

Department of Education

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Fiscal Year 2013 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language.....	B-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes .....	B-4
Amounts Available for Obligation.....	B-8
Obligations by Object Classification .....	B-9
Summary of Changes .....	B-10
Authorizing Legislation.....	B-11
Appropriations History.....	B-12
Significant Items in FY 2012 Appropriation Reports.....	B-13
Summary of Request .....	B-14
Activities:	
College- and career-ready students .....	B-17
School turnaround grants .....	B-37
Evaluation .....	B-46
State agency programs:	
Migrant student education.....	B-49
Neglected and delinquent children and youth education .....	B-57
Homeless children and youth education.....	B-63
State Tables .....	B-73

[EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED] ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY<sup>1</sup>

[For carrying out title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (referred to in this Act as “ESEA”) and section 418A of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (referred to in this Act as “HEA”), \$15,750,983,000, of which \$4,817,117,000 shall become available on July 1, 2012, and shall remain available through September 30, 2013, and of which \$10,841,177,000 shall become available on October 1, 2012, and shall remain available through September 30, 2013, for academic year 2012–2013:<sup>2</sup> *Provided*, That \$6,584,750,000 shall be for basic grants under section 1124 of the ESEA:<sup>3</sup> *Provided further*, That up to \$3,992,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary of Education (referred to in this title as “Secretary”) on October 1, 2011, to obtain annually updated local educational agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census:<sup>4</sup> *Provided further*, That \$1,362,301,000 shall be for concentration grants under section 1124A of the ESEA:<sup>5</sup> *Provided further*, That \$3,288,183,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA:<sup>6</sup> *Provided further*, That \$3,288,183,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A of the ESEA:<sup>7</sup> *Provided further*, That \$3,200,000 shall be to carry out sections 1501 and 1503 of the ESEA:<sup>8</sup> *Provided further*, That \$534,562,000 shall be available for school improvement grants under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, which shall be allocated by the Secretary through the formula described in section 1003(g)(2) and shall be used consistent with the requirements of section 1003(g), except that State and local educational agencies may use such funds to serve any school eligible to receive assistance under part A of title I that has not made adequate yearly progress for at least 2 years or is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates and, in the case of secondary schools, priority shall be given to those schools with graduation rates below 60 percent:<sup>9</sup> *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 1003(g)(5)(A), each State educational agency may establish a maximum subgrant size of not more than \$2,000,000 for each participating school applicable to such funds:<sup>10</sup> *Provided further*, That the Secretary may

reserve up to 5 percent of the funds available for section 1003(g) of the ESEA to carry out activities to build State and local educational agency capacity to implement effectively the school improvement grants program: <sup>11</sup> *Provided further*, That \$160,000,000 shall be available under section 1502 of the ESEA for a comprehensive literacy development and education program to advance literacy skills, including pre-literacy skills, reading, and writing, for students from birth through grade 12, including limited-English-proficient students and students with disabilities, of which one-half of 1 percent shall be reserved for the Secretary of the Interior for such a program at schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Education, one-half of 1 percent shall be reserved for grants to the outlying areas for such a program, up to 5 percent may be reserved for national activities, and the remainder shall be used to award competitive grants to State educational agencies for such a program, of which a State educational agency may reserve up to 5 percent for State leadership activities, including technical assistance and training, data collection, reporting, and administration, and shall subgrant not less than 95 percent to local educational agencies or, in the case of early literacy, to local educational agencies or other nonprofit providers of early childhood education that partner with a public or private nonprofit organization or agency with a demonstrated record of effectiveness in improving the early literacy development of children from birth through kindergarten entry and in providing professional development in early literacy, giving priority to such agencies or other entities serving greater numbers or percentages of disadvantaged children: <sup>12</sup> *Provided further*, That the State educational agency shall ensure that at least 15 percent of the subgranted funds are used to serve children from birth through age 5, 40 percent are used to serve students in kindergarten through grade 5, and 40 percent are used to serve students in middle and high school including an equitable distribution of funds between middle and high schools: <sup>13</sup> *Provided further*, That eligible entities receiving subgrants from State educational agencies shall use such funds for services and activities that have the characteristics of effective literacy instruction through

professional development, screening and assessment, targeted interventions for students reading below grade level and other research-based methods of improving classroom instruction and practice.]<sup>14</sup> (*Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2012.*)

#### NOTES

No new language is included for this account. All programs proposed for inclusion in this account for fiscal year 2013 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.

Each language provision that is followed by a footnote reference is explained in the Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes document which follows the appropriation language.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<sup>1</sup> <u>[Education for the Disadvantaged] Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity</u>	This language changes the title of this account from Education for the Disadvantaged to Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity.
<sup>2</sup> [...of which \$4,817,117,000 shall become available on July 1, 2012, and shall remain available through September 30, 2013, and of which \$10,841,177,000 shall become available on October 1, 2012, and shall remain available through September 30, 2013, for academic year 2012–2013:]	This language provides for funds to be appropriated on a forward-funded basis for the Title I Basic Grants, Concentration Grants, Targeted Grants, Education Finance Incentive Grants, School Improvement Grants, State Agency Migrant and Neglected and Delinquent, and Striving Readers programs. The language also provides that a portion of the funds is available in an advance appropriation that becomes available for obligation on October 1 of the following fiscal year.
<sup>3</sup> [... <i>Provided</i> , That \$6,584,750,000 shall be for basic grants under section 1124 of the ESEA:]	This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Basic Grants.
<sup>4</sup> [... <i>Provided further</i> , That up to \$3,992,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary of Education (referred to in this title as “Secretary”) on October 1, 2011, to obtain annually updated local educational agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census:]	This language makes available, on a current-funded basis, \$3,992,000 from Basic Grant funds to support continued work by the Census Bureau to update LEA-level poverty data.
<sup>5</sup> [... <i>Provided further</i> , That \$1,362,301,000 shall be for concentration grants under section 1124A of the ESEA:]	This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Concentration Grants.
<sup>6</sup> [... <i>Provided further</i> , That \$3,288,183,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA:]	This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Targeted Grants.
<sup>7</sup> [... <i>Provided further</i> , That \$3,288,183,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A of the ESEA:]	This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Education Finance Incentive Grants.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><a href="#">8</a> [ <i>Provided further</i>, That \$3,200,000 shall be to carry out sections 1501 and 1503 of the ESEA:]</p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Evaluation.</p>
<p><a href="#">9</a> [...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$534,562,000 shall be available for school improvement grants under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, which shall be allocated by the Secretary through the formula described in section 1003(g)(2) and shall be used consistent with the requirements of section 1003(g), except that State and local educational agencies may use such funds to serve any school eligible to receive assistance under part A of title I that has not made adequate yearly progress for at least 2 years or is in the State's lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates and, in the case of secondary schools, priority shall be given to those schools with graduation rates below 60 percent:]</p>	<p>This language expands eligibility for participation in the School Improvement Grants (SIG) program to schools that are eligible for but do not receive Title I Part A funds and meet certain requirements. The language also establishes a priority for secondary schools that have graduation rates below 60 percent.</p>
<p><a href="#">10</a> [...<i>Provided further</i>, That notwithstanding section 1003(g)(5)(A), each State educational agency may establish a maximum subgrant size of not more than \$2,000,000 for each participating school applicable to such funds:]</p>	<p>This language overrides the statutory cap on the maximum per-school subgrant size for subgrants made by States under the School Improvement Grants program.</p>
<p><a href="#">11</a> [...<i>Provided further</i>, That the Secretary may reserve up to 5 percent of the funds available for section 1003(g) of the ESEA to carry out activities to build State and local educational agency capacity to implement effectively the school improvement grants program:]</p>	<p>This language authorizes the Secretary to reserve up to 5 percent of the funds appropriated for the SIG program for capacity-building.</p>

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>12</sup> [...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$160,000,000 shall be available under section 1502 of the ESEA for a comprehensive literacy development and education program to advance literacy skills, including pre-literacy skills, reading, and writing, for students from birth through grade 12, including limited-English-proficient students and students with disabilities, of which one-half of 1 percent shall be reserved for the Secretary of the Interior for such a program at schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Education, one-half of 1 percent shall be reserved for grants to the outlying areas for such a program, up to 5 percent may be reserved for national activities, and the remainder shall be used to award competitive grants to State educational agencies for such a program, of which a State educational agency may reserve up to 5 percent for State leadership activities, including technical assistance and training, data collection, reporting, and administration, and shall subgrant not less than 95 percent to local educational agencies or, in the case of early literacy, to local educational agencies or other nonprofit providers of early childhood education that partner with a public or private nonprofit organization or agency with a demonstrated record of effectiveness in improving the early literacy development of children from birth through kindergarten entry and in providing professional development in early literacy, giving priority to such agencies or other entities serving greater numbers or percentages of disadvantaged children:]</p>	<p>This language provides funding for a Striving Readers program that serves students from birth through grade 12; provides a portion of the funds to the Department of Interior/Bureau of Indian Education and the Outlying Areas; establishes the amount the Department may reserve for national activities; and establishes the amount the Department must distribute through competitive awards to States. The language also specifies the amount of funds that States receiving competitive awards may reserve for State leadership activities and the amount of funds that they award through subgrants to local educational agencies or to nonprofit organizations that provide early childhood education services.</p>

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>13</sup> [...<i>Provided further</i>, That the State educational agency shall ensure that at least 15 percent of the subgranted funds are used to serve children from birth through age 5, 40 percent are used to serve students in kindergarten through grade 5, and 40 percent are used to serve students in middle and high school including an equitable distribution of funds between middle and high schools:]</p>	<p>This language establishes that States must use particular amounts of Striving Readers funds to support projects serving children in specific age groups or grades.</p>
<p><sup>14</sup> [...<i>Provided further</i>, That eligible entities receiving subgrants from State educational agencies shall use such funds for services and activities that have the characteristics of effective literacy instruction through professional development, screening and assessment, targeted interventions for students reading below grade level and other research-based methods of improving classroom instruction and practice.]</p>	<p>This language establishes requirements for the types of activities that entities may conduct with their Striving Readers funds.</p>

**ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY**

**Amounts Available for Obligation**  
(dollars in thousands)

Appropriation and Adjustments	2011	2012	2013
Discretionary budget authority:			
Appropriation .....	\$15,515,443	\$15,750,983	\$15,558,649
Across-the-board reduction (P.L. 112-10)	-31,133	0	0
Across-the-board reduction (P.L. 112-74).....	<u>-20,450</u>	<u>-9,280</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, budget authority .....	15,515,483	15,741,703	15,558,649
Comparative transfers to <u>Education Improvement Programs</u> for:			
Striving Readers	0	-159,698	0
High School Graduation Initiative	-48,902	-48,809	0
Comparative transfers to <u>Higher Education</u> for Special Programs for Migrant Students	-36,595	-36,526	0
Comparative transfers from <u>Education Improvement Programs</u> for Homeless Children and Youth Education	<u>65,296</u>	<u>65,173</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, comparable discretionary appropriation	15,495,282	15,561,843	15,558,649
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	-10,820,686	-10,841,177	-11,681,898
Advance from prior year	<u>10,841,176</u>	<u>10,820,686</u>	<u>10,841,177</u>
Subtotal, comparative budget authority	15,515,772	15,541,352	14,717,928
Unobligated balance, start of year	768,705	543,464	0
Unobligated balance, expiring	-917	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year	-543,464	0	0
Comparative transfers:			
Unobligated balance, start of year to <u>Education Improvement Programs</u> for			
Striving Readers	-200,000	0	0
Even Start	-4,267	0	0
Unobligated balance, start of year from <u>Education Improvement Programs</u> for Homeless Children and Youth Education	<u>65</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<b>Total, direct obligations</b>	<b>15,535,894</b>	<b>16,084,816</b>	<b>14,717,928</b>

**Obligations by Object Classification**  
(dollars in thousands)

Object Class	2011	2012	2013
Printing and reproduction .....	\$3	0	0
Contractual services and supplies:			
Advisory and assistance services .....	4,936	\$35,818	\$34,426
Other services .....	26,850	1,163	365
Peer review .....	479	5	5
Purchases of goods and services from other government accounts .....	3,992	3,985	4,000
Subtotal, other contractual services .....	36,253	40,971	30,557
Grants, subsidies, and contributions .....	<u>15,499,635</u>	<u>16,043,845</u>	<u>14,679,132</u>
Total, direct obligations .....	15,535,894	16,084,816	14,717,928

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Summary of Changes  
(dollars in thousands)

---

2012.....	\$15,561,843
2013.....	<u>15,558,649</u>
Net change .....	-3,194

---

	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
<b>Decreases:</b>	<u>base</u>	<u>from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
Eliminate separate funding for Evaluation. The ESEA reauthorization proposal would include provisions for funding program evaluations through set-asides from program funds.	\$3,194	-\$3,194

**Authorizing Legislation**

(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2012 Authorized	2012 Estimate	2013 Authorized	2013 Request
College- and career-ready students ( <i>ESEA-1-A</i> ):				
LEA grants formulas:	0 <sup>1</sup>		To be determined <sup>1</sup>	
Basic grants ( <i>Section 1124</i> )	<sup>2</sup>	\$6,577,904	<sup>2</sup>	\$6,577,904
Concentration grants ( <i>Section 1124A</i> )	<sup>2</sup>	1,362,301	<sup>2</sup>	1,362,301
Targeted grants ( <i>Section 1125</i> )	<sup>2</sup>	3,288,126	<sup>2</sup>	3,288,126
Education finance incentive grants ( <i>Section 1125A</i> )	<sup>2</sup>	3,288,126	<sup>2</sup>	3,288,126
School turnaround grants ( <i>ESEA Section 1003(g)</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	533,552	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	533,552
Evaluation ( <i>ESEA I-E-1501 and 1503</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	3,194	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	0
State agency programs:				
Migrant student education ( <i>ESEA I-C</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	393,236	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	393,236
Neglected and delinquent children and youth education ( <i>ESEA I-D</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	50,231	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	50,231
Homeless children and youth education ( <i>McKinney-Vento   Act, Title VII-B</i> )	<u>Indefinite</u>	<u>65,173</u>	<u>Indefinite</u>	<u>65,173</u>
Total definite authorization	0		0	
Total appropriation		15,561,843		15,558,649
Portion of request subject to reauthorization		15,561,843		15,558,649

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 20, 2008. Reauthorizing language is sought for FY 2013.

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

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2004 (2004 Advance for 2005)	\$14,184,000 (7,383,301)	\$14,507,000 (7,383,301)	\$14,107,356 (7,383,301)	\$14,446,343 (7,383,301)
2005 (2005 Advance for 2006)	15,205,168 (7,383,301)	15,515,735 (7,383,301)	15,500,684 (7,383,301)	14,843,974 (7,383,301)
2006 (2006 Advance for 2007)	16,431,473 (7,383,301)	14,728,735 (7,383,301)	14,532,785 (7,383,301)	14,481,161 (7,383,301)
2007 (2007 Advance for 2008)	16,469,541 (7,383,301)	N/A <sup>1</sup>	N/A <sup>1</sup>	14,725,593 (7,383,301)
2008 (2008 Advance for 2009)	16,689,090 (7,383,301)	15,969,818 (8,136,218)	15,867,778 (8,867,301)	15,489,476 (7,934,756)
2009 (2009 Advance for 2010) Recovery Act Supplemental (PL 111-5)	16,917,059 (7,934,756)	15,788,285 <sup>2</sup> (10,841,176)	15,735,884 <sup>2</sup> (8,893,756)	15,760,086 (10,841,176)
		13,000,000	12,400,000	13,000,000
2010 (2010 Advance for 2011)	16,431,632 (10,841,176)	15,938,215 (10,841,176)	15,891,132 <sup>3</sup> (10,841,176)	15,914,666 (10,841,176)
2011 (2011 Advance for 2012) Rescission (P.L. 112-74)	15,912,193 (11,681,897)	15,914,666 <sup>4</sup> (10,841,176)	16,726,579 <sup>5</sup> (10,841,176)	15,914,666 <sup>6</sup> (10,841,176) -(20,490)
2012 (2012 Advance for 2013)	16,253,026 (11,681,897)	15,949,319 <sup>7</sup> (13,279,177)	15,741,703 <sup>7</sup> (10,841,177)	15,741,703 (10,841,177)
2013 (2013 Advance for 2014)	15,558,649 (11,681,898)			

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

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

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

<sup>4</sup> The level for the House allowance reflects the House-passed full-year continuing resolution.

<sup>5</sup> The level for the Senate allowance reflects Committee action only.

<sup>6</sup> The level for appropriation reflects the continuing resolution (P.L. 111-322) passed December 22, 2010.

<sup>7</sup> The level for the House allowance reflects an introduced bill; the level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Committee action only.

## **ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY**

### **Significant Items in FY 2012 Appropriation Reports**

#### **School Improvement Grants**

Conference: The conferees direct the Department to require that all schools receiving SIG funds have a plan in place for addressing the academic and non-academic needs of their students, including improving the overall school climate where necessary, in addition to addressing factors such as the usage of time, instructional practices, and professional development and supports. The conferees expect the plan to assess and address as appropriate the mental health needs and interventions of the students at the school in an integrated manner within the overall turnaround strategy; related training and professional development for all staff that increase classroom efficacy such as classroom organization and management, including teachers and administrators; access to school-based counseling services; the development of school-based systems, such as teams, to identify and address individual student academic, behavioral, health, or social needs and to support a positive and developmentally appropriate school climate; and how parents, families and the community will be engaged in this and other aspects of the school turnaround process.

Response: Program requirements for the transformation and turnaround models include activities related to addressing both the academic and non-academic needs of students served under the SIG program, while the restart model allows, but does not require, such activities. Nearly all fiscal year 2012 SIG funds will be used for continuation of SIG awards made in previous years, but the Department will consider the recommendations of the conferees as it determines whether to provide additional regulations or guidance related to SIG implementation in fiscal year 2013, when States will make a 3rd cohort of SIG awards to an estimated 500 additional persistently lowest-achieving schools.

#### **School Improvement Grants: Capacity-Building Activities**

Senate: Prior to obligating any national activities funds, the Committee requests a multi-year strategic vision and operating plan for how it will utilize this new authority and coordinate these new efforts with existing technical assistance and related efforts that the Department supports.

Response: The Department currently is in the initial stages of developing a multi-year operating plan for the national activities authority provided for the first time in the fiscal year 2012 appropriations act. The Department will consult with the Committee in the development of its fiscal year 2012 SIG national activities plan and will provide the final plan to the Committee before implementation.

[Click here for accessible version](#)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2013 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(in thousands of dollars)						
Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	2011 Appropriation	2012 Appropriation	2013 President's Budget	2013 President's Budget Compared to 2012 Appropriation	
					Amount	Percent
<b>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity</b>						
1. College- and career-ready students (ESEA I-A):						
(a) Basic grants (section 1124)						
Annual appropriation	D	3,622,240	3,615,394	2,834,559	(780,835)	-21.598%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	2,956,911	2,962,510	3,743,345	780,835	26.357%
Subtotal		6,579,151	6,577,904	6,577,904	0	0.000%
(b) Concentration grants (section 1124A)						
Annual appropriation	D	0	0	0	0	---
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	1,359,726	1,362,301	1,362,301	0	0.000%
Subtotal		1,359,726	1,362,301	1,362,301	0	0.000%
(c) Targeted grants (section 1125)						
Annual appropriation	D	0	29,943	0	(29,943)	-100.000%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	3,252,025	3,258,183	3,288,126	29,943	0.919%
Subtotal		3,252,025	3,288,126	3,288,126	0	0.000%
(d) Education finance incentive grants (section 1125A)						
Annual appropriation	D	0	29,943	0	(29,943)	-100.000%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	3,252,025	3,258,183	3,288,126	29,943	0.919%
Subtotal		3,252,025	3,288,126	3,288,126	0	0.000%
Subtotal, Grants to LEAs		14,442,927	14,516,457	14,516,457	0	0.000%
Annual appropriation	D	3,622,240	3,675,280	2,834,559	(840,721)	-22.875%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year <sup>1</sup>	D	10,820,687	10,841,177	11,681,898	840,721	7.755%
2. School turnaround grants (ESEA section 1003(g))						
3. Evaluation (ESEA sections 1501 and 1503)						
4. State agency programs:						
(a) Migrant student education (ESEA I-C)						
(b) Neglected and delinquent children and youth education (ESEA I-D)						
Subtotal		444,307	443,467	443,467	0	0.000%

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

-Programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for which funds are requested in 2013 or that are shown as consolidated in 2013 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 2011 and 2012 have been adjusted to be comparable to the fiscal year 2013 request.

-Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> Under the terms of the FY 2012 appropriations bill, a 0.189 percent across-the-board rescission is applied to discretionary budget authority available in FY 2012. As a result, FY 2011 advance appropriations available in FY 2012 are reduced by \$20,490 thousand.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2013 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(in thousands of dollars)						
Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	2011 Appropriation	2012 Appropriation	2013 President's Budget	2013 President's Budget Compared to 2012 Appropriation	
					Amount	Percent
<b>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity (continued)</b>						
5. Homeless children and youth education (MVHAA Title VII-B)	D	65,296	65,173	65,173	0	0.000%
Total, Appropriation <sup>1</sup>	D	15,495,243	15,561,843	15,558,649	(3,194)	-0.021%
Total, Budget authority	D	15,515,732	15,541,352	14,717,928	(823,424)	-5.298%
Current <sup>2</sup>		4,674,556	4,720,666	3,876,751	(843,915)	-17.877%
Prior year's advance		10,841,176	10,820,686	10,841,177	20,491	0.189%

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

-Programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for which funds are requested in 2013 or that are shown as consolidated in 2013 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 2011 and 2012 have been adjusted to be comparable to the fiscal year 2013 request.

-Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> Adjusted for comparability. Excludes \$36,595 thousand in FY 2011, and \$36,526 thousand in FY 2012 and proposed in the FY 2013 President's Budget for Special Programs for Migrant Students in the Higher Education account.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes advance appropriations that become available on October 1 of the following fiscal year. Advance appropriations are \$10,820,687 thousand in FY 2011, \$10,841,177 thousand in FY 2012, and \$11,681,898 thousand in the FY 2013 President's Budget request. The FY 2013 amount for advances is increased to account for the proposed consolidation of Teacher Quality State grants into the Innovation and Instructional Teams account, which does not have advances.

## **ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY**

The programs in the Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity (formerly Education for the Disadvantaged) account provide the foundation for school improvement efforts needed to ensure that all children receive a high-quality education authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Administration is requesting a total of \$15.6 billion in fiscal year 2013 for the programs in this account.

Most of the programs in the account are authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and are, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that these programs will be implemented in fiscal year 2013 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal.

The \$14.5 billion request for the reauthorized College- and Career-Ready Students program (under current law Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)) would support local programs aimed at helping more than 21 million students in high-poverty schools make progress toward the new college- and career-ready standards that States would implement under the Administration's reauthorization proposal (and that the great majority of States are implementing). The reauthorized program also would support a more differentiated approach to measuring school progress and identifying schools in need of improvement, reward highly effective schools and LEAs, require implementation of rigorous school intervention models in the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I schools, strengthen LEA improvement, and help ensure an equitable distribution of effective teachers across high- and low-poverty schools.

The 2013 request also includes \$533.6 million for the School Turnaround Grants program (under current law School Improvement Grants) to support a reauthorized program that would require States and LEAs to use most funds to implement one of four school intervention models (Turnaround, Restart, School Closure, and Transformation) in each of their schools that (1) are in the bottom 5 percent of schools in the State in terms of student achievement or (2) in the case of secondary schools, have graduation rates below 60 percent. The reauthorized program also would include a national activities authority that would allow the Department to build nationwide school turnaround capacity by awarding funds to outside entities with a demonstrated ability to turn around low-performing schools.

The request would level-fund the other programs in this account, including \$393.2 million for Migrant Student Education, \$50.2 million for Neglected and Delinquent Children and Youth Education, and \$65.2 for Homeless Children and Youth Education.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

---

### College- and career-ready students

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget authority:

	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>Change</u>
Basic grants	\$6,577,904	\$6,577,904	0
Concentration grants	1,362,301	1,362,301	0
Targeted grants	3,288,126	3,288,126	0
Education finance incentive grants	<u>3,288,126</u>	<u>3,288,126</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	14,516,457	14,516,457	0
Annual appropriation	3,675,280	2,834,559	-\$840,721
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	10,841,177	11,681,898	+840,721

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2013.

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) provide supplemental education funding, especially in high-poverty areas, for local programs that provide extra academic support to help raise the achievement of students at risk of educational failure or, in the case of schoolwide programs, to help all students in high-poverty schools meet challenging State academic standards. The program serves an estimated 21 million students in more than 90 percent of school districts and more than half of all public schools—including two-thirds of the Nation's elementary schools. Title I Grants to LEAs were first authorized as part of the original Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) and were most recently reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB).

The ESEA gives school districts and schools considerable flexibility in using Title I dollars to support instructional strategies and methods that best meet local needs. Title I schools help students reach challenging State standards through one of two models: "targeted assistance" that supplements the regular education program for individual children deemed most in need of special assistance, or a "schoolwide" approach that allows schools to use Title I funds—in combination with other Federal, State, and local funds—to improve the overall instructional program for all children in a school. Schools in which poor children account for at least 40 percent of enrollment are eligible to operate schoolwide programs, and approximately 35,000 schools, or 65 percent of all Title I schools, currently operate these programs. In the 2009-2010

## **ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY**

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

---

school year, these schoolwide programs accounted for an estimated 90 percent of participating students and received two-thirds of the Title I Grants to LEAs funding allocated to schools.

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

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

### **Standards and Assessments**

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

The States also were required to create or adopt academic assessments that measure the achievement of all students against their standards. These assessments must be valid and reliable, include measures that assess higher-order thinking skills and understanding of challenging content, and enable achievement results to be disaggregated by major racial and ethnic group, gender, and poverty, disability, English proficiency, and migrant status. The Department provides dedicated State formula grant support for the development and implementation of required State assessments (see Assessing Achievement in the Education Improvement Programs account).

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

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

#### Adequate Yearly Progress

State assessments are used to hold LEAs and schools accountable for making adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward State standards for proficiency in reading and math, with the goal of ensuring that all students are proficient in both subjects by the 2013-2014 school year. For a school to make AYP, all students, as well as those in statutorily specified groups—economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and EL students—must meet the same annual statewide measurable objectives for improved achievement. However, the statute includes a “safe harbor” exception under which a school can be considered to have made AYP if the percentage of students in each group not reaching the proficient level decreases by at least 10 percent from the previous year and the school makes progress on the “other academic indicator” included in the State’s AYP definition.

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

In addition, the Department allows States to exclude from AYP calculations the assessment results for EL students in their first year of enrollment in U.S. schools. States also may include in the EL subgroup for up to 2 years those students who were EL but who have attained English proficiency. Finally, the Department has taken steps to allow States to incorporate individual academic growth into their AYP systems, beginning with a pilot growth-model initiative in late 2005 and then in a final regulation published in 2008 permitting all States to apply for approval to add growth models to AYP determinations. Fourteen States currently include growth models in their AYP definitions.

#### Accountability and School Improvement

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

#### School Improvement

LEAs must identify for school improvement any school that does not make AYP for 2 consecutive years, and both LEAs and SEAs must include such identification in their annual report cards to parents and the public. Identified schools must develop 2-year improvement plans that incorporate strategies from scientifically based research on how to strengthen

## **ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY**

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

---

instruction in the core academic subjects and address the specific issues that caused the school to be identified for improvement. These plans must include the annual reservation of at least 10 percent of the school's Title I, Part A allocation for professional development that directly addresses the problems that led to identification for improvement.

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

#### **Corrective Action**

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

#### **Restructuring**

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

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

The ESEA requires LEAs to ensure that all Title I teachers hired after the beginning of the 2002-2003 school year are "highly qualified." For new teachers, this means being certified by the State (which may be through an alternative route to certification), holding at least a bachelor's degree, and passing a rigorous State test on subject knowledge and teaching skills. Veteran teachers also must possess a bachelor's degree and be fully certified or licensed by the State, and must either pass the State test on subject-matter knowledge or demonstrate subject-matter competency through a "high, objective, uniform State standard of evaluation." LEAs must use at least 5 percent of their Part A allocations to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified. States were required to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that would ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects were highly qualified by the end of the 2005-06 school year, and both States and LEAs must report annually on progress toward this goal. In addition, LEAs must annually notify parents of their right to receive information on the professional qualifications of their child's teachers.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

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

### ESEA Flexibility

The ESEA was scheduled for reauthorization in 2007 and now is entering its second decade without modification to reflect State progress in implementing the law or new directions in State and local education reform policies. In addition, the rapidly approaching 2014 deadline under current law for ensuring that 100 percent of students are proficient in reading and mathematics means that States will soon be forced to identify nearly all of their Title I schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. This failure of current law to differentiate among schools that are helping most, but not all, of their students to meet State academic standards and schools in which large majorities of students are not meeting such standards threatens to undermine public support for ESEA accountability requirements. Moreover, State and local educational agencies simply do not have the capacity to intervene effectively in all Title I schools to bring about meaningful change and improvement, as would soon be required under current law. In addition, more than 40 States already are engaged in transitioning to “next-generation accountability systems” based on the adoption of State standards linked to college- and career-readiness, new assessments aligned with those standards, differentiated approaches to LEA and school accountability that target improvement resources to the lowest-performing LEAs and schools and those with the largest achievement gaps, and new systems for evaluating and supporting teachers and principals that are based in part on student growth.

In recognition of these changes, in September 2011 the Administration invited all States to request “ESEA flexibility,” which offers waivers of key provisions of current law in exchange for a comprehensive plan to improve educational outcomes for all students, close achievement gaps, and improve the quality of instruction. More specifically, States approved for ESEA flexibility would no longer have to meet the 2014 deadline for ensuring that 100 percent of students are proficient in reading and mathematics; would no longer have to identify schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and would no longer have to carry out the prescriptive improvement, corrective action, or restructuring plans required under current law. States and LEAs also would receive greater flexibility in the use of funds in rural schools, in adopting the schoolwide program model regardless of school poverty levels, in meeting teacher qualification requirements, and in transferring funds among ESEA programs.

