

Archived Information

Department of Education

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Fiscal Year 2008 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language.....	A-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	A-2
Amounts Available for Obligation.....	A-3
Obligations by Object Classification.....	A-4
Summary of Changes.....	A-5
Authorizing Legislation.....	A-7
Appropriations History.....	A-9
Significant Items in FY 2007 Appropriations Reports.....	A-10
Summary of request.....	A-11
Activities:	
Grants to local educational agencies.....	A-15
School improvement grants.....	A-38
Reading first:	
Reading first State grants.....	A-45
Early reading first.....	A-55
Striving readers.....	A-61
Math now for elementary school students.....	A-65
Math now for middle school students.....	A-68
Even start.....	A-71
Literacy through school libraries.....	A-78
Choice Opportunities:	
Promise scholarships.....	A-83
Opportunity scholarships.....	A-86
State agency programs:	
Migrant.....	A-89
Neglected and delinquent.....	A-96
Comprehensive school reform.....	A-101
Evaluation.....	A-106
Migrant education – High school equivalency and College assistance migrant programs.....	A-110
State tables.....	A-116

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

For carrying out title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 ("ESEA") and section 418A of the Higher Education Act of 1965, \$16,139,090,000, of which \$8,571,383,000 shall become available on July 1, 2008, and shall remain available through September 30, 2009, and of which \$7,383,301,000 shall become available on October 1, 2008, and shall remain available through September 30, 2009 for academic year 2008-2009:¹ Provided, That \$6,808,408,000 shall be for basic grants under section 1124:² Provided further, That up to \$4,000,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary of Education on October 1, 2007, to obtain annually updated educational-agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census:³ Provided further, That \$1,365,031,000 shall be for concentration grants under section 1124A:⁴ Provided further, That \$3,466,618,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125:⁵ Provided further, That \$2,269,843,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A:⁶ Provided further, That \$500,000,000 shall be for school improvement grants under section 1003(g):⁷ Provided further, That \$9,327,000 shall be to carry out part E of title I.⁸

NOTES

A regular 2007 appropriation for this account had not been enacted at the time the budget was prepared; therefore, this account is operating under a continuing resolution (P.L. 109-289, as amended). The amounts included for 2007 in this budget reflect the levels provided by the continuing resolution.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>¹ <u>... of which \$8,571,383,000 shall become available on July 1, 2008, and shall remain available through September 30, 2009, and of which \$7,383,301,000 shall become available on October 1, 2008, and shall remain available through September 30, 2009, for academic year 2008-2009:</u></p>	<p>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, Reading First State Grants, and 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.</p>
<p>² <u>Provided, That \$6,808,408,000 shall be for basic grants under section 1124:</u></p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Basic Grants.</p>
<p>³ <u>Provided further, That up to \$4,000,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary of Education on October 1, 2007, to obtain annually updated educational-agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census:</u></p>	<p>This language makes available on a current-funded basis, \$4,000,000 from Basic Grant funds to support continued work by the Census Bureau to update LEA-level poverty data.</p>
<p>⁴ <u>Provided further, That \$1,365,031,000 shall be for concentration grants under section 1124A:</u></p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Concentration Grants.</p>
<p>⁵ <u>Provided further, That \$3,466,618,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125:</u></p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Targeted Grants.</p>
<p>⁶ <u>Provided further, That \$2,269,843,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A:</u></p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Education Finance Incentive Grants.</p>
<p>⁷ <u>Provided further, That \$500,000,000 shall be for school improvement grants under section 1003(g):</u></p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I School Improvement Grants.</p>
<p>⁸ <u>Provided further, That \$9,327,000 shall be to carry out part E of title I.</u></p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Evaluation.</p>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

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

	2006	2007	2008
Discretionary authority:			
Annual appropriation.....	\$14,627,435	0	\$16,689,090
Across-the-board reduction	-146,274	0	0
CR annual rate.....	<u>0</u>	<u>\$14,481,188</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, appropriation.....	14,481,161	14,481,188	16,689,090
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	-7,383,301	-7,383,301	-7,383,301
Advance from prior year	<u>7,383,301</u>	<u>7,383,301</u>	<u>7,383,301</u> ¹
Subtotal, budget authority.....	14,481,161	14,481,188	16,689,090
Unobligated balance, start of year	129,510	129,479	0
Recovery of prior-year obligations	1,306	0	0
Unobligated balance, expiring.....	-808	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year	<u>-129,479</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations	14,481,690	14,610,667	16,689,090

¹ The FY 2008 President's budget assumes that statutory language will be included in a full year 2007 Continuing Resolution to make advance appropriations available in 2008 at the same level as provided in the 2006 Department of Education Appropriations Act for use in 2007.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Obligations by Object Classification
(\$000s)

	2006	2007	2008
Printing and reproduction	\$2,263	\$2,363	\$2,363
Other contractual services and supplies:			
Advisory and assistance services	4,914	6,502	6,801
Peer review	141	142	752
Other services	58,179	45,644	43,485
Purchases of good and services from other government accounts	<u>3,437</u>	<u>3,500</u>	<u>5,000</u>
Subtotal, other contractual services	72,591	56,794	56,038
Grants, subsidies, and contributions	14,406,827	14,551,506	16,630,687
Interest and dividends	<u>9</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>
Total, direct obligations	14,481,690	14,610,667	16,689,090

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Changes (\$000s)

2007	\$14,481,188
2008	<u>16,689,090</u>
Net change.....	+2,207,902

	<u>2007 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
Increases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
Increase funding for Grants to LEAs for Targeted grants primarily to provide additional funding for high school programs.	\$12,713,233	+\$1,196,667
Initial funding for School Improvement Grants to provide assistance for local school improvement activities required by section 1116(b) of the ESEA for Title I schools that do not make adequate yearly progress for at least 2 consecutive years.	0	+500,000
Increase funding for Early Reading First to strengthen partnerships between preschool providers and institutions of higher education that provide professional development to early childhood educators.	\$103,118	+14,548
Increase funding for Striving Readers to develop, implement, and evaluate reading interventions for middle- and high-school students reading significantly below grade level.	\$31,596	+68,404
Initial funding for Math Now for Elementary School Students to improve instruction in mathematics for students in kindergarten through 6 th grade through such activities as professional development, diagnostic assessments, and curriculum implementation.	0	+125,000
Initial funding for Math Now for Middle School Students to improve mathematics instruction for middle-school students whose achievement is significantly below grade level.	0	+125,000

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Changes (\$000s)

	<u>2007 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
Increases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
Initial funding for Promise Scholarships for formula grants to LEAs to assist low-income students enrolled in persistently low-performing schools to attend a private or out-of-district public school or to receive intensive, sustained tutoring assistance.	0	+\$250,000
Initial funding for Opportunity Scholarships for competitive grants to assist low-income students enrolled in schools undergoing improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to attend a private or out-of-district public school or to receive intensive, sustained tutoring assistance.	0	<u>+50,000</u>
Subtotal, increases		+2,329,619
Decreases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
Eliminate funding for Even Start to target funds to other high-priority programs, including programs that are better focused on achieving the President's literacy goals.	\$111,584	-\$111,584
Eliminate funding for Comprehensive School Reform to target funds to other high-priority programs.	10,133	<u>-10,133</u>
Subtotal, decreases		<u>-121,717</u>
Net change		+2,207,902

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

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

Activity	2007 Authorized	2007 Estimate	2008 Authorized	2008 Request
Grants to LEAs (ESEA-1-A):				
LEA grants formulas:	\$25,000,000		\$25,000,000 ¹	
Basic Grants (Section 1124)	(2)	\$6,808,516	(2)	\$6,808,408
Concentration Grants (Section 1124A)	(2)	1,365,031	(2)	1,365,031
Targeted Grants (Section 1125)	(2)	2,269,843	(2)	3,466,618
Education Finance Incentive Grants (ESEA I-A-1125A)	Indefinite	2,269,843	Indefinite ¹	2,269,843
School improvement grants (ESEA I-1003(g))	Indefinite	0	Indefinite ¹	500,000
Reading first State grants (ESEA I-B-1)	Indefinite ³	1,018,692	Indefinite ^{3,4}	1,018,692
Early reading first (ESEA I-B-2)	Indefinite	103,118	Indefinite ¹	117,666
Striving readers (ESEA I-E-1502)	Indefinite	31,596	Indefinite ¹	100,000
Math now for elementary school students (Proposed legislation)	--	--	To be determined	125,000
Math now for middle school students (Proposed legislation)	--	--	To be determined	125,000
Even Start (ESEA I-B-3)	Indefinite	111,584	Indefinite ⁵	0
Literacy through school libraries (ESEA I-B-4)	Indefinite	19,486	Indefinite ⁴	19,486
Promise scholarships (Proposed legislation)	--	--	To be determined	250,000
Opportunity scholarships (Proposed legislation)	--	--	To be determined	50,000
State agency programs:				
Migrant (ESEA I-C)	Indefinite	380,295	Indefinite ⁴	380,295
Neglected and delinquent (ESEA I-D)	Indefinite	49,797	Indefinite ¹	49,797
Comprehensive school reform (ESEA I-F)	Indefinite	10,133	Indefinite ⁵	0
Evaluation (ESEA I-E-1501 and 1503)	Indefinite	9,327	Indefinite ⁴	9,327

A-7

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Activity	2007 Authorized	2007 Estimate	2008 Authorized	2008 Request
Migrant education (<i>HEA IV-A-418A</i>):				
High school equivalency program	0 ⁶	\$18,550	0 ⁶	\$18,550
College assistance migrant program	<u>0⁶</u>	<u>15,337</u>	<u>0⁶</u>	<u>15,377</u>
Total definite authorization	\$25,000,000		\$25,000,000	
Total appropriation		14,481,188		16,689,090
Portion of request subject to reauthorization				16,139,090
Portion of request not authorized				550,000

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; however, additional authorizing legislation is sought.

