular elementary school-aged participants improved from not proficient to proficient or above on State assessments in reading, while 16.9 percent of regular participants who were in middle or high school improved from not proficient to proficient or above on State assessments in math. These data represent 43,196 regular elementary school-aged attendees and 50,332 middle- and high-school-aged attendees. Targets for 2007 through 2010 were set based on actual performance in 2006. The program made progress in 2009 but did not meet the target of 26 percent for elementary school reading. Performance increased slightly for middle or high school math, and the program exceeded the target of 16 percent. The Department calculates data for this measure by dividing the number of regular participants who scored proficient or better in spring of the reporting year (but were not proficient in the previous year) by the total number of current-year regular participants who scored below proficient the previous spring. For a regular participant to be included in the data for this measure, the center has to have data on the student's prior-year and current-year State assessment results.

Year	Target			lents with teacher-reported improvements in student behavio		
	Elementary	Middle and High School	Overall	Elementary	Middle and High School	Overall
2007	75	75	75	68.2	68.8	70.7
2008	75	75	75	70.4	68.5	72.5
2009	75	75	75	68.7	67.6	68.6
2010	75	75	75			
2011	75	75	75			
2012	75	75	75			

Additional information: According to data that grantees submitted to the 21st CCLC Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS), program performance in the area of student behavior decreased slightly for all three categories of students for this measure, and the program did not meet the 2009 targets. As with the measures for reading and math grades and proficiency, to report data by grade span for this measure the data system sorts program performance data by analyzing participant demographic information at the center level (as opposed to the individual student level). For this reason, programs that serve youth of all ages are not included in the columns disaggregated by grade level. The methodology used to report

21st Century community learning centers

for this measure, therefore, partially explains why the 2007 and 2008 figures for "Overall" are higher than those figures disaggregated by grade level.

Efficiency Measures

The Department has developed three operational efficiency measures for the 21st CCLC program.

Measure: The percentage of SEAs that submit complete data on 21st Century Community Centers program performance measures by the deadline.						
Year	Target	Actual				
2008		80				
2009	80	80				
2010	85	86				
2011	90					
2012	95					

Additional information: States took an average of 86 days to submit complete data on performance measures, exceeding the target.

Measure: The average number of days it takes the Department to submit a final monitoring report to an SEA after the conclusion of a site visit.		
Year	Target	Actual
2008		55
2009	45	60
2010	40	45
2011	35	
2012	35	

Additional information: The Department took an average of 45 days to submit a final monitoring report to an SEA after the conclusion of a site visit, and thus did not meet the target.

risit report. Year	Target	Actual
2009	i ui got	5
2010	4	4
2011	4	
2012	4	

Additional information: This measure tracks States' timeliness in responding to the Department's fiscal management monitoring findings that require States to take corrective action within 30 days. Examples of such fiscal management findings include: drawing down funds in a manner that is not consistent with State and Federal policies; awarding funds for

21st Century community learning centers

periods other than between 3 and 5 years (the subgrant length required by the statute); and improperly limiting entities eligible for subgrants. States took an average of 4 weeks to resolve compliance findings in 2010, meeting the target.

Other Performance Information

In 2003, the Department's Institute of Education Sciences began a rigorous study that developed and tested the effectiveness of two after-school interventions (one each in math and reading) that were adapted from materials from existing school-day curricula that are based on sound theory or that have scientific evidence of effectiveness. The final report for this study, *The Evaluation of Enhanced Academic Instruction in After-School Programs*, was released in September 2009. The evaluation found a statistically significant difference in student achievement between students in the math after-school program and those in the regular after-school activities after 1 year of enhanced instruction and no additional achievement benefit beyond the 1-year impact after 2 years of the program. In study sites implementing the reading program, there was no statistically significant difference in reading achievement between students in the reading after-school program and those in the regular after-school activities after 1 year of the program; after 2 years of the program, there was a statistically significant negative impact on reading achievement. It is important to note that the sample of centers was not nationally representative and that findings from this study cannot, therefore, be generalized to the 21st CCLC program.

In addition, the Department's Policy and Program Studies Service analyzed data from a nationally representative sample of 21st CCLC programs to evaluate State and local program implementation. The resulting report, *21st Century Community Learning Center: Descriptive Study of Program Practices*, was released in July 2010. The evaluation focused on how, and to what extent, funds support high-quality programs that emphasize academic content, as well as staffing patterns and other features of after-school program implementation that may have an impact on the quality of the programming offered. Centers reported that about half of their students attended roughly 2 days a week or more. In addition, three-quarters of the centers reported that a typical student participated in reading activities (75 percent) and mathematics activities (81 percent) for less than 4 hours per week. About half of centers reported offering professional development opportunities to staff through training courses or conferences.