States seeking ESEA flexibility must submit plans to the Department describing how they will transition to State college- and career-ready standards and aligned assessments capable of measuring student academic growth; implement differentiated recognition, accountability, and support systems that identify and reward high-performing schools, require rigorous interventions in the lowest-performing schools, and target meaningful improvement measures to schools with the largest achievement gaps; and develop and implement high-quality teacher and principal

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

evaluation and support systems that use multiple valid measures, including data on student growth as a significant factor, to determine performance levels.

All States are eligible to receive ESEA flexibility, and 11 States submitted requests in the first application window, which closed on November 14, 2011. The second submission deadline for requesting ESEA flexibility is February 21, 2012. As of early January, 2012, 28 States, D.C. and Puerto Rico had submitted their intent to request ESEA Flexibility for the second window. The Department has established a rigorous processing for reviewing and approving State requests, including expert peer review. Additional information on ESEA flexibility is available at <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility>.

### Allocations

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

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

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

In determining allocations under each of the four formulas, the statute requires the use of annually updated Census Bureau estimates of the number of children from low-income families in each local educational agency. There is roughly a 2-year lag between the income year used for LEA poverty estimates and the fiscal year in which those estimates are used to make Title I allocations. For example, the fiscal year 2011 allocations were based on LEA poverty estimates for 2009. The Department transfers a small amount of funding from the annual Title I appropriation (\$3.9 million in 2011) to the Census Bureau to finance the preparation of these LEA poverty estimates.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

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

One percent of the total appropriation for Title I Grants to LEAs is reserved for the Department of the Interior’s Bureau of Indian Education and the Outlying Areas (the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands). In addition, States are permitted to reserve up to 1 percent, or \$400,000, whichever is greater, to cover SEA costs of administering Title I programs, except that such amounts may not exceed the level that is provided if the total appropriation for Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA equals \$14 billion, a threshold that has been exceeded each year beginning with fiscal year 2008.

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

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

(dollars in thousands)

	<u>Basic Grants</u>	<u>Concentration Grants</u>	<u>Targeted Grants</u>	<u>Education Finance Incentive Grants</u>
2008.....	\$6,597,946	\$1,365,031	\$2,967,949	\$2,967,949
2009.....	6,597,946	1,365,031	3,264,712	3,264,712
Recovery Act .....	0	0	5,000,000	5,000,000
2010.....	6,597,946	1,365,031	3,264,712	3,264,712
2011.....	6,579,151	1,359,726	3,252,025	3,252,025
2012.....	6,577,904	1,365,031	3,288,126	3,288,126

### **FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration’s 2013 budget request for the College- and Career-Ready Students (CCRS) program (Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies under current law) is \$14.5 billion, the same as the 2012 appropriation. The request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2013 under a reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) that is consistent with the Administration’s reauthorization proposal. This proposal would make key changes in the areas of standards and assessments; accountability and support for schools, local educational agencies (LEAs) and States; and teacher and leader effectiveness and equity. The reauthorization proposal also would permit the Department to reserve up to 0.5 percent of Title I formula grant funds for ESEA program evaluation and performance measurement.

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

While the current Title I program has succeeded in firmly establishing standards-based accountability systems in all 50 States, No Child Left Behind’s emphasis on punitive sanctions

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

for not making lock-step progress toward meeting the goal of 100 percent proficiency in reading/language arts and mathematics has inadvertently encouraged States to lower the quality of their standards as well as the levels of proficiency needed to meet them. The net result has been wide divergence in most States in student performance on State assessments compared to student performance on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). For example, the August 2011 report from the National Center for Education Statistics, *Mapping State Proficiency Standards Onto NAEP Scales: 2005-2009*, found that 35 States set grade 4 standards for the Proficient level in reading that were lower than the Basic level on NAEP.

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

The proposed new standards and assessments would give families and communities the information they need to determine whether their students are on track to college- and career-readiness and to evaluate the effectiveness of their schools. States would also continue to implement statewide science standards and aligned assessments in specific grade spans, and could include those assessments—as well as statewide assessments in other subjects, such as history—in their Title I accountability system so long as they meet the same “college- and career-ready” requirements as the reading and mathematics standards. Finally, States would develop and adopt statewide English language proficiency standards for English Learners, as well as aligned English language proficiency assessments, that reflect the academic language necessary to master each State's content standards.

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

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

The foundation of these new, more rigorous and fair accountability systems would be comprehensive data systems that gather information that is critical to determining how schools and districts are progressing in preparing students to graduate from high school prepared for college and careers. States and districts would collect and publicly report data relating to student academic achievement and growth in reading and mathematics, student academic achievement in science, and, if States choose, student academic achievement and growth in other subjects, such as history. At the high school level, States also would collect and report graduation rates and, over time, college enrollment rates and college persistence rates. All of these data would be disaggregated by race, gender, ethnicity, disability status, English Learner status, status as connected to the active-duty military, and family income. States and districts

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

also would collect other key information about teaching and learning conditions, including information on school climate, such as student, teacher and school leader attendance; disciplinary incidents; or the results from student, parent, or school staff surveys about their school experience.

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

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

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

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

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

### Equitable Distribution of Effective Teachers and Leaders

Strong teachers and leaders are the heart of educational improvement, yet current law largely ignores the effectiveness of teachers in improving student learning and does little to recognize the importance of or support the development of effective school leaders. The Administration's reauthorization proposal would require States to develop definitions of "effective" and "highly effective" teachers and principals, based in significant part on student academic growth, which would be used in the development of State and local teacher and principal evaluation systems. In addition, both States and LEAs would be required to develop meaningful plans to achieve the equitable distribution of effective teachers and leaders. As noted below, most LEAs would be

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

allowed to spend Title I, Part A funds on activities to achieve such equitable distribution across their schools.

#### Resources for Reform

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

In addition, the Administration's reauthorization proposal would broaden the requirement in current law for LEAs with schools in improvement to spend an amount equal to 20 percent of their Title I, Part A allocations on public school choice and/or supplemental educational services.

LEAs would instead be required to use an identical amount to improve student performance in high-need schools by implementing effective school improvement strategies and carrying out strategies designed to ensure the equitable distribution of effective teachers and school leaders.

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

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

#### Title I Rewards Program

The Administration also is proposing a new Title I Rewards program that would help ensure that State accountability systems provide meaningful positive incentives and rewards that recognize and encourage improved student outcomes. Encouraging, recognizing, and rewarding outstanding performance by high-poverty schools and LEAs would bring a much-needed corrective balance to the emphasis of current law on what often are perceived as punitive sanctions for low performance. While the reauthorization proposal would create a separately funded State formula grant program for Title I Rewards, for 2013 the Administration would work with the appropriators to provide a 2 percent State-level set-aside of funds under Title I Grants for LEAs that would be used to reward high-poverty LEAs and schools that are the highest-achieving or making the most progress in improving student achievement. Such rewards could include: (1) financial rewards for principals, teachers, and other staff; (2) college scholarships for students in high-performing schools; (3) school-level financial rewards; or (4) other innovative rewards and incentives developed by the States.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

#### Evaluation

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

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

#### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands, except per-child amounts)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
Allocations by LEA Poverty Rate			
0-15%	5,830	5,100	5,100
# of LEAs			
Dollars	\$2,219,613	\$1,894,391	\$1,928,103
of Total \$	15.68	13.31	13.54
# of Formula Eligible Children	1,946,294	1,820,891	1,820,891
0-15% \$ Per Formula Child	\$1,140	\$1,040	\$1,059
15-25%	4,517	4,653	4,653
# of LEAs			
Dollars	\$5,001,127	\$4,467,816	\$4,532,346
% of Total \$	35.34	31.39	31.83
# of Formula Eligible Children	3,824,887	3,786,340	3,786,340
\$ Per Formula Child	\$1,308	\$1,180	\$1,197
>25%	2,747	3,412	3,412
# of LEAs			
Dollars	\$6,932,085	\$7,870,507	\$7,778,961
% of Total \$	48.98	55.30	54.63
# of Formula Eligible Children	4,393,727	5,495,550	5,495,550
\$ Per Formula Child	\$1,578	\$1,432	\$1,416
LEA Allocation Subtotal	\$14,152,825	\$14,232,714	\$14,239,320
BIA/Outlying Areas	144,389	145,125	145,125
Part D, Subpart 2	141,721	134,634	128,012
Census Updates	<u>3,992</u>	<u>3,984</u>	<u>4,000</u>
Grants to LEAs Total	14,442,927	14,516,457	14,516,457
Schools receiving Title I funds	53,850	53,850	53,850
Schoolwide programs	35,068	35,068	35,068
Targeted assistance programs	18,782	18,782	18,782
Students served (in millions)			
In schoolwide programs	19.2	19.2	19.2
In targeted assistance programs	1.7	1.7	1.7
In non-public and N&D programs	<u>0.3</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>0.3</u>
Total	21.2	21.2	21.2

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents selected program performance information for the Title I Grants to LEAs program, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data, as well as an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years, and those requested for fiscal year 2013 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

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

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

**Measure:** The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading assessments.

Year	Target Percentage of Students Who Test At or Above Proficiency	Actual Percentage of Students Who Test At or Above Proficiency
2008	66.5	58.1
2009	72.1	61.1
2010	77.7	61.4
2011	83.2	
2012	88.8	
2013	94.4	

**Additional information:** Assessment data for 2010 show that the average proficiency rate in reading/language arts for economically disadvantaged students was virtually unchanged from the previous year. Unless the rate of improvement picks up in future years, less than two-thirds of economically disadvantaged students will be proficient in reading in 2014, well short of the ESEA’s current goal of 100-percent proficiency.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

**Measure:** The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State math assessments.

Year	Target Percentage of Students Who Test At or Above Proficiency	Actual Percentage of Students Who Test At or Above Proficiency
2008	64.2	57.8
2009	70.2	60.7
2010	76.2	61.6
2011	82.1	
2012	88.1	
2013	94.0	

**Additional information:** Assessment data for 2010 show that the average proficiency rate in mathematics for economically disadvantaged students rose less than 1 percentage point from the previous year. Unless the rate of improvement picks up in future years, only two-thirds of economically disadvantaged students will be proficient in mathematics in 2014, well short of the ESEA's current goal of 100-percent proficiency.