² 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.

³ Beginning in fiscal year 2004, if the amount appropriated for the Reading First State Grants program exceeds the fiscal year 2003 appropriation, the Secretary is required to reserve \$90,000 thousand or 10 percent of the excess amount, whichever is less, for Targeted Assistance Grants to States.

⁴ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought.

⁵ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008. The Administration is not seeking reauthorizing legislation.

⁶ The Higher Education Act expires June 30, 2007. This program is expected to be authorized in FY 2007 through appropriations language. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2008.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriations History
(\$000s)

	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
1999	\$8,495,892	\$8,056,132	\$8,334,781	\$8,370,520
(1999 Advance for 2000)	(1,448,386)	(1,448,386)	(2,500,000)	(6,148,386)
(1999 Supplemental Advance for 2000)	0	0	0	(56,377)
2000	8,743,920	8,417,897	8,750,986	8,700,986
(2000 Advance for 2001)	(6,148,386)	(6,204,763)	(6,204,763)	(6,204,763)
2001	9,149,500	8,816,986	8,986,800	9,532,621
(2001 Advance for 2002)	(6,204,763)	(6,204,763)	(6,223,342)	(6,758,300)
2002	11,032,621	12,571,400	11,926,400	12,346,900
(2002 Advance for 2003)	0	(6,758,300)	(6,953,300)	(7,383,301)
2003	13,388,330	12,936,900	18,178,400	13,774,039
(2003 Advance for 2004)	(7,383,301)	(6,883,301)	(8,627,301)	(9,027,301)
2003 Amended	0	0	0	2,244,000
(2003 Amended Advance for 2004)	0	0	0	(-2,444,000)
2003 Supplemental	0	0	0	4,353
2004	14,184,000	14,507,000	14,107,356	14,446,343
(2004 Advance for 2005)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)
2005	15,205,168	15,515,735	15,500,684	14,843,974
(2005 Advance for 2006)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)
2006	16,431,473	14,728,735	14,532,785	14,481,161
(2006 Advance for 2007)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)
2007	16,469,541			14,481,188
(2007 Advance for 2008)	(7,383,301)			(7,383,301) ^{1,2}
2008	16,689,090			
(2008 Advance for 2009)	(7,383,301)			

¹ A regular 2007 appropriation for this account had not been enacted at the time the budget was prepared; therefore, this account is operating under a continuing resolution (P.L. 109-289, Division B, as amended). The amounts included for 2007 in this budget reflect the levels provided by the continuing resolution.

² The FY 2008 President's budget assumes that statutory language will be included in a full year 2007 Continuing Resolution to make advance appropriations available in 2008 at the same level as provided in the 2006 Department of Education Appropriations Act for use in 2007.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Significant Items in FY 2007 Appropriations Reports

Grants to Local educational agencies

Senate: The Committee directs the Department to provide, not later than 60 days after enactment of this act, a report, based on its monitoring and other relevant sources of information, of specific scientifically based research strategies identified and implemented by school districts using the 4 percent setaside for school improvement and other Federal funds. The Committee expects this report to contain, at a minimum, a full and complete accounting of the average per student grant amount, and the duration and number of grants made to local education agencies; the criteria used to distribute grant funds; the types of activities supported with such funds and the evidence of effectiveness justifying their use; and the number of schools receiving assistance that have been removed from State watch lists or are now making adequate yearly progress.

Response: The Department shares the Committee's concern about the effective use of Title I school improvement funds and is developing plans to collect the requested data. The Department will provide a status report within 60 days of enactment of an appropriation.

School Improvement Grants

Senate: The Committee requests that the 2008 congressional justification include specific information about the actions taken to support the Committee's intention in providing resources for this program and other school improvement activities and steps the Department will take to collect evidence on the outcomes achieved with school improvement funds.

Response: As the program gets underway, once it receives an appropriation, the Department will provide the Committee with information on its plans for implementation and data collection.

Striving Readers

Senate: The Committee intends that funds provided in this bill continue to be utilized in accordance with the priorities established in the statement of the managers accompanying the Fiscal Year 2005 Appropriations Act that relate to a rigorous evaluation requirement and parity in funding for middle schools and high schools.

Response: As in the past, the Department will require Striving Readers grantees to conduct rigorous evaluations of their projects and intends to make, to the extent possible, an equal number of awards to projects that will serve middle schools and those that will serve high schools.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2008 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST

(in thousands of dollars)		Category Code	2006 Appropriation	2007 Current Estimate	2008 President's Request	2008 President's Request Compared to 2007 Current Level	
Account, Program, and Activity	Amount					Percent	
Education for the Disadvantaged							
1. Grants to local educational agencies (ESEA I-A):							
(a) LEA grants formulas:							
(1) Basic grants (section 1124)							
Annual appropriation	D	5,329,824	5,329,932	5,329,824	(108)	0.0%	
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	<u>1,478,584</u>	<u>1,478,584</u> ¹	<u>1,478,584</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	
Subtotal		6,808,408	6,808,516	6,808,408	(108)	0.0%	
(2) Concentration grants (section 1124A)							
Annual appropriation	D	0	0	0	0	---	
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	<u>1,365,031</u>	<u>1,365,031</u> ¹	<u>1,365,031</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	
Subtotal		1,365,031	1,365,031	1,365,031	0	0.0%	
(3) Targeted grants (section 1125)							
Annual appropriation	D	0	0	1,196,775	1,196,775	---	
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	<u>2,269,843</u>	<u>2,269,843</u> ¹	<u>2,269,843</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	
Subtotal		2,269,843	2,269,843	3,466,618	1,196,775	52.7%	
(4) Education finance incentive grants formula (section 1125A)							
Annual appropriation	D	0	0	0	0	---	
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	<u>2,269,843</u>	<u>2,269,843</u> ¹	<u>2,269,843</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	
Subtotal		<u>2,269,843</u>	<u>2,269,843</u>	<u>2,269,843</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	
Subtotal, LEA grants formulas		12,713,125	12,713,233	13,909,900	1,196,667	9.4%	
Subtotal, Grants to LEAs		12,713,125	12,713,233	13,909,900	1,196,667	9.4%	
Annual appropriation	D	5,329,824	5,329,932	6,526,599	1,196,667	22.5%	
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	<u>7,383,301</u>	<u>7,383,301</u> ¹	<u>7,383,301</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	
2. School improvement grants (ESEA section 1003(g))							
	D	0	0	500,000	500,000	---	
3. Reading first:							
(a) Reading first State grants (ESEA I-B-1)							
	D	1,029,234	1,018,692	1,018,692	0	0.0%	
(b) Early reading first (ESEA I-B-2)							
	D	<u>103,118</u>	<u>103,118</u>	<u>117,666</u>	<u>14,548</u>	<u>14.1%</u>	
Subtotal, Reading first		1,132,352	1,121,810	1,136,358	14,548	1.3%	
4. Striving readers (ESEA I-E section 1502)							
	D	29,700	31,596	100,000	68,404	216.5%	
5. Math now for elementary school students (proposed legislation)							
	D	0	0	125,000	125,000	---	
6. Math now for middle school students (proposed legislation)							
	D	0	0	125,000	125,000	---	
7. Even start (ESEA I-B-3)							
	D	99,000	111,584	0	(111,584)	-100.0%	
8. Literacy through school libraries (ESEA I-B-4)							
	D	19,486	19,486	19,486	0	0.0%	

¹ The FY 2008 President's budget assumes that statutory language will be included in a full year 2007 Continuing Resolution to make advance appropriations available in 2008 at the same level as provided in the 2006 Department of Education Appropriations Act for use in 2007.

(in thousands of dollars)						
Account, Program, and Activity	Category Code	2006 Appropriation	2007 Current Estimate	2008 President's Request	2008 President's Request Compared to 2007 Current Level	
					Amount	Percent
Education for the Disadvantaged (continued)						
9. Choice opportunities						
(a) Promise scholarships (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	250,000	250,000	---
(b) Opportunity scholarships (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	50,000	50,000	---
Subtotal	D	0	0	300,000	300,000	---
10. State agency programs:						
(a) Migrant (ESEA I-C)	D	386,524	380,295	380,295	0	0.0%
(b) Neglected and delinquent (ESEA I-D)	D	49,797	49,797	49,797	0	0.0%
Subtotal		436,321	430,092	430,092	0	0.0%
11. Comprehensive school reform (ESEA I-F)	D	7,920	10,133	0	(10,133)	-100.0%
12. Evaluation (ESEA sections 1501 and 1503)	D	9,330	9,327	9,327	0	0.0%
13. Migrant education (HEA IV-A-5):						
(a) High school equivalency program	D	18,550	18,550	18,550	0	0.0%
(b) College assistance migrant program	D	15,377	15,377	15,377	0	0.0%
Subtotal		33,927	33,927	33,927	0	0.0%
Total, Appropriation	D	14,481,161	14,481,188 ¹	16,689,090	2,207,902	15.2%
Total, Budget authority	D	14,481,161	14,481,188	16,689,090	2,207,902	15.2%
Current		7,097,860 ¹	7,097,887 ¹	9,305,789 ¹	2,207,902	31.1%
Prior year's advance		7,383,301	7,383,301	7,383,301 ²	0	0.0%
Outlays	D	14,695,815	14,837,982	14,534,129	(303,853)	-2.0%

¹ Excludes an advance appropriation of \$7,383,301 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of the following fiscal year.