**Measure:** The difference between the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading assessments and the percentage of all students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading assessments.

Year	Target Gap in Proficiency Percentage Between Economically Disadvantaged Students and All Students	Actual Gap in Proficiency Percentage Between Economically Disadvantaged Students and All Students
2008	9.8	12.5
2009	8.1	11.5
2010	6.5	10.8
2011	4.9	
2012	3.3	
2013	1.6	

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

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

**Measure:** The difference between the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State math assessments and the percentage of all students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State math assessments.

Year	Target Gap in Proficiency Percentage Between Economically Disadvantaged Students and All Students	Actual Gap in Proficiency Percentage Between Economically Disadvantaged Students and All Students
<b>2008</b>	9.5	11.8
<b>2009</b>	7.9	10.8
<b>2010</b>	6.4	10.1
<b>2011</b>	4.8	
<b>2012</b>	3.2	
<b>2013</b>	1.6	

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

### Efficiency Measure

**Measure:** Average time to complete State monitoring reports, in days, following the completion of a site visit.

Year	Target Number of Days	Actual Number of Days
<b>2008</b>	40.0	41.3
<b>2009</b>	40.0	25.5
<b>2010</b>	40.0	30.9
<b>2011</b>	40.0	35.2
<b>2012</b>	40.0	
<b>2013</b>	40.0	

**Assessment of progress:** In 2011, the Department continued to outperform its target of completing State monitoring reports within 40 days of the conclusion of a site visit. The average time-to-completion for 2011 was 35.2 days. The measure is not fully comparable to previous years because the Department's monitoring effort in 2011 focused primarily on the School Improvement Grants program rather than Title I Grants to LEAs and the monitoring protocols for the two programs are different. The Department expects to review its monitoring efficiency targets for 2012 and future years once Congress completes ESEA reauthorization.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

#### Other Performance Information

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

The ESEA required a comprehensive, multi-year national assessment on the implementation and impact of the Title I Grants to LEAs. The most recent data from this assessment are included in two reports. The first, a 2009 report entitled *Title I Implementation: Update on Recent Evaluation Findings*, provides a summary of findings from Title I evaluation studies that have become available after the publication of the National Assessment of Title I final report in 2007. The second report, *State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, Volume IX-Accountability Under NCLB: Final Report*, was published in 2010 and provides updated information on State, district, and school implementation of NCLB provisions concerning accountability and school improvement. Both reports, as well as other related Title I evaluation reports, are available in full on the Department of Education's Web site at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oepd/ppss/reports.html#title>. Highlights of key findings follow, with updates reflecting more recent ED or State-reported data where noted:

#### Trends in Student Achievement

- In 30 States that had State assessment trend data available from 2004–05 to 2006–07, the percentage of students achieving at or above the proficient level rose for most student groups in a majority of the States. However, none of the 30 States would meet the goal of 100 percent proficiency by 2013–14 unless the percentage of students achieving at the proficient level increased at a faster rate.
- Looking across eight different student groups (low-income, Black, Hispanic, White, English Learner, migrant, students with disabilities, and the “all students” group) and four assessments (reading and mathematics in fourth grade and eighth grade), an average of 16 percent of the student groups within the 30 States would be predicted to reach 100 percent proficiency if recent growth rates were to continue.
- States that set higher performance standards tended to have a lower percentage of students scoring at the proficient level and, therefore, needed to make greater progress in student achievement to reach the 2013–14 goal. Put simply, States with higher standards are likely to face more challenges in reaching 100 percent proficiency.
- Trends on the main NAEP assessment from 2002 to 2007 showed gains for fourth-grade students in reading, mathematics, and science, overall and for minority students and students in high-poverty schools. However, NAEP trends for middle and high school students were mixed, with eighth-grade students making significant gains in mathematics but not in reading or science and 12th-grade scores either flat or, over the longer term, declining in reading and science. Trend data for 12th-grade mathematics were not available for this study.
- Data from both State assessments and NAEP provided some indications that achievement gaps between disadvantaged students and other students may be narrowing.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

#### Implementation of State Assessment and Accountability Systems

- As of January 2012, 27 States had fully approved assessment systems for reading/language arts, mathematics, and science. In addition, 10 States had approved assessments for reading/language arts and mathematics but had not yet received approval for their science assessments. (Science assessments were not required to be in place until the end of the 2007-2008 school year.) Fourteen States had submitted evidence to the Department for their alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards and 4 of these States had received approval. [Updated January 2012]
- By 2006–07, nearly all States reported that they had implemented English language proficiency (ELP) assessments aligned with State ELP standards; almost half the States developed their ELP assessments in collaboration with a multi-state consortium.
- In 2005–06, two-thirds of the States (36) met the requirement to annually assess 95 percent or more of their students, including major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, English Learners, and low-income students. The remaining 16 States did not meet the minimum test participation requirement for one or more student subgroups.
- Overall, three-quarters of the Nation’s schools made AYP in 2005–06, a nearly identical proportion as in 2003–04 and 2004–05. In fact, four-fifths of schools had the same AYP designation from one year to the next. Sixty-five percent of schools made AYP in both years, and 16 percent missed AYP in both years. Ten percent of schools’ designations worsened (i.e., moved from making AYP in 2004–05 to missing AYP in 2005–06) and 9 percent of schools’ designations improved. In the 2009-2010 school year, just 61 percent of all public schools made AYP, likely reflecting the greater difficulty of making AYP as each State’s annual targets rise toward the 100-percent proficiency goal in the 2013-2014 school year. [Updated January 2012]
- Based on data from 43 States, schools most commonly missed AYP for the achievement of the “all students” group or for multiple targets. Only one-fourth (24 percent) missed AYP solely due to the achievement of a single subgroup.
- The number of Title I schools that were identified for improvement rose to 10,781 in 2006–07, an 11 percent increase over the 9,694 identified Title I schools in 2005–06. Twenty percent of all Title I schools were identified in 2006–07. The number and percentage of schools identified for improvement varied considerably across States: 9 States had identified 5 percent or fewer of their Title I schools, while 12 States had identified more than one-third of their Title I schools. In the 2010-2011 school year, the number of schools identified for improvement was 16,010, or nearly 30 percent of all Title I schools. [Updated January 2012]
- Most schools that were identified for improvement in 2004–05 remained in improvement status 2 years later, in 2006–07. Nearly three-fourths of identified schools in 2004–05 continued to be identified schools in 2006–07, while 28 percent had exited school

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

improvement status. About half of the 2004–05 cohort of identified schools had moved into corrective action (25 percent) or restructuring status (22 percent) by 2006–07.

- Almost half of identified Title I schools were in the more advanced stages of identification status. Forty-six percent of all identified Title I schools in 2006–07 were in either corrective action or restructuring.
- Schools with high concentrations of poor and minority students were much more likely to be identified than other schools, as were schools located in urban areas. Over one-third of high-poverty schools (37 percent) and schools with high percentages of minority students (38 percent) were identified schools in 2006–07, compared with 4 to 5 percent of schools with low concentrations of these students. Schools in urban areas were more likely to be identified (25 percent) than were suburban and rural schools (12 percent and 9 percent, respectively). Middle schools were more likely to be identified (22 percent of middle schools) than were high schools (13 percent) or elementary schools (14 percent).
- The most common improvement strategies reported by identified schools involved using achievement data to inform instruction (88 percent) and providing additional instruction to low-achieving students (77 percent). Other common strategies included a major focus on aligning curricula and instruction with standards and assessments (81 percent), new instructional approaches or curricula in reading and mathematics (66 percent and 64 percent, respectively), and increasing the intensity, focus, and effectiveness of professional development (63 percent).

### Title I School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

- In the 2008-2009 school year, 5.8 million students were eligible to exercise a Title I public school choice option, down from 6.4 million in the 2007-2008 school year, but up slightly from 5.6 million in the 2006-2007 school year. Participation rates (the proportion of eligible students exercising a choice option) have risen steadily, but remain modest, growing from approximately 1 percent (31,907 students) in the 2003-2004 school year to 2.65 percent (154,615 students) in the 2008-2009 school year. School districts spent \$123 million on public school choice (primarily transportation) in the 2009-2010 school year. [Updated January 2012]
- The number of students eligible for supplemental educational services (SES) rose to 4.3 million in the 2008-2009 school year, up from 1.7 million in the 2003-2004 school year. The number of students receiving SES rose to 672,101 in 2008-2009, an increase of almost 92,000 students, or nearly 16 percent, over the 580,500 students who received SES in the 2007-2008 school year. SES participation rates have remained steady over the past 5 years, averaging about 15 percent of eligible students. School districts spent \$909 million on SES in the 2009-2010 school year. [Updated January 2012]
- Districts reported spending an average of \$836 per SES participant in 2005–06, 26 percent less than the maximum per-child amount they reported allocating for such services in that year (\$1,134).

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

- The timeliness of parental notification about the school choice option improved from 2004–05 to 2006–07, but still was often too late to enable parents to choose a new school before the start of the 2006–07 school year.
- Although nearly all districts required to offer school choice and SES reported (in a nationally representative survey) that they notified parents about these options, a survey of eligible parents in eight large urban school districts found that many parents were unaware of these choice options.
- Across a sample of seven districts, SES participants experienced gains in achievement in both reading and mathematics that were greater than the gains for nonparticipating students. On average, the effect sizes measured were 0.08 of a standard deviation in both reading and math for students who participated in SES during one school year and 0.15 to 0.17 for students who received SES during 2 or more years.
- For Title I school choice, the same study did not find a statistically significant relationship between participation and student achievement. However, sample sizes for the school choice analysis were substantially smaller, due to the relatively small number of participants.