² The FY 2008 President's budget assumes that statutory language will be included in a full year 2007 Continuing Resolution to make advance appropriations available in 2008 at the same level as provided in the 2006 Department of Education Appropriations Act for use in 2007.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Request

The programs in the Education for the Disadvantaged account are the foundation of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), President Bush's landmark education initiative designed to close achievement gaps and ensure that all children have the opportunity to obtain a high-quality education. The Department is requesting a total of \$16.7 billion in fiscal year 2008 for the programs in this account, an increase of \$2.2 billion, or 15.2 percent, over the 2007 level.

With the exception of HEP and CAMP, most of the programs in this account are authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and are, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that these programs will be implemented in fiscal year 2008 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal.

The \$13.9 billion request for the **Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)** program would support a comprehensive set of reauthorization proposals, including the strengthening of NCLB accountability and more rigorous course-taking in the Nation's high schools; ensuring meaningful choices for parents and students during the school improvement process, including private school transfer options for students in restructuring schools; and encouraging fundamental change and reform in schools identified for restructuring. The \$1.2 billion increase would mainly support the expansion of Title I programs in high schools and would complement a reauthorization proposal to ensure that LEAs distribute a share of Title I funds to their high schools that more closely matches the share of students from low-income families enrolled by those schools.

In addition, the 2008 request would provide \$500 million in new funding for a reauthorized section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants program that would help States build capacity in the area of school improvement and provide expanded support to LEAs with schools identified for restructuring.

The request also includes \$250 million for the proposed **Promise Scholarships** program and \$50 million for the proposed **Opportunity Scholarships** program. These two complementary programs would enable low-income students enrolled in persistently low-performing schools to attend a private or out-of-district public school, or to receive intensive, sustained tutoring assistance. The Promise Scholarships program would be administered through formula grants to LEAs that have students in restructuring schools, while Opportunity Scholarships would be open to a broader range of entities (including private, non-profit organizations, mayors' offices, and States) and make choice options available to a wider category of students, not just those in restructuring schools, but also those in schools undergoing improvement and corrective action. Taken together, these programs would markedly expand the options available to eligible students and allow a broader range of choice initiatives to be tested and evaluated.

The Administration requests funding for two key components of the President's American Competitiveness Initiative: \$125 million for a new **Math Now for Elementary School Students** program that would support research and dissemination of promising practices to help K-6 teachers prepare students for the more rigorous math courses they will encounter in middle and high school; and \$125 million for a new **Math Now for Middle School Students** program designed to identify middle school students who are not proficient in math and provide targeted services to improve their achievement. The request also would seek \$100 million for the

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Request

Striving Readers program to expand the number of school districts offering high-quality, research-based reading instruction for middle- and high-school students who are reading below grade level.

The request also provides an increase in funding for **Early Reading First** by consolidating it with Early Childhood Professional Development. This program helps young children, particularly those from low-income families, build a strong foundation for learning to read. The request would support a reauthorization proposal that would strengthen the partnerships between preschool providers and institutions of higher education that provide professional development to early childhood educators.

The request would level-fund most of the other programs in this account, including \$1.0 billion for **Reading First State Grants**, \$19.5 million for **Literacy Through School Libraries**, \$380.3 million for **Migrant State Grants**, \$49.8 million for the **Neglected and Delinquent** program, \$18.6 million for the **High School Equivalency Program** (HEP), and \$15.4 million for the **College Assistance Migrant Program** (CAMP). The request also would maintain support for **Title I Evaluation** at \$9.3 million.

The Administration is proposing to eliminate funding for the **Even Start** program, which has been shown through repeated evaluations to have little impact on the achievement of program participants, and for **Comprehensive School Reform**, which supports activities that may be funded under the much larger Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): \$25,000,000 ¹

Budget authority (\$000s):

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
LEA Grants Formulas:			
Basic grants	\$6,808,516	\$6,808,408	-\$108
Concentration grants	1,365,031	1,365,031	0
Targeted grants	2,269,843	3,466,618	+1,196,775
Education finance incentive grants	<u>2,269,843</u>	<u>2,269,843</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, Grants to LEAs	12,713,233	13,909,900	+1,196,667
Annual appropriation	5,329,932	6,526,599	+1,196,667
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	7,383,301 ²	7,383,301	0

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; however, additional authorizing legislation is sought.

² The FY 2008 President's budget assumes that statutory language will be included in a full year 2007 Continuing Resolution to make advance appropriations available in 2008 at the same level as provided in the 2006 Department of Education Appropriations Act for use in 2007.

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 to meet challenging State academic standards. The program serves an estimated 18 million students in nearly all 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 more than \$200 billion has been invested in the program since that time. Annual funding has grown even more rapidly in recent years, more than tripling since 1987.

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB Act) reauthorized both Title I and the broader ESEA based on the principles of greater accountability for student achievement, more choices for students and parents, increased flexibility for State and school districts, and the use of instruction drawn from scientifically based research on what works in the classroom.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Title I Grants to LEAs give school districts and schools considerable flexibility in using Federal education dollars to support instructional strategies and methods that best meet local needs. Title I schools help students reach challenging State standards through one of two models: “targeted assistance” that supplements the regular education program for individual children deemed most in need of special assistance, or a “schoolwide” approach that allows schools to use Title I funds—in combination with other Federal, State, and local funds—to improve the overall instructional program for all children in a school. Schools in which poor children account for at least 40 percent of enrollment are eligible to operate schoolwide programs, and an estimated 30,000 schools, or about 55 percent of all Title I schools, currently operate such programs.

The ESEA, as reauthorized by the NCLB Act, also 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 are required to give primary consideration to instructional arrangements—such as after-school, weekend, and summer programs—through which participating children receive Title I services in addition to, and not instead of, all the regular classroom instruction that other children receive. Schools also must provide ongoing professional development for staff working with disadvantaged students and carry out activities designed to increase parental involvement.

The NCLB Act strengthened the accountability requirements for Title I Grants to LEAs, particularly in the areas of standards and assessments, measuring adequate yearly progress, school improvement, and teacher quality.

Standards and Assessments

Each State must 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 and mathematics, and academic achievement standards that describe three levels of proficiency (basic, proficient, and advanced) for meeting the State content standards. In addition, States were required to develop science standards by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

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

Beginning with the 2005-2006 school year, States must administer these assessments annually to all students in grades 3-8 and once in high school in reading and math. States also must annually assess English proficiency for all limited English proficient (LEP) students and must add science assessments by 2007-2008 (testing once in each of three grade spans specified in the law).

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

To discourage States from setting low standards, the law requires biennial State participation in the reading and mathematics assessments for 4th- and 8th-graders conducted by the National Assessment of Educational Progress.

Adequate Yearly Progress

State assessments are used to hold LEAs and schools accountable for making adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward State standards for proficiency in reading and math, with the goal of ensuring that all students are proficient in both subjects by the 2013-2014 school year. The NCLB Act tightened the definition of AYP to require all students, as well as specific groups—including economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and LEP students—to meet the same annual statewide measurable objectives for improved achievement.

Each student group must meet the statewide achievement goal for a school to make AYP, except that a school can be considered to have made AYP if the percentage of students in a group not reaching the proficient level decreases by at least 10 percent from the previous year. States that do not put in place the required standards and system for measuring AYP by the statutory deadline may lose a portion of the Title I funds they receive for State-level administrative activities.

The Department has recognized the need for some flexibility within the statutory framework for making AYP determinations, while still holding States to the “bright line” principles of the law, including annual assessment, disaggregation of data, and proficiency for all students by 2013-2014. 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. Without this flexibility, those scores would have to be measured against grade-level standards and considered “not proficient” when States determine adequate yearly progress. 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).

In early 2004, the Department also announced that States are not required to count in AYP calculations the assessment results of LEP students in their first year of enrollment in U.S. schools. States also may include in the LEP subgroup for up to 2 years those students who were LEP but who have attained English proficiency.

In early 2005, the Department announced *Raising Achievement: A New Path for No Child Left Behind*. Under this new, common-sense approach to implementing NCLB, States that are raising student achievement and closing achievement gaps will be given additional alternatives and flexibility in such areas as making AYP determinations. States seeking this new flexibility must demonstrate that they are improving student achievement and closing achievement gaps; that their accountability systems include all students and schools and meet NCLB assessment requirements; that parents receive timely information about the performance of their children's schools and available choice options; and that they have systems in place to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

The first broad-based decision under the *New Path* was to permit 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. This decision recognizes that some students with disabilities who are capable of meeting grade-level standards may need more time to do so. Under the Department’s December 2005 notice of proposed rulemaking, which would codify the “2 percent rule,” States also would be permitted to include in AYP calculations for the students with disabilities subgroup the scores of students previously identified as having disabilities, for up to 2 years, after they no longer receive special education services. These proposals are intended to give schools and teachers credit for raising the achievement of students with disabilities.

In addition to providing greater flexibility on AYP through the regulatory process, the Department launched a pilot program in late 2005 under which it will permit up to 10 States to use growth-based accountability models to determine AYP for the 2005-2006 school year. States must submit proposals for using such models to the Department for approval, and proposals must embody the key principles and requirements of the NCLB Act, such as ensuring that all students are proficient in reading and math by 2014, annual goals to close achievement gaps, the inclusion of all students in testing for grades 3-8, and subgroup accountability. As of November 2006, five States had received approval for participation in the growth model pilot program.

Accountability and School Improvement

No Child Left Behind significantly strengthened Title I accountability and school improvement provisions, requiring progressively tougher improvement measures over time for schools that continue to miss AYP targets, providing additional funding to support district-led improvement efforts, and offering immediate benefits to students through public school choice and supplemental educational services options.