### Teacher Quality and Professional Development

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

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### College- and career-ready students

---

development focused on instructional strategies for teaching mathematics during the 2005–06 school year and summer, but only 44 percent participated for 6 or more hours and only 11 percent participated for more than 24 hours.

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

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

---

### School turnaround grants

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget authority:

	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$533,552	\$533,552	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2013.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

## **ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY**

### **School turnaround grants**

---

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

The 2012 appropriations act authorized the Department to reserve up to 5 percent of SIG funds to carry out activities to build SEA and LEA capacity to implement effectively the SIG program.

### **Rapid Funding Growth**

Congress first funded the School Improvement Grants program in fiscal year 2007 with an initial appropriation of \$125 million, followed by a large increase to \$491 million in fiscal year 2008 and \$546.6 million in the regular 2009 appropriation. In addition, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act) included \$3 billion for the SIG program, for a 2009 total of just over \$3.5 billion. In response to this unprecedented increase in SIG funding, and as part of a comprehensive effort to maximize the impact of one-time Recovery Act funding, the Administration developed and issued new regulations governing the SIG program. These regulations, which were coordinated with regulations published for two other major education programs in the Recovery Act—the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund and the Race to the Top program—were aimed primarily at ensuring that the historic Recovery Act investment in the SIG program was used to implement rigorous school intervention models in the Nation’s persistently struggling schools, including many of the high school “dropout factories” with graduation rates below 60 percent.

### **New Regulations**

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

### **Defining Greatest Need**

A key purpose of the SIG regulations was to define more closely the statutory priorities on awarding SIG funds to LEAs that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to ensuring that the funds are used to provide resources that enable the lowest-

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### School turnaround grants

---

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

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

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

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

The rules governing implementation of program activities in the schools in these tiers that receive SIG funds are described below, under "Defining Strongest Commitment."

States that choose to add schools that are newly eligible for SIG under the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010 must ensure that these schools are no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school in the tiers to which they are added. The Department also has provided flexibility, available through a waiver, for States to include low-achieving Title I secondary schools in their lists of Tier II schools (which, absent this waiver, would include only

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### School turnaround grants

---

secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds). State applications for SIG funds must include their lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, and States must use these lists to determine which LEAs have the greatest need for SIG funds.

In May 2011, the Department released a study entitled *Baseline Analyses of SIG Applications and SIG-Eligible and SIG-Awarded Schools* (SIG Baseline Study), which collected data on the first year of SIG implementation under the new regulations. This study showed that States identified a total of 1,107 Tier I schools, 1,034 Tier II schools, and 13,136 Tier III schools that were eligible to receive SIG funds in the fiscal year 2009 State competitions conducted under the final regulatory requirements. Of the total of 15,277 eligible schools identified, 55 percent were elementary schools, 20 percent were middle schools, 19 percent were high schools, and 6 percent were “non-standard.”

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

### Defining Strongest Commitment

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

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

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### School turnaround grants

---

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

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

### SEA Priorities in Awarding SIG Funds

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

According to the SIG Baseline Study, in the fiscal year 2009 SIG competitions, which were conducted in spring and summer of calendar year 2010, States served a total of 414 Tier I schools, 312 Tier II schools, and 402 Tier III schools. Of the total of 1,228 schools served in fiscal year 2009, 32 percent were elementary schools, 22 percent were middle schools, and 40 percent were high schools. (Five percent were “non-standard.”) States made just over half of SIG awards to urban schools, about one-quarter to suburban schools, and about one-quarter to rural schools. High schools were particularly likely to be funded, receiving 40 percent of SIG awards while constituting just 19 percent of eligible schools. Rural schools also competed successfully, receiving almost a quarter of awards despite constituting only one-fifth of eligible schools. The following table compares SIG-eligible and SIG-awarded schools by grade range and school locale:

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### School turnaround grants

---

**Comparison of FY 2009 SIG-Eligible and SIG-Awarded Schools  
by School Level and Locale**

<b>Grade range</b>	<b>SIG-eligible schools</b>	<b>SIG-awarded schools</b>
% Elementary	55.3%	32.2%
% Middle	20.1%	22.1%
% High	19.1%	40.4%
% Non-standard	5.5%	5.2%
<b>Locale Type</b>		
% Central City	44.9%	52.5%
% Urban Fringe	35.2%	24.3%
% Rural	19.9%	23.2%

Other key findings of the SIG Baseline Study include the following:

- Nearly three-quarters (603 schools, or 74 percent) of SIG-awarded Tier I and Tier II schools are implementing the transformation model, while 20 percent (168 schools) are implementing the turnaround model. Just 33 schools, or 4 percent, are implementing the restart model and 16 schools, or 2 percent, are implementing school closure.
- Fiscal year 2009 school-level SIG award amounts varied by tier and by State. The average 3-year award among Tier I and Tier II schools was \$2.54 million, compared to \$520,000 among Tier III schools. Additionally, the average 3-year award for Tier I and Tier II schools in Illinois was \$4.63 million compared to \$620,000 in Vermont.
- The percentage increase in overall per-pupil funding associated with SIG varied across States. For example, Tier I and Tier II schools receiving SIG awards in Montana increased their per-pupil funding by 58 percent, while the increase was 3 percent in Vermont.

Preliminary data from 37 States and the District of Columbia show that for their fiscal year 2010 SIG competitions, which were conducted in the spring and summer of calendar year 2011, States made SIG awards to an additional 266 Tier I schools, 158 Tier II schools, and 104 Tier III schools. Of the total of 528 schools in this second SIG cohort, 36 percent (189 schools) were elementary schools, 20 percent (108 schools) were middle schools, 38 percent (201 schools) were high schools, and 6 percent (30 schools) were “non-standard.”

### **Maximizing the Number of SIG-Eligible Schools Served**

In fiscal year 2009, the Department offered a waiver (which all States applied for and were approved to implement) of the period of availability of fiscal year 2009 SIG funds beyond September 30, 2011, the statutory deadline for obligation. These waivers allowed SEAs to use fiscal year 2009 funds to make “frontloaded” awards to eligible LEAs that provided the full amount of an LEA’s 3-year SIG award and thus do not entail continuation costs in subsequent years. For fiscal year 2010, the Department encouraged SEAs to continue to “frontload” any awards made with fiscal year 2009 carryover funds, while providing only the first year of 3-year

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### School turnaround grants

---

SIG awards made with fiscal year 2010 SIG funds. This hybrid funding model reflects the goal of serving the maximum number of Tier I and Tier II schools with the smaller allocations available from the fiscal year 2010 SIG appropriation. For example, a State that had \$3 million in fiscal year 2010 funding available for SIG awards could have made a single \$3 million, 3-year award (\$1 million annually) to a Tier I or Tier II school (thus “frontloading” the grant), or it could have funded 3 separate Tier I and/or Tier II schools, providing \$1 million to each school in the first year with 2010 funds and paying continuation costs from SIG appropriations in subsequent fiscal years.

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

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

	(dollars in thousands)
2008 .....	\$491,265
2009 .....	545,633
Recovery Act .....	3,000,000
2010 .....	545,633
2011 .....	534,552
2012 .....	533,552

### FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is requesting \$533.6 million for the School Turnaround Grants (under current law School Improvement Grants) program in fiscal year 2013, the same as the 2012 level. The program would be reauthorized for fiscal year 2013 as part of the Administration’s proposed reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) and would play a critical role in the new Title I statewide accountability systems that would be created under that reauthorization plan.

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

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### School turnaround grants

---

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

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

The 2013 request would fund school intervention models in a new cohort of schools, as States that used fiscal year 2010 funds to fund only the first year of the 3-year grant will have completed the third year by fiscal year 2012. Assuming an average award of \$1 million per school, the \$533.6 million request would allow States to make first-year awards to an estimated 500 additional persistently low-performing schools in 2013.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
Number of State grant awards	52	52	52
Range of awards	\$134-\$63,020	\$134-\$62,895	\$138-\$59,737
Average award	\$10,184	\$10,164	\$10,162
National activities	0	— <sup>1</sup>	— <sup>1</sup>
BIE and outlying areas	\$3,663	\$3,656	\$3,765

---

<sup>1</sup>The 2012 appropriations authorized the Department to reserve up to 5 percent of SIG funds for activities to build SEA and LEA capacity to effectively implement the SIG program. The Department has not yet determined the amount of funds that may be reserved under this authority. Similarly, the Department has not yet determined the specific amount that would be reserved under the national activities authority in the Administration's reauthorization proposal.

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The final regulatory requirements for the School Improvement Grants (SIG) program include reporting metrics intended to help the Department, States, and LEAs evaluate the effectiveness of the required interventions and to inform technical assistance activities. States must report to the Department on the LEAs that received SIG awards, the size of the award, and the schools served by the LEA with SIG funds (including the level of support provided to each participating school). States also must report school-level information, such as the type of intervention, student achievement levels, graduation and dropout rates, and data on teacher performance and school climate. The Department these data through *EDFacts* data collections. The

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### School turnaround grants

---

Department also will develop indicators to measure its own performance in administering the SIG program.

As noted above, in May 2011 the Department published *Baseline Analyses of SIG Applications and SIG-Eligible and SIG-Awarded Schools*, which is available at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20114019/>. The Department also has made available a *SIG Database of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools (Cohort 1)*, as well as an interactive national map of SIG data, at <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/index.html>.

In addition, the Department has initiated three activities as part of a comprehensive effort to assess the implementation and impact of the School Improvement Grants program as well as to inform Department technical assistance to SIG grantees. First, the Department is undertaking a set of case studies to examine the process of implementing school turnaround efforts in 50 schools receiving SIG funds as part of the first cohort of schools funded under the SIG final requirements. These in-depth studies will provide periodic progress reports for a subset of schools that receive SIG funds and examine the approaches taken to school turnaround, including the extent to which States and districts pursue more aggressive efforts than those required.

Second, the Department is evaluating the impact of both the Race to the Top (RTT) and SIG programs on outcomes for low-performing schools. This Impact Evaluation of Race to the Top and School Improvement Grants will involve 1,200 schools in 120 districts across 30 States and will focus on (1) the impact of the receipt of RTT and SIG funds on outcomes in the lowest-achieving schools and (2) the effectiveness of the four school turnaround models and related improvement strategies on student outcomes and school performance. Data collection for this study will continue through the 2013-14 school year. The Department expects to begin releasing evaluation briefs on specific topics in late 2013, with the first full report scheduled for release in mid-2014.

Third, the Department will use a data analysis contract to collect and analyze leading indicators and other program performance information and will use that information primarily to guide program management and technical assistance efforts.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

---

### Evaluation

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$3,194	0	-\$3,194

---

<sup>1</sup>The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. No appropriations language or new reauthorization legislation is sought.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

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

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Evaluation

---

The 2012 funding level for Title I Evaluation would support continuation of the following activities:

- \$1.5 million for case studies of the implementation of school turnaround models. These case studies, involving approximately 60 schools in 6 States, will focus on the change process in schools implementing school turnaround models, leading indicators of successful implementation of the models, and a cross-site analysis to provide information useful to both policy-makers and practitioners.
- \$1.7 million for a study of the implementation of state and district accountability provisions and the equitable distribution of effective teachers and leaders. This study will collect data from all States and a random sample of districts and schools and will complement the ongoing study of State capacity and school turnaround models under Race to the Top and School Improvement Grants.

No funds are available in fiscal year 2012 to provide quick-turnaround support and other analyses related to the implementation and effectiveness of Title I or to the reauthorization of the ESEA.

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

	(dollars in thousands)
2008 .....	\$9,167
2009 .....	9,167
2010 .....	9,167
2011 .....	8,151
2012 .....	3,194

### FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for Title I Evaluation in fiscal year 2013. The Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal would consolidate this activity into a broader evaluation authority aimed at supporting comprehensive evaluation of the implementation, outcomes, impact, and cost-effectiveness of ESEA programs. Funding would be made available through a reservation of up to 0.5 percent of the funds appropriated each year for programs authorized by Title I of the ESEA and up to 1.5 percent of the funds appropriated each year for all other ESEA programs.

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

## EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

### Evaluation

---

authority would enable the Department to provide increased technical assistance on evaluation to States and LEAs in order to promote quality and comparability of evaluation results.

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

In addition to evaluation and impact studies, the Department would carry out analyses of data from evaluations and other sources intended to inform policy-making and promote continuous program improvement. A recent example of this kind of activity is the policy brief published in November 2011 entitled *The Potential Impact of Revising the Title I Comparability Requirement to Focus on School-Level Expenditures*, which was based on a study of school-level expenditures conducted in response to a requirement in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

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

### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
Implementation of Title I and Title II Program Initiatives	\$2,423	\$1,662	0
Study of Early Childhood Language Development	5,377	0	0
School Turnaround Study	0	1,532	0
Data Analysis and Support	341	0	0
Printing	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, Evaluation	8,151	3,194	0

NOTE: Reflects preliminary estimates for fiscal year 2012 pending final approval of the Evaluation spending plan.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

---

### Migrant student education

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$393,236	\$393,236	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2013.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Migrant student education

---

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

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

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

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

	(dollars in thousands)
2008 .....	\$379,771
2009 .....	394,771
2010 .....	394,771
2011 .....	393,981
2012 .....	393,236

### FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2013, the Administration requests \$393.2 million for the Title I Migrant Student Education program, the same amount as the 2012 appropriation. The fiscal year 2013 appropriation would support a reauthorized program that would continue to fund activities that identify highly mobile migratory children and youth, provide them comprehensive services that address their specific needs, and promote coordination of the Federal resources available to serve this population.

Migrant children, by definition, move across school district and State boundaries, and this movement, in combination with the fact that no single school district or State has ongoing responsibility for the education of these students due to their mobility, creates a need for Federal support. Furthermore, the characteristics of the migrant population create a need for educational services that go well beyond services traditionally supported with State and local education budgets.

Migrant students represent an especially disadvantaged, hard-to-serve group due to a multitude of risk factors present in the population. In addition to being highly mobile, they tend live in poverty, have limited English proficiency, and belong to families that are likely to experience food and job insecurity, and poor health and housing conditions. Almost one-third (29.3 percent) of the children and youth eligible to receive services in 2009-2010 under the program had moved within the previous 12 months. In addition, 35.3 percent of eligible children and youth were limited English proficient.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Migrant student education

---

Migrant children and youth may also help their families perform agricultural work, and a growing number of migrant “emancipated youth” travel without a parent or guardian to obtain migratory work in the fields and in processing plants. A significant proportion of migrant individuals eligible for services under the program (15.1 percent of the eligible population in 2009-2010) are school-aged youth who do not attend school.

Data for 2009-10 indicate that the program provided services to 241,118 migrant students during the regular school year and 138,757 during the summer or intersessions. Program funds supported 3,565 projects that operated during the school day, 938 projects that provided an extended school day during the regular school year, 762 summer or intersession projects, and 2,132 year-round projects. The program served 4,002 children aged birth through 2; 30,380 children aged 3 through 5; 227,556 children and youth in kindergarten through grade 12; and 26,797 out-of-school youth. Services provided that year included supplemental instruction in reading, math, and other academic areas, family literacy and preschool instruction, and high school credit accrual. Program funds were also used to provide such support services as counseling, health and nutrition services, advocacy and referrals for migrant students with disabilities, and (especially in the summer) transportation.

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

The Department would reserve approximately \$10 million from the fiscal year 2013 appropriation for migrant coordination and national activities, including \$3 million for consortium incentive grants and the remainder for activities related to inter- and intra-State coordination, primarily for maintenance and operation of the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX), including for technical assistance to States as they continue to implement their systems to collect and exchange data on migrant students.

The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2013 under reauthorized legislation. The Administration’s reauthorization proposal would revise the funding formula to address the problems identified in program reviews and audit findings. The current formula includes provisions that are cumbersome, difficult to interpret, and based on child counts from fiscal year 2001. The reauthorization proposal would simplify the formula and ensure that allocations respond to shifts in State counts of migrant students. The proposal would also improve targeting of services to migrant students by strengthening the program purpose language and sharpening the provisions that determine which students receive priority for program services. State and local recipients would continue to have wide flexibility in how they spend program funds so long as they track and report on the academic achievement of migratory students in the State.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Migrant student education

---

#### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
Number of eligible children	400,892	400,892	400,892
SEA program:			
Amount for State grants	\$383,981	\$383,236	\$383,236
Range of State awards	\$69-\$135,023	\$69-\$134,761	\$69-\$134,760
Coordination activities:			
Consortium incentive grants	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000
Migrant student information exchange and related coordination activities	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000

#### **PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

##### **Performance Measures**

This section presents selected program information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years, and in FY 2013 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Migrant student education

---

**Measure:** Number of States meeting performance target (of States reporting) for Elementary Reading.

Year	Target Number of States	Number of States
2008	22	27
2009	31	27
2010	33	24
2011	35	
2012	36	
2013	37	

**Measure:** The number of States meeting an annually set performance target in reading at the middle school level for migrant students.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	23	21
2009	25	25
2010	27	22
2011	29	
2012	31	
2013	33	

**Measure:** The number of States meeting an annually set performance target in mathematics at the elementary school level for migrant students.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	26	35
2009	31	36
2010	33	32
2011	35	
2012	37	
2013	39	

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Migrant student education

---

**Measure:** The number of States meeting an annually set performance target in mathematics for middle school migrant students.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	20	23
2009	23	27
2010	25	25
2011	27	
2012	29	
2013	31	

**Additional information:** These measures call for States to reach annually set performance targets; the Department set the current target, which calls for 50 percent of migrant students performing at the proficient or above level on State reading and mathematics assessments. As more States reach the initial target level, the Department will raise the target accordingly. Thirty-five out of 47 participating States reported dropout data in 2010, and 40 States reported graduation data. Forty-seven States participated in the program in 2010, and all 47 reported data for these measures. The source of the data is the Consolidated State Performance Reports that States submit to the Department. Data for 2011 will be available in summer 2012.

Based on State data, 49.7 percent of migrant 4<sup>th</sup>-grade students were proficient in reading and 58.7 percent in math in 2010, an increase from 48.6 percent in reading and 54.9 percent in math in 2009. For 8<sup>th</sup>-grade migrant students, 47.1 percent were proficient in reading in 2010 and 44.6 percent in math, an increase from 42.7 percent in reading and 41.4 percent in math in 2009.

**Measure:** The number of States meeting an annually set performance target for dropout rate for migrant students.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	19	38
2009	27	41
2010	29	
2011	31	
2012	33	
2013	35	

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Migrant student education

---

**Measure:** The number of States meeting an annually set performance target for high school graduation of migrant students.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	17	23
2009	18	26
2010	19	
2011	20	
2012	21	
2013	22	

**Additional information:** The measures call for States to reach annually set performance targets; the Department set the current target, which calls for 50 percent or fewer migrant students dropping out of school and 50 percent or more migrant students graduating from high school. Thirty-five out of 47 participating States reported dropout data in 2010, and 40 States reported graduation data. Note that variation in States' calculation of dropout rates limits the validity of comparisons across the States. This measure will have greater validity and reliability over time as State procedures for calculating and reporting dropout and graduation rates stabilize, and as they include all migrant students appropriately in the calculations and properly disaggregate and report results. The source of the data is the Consolidated State Performance Reports that States submit to the Department. Data for 2010 will be available in summer 2012.

### Efficiency Measures

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

**Measure:** The percentage of consolidated records for migrant students that have been entered into MSIX.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	50	26.5
2010	75	87.0
2011	100	
2012	100	
2013	100	

**Additional information:** The system began collecting data from a number of States in December 2007, but not every State had access to the system at that time. The Department continues to work with States to ensure that their data systems meet the appropriate technical

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### **Migrant student education**

---

standards needed to connect to MSIX. In addition, the Department has developed a 3-phase plan to ensure that States collect all the required student data elements and make them available to other States through MSIX. Under phase 1, the Department will set a deadline for when States will be required to collect and make available all data elements for basic student information; under phase 2, States will be required to add student assessment data; and under phase 3, States will be required to add credit accrual information for secondary students. The Department plans to issue regulations to establish deadlines for collecting and transmitting data to MSIX under each phase. The data reported in this table represent the percentage of consolidated records for migrant students entered into MSIX under phase 1. This measure will have greater validity and reliability over time as State procedures for collecting and providing the data elements improve.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

---

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

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$50,231	\$50,231	0

---

<sup>1</sup>The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2013.