LEAs must identify for school improvement any school that does not make AYP for 2 consecutive years. Identified schools must develop 2-year improvement plans incorporating strategies from scientifically based research on how to strengthen instruction in the core academic subjects, and addressing 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 Part A allocation for professional development that directly addresses the problems that led to identification for improvement.

States must reserve 4 percent of their Part A allocations for school improvement purposes, and are required to distribute 95 percent of these funds to LEAs with schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

In addition to helping schools identified for improvement to develop and implement improvement plans, LEAs must immediately provide students attending such schools the option of attending another public school, which may include a public charter school, that is not identified for improvement. LEAs must provide or pay for transportation to the new school, though this obligation is limited by the funding available for this purpose, as described below.

If a school does not make AYP following 1 year of improvement (3 years of not making AYP), the LEA must permit low-income students remaining in the school to obtain supplemental educational services (SES), such as tutoring, from the State-approved public- or private-sector provider selected by students and their parents, with the LEA paying the cost of the services.

LEAs must promptly notify the parents of eligible students attending schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring of their option to transfer their child to another public school or to obtain supplemental services. If funding is not available to provide choice or supplemental educational services to all eligible students, LEAs are required to give priority to low-achieving children from low-income families in making available those options.

In 2005, the Department launched 2 pilot demonstrations related to the choice and SES requirements. The first is a pilot in Virginia permitting 4 LEAs to offer SES in lieu of choice during the first year of improvement. Participating LEAs still must offer both choice and SES beginning in the second year of improvement. The pilot is designed to increase significantly the participation of eligible students in supplemental educational services. In 2006, this pilot was expanded to a limited number of districts in Alaska, Delaware, Indiana, and North Carolina.

The second pilot permits several urban LEAs, including Chicago, New York City, and Boston, to continue to serve as SES providers even though they are identified for improvement. (Title I regulations otherwise prohibit an LEA that has been identified for improvement from serving as an SES provider.) As with the first pilot, this demonstration is intended to ensure that the maximum number of eligible students receive high-quality supplemental educational services, as well as to evaluate the efficacy of allowing LEAs to provide SES while they are going through the improvement process.

The law requires LEAs to use an amount equal to 20 percent of their Part A allocations to pay for the transportation of students exercising the choice option or for supplemental educational services for eligible students. In reserving such funds, LEAs may not reduce allocations to schools identified for corrective action or restructuring by more than 15 percent. The per-child cost of supplemental services is set at the lesser of the LEA's per-child Part A allocation or the cost of services.

Students who transfer to another school are permitted to remain in that school through its highest grade, but the LEA is required to provide transportation to the new school only as long as the student's original school is subject to school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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 include measures likely to bring about meaningful change, such as 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 supplemental services options to students in schools identified for corrective action.

Restructuring

If a school does not respond 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, or turning operation of the school over to a private management company with a demonstrated record of effectiveness. 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 supplemental services options to students attending such schools.

Delay, Exit, and Reward

An LEA may delay implementation of the next level of interventions (SES requirements, corrective action, or restructuring) if a school identified for such measures makes AYP for 1 year. If the school makes AYP for a 2nd consecutive year, it is no longer subject to school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. Schools that exceed AYP for 2 or more consecutive years, or that significantly close achievement gaps between groups of students identified for AYP purposes, are eligible for State Academic Achievement Awards, which may include financial compensation.

Qualifications for Teachers and Paraprofessionals

The law 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 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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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.

As the deadline approached for meeting the HQT requirements at the end of the 2005-06 school year, the Department announced a new “reasonable implementation” policy in the expectation that some States and school districts, despite their best efforts, might not meet those requirements. States that had met other HQT implementation milestones—such as having a strong definition of a “highly qualified teacher,” reporting to parents and the public on classes taught by highly qualified teachers, accurate HQT data, and ensuring that poor and minority students are not taught by unqualified or inexperienced teachers at a greater rate than other students—but had fallen short of having highly qualified teachers in each and every classroom, were given the opportunity to negotiate and implement a revised plan for meeting the HQT goal by the end of the 2006-07 school year. However, in cases where the Department determines that a State is both not in compliance and not making a good-faith effort to meet the HQT requirements, it reserves the right to take appropriate action such as the withholding of funds.

Allocations

Title I, Part A funds are allocated through four separate formulas. All four formulas begin with the number of children from low-income families in each LEA, and each formula also includes factors such as the LEA’s poverty rate and State per-pupil expenditures for education. 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 children from low-income families in each LEA, weighted by State per-pupil expenditures for education. Basic Grants are awarded to school districts with at least 10 poor children who make up more than 2 percent of enrollment and, thus, spread funds thinly across virtually all LEAs. Funding for Basic Grants is statutorily fixed at approximately the 2001 appropriation level.

Concentration Grants provide additional funds to LEAs in which the number of poor children exceeds 6,500 or 15 percent of the total school-age population. Funding for Concentration Grants is statutorily fixed at the 2001 appropriation level.

The Targeted Grants formula weights child counts to make higher payments to school districts with high numbers or percentages of poor students. For example, the number of poor children exceeding 38.24 percent of the school-age population in an LEA is assigned a weighting factor of 4.0, generating a higher per-child award than the 1.0 factor applied when the number of poor children represents 15.58 percent or less of an LEA’s school-age population. The authorizing statute requires the Targeted Grants formula to be used for allocating all LEA Grant funds in excess of the 2001 appropriation for Basic and Concentration Grants.

In addition to Basic, Concentration, and Targeted Grants, 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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

systems. Once State allocations are determined, suballocations to the LEA level are based on a modified version of the Targeted Grants formula.

Targeted Grants and Education Finance Incentive Grants were first authorized in 1994, but have been funded only since fiscal year 2002. In practice, the annual appropriations acts have divided all funding in excess of the fiscal year 2001 level equally between the Targeted and EFIG formulas.

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 3-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 2007 allocations will be based on LEA poverty estimates for 2004. The Department transfers a small amount of funding from the annual Title I appropriation to the Census Bureau to finance the preparation of these LEA poverty estimates.

LEAs also use poverty data—generally the number of students eligible for free- or reduced-price lunch—to make within-district allocations to schools. LEAs with more than 1,000 students must serve all schools with a poverty rate of 75 percent or more, including middle and high schools, before serving schools with less needy student populations. In addition, LEAs must allocate a minimum amount per poor child unless all schools served have poverty rates above 35 percent.

One percent of the total LEA Grant appropriation is reserved for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Outlying Areas (the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands). From the amount for the Outlying Areas, up to \$5 million is reserved for a program of discretionary grants to LEAs in the Outlying Areas and the Republic of Palau. The other Freely Associated States—the Federated States of Micronesia and the Marshall Islands—have entered into their “Compacts of Free Association” and no longer receive Title I, Part A funds. A Hawaii-based non-profit organization, Pacific Resources for Education and Learning (PREL), administers the competition for this program and provides technical assistance to grantees.

States must withhold from their Part A allocations amounts generated by annual counts of delinquent children in local institutions in order to operate State-administered projects in LEAs that have the highest dropout rates and are located in areas serving large numbers of children in local correctional facilities. In fiscal year 2006, the 44 States with these counts reserved about \$103 million for this purpose.

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 and, as noted above, must reserve an additional 4 percent for State school improvement activities. States must distribute 95 percent of school improvement funds to LEAs.

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 remain available for Federal obligation for 15 months. The remaining funds become available on October 1 of the fiscal year following the appropriations act, and remain

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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:

	<u>Basic Grants</u> (\$000s)	Concentration <u>Grants</u> (\$000s)	Targeted <u>Grants</u> (\$000s)	Education Finance <u>Incentive Grants</u> (\$000s)
2003	\$7,111,635	\$1,365,031	\$1,670,239	\$1,541,499
2004	7,037,591	1,365,031	1,969,843	1,969,843
2005	6,934,854	1,365,031	2,219,843	2,219,843
2006	6,808,408	1,365,031	2,269,843	2,269,843
2007	6,808,516	1,365,031	2,269,843	2,269,843

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Title I Grants to LEAs program is authorized by the ESEA and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2008 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal. The 2008 request for Title I Grants to LEAs is \$13.9 billion, an increase of \$1.2 billion, or 9.4 percent, over the 2007 level. The increase would drive more money to high schools as part of a realignment of Title I funding aimed at ensuring that local allocations to high schools more closely reflect the enrollment of students from low-income families in those schools. The overall request level would support a comprehensive reauthorization proposal intended to expand the impact of NCLB accountability at the high school level, strengthen adequate yearly progress determinations while giving States greater flexibility in defining AYP, make available more meaningful choice options to students in low-performing schools, and encourage adoption of fundamental staffing and governance changes in schools undergoing restructuring.

In addition to the request for Title I Grants to LEAs, the Administration's reauthorization proposal for Title I would be supported by (1) a separate \$500 million request for School Improvement Grants in this account that would help States provide additional technical assistance and other support for participating LEAs and schools that are identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; (2) a \$411.6 million request for State Assessment Grants (described under School Improvement Programs) that would help States development and implement new high school assessments, (3) a \$250 million request for new Promise Scholarships for low-income students in restructuring schools, and (4) a \$50 million Opportunity Scholarships proposal that would fund a variety of mechanisms for expanding public and private school options for low-income students whose schools are undergoing improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

The \$13.9 billion request for Title I Grants to LEAs includes a modest increase in the amount that would be transferred to the Census Bureau to support preparation of annual LEA poverty estimates used to make allocations under the Grants to LEAs formulas. The amount transferred would rise from approximately \$3.5 million to \$4 million to reflect both rising costs in collecting

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

and processing the data required for the poverty estimates and planned improvements, such as incorporating data from the American Community Survey, and producing annual LEA boundary updates.

Expanding NCLB Accountability in Our High Schools

The key budget proposal in the 2008 request for Title I Grants to LEAs is a \$1.2 billion increase that would support a proposed change in local allocation practices designed to direct more Title I dollars to the high school level. Historically, LEAs have distributed 75-80 percent of their Part A allocations to grades pre-K through 6, and just 20-25 percent to grades 7-12. The current share of Title I dollars reaching the high school level (grades 9-12) is even smaller, ranging from 8-10 percent over the past decade, even though high schools enrolled about one-quarter of all elementary and secondary school students—and about one-fifth of the low-income K-12 students who are the focus of Title I—during that period.

Achievement and attainment data suggest that the Nation is paying a price for this underinvestment in our high-poverty high schools. NCLB has helped produce measurable gains in student achievement, and in closing longstanding achievement gaps, in the earlier grades where LEAs currently target Title I funds. By contrast, high school achievement, as measured by the National Assessment of Educational Progress, has changed little over the past two decades. In addition, the national graduation rate is estimated at 70-75 percent, unacceptably low for a Nation striving to preserve and extend its leadership and prosperity in an increasingly competitive global economy. In the high-poverty districts targeted by Title I, the graduation rate often falls to 50 percent or lower.

For this reason, the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal would require each LEA to ensure that the proportion of Title I funds received by its high schools is at least 90 percent of the share of the district's poor students enrolled in grades 9-12. For example, if a district's high schools enroll 25 percent of its students from low-income families, those schools would have to receive at least 22.5 percent of the district's Title I school allocations. The Administration's proposal would provide greater flexibility for small districts (those with 1-2 high schools) to minimize the diversion of Title I funds from higher-poverty elementary and middle schools to lower-poverty high schools. The \$1.2 billion increase requested for 2008 would help ensure that the transition to the new allocation rules does not result in a "zero-sum game" involving the elimination of Title I programs at many elementary schools to make funds available for high schools.

In addition to ensuring a fair allocation of Title I funds, the Administration's proposal would support two reauthorization proposals intended to increase accountability and promote meaningful reforms in the Nation's high schools.

First, the Administration is proposing to expand assessment at the high school level. Current law requires annual assessment in reading and mathematics in grades 3 through 8—a full range of assessments for the early grades—but only one grade at the high school level. This limits the ability of States and school districts to measure effectively the performance of their high schools, and of the high schools themselves to identify instructional strengths and weaknesses and to target resources and attention to those students with the greatest need for assistance.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

The results are both widely known and increasingly unacceptable: more than 1 million students drop out of high school each year and millions of other students graduate without the skills needed to obtain good jobs or the academic preparation required for postsecondary education.

To help improve the performance of our high schools, the Administration's proposal would require assessment in math and in reading or language arts in two additional high school grades, including a mandatory 11th-grade assessment of college readiness in each subject. These new assessments, which would be in place by the end of the 2012-13 school year, would strengthen the impact of Title I accountability requirements at the high school level by giving parents, teachers, and principals more information on the progress of high school students toward State proficiency standards. They also would let students know if they are on track to graduate from high school prepared to succeed in either college or the workforce. The Administration would extend the authorization for State Assessment Grants (described under School Improvement Programs) and maintain annual funding at the 2007 level of \$411.6 million, primarily to help pay for the development and implementation of the new high school assessments.

The second major reauthorization proposal focused on high school involves strengthening the role of graduation rates in AYP determinations. States would be required to use a graduation rate definition approved by the Department, and would add continuous improvement in the graduation rate as a condition for making AYP. Under current law, graduation rates are a required "additional indicator" for high schools, but the impact of this requirement is minimal because of inconsistent measurement of the graduation rate across States and because LEAs and schools are not required to improve on their current rate. Given the well-documented social and economic costs of not graduating from high school, it is clear that graduation rates should be a key measure of high school performance, and that increasing the national graduation is a critical national goal.

Strengthening Adequate Yearly Progress

In addition to requiring improvement in the graduation rate for high schools to make AYP, the Administration's reauthorization proposal includes three other changes intended to strengthen measurement of adequate yearly progress. First, States would be required to include the results of science assessments in their AYP determinations beginning with the 2008-09 school year. After determining baseline levels, States would be required to set annual measurable objectives for science on a timeline ensuring that all students are proficient in science by 2020.

Second, States would be permitted to incorporate student academic growth into their AYP definitions so long as they adhere to key No Child Left Behind accountability principles such as the inclusion of all students, subgroup accountability, and ensuring that all students are proficient in reading and mathematics by 2014. This proposal, under which State growth model proposals would be subject to approval by the Department, responds both to State requests for more flexible approaches to measuring student and school progress toward State academic standards and to the expectation that pilot growth model projects currently under way in two States will demonstrate that such models can be consistent with the long-term proficiency goals and other core principles of No Child Left Behind.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Third, the reauthorization proposal would allow States to incorporate into their AYP definitions for limited English proficient students the progress of those students in attaining English language proficiency, as measured by the results of the English language assessments required by NCLB. This proposal recognizes schools deserve credit in AYP determinations for improving English language proficiency because as students progress in English, their content scores tend to rise. Including English language mastery in AYP determinations also would provide an incentive for schools to accelerate English language acquisition for their LEP students.

Ensuring Meaningful Choice During the NCLB Improvement Process

Another key focus of the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal is promoting more meaningful, effective choice options for students attending schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. NCLB is helping to bring about a revolution in our education system by requiring, for the first time, universal public school choice and supplemental educational services (tutoring) options for students in low-performing schools. However, the impact of these options has been limited by both poor implementation and capacity issues. The Department has begun to address implementation problems through stronger enforcement of existing law and regulations. The Administration's reauthorization proposals in this area are aimed at expanding capacity, targeting choice options on those students with the greatest need for improved educational opportunities, and recognizing that a "one size fits all" approach does not always make sense.

The Administration is proposing the following changes to supplemental educational services (SES) and public school choice options:

- Require that LEAs offer both choice and SES to eligible students enrolled in schools identified for a first year of improvement. With a growing number of SES providers, expanding the availability of SES makes sense both as a way to increase options for parents and as a school improvement strategy.
- Provide an incentive for SES providers to serve students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, and students in isolated rural areas by establishing a separate, higher per-child expenditure cap for these students equal to 200 percent of the LEA's per-pupil Title I allocation. These three categories of students are more expensive to serve and, under current law, have experienced difficulty obtaining SES.
- Permit schools that have been identified for improvement or corrective action only because of the achievement of one subgroup, but that are making AYP for the "all students" group, to serve as receiving schools under the public school choice transfer option. This proposal would expand public school choice options by recognizing that a school that meets its targets for all but one subgroup is likely to be a successful school that should be made available as a choice option. Schools in restructuring would continue to be ineligible to serve as receiving schools.
- Permit schools that have been identified for improvement due to one or more subgroups missing AYP, but that are making AYP for the "all students" group, to offer SES and public school choice options only to students who are not proficient in at least one tested

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

subject. This and other “differentiated interventions” that the Department would be authorized to approve under the reauthorization recognize that it may be appropriate to implement different interventions in, for instance, a school that does not make AYP due to the achievement of a single group, versus another school that misses AYP targets for multiple groups.

- Require an LEA with schools in improvement to spend the full 20 percent reservation only on choice-related transportation and SES unless the LEA provides extensive documentation of its efforts to promote participation in SES.
- Ensure a level playing field for non-LEA providers of supplemental educational services by requiring LEAs to make school facilities available to non-LEA SES providers and to promote appropriate participation by all approved providers through a transparent enrollment process.
- Permit LEAs to use up to 1 percent of their Title I, Part A allocations for parent outreach and assistance aimed at promoting greater participation in public school choice and SES options, with such funds counting toward the “20-percent reservation” requirement. This proposal is intended to increase both the quality and extent of parent outreach activities.
- Establish an expedited complaint process for parents and students who believe that their LEAs are not adhering to the law in making available public school choice and supplemental educational services options to eligible students. State educational agencies (SEAs) would be required to investigate and resolve any complaints within 60 days, and complainants would have to right to appeal SEA decisions to the Secretary.

Scholarships for Students in Restructuring Schools

In addition to these measures aimed at increasing the availability and effectiveness of public school choice and supplemental educational services options, the Administration is proposing to require LEAs to offer private school choice to students from low-income families in grades 3-12 who are attending schools that are in restructuring status.

The growing number of schools identified for restructuring means that an estimated 2.5 million students will be attending such chronically low-performing schools by the 2008-09 school year. Most of these students attend schools in urban or rural areas with few available public school choice options within their districts, sharply limiting the effectiveness of current choice options. The proposed amendment would require LEAs serving such schools to offer eligible students from low-income families a scholarship—composed of Title I, IDEA, and new State formula grant funds—that could be used to transfer to a better-performing private or out-of-district public school.

More specifically, these scholarships would consist of (1) the LEA’s per-student Title I allocation, (2) any funds provided to the LEA attributable to that student under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and (3) allocations from a separately funded \$250 million Promise Scholarships program (described elsewhere in this account). In most cases, the total

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

scholarship would be approximately \$4,000 per student. Scholarship recipients would be required to take State assessments or a nationally normed test in each grade and subject required by the ESEA.

Strengthening Restructuring Provisions

Schools that do not make adequate yearly progress for 5 years despite the implementation of improvement and corrective action plans are identified for restructuring. This final phase of the improvement process is expected to result in fundamental change in a school's operations, such as the replacement of most or all of a school's leadership and staff, placement under either State control or private management, or conversion to a charter school. The first year of restructuring is a planning year—reflecting the challenge and complexity of developing a meaningful restructuring plan—with the actual restructuring occurring in the following year (assuming the school does not make AYP for a sixth year).

As might be expected, given the length of time required to enter restructuring, relatively few schools have been restructured during the first 5 years of NCLB implementation. However, an estimated 2,000 Title I schools were in the first or second year of restructuring during the 2005-2006 school year, and this number could climb significantly in future years due to the implementation of the full range of assessments in grades 3-8, which will increase the number of subgroups included in AYP determinations, and rising annual proficiency targets.

Preliminary data from the National Assessment of Title I Interim Report, the Center on Education Policy's Report on Restructuring in California, and press reports indicate that most LEAs are implementing the weakest of the statutory restructuring options, defined as "any other major restructuring of the school's governance arrangement that makes fundamental reforms." For example, three-quarters of California schools in restructuring during the 2005-06 school year chose this option, which often resulted in the implementation of relatively minor changes, such as appointing a leadership team to oversee school operations or the hiring of coaches for teachers. While it is possible that the flexibility provided by this "any other major restructuring" option could, in some cases, produce a turnaround in a school's performance, the Administration believes that schools that have missed AYP for 6 years should be subjected to the more fundamental transformation suggested by the other statutory restructuring options.

For this reason, the Administration's reauthorization proposal would limit the availability of the "any other major restructuring" option to schools that enter restructuring due to the performance of a single subgroup. LEAs would be required to implement the more far-reaching statutory restructuring options for all other schools entering restructuring. As noted above, available data suggest that LEAs too often use the "any other major restructuring" option to avoid more far-reaching changes. The Administration's proposal would help ensure that the worst-performing schools (those that have missed AYP for multiple subgroups for 5 or more years) take actions that have the greatest likelihood of bringing about real improvement.

In addition, the Administration is proposing to repeal section 1116(d) of the ESEA, which potentially limits LEA and school improvement actions that conflict with the rights of employees under Federal, State, and local laws and collective bargaining agreements. A growing body of research and data points to staffing arrangements governed by collective bargaining

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

agreements as a key obstacle to improving instruction at the high-poverty schools that are the focus of Title I. Such collective bargaining agreements, which too often put the interests of staff ahead of the interests of students and parents, should not be permitted to hinder school improvement efforts. For example, a school district that is restructuring a chronically low-performing school should have the authority to transfer teachers out of such a school as part of a restructuring plan.

The Administration's proposal also would authorize (1) reopening a school as a charter school under a restructuring plan regardless of any restrictions in State law, such as legislative caps on the number of charter schools that may operate in a State, that otherwise would prohibit this restructuring option; and (2) turning over the operation of a school to an elected official, such as a city mayor, as an approved alternative governance arrangement under a restructuring plan.

The Administration recognizes the significant challenge that LEAs will face in restructuring large numbers of schools and putting them on the path to making AYP and reaching NCLB proficiency goals. This is why the Administration's 2008 request would provide \$500 million in funding for a reauthorized section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants program that would provide additional funding to LEAs with schools identified for restructuring. This new funding would provide a significant supplement to the estimated \$550 million that would be available to LEAs for school improvement under section 1003(a) of the ESEA, which requires States to reserve 4 percent of their Title I Grants to LEAs allocations for school improvement purposes.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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

		<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
<u>LEA Poverty Rate</u>				
0-15%	# of LEAs	8,072	8,168	8,168
	Dollars	\$2,574,685	\$2,700,555	\$2,969,865
	% of Total \$	20.63	21.63	21.57
	\$ Per Formula Child	\$1,136	\$1,121	\$1,219
15<25%	# of LEAs	4,178	4,305	4,305
	Dollars	\$4,160,394	\$4,027,060	\$4,402,619
	% of Total \$	33.34	32.26	31.98
	\$ Per Formula Child	\$1,329	\$1,323	\$1,446
>25%	# of LEAs	1,929	1,706	1,706
	Dollars	\$5,744,911	\$5,755,375	\$6,394,357
	% of Total \$	46.03	46.11	46.45
	\$ Per Formula Child	\$1,524	\$1,522	\$1,702
LEA Allocation Subtotal		\$12,479,990	\$12,482,990	\$13,766,841
BIA/Outlying Areas		127,097	127,097	139,059
Part D, Subpart 2		102,601	99,709	0 ¹
Census Updates		<u>3,437</u>	<u>3,437</u>	<u>4,000</u>
Grants to LEAs Total		12,713,125	12,713,233	13,909,900
Schools receiving Title I funds		54,600	54,600	54,600
Schoolwide programs		30,300	30,300	30,300
Targeted assistance programs		24,300	24,300	24,300
<u>Students served</u> (in millions)				
In schoolwide programs		15.3	15.3	16.6
In targeted assistance programs		2.4	2.4	2.5
In other programs (non-public, N&D)		<u>0.3</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>0.3</u>
Total		18.0	18.0	19.4

¹ The Administration is proposing to repeal Title I Part D, Subpart 2 as part of its ESEA reauthorization plan.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2008 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Title I Grants to LEAs program completed the PART process in 2006, receiving a “Moderately Effective” rating. The PART process included the development of new performance measures and targets that replaced earlier measures developed in compliance with the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act. These new measures are based 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 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	Actual
2004		49.7
2005		52.6
2006	57.8	
2007	63.1	
2008	68.4	

Assessment of progress: The baseline (2004) and comparison year (2005) data used all students tested within grades 3-8 during the given year to establish the national percentage of students at least proficient for each year. The data showed a small but significant increase in the reading proficiency of economically disadvantaged students from 2004 to 2005. The baseline will be recalculated once 2005-2006 assessment data are available, since that is the first year States are required to assess all students annually in grades 3-8 and thus will support a more accurate comparison in subsequent years.

Measure: The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State math assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		47.6
2005		50.6
2006	56.1	
2007	61.6	
2008	67.1	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Assessment of progress: The baseline (2004) and comparison year (2005) data used all students tested within grades 3-8 during the given year to establish the national percentage of students at least proficient for each year. The data showed a small but significant increase in the mathematics proficiency of economically disadvantaged students from 2004 to 2005. The baseline will be recalculated once 2005-2006 assessment data are available, since that is the first year States are required to assess all students annually in grades 3-8 and thus will support a more accurate comparison in subsequent years.

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	Actual
2004		13.9
2005		13.3
2006	11.8	
2007	10.3	
2008	8.8	

Assessment of progress: The baseline (2004) and comparison year (2005) data used all students tested within grades 3-8 during the given year to establish the national percentage of students at least proficient for each year. The data showed a small but significant decrease in the reading achievement gap between economically disadvantaged students and the “all students” group from 2004 to 2005. The baseline will be recalculated once 2005-2006 assessment data are available, since that is the first year States are required to assess all students in grades 3-8 annually and thus will support a more accurate comparison in subsequent years.

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	Actual
2004		13.3
2005		12.8
2006	11.4	
2007	9.9	
2008	8.5	

Assessment of progress: The baseline (2004) and comparison year (2005) data used all students tested within grades 3-8 during the given year to establish the national percentage of students at least proficient for each year. The data showed a small but significant decrease in the mathematics achievement gap between economically disadvantaged students and the “all students” group from 2004 to 2005. The baseline will be recalculated once 2005-2006 assessment data are available, since that is the first year States are required to assess all students in grades 3-8 annually and thus will support a more accurate comparison in subsequent years.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Efficiency Measures

The Department has adopted an efficiency measure for this program. That measure is the average number of business days required to complete State monitoring reports following the completion of a site visit. For the fiscal year 2005 baseline, the average time to complete State monitoring reports was 46.3 days. The Department reduced this time to 43.3 days in fiscal year 2006, and has set targets of 40.3 for 2007 and 40.0 for 2008.

Other Performance Information

The Department released the National Assessment of Title I (NATI) Interim Report in April 2006. Volume I of this report provided a wide range of information and data on the implementation of No Child Left Behind through the 2004-05 school year. Updated versions of this report will be published in spring 2007 and early in 2008. Major findings of the 2006 Interim Report included the following:

Achievement and Assessment

- For both State assessment and National Assessment of Educational Progress results, recent achievement trends through 2004 or 2005 are positive both overall and for key subgroups.
- While some States had standards and assessments in place in all of the required grade levels, most States have needed to implement additional assessments to meet the NCLB requirements by 2005-06 for reading and mathematics and by 2007-08 for science.
- All States had an assessment measuring English language proficiency (ELP) in place for 2004-05, but 44 States indicated that they anticipated making revisions to their ELP assessments.
- Most States had met the requirement to annually assess 95 percent or more of their students, including major racial/ethnic groups, students with disabilities, limited English proficient (LEP) students, and low-income students. However, 14 States did not meet the minimum test participation requirement for one or more student subgroups.
- The lowest participation rates were for students with disabilities. While States missing the test participation requirement for other subgroups often missed by just 1 or 2 percentage points, States that failed to assess 95 percent of students with disabilities typically had lower participation rates for those students (as low as 77 percent in one State).
- By the 2004-05 school year, the number of States that report student achievement data had more than doubled since NCLB was enacted. Fifty States presented data disaggregated by race/ethnicity and gender and for limited English proficient students, students with disabilities, and low-income students on State report cards.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

School Improvement

- States identified 13 percent of all schools for improvement for 2004-05. Of these, 9,028 were Title I schools (18 percent of Title I schools), representing nearly a 50 percent increase over the approximately 6,000 Title I schools identified for the previous 2 years. Most (76 percent) of the identified Title I schools were in their first year or second year of improvement, 12 percent were in corrective action, and 12 percent were in restructuring status. The number and percentage of Title I schools identified for improvement varied considerably across States.
- Schools in large and urban districts, and those with high concentrations of poor, minority, and LEP students, were more likely to be identified than other schools. For example, just over one-third of all schools with 75 percent or more of their students from low-income families or minority groups were identified schools in 2004-05, compared with fewer than 5 percent of schools with low concentrations of these students. Middle schools also were more likely to be identified (18 percent of middle schools) than were elementary or high schools (11 percent at each level).
- Schools most commonly missed AYP for the achievement of all students and/or multiple subgroups; only in a minority of cases did schools miss only one AYP target. Based on data from 33 States, among schools that missed AYP in 2003-04, 33 percent did not meet achievement targets for the “all students” group in reading or mathematics and another 18 percent missed AYP for the achievement of two or more subgroups. Only 23 percent missed AYP solely due to the achievement of a single subgroup.
- Schools that were held accountable for more subgroups were less likely to make AYP. Among schools for which AYP was calculated for six or more subgroups, 39 percent did not make AYP, compared with 10 percent of schools for which AYP was calculated based on only one subgroup.
- All States notified schools about their identification status for 2004-05 based on 2003-04 testing, and a majority provided preliminary results before September 2004, but 20 States did not, and only 15 States provided final results by that time. NCLB regulations require States to notify schools and districts of their school improvement status prior to the beginning of the school year; this is important in enabling districts with identified schools to notify parents of eligible students about their Title I choice options in a timely manner.
- Nearly all States applied NCLB consequences for school identification (i.e., public school choice, supplemental services, corrective actions, and restructuring) to Title I schools only.
- Almost all States had implemented a statewide system of support for identified schools by fall 2004, and these often involved school support teams and specialized individuals.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

- Identified schools were much more likely to report needing assistance in a variety of specific areas than non-identified schools, and they also reported receiving more days of assistance than non-identified schools, particularly in the area of professional development.
- The most common improvement strategies implemented by identified schools included developing a school improvement plan, using assessment data to inform instruction, and providing additional instruction to low-achieving students.
- Title I schools in corrective action status in 2004-05 nearly universally experienced the interventions NCLB defines for schools in this stage of improvement, with the most common action reported being the implementation of new research-based curricula or instructional programs.

Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

- Although more students were eligible to participate in the Title I school choice option, a larger number actually participated in the supplemental services option. This may be explained in part by the finding that the timing of parental notification was often too late to enable parents to choose a new school before the start of the 2004-05 school year. Almost half (49 percent) of districts notified parents after the school year had already started, and in these districts this notification occurred, on average, five weeks after the start of the school year.
- The number of State-approved supplemental service providers had tripled over two years, rising from 997 in May 2003 to 2,734 in May 2005. Private firms accounted for 76 percent of approved providers in May 2005 and served 59 percent of participating students in the previous school year (2003-04).
- A growing number of faith-based organizations had obtained State approval to provide SES, rising from 18 providers (2 percent of providers) in May 2003 to 249 (9 percent) in May 2005, but they served less than one-half of 1 percent of student participants in 2003-04.
- School districts and public schools accounted for 17 percent of providers in May 2005, but served a much larger proportion of participants (40 percent in 2003-04).
- States report that they are working to develop and implement systems for monitoring and evaluating the performance of supplemental service providers, but, as of early 2005, 15 States had not established any monitoring process, 25 States had not yet established any standards for evaluating provider effectiveness, and none had finalized their evaluation standards.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Professional Qualifications of Teachers and Staff

- The large majority of teachers across the country have been designated as “highly qualified” under NCLB. According to State-reported data for 42 States, highly qualified teachers taught 86 percent of classes in the 2003-04 school year.
- Students in schools that had been identified for improvement were more likely to be taught by teachers who were not highly qualified than were students in non-identified schools, and schools with high concentrations of poor and minority students had more teachers who are considered not highly qualified than low-poverty, low-minority schools.
- Teachers in high-poverty schools were more likely to participate in professional development focused on reading and mathematics than were teachers in low-poverty schools.
- According to principal reports, 63 percent of Title I instructional aides had been determined to meet NCLB qualification requirements as of the 2004-05 school year. However, 87 percent of Title I instructional aides indicated that they had at least two years of college (and/or an associate’s degree) or had passed a paraprofessional assessment.
- Nearly one-quarter (23 percent) of Title I instructional aides reported that a teacher was present only half or less of the time that they spent tutoring or working with students in a classroom.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

Title I Grants to LEAs was assessed through the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) process in 2006 and received a “Moderately Effective” rating. This rating was based on evidence that the program is well structured to meet its goals, is effectively and efficiently implemented, has established meaningful long-term performance measures and annual targets, and is making moderate progress in increasing achievement among the students served by the program. In particular, the Department has taken major steps to increase the transparency of performance information available to policy makers and the public, including the posting of performance indicators compiled to meet the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), program performance plans, and State monitoring reports. For example, the Department is posting individual State data on student academic performance that are used for national performance measures under both GPRA and the PART. The Department also will be making available “after action” reports on the outcomes of its monitoring process, with tables showing specific actions taken by States to correct adverse findings.

The PART process also involved developing improvement plans to be implemented in calendar year 2007. These plans include developing and submitting to Congress a comprehensive proposal for reauthorizing Title I Grants to LEAs as part of the broader reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Key elements of this proposal are described above, under the FY 2008 Budget Request. The Department also will continue to improve timeliness and transparency related to the collection and analysis of program performance data, with the

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

goal of using these data to strengthen program management. Finally, the Department will work to expand support for the school improvement process, including encouraging greater participation by students and parents in the public school choice and supplemental educational services options.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

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

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite ¹

Budget authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
0	\$500,000	\$500,000

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; however, additional authorizing legislation is sought.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) authorizes a separate State formula grant program making awards to States to provide assistance for local school improvement activities required by section 1116(b) of the ESEA for Title I schools that do not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) for at least 2 consecutive years. Authorized activities include the development and implementation of school improvement plans, professional development for teachers and staff, corrective actions such as instituting a new curriculum, development and implementation of restructuring plans, and the provision of public school choice and supplemental educational service options for students enrolled in schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

Under No Child Left Behind, a school that does not make AYP toward State proficiency standards for 2 consecutive years is identified for improvement, and must develop and implement a 2-year improvement plan that addresses the reasons it missed AYP. In the first year of improvement, the local educational agency (LEA) also must offer public school choice options to all students enrolled in the school. If the school continues to miss AYP for a third consecutive 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.

After 4 years of not making AYP (and 2 years of implementing its improvement plan), the LEA must take corrective action, which includes measures such as replacing school staff responsible for the continued inability to make AYP, implementation of a new curriculum, and 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 6th 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.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

A school that makes AYP for 2 consecutive years exits improvement status and is not subject to any further improvement actions.

To receive a School Improvement Grant, States must submit an application describing how funds will be used to assist State and local school improvement efforts, and funds are allocated in proportion to each State's share of funding received under parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA. States must subgrant 95 percent of their allocations to local educational agencies (LEAs) with schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. 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-achieving schools successfully implement their improvement plans. Grants to LEAs must be between \$50,000 and \$500,000 and are renewable for up to 2 years.

States may use up to 5 percent of their allocations for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance activities.

This is a forward-funded program. Funds would 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.

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The School Improvement Grants program is authorized by the ESEA and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2008 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal. The Administration is requesting \$500 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year 2008. The request reflects the critical importance of State and local implementation of effective LEA and school improvement strategies in helping to meet the academic proficiency goals of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), as well the need to focus greater resources on the growing number of schools identified for restructuring under NCLB.

School Improvement: A Growing Need

The need for additional emphasis on school improvement is increasingly apparent. According to the National Assessment of Title I Interim Report (NATI Interim Report), less than three-quarters of districts with schools identified for improvement reported having the staff, expertise, time, or money to help identified schools turn around their performance during the 2004-05 school year. And only one-fifth of high-poverty districts (enrolling 50 percent or more students from low-income families) had sufficient funding to finance school improvement efforts.

State data for school year 2006-2007 suggest that growing demand will place even more pressure on the limited resources currently available for school improvement. Even with the new flexibility provided by the Department, States are continuing to identify greater numbers of schools for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. Preliminary data compiled by the Department showed that the number of schools identified for improvement nationwide rose from 9,071 in the 2005-2006 school year to 10,214 in the 2006-2007 school year. This 13 percent

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

increase does not include data for 9 States, and thus will likely be considerably higher once all States have reported.

Individual States have reported much higher growth in the number of schools identified for improvement, as shown in the following chart.

Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring in Selected States		
State	School Year 2005-2006	School Year 2006-2007
California	1,746	2,215
Massachusetts	320	440
New Jersey	386	574
North Carolina	187	248
Ohio	291	704
Texas	176	291

States also generally continue to report large numbers of schools not making adequate yearly progress (AYP) for a first year, particularly as performance targets rise in accordance with interim objectives in State accountability plans and as States phase in required assessments in additional grades. With States and school districts forced to concentrate limited improvement resources on those schools already identified for improvement, it is likely that many of these schools will miss AYP for a second consecutive year and enter improvement status. This is particularly true for the 20 States that, according to the NATI Interim Report, employed a “triage” approach to school improvement, in which the level of support is tailored to the number of years of failing to make AYP.

A New Emphasis on Restructuring

At the other end of the school improvement spectrum, the seventh year of NCLB implementation (the request would fund improvement activities in school year 2008-09) will bring substantial demand for the more comprehensive improvement measures required under corrective action and restructuring. Districts will be faced with the challenge of undertaking fundamental, potentially disruptive interventions at many schools while continuing to offer meaningful public school choice and effective supplemental service options to students and their parents.

The potential demand for effective corrective action and restructuring measures is brought into sharp relief by the preliminary data for the 2006-2007 school year. While the number of schools identified for restructuring grew only modestly, from roughly 1,700 to 2,000 schools, the number of schools in corrective action more than doubled, from 1,231 to 2,586. Since schools in corrective action have only 1 year to make AYP before being identified for restructuring, the data suggest that the 2007-2008 school year may well bring an increase of 50 percent or more in the number of schools so identified. Individual States may face even greater challenges. For example, in the 2005-2006 school year, Illinois reported a tenfold increase in the number of schools in restructuring, from 21 schools to 238 schools.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

Two factors are likely to support or even accelerate this trend toward moving large numbers of schools into the restructuring phase of improvement. First, annual AYP objectives will continue to rise as States move closer to the goal of 100 percent proficiency by 2014. Second, the implementation of assessments for all grades (3-8) in the 2005-2006 school year will increase the number of subgroups counted for school-level AYP determinations, making it more difficult for schools to make AYP. These factors, along with current improvement data, suggest that the number of schools identified for restructuring would more than double by fiscal year 2008, to an estimated 5,000 schools. While this estimate may seem high, it would represent less than 10 percent of the 54,000 schools participating in Title I and subject to NCLB accountability requirements.

In addition to the sheer quantity of restructuring assistance likely to be needed by fiscal year 2008, other evidence points to the need for improvement in the quality of that assistance. For example, in its February 2006 report, "Wrestling the Devil in the Details: An Early Report at Restructuring in California," the Center on Education Policy found that most LEAs in California were implementing the weakest of the statutory restructuring options, defined as "any other major restructuring of the school's governance arrangement that makes fundamental reforms." Restructuring actions implemented under this option have included relatively minor changes, such as appointing a leadership team to oversee school operations or the hiring of coaches for teachers, that do not require intensive intervention by State or local educational agencies.

However, the Administration's reauthorization proposal for Title I Grants to LEAs would strengthen restructuring by generally eliminating the "any other major restructuring" option, requiring a substantial increase in State and local capacity to undertake the other, more far-reaching statutory restructuring options. These include the replacement of most or all of a school's leadership and staff, placement under either State control or private management, or conversion to a charter school.

Finally, it is important to keep in mind that the growing demand for fundamental restructuring of chronically low-performing schools will take place amidst the backdrop of States increasingly identifying districts themselves for improvement. To return to the Illinois example, in the 2005-06 school year, the State not only faced the challenge of restructuring 238 schools, but also of carrying out improvement efforts in 240 of its 794 Title I districts. LEAs identified for improvement included some of the State's largest districts, which typically are the most challenging to reform and improve, and are unlikely to have the capacity or expertise to restructure large numbers of schools while simultaneously addressing the issues that led to their own identification for improvement.

NCLB Requires Strong State Improvement Role

The growing number of schools and LEAs identified for improvement under NCLB, the increasing complexity, over time, of the improvement measures required, and the relative scarcity of effective improvement models all argue for a strong State role in developing and delivering comprehensive leadership and technical assistance in the area of LEA and school improvement.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

The ESEA, as reauthorized by the NCLB Act, not only envisions but also requires this strong State role. ESEA section 1117 requires each State to “establish a statewide system of intensive and sustained support and improvement for local educational agencies and schools” receiving funds under Part A of Title I. More specifically, the law requires States to create school support teams to provide expert advice and other assistance to help LEAs and schools analyze their improvement needs and develop and implement appropriate plans to meet those needs.

In addition, under ESEA section 1116(c), States are responsible for carrying out comprehensive and effective improvement measures for LEAs that have been identified for improvement and corrective action.

Little Funding Currently Available for State-Level Improvement Efforts

Unfortunately, current law does not generate adequate funding for States to carry out effectively these statutory responsibilities related to LEA and school improvement. Section 1117 directs States to use administrative funding reserved under section 1004(a), which permits States to reserve up to 1 percent of funds received under Parts A, C, and D of Title I for administrative purposes, and to use the State share of improvement funds authorized under sections 1003(a) and 1003(g).

However, the 1-percent reservation for Title I administration must cover all administrative activities required by Title I, including the development and implementation of State accountability plans, fiscal oversight of Title I allocations, monitoring of local implementation, mandated data collection, and administration of supplemental educational services. Very little is left over for statewide improvement systems.

Similarly, the statute currently requires States to subgrant 95 percent of improvement funds received under either the 4 percent reservation or the separate 1003(g) grant program to LEAs with schools identified for improvement. Again, very little is left over to support State-level efforts.

In fiscal year 2005, for example, the 5 percent of school improvement funds that States were permitted to keep under section 1003(a) exceeded \$1 million for only 5 States (CA, NY, TX, FL, and IL). Only 13 States could retain more than \$500,000 to support State-level school improvement activities. The vast majority of States likely expended these amounts simply on the additional administrative costs of subgranting the other 95 percent of section 1003(a) funds.

The NATI Interim Report broadly confirmed this lack of resources at the State level, finding that resource limitations posed “moderate or serious challenges” to effective State implementation of NCLB in several areas, including adequacy of State educational agency staff sizes (45 States), adequacy of State funds (40 States), adequacy of Federal funds allocated to the State level (39 States), and adequacy of State-level staff expertise (30 States).

Few States Provide Comprehensive Improvement Support

As a result of these funding limitations, few if any States are able to deliver on the NCLB promise of meaningful and substantial assistance to LEAs and schools identified for improvement. For example, that NATI Interim Report found that the school support teams

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

required by NCLB were operating in just two-thirds of the States during the 2004-05 school year.

And even in States that are able to establish school support teams, a lack of adequate funding likely limits the reach of those teams. In 2004-05, for example, just 13 States fielded school support teams that were able to serve all schools identified for improvement, while 21 States provided support to only a subset of identified schools. The data on LEA improvement efforts are equally discouraging: just 1 in 10 LEAs identified for improvement experienced at least one State intervention during the 2004-05 school year. As the number of LEAs identified for improvement grows, States will need to scale up LEA improvement activities significantly.

The Administration's Reauthorization Proposal

The Administration is proposing to reauthorize the section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants authority to (1) build State capacity to lead LEA and school improvement and (2) target new resources to LEAs to support school improvement activities, including the development and implementation of effective restructuring plans.

Under this proposal, States would be permitted to retain up to 50 percent of their allocations to carry out their responsibilities under sections 1116 and 1117 to establish statewide systems of support for LEA and school improvement. Remaining funds would be used to make competitive awards to LEAs. The reauthorization proposal also would require States to develop plans to ensure that activities supported by School Improvement Grants are (1) integrated with local awards under the section 1003(a) reservation for school improvement, and (2) grounded in scientifically based research on improving student achievement. The Department would support the latter requirement by reserving up to 1 percent of School Improvement Grant funding for the identification and dissemination of promising school improvement practices.

In conjunction with the Administration's reauthorization proposal, the \$500 million request for School Improvement Grants would help ensure that States are able to carry out their statutory improvement responsibilities under sections 1116(c) and section 1117 of the ESEA while providing significant new support for LEA efforts to fundamentally restructure chronically low-performing schools. The reauthorized program also would help States better leverage, through improved coordination and monitoring, more effective expenditure of the existing multi-billion Federal investment in Title I Grants to LEAs, which increasingly must be seen not as the means for continuing longstanding but often ineffectual local programs serving academically disadvantaged students, but as critical resources for change and improvement.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>
Number of awards	57
Range of awards	\$124-66,164

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Department has not yet developed performance measures for the School Improvement Grants program. Program performance likely will be assessed on the basis of the numbers or percentages of schools receiving assistance through the program that make adequate yearly progress or exit improvement status.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Reading first State grants

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

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$1,018,692	\$1,018,692	0

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; however, additional authorizing legislation is sought.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Reading First State Grants program provides State educational agencies (SEAs) and local educational agencies (LEAs) with funds to implement comprehensive reading instruction for children in kindergarten through third grade that is grounded in scientifically based reading research. Participating LEAs and schools use program funds to provide professional development in reading instruction for teachers and administrators; adopt and use screening, diagnostic, and program monitoring assessments for students in kindergarten through third grade to determine where they need help in learning to read; implement reading curricula that reflect scientifically based reading research; and provide reading interventions for children in the early grades who are not reading at grade level.

The Department awards grants for up to 6 years to States through a formula based on the States' share of children aged 5 to 17 whose families have incomes below the poverty line, after first reserving one-half of 1 percent for the Outlying Areas and one-half of 1 percent for Bureau of Indian Affairs schools. The Department awarded initial Reading First State grants after a peer review panel consisting of experts in reading research and instruction examined applications submitted by States in the first year of the program (fiscal year 2002).

States award at least 80 percent of their funds to eligible LEAs on a competitive basis. Eligible LEAs are those that have the highest numbers or percentages of students in grades kindergarten through 3 who are reading below grade level and that have: (1) part or all of an Empowerment Zone or Enterprise Community in their jurisdiction, (2) a significant number or percentage of schools that have been identified for Title I school improvement, or (3) the highest numbers or percentages of students from low-income families compared to other LEAs in the State. SEAs give priority to eligible LEAs in which at least 15 percent or 6,500 children in the LEA are from families with incomes below the poverty line. In determining the amount of funds that LEAs awarded subgrants will receive, the SEA must give each LEA at least the same percentage of the State's funds as it received from the State's allocation under the Title I, Part A program in the preceding fiscal year. LEAs, in turn, provide funds only to schools that both: (1) have the highest numbers or percentages of students in kindergarten through 3rd grade who

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Reading first State grants