---

### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

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

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

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

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Neglected and delinquent children and youth education

---

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

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

	(dollars in thousands)
2008 .....	\$48,927
2009 .....	50,427
2010 .....	50,427
2011 .....	50,326
2012 .....	50,231

### **FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST**

For 2013, the Administration requests \$50.3 million, the same as the 2012 level, for the Neglected and Delinquent (N and D) program. The activities supported with this funding would help an estimated 109,000 N and D students return to and complete school and obtain employment after they are released from State institutions.

The N and D program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2013 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal. The reauthorized program would support States in helping neglected and delinquent children and youth receive instruction aligned with the State's college- and career-ready standards and in helping them transition into locally operated programs and postsecondary and career and technical education programs.

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

The population served by the Subpart 1 program is extremely disadvantaged and isolated, and research has shown that the youth served are up to 3 years behind in grade level, on average, and generally lack job skills. Harris, Baltodano, Bal, Jolivette, and Malcahy (2009) found low levels of reading achievement among youth incarcerated in three long-term correctional facilities, and "significant differences by ethnicity and special education status." Balfanz, Spiridakis, Neild, and Legters (2003) noted that incarcerated youths in a large mid-Atlantic city tended to have failed at least half of their classes and had extremely low attendance rates in the year prior to incarceration. Keith and McCray (2002) reported on the special and underserved needs of incarcerated youth offenders with reading disabilities. International studies bear similar results: Snowling, Adams, Bowyer-Crane, and Tobin (2000) found that the reading skills of male youths in a correctional facility in northern England were, on average, approximately one standard

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Neglected and delinquent children and youth education

---

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

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

From the 2013 request, the Department would reserve approximately \$1.3 million to continue to provide technical assistance and other services through the National Evaluation and Technical Assistance Center for Children who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk, which the Department established with N and D national activities funds. Some of the center's activities include: (1) developing a national model for evaluating the effectiveness of N and D programs; (2) collecting and disseminating information on tools and effective practices that can be used to support N and D youth; and (3) providing technical assistance, using experts and practitioners, to State agencies.

### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
Number of participating institutions	720	720	720
Estimated number of students served	109,146	109,146	109,146
Average Federal contribution per child (whole dollars)	\$461	\$460	\$460
Range of awards to States	\$74-\$2,835	\$74-\$2,830	\$74-\$2,830
Average State award	\$944	\$942	\$942
National activities	\$1,258	\$1,256	\$1,256

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Neglected and delinquent children and youth education

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents selected program performance information, including GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2013 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

**Measure:** The percentage of neglected or delinquent students obtaining a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent while in the N and D program.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	12.2	11.8
2009	12.8	10.6
2010	13.4	11.2
2011	14.1	
2012	14.8	
2013	15.5	

**Additional information:** Student counts for this measure are based on the number of long-term N and D students (those enrolled in a participating program or facility for 90 or more consecutive calendar days). The Department may consider revising its performance targets to better align with recent performance. Data for 2011 will be available in fall 2012.

**Measure:** The percentage of neglected or delinquent students earning high school course credits.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	64.8	50.5
2009	55.2	47.9
2010	58.0	52.0
2011	60.9	
2012	63.9	
2013	67.1	

**Additional information:** This measure includes students between the ages of 13 and 21 in neglected, juvenile detention, and juvenile correctional institutions, and not students in adult corrections. One State, representing less than 1 percent of all N and D students, did not report

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Neglected and delinquent children and youth education

---

on this measure for 2009 and is excluded from the result for that year. The Department may consider revising its performance targets to better align with recent performance. Data for 2011 will be available in fall 2012.

**Measure:** The percentage of long-term neglected or delinquent students who improve reading skills as measured through State-approved assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	84.0	71.1
2009	88.2	68.3
2010	92.6	69.9
2011	97.2	
2012	100	
2013	100	

**Measure:** The percentage of long-term neglected or delinquent students who improve mathematics skills as measured through State-approved assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	76.4	72.2
2009	80.2	70.7
2010	84.2	71.3
2011	88.4	
2012	92.8	
2013	97.4	

**Additional information:** Student counts are based on the number of long-term students (those enrolled in a participating program or facility for 90 or more consecutive calendar days) who are in N and D institutions and complete pre- and post-testing in reading and mathematics. These are not the same as the State assessments required under ESEA Title I and do not necessarily reflect State proficiency levels. The 2008 results exclude two States that were unable to report on reading or math. The 2009 results exclude one State that did not report on academic achievement in reading or math, and a second State that did not report on academic achievement in math. The Department may consider revising its performance targets to better align with recent performance. Data for 2011 will be available in fall 2012.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Neglected and delinquent children and youth education

---

#### Efficiency Measure

**Measure:** The cost per high school diploma or equivalent.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	\$4,232	\$4,418
2009	3,978	5,013
2010	3,739	5,256
2011	3,515	
2012	3,304	
2013	3,106	

**Additional information:** This measure attempts to determine program cost efficiency by tracking the ratio of the number of participating students achieving a high school diploma or its equivalent to the cost of the program. The Department may consider revising its performance targets to better align with recent performance. Data for 2011 will be available in fall 2012.

#### Other Performance Information

A 1998 study, conducted by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, examined data from seven States to gauge the feasibility of collecting data that could be used to estimate the impact of correctional education services on incarcerated youth. The study determined that, with assistance, some States could provide reliable data on dropout rates, recidivism, diploma and degree completions, and employment. According to a Department study in 2001, 46 State agencies maintained data on the number of GEDs earned by Neglected and Delinquent students but only 20 State agencies maintained data on the number of school credits earned. In addition, the Research Triangle Institute's Study of Local Agency Activities under the Title I, Part D, Program (2000) found that although all districts participating in the study made attempts to collect student achievement data, these data were typically incomplete and, because of high student mobility, measures of student gains on test scores are especially difficult for districts to obtain. States' development of longitudinal student data systems and the Department's collection of future years' N and D data through the *ED Facts* electronic data system should improve the quality and consistency of student data.

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

---

### Homeless children and youth education

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: Indefinite

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$65,173	\$65,173	0

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

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

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Homeless children and youth education

---

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

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

	(dollars in thousands)
2008 .....	\$64,067
2009 .....	65,427
Recovery Act .....	70,000
2010 .....	65,427
2011 .....	65,296
2012 .....	65,173

### FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2013, the Administration requests \$65.2 million for the Homeless Children and Youth Education program (which under current law is named the Education for Homeless Children and Youths program and is in the School Improvement Programs account), the same as the 2012 appropriation. The Administration is proposing to strengthen this program through the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The fiscal year 2013 appropriation would fund the first year of operations of a reauthorized program, which would more directly target resources to homeless children and remove barriers to serving them effectively. Under the reauthorization proposal, program funds would be allocated to States based on the most recent State-reported data on the number of homeless children and youth rather than on State shares of Title I, Part A funds, a change that would help ensure that program funds flow to States on the basis of program need. An additional change would eliminate the exemption to the prohibition against operating separate schools for homeless youth; this change is needed because homeless students are unlikely to receive a high-quality education in a segregated environment and because of the stigma attached to groups of students placed in segregated schools. The reauthorization proposal would also better align the uses of funds under the program with the reforms promoted in general through the ESEA reauthorization.

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

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Homeless children and youth education

---

#### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
Amount for State grants	\$63,661	\$63,604	\$63,563
Average State award	1,224	1,223	1,222
Amount to Outlying Areas	65	65	65
Amount to BIE	653	652	652
Evaluation and dissemination	917	852	893

#### **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 2013 and future years and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

**Measure:** The percentage of homeless children and youth, grades three through eight, included in statewide assessments in reading and mathematics, as reported by LEA subgrantees.

Year	Target – Reading	Actual – Reading	Target – Math	Actual – Math
2008	63	74	63	74
2009	66	69	66	69
2010	69	70	69	70
2011	72		72	
2012	75		76	
2013	79		79	

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### Homeless children and youth education

---

**Measure:** The percentage of assessed homeless students, grades three through eight, who meet or exceed proficiency on State assessments in reading and mathematics.

Year	Target – Reading	Actual – Reading	Target – Math	Actual – Math
2008	52	45	52	45
2009	55	50	55	50
2010	57	53	57	52
2011	60		60	
2012	63		63	
2013	66		66	

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

**Additional Information:** Data for these measures are reported only for LEAs receiving subgrants under the program. Beginning in 2009, the Department has directed States to report data based on whether homeless students were enrolled in LEAs with subgrants rather than whether the students were served by (but not necessarily enrolled in) such LEAs. Because student enrollment data are available for verification in State data systems, the Department believes that these data are the more reliable.

The Department has worked to improve performance and reporting for these measures by requiring States to report on the measures through the Consolidated State Performance Report and the Education Data Exchange Network and by providing, together with the National Center for Homeless Education (the Department’s technical assistance contractor), a variety of guidance and technical assistance, including an annually updated Federal data collection guide for the program.

Data for these measures for 2011 will be available in the summer of 2012.

### Efficiency Measure

The Department has established the following efficiency measure for the program.

**Measure:** The average number of days it takes the Department to send a monitoring report to States after monitoring visits.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	40	41.7
2009	40	25.5
2010	40	30.9
2011	40	35.2
2012	40	
2013	40	

**Additional Information:** This measure provides information on monitoring visits to States conducted by the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. These visits cover the following Department formula grant programs: College- and Career-Ready Students, Neglected and Delinquent Children and Youth Education, Homeless Children and Youth Education, and

## ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

### **Homeless children and youth education**

---

Language Acquisition State Grants. In 2011, the Department's monitoring effort focused on the School Turnaround Grants program and used different monitoring protocols.

### **Other Information**

The Department initiated a national study of implementation of the Homeless Children and Youth Education program in the fall of 2010. Results from the implementation study are expected in the summer of 2013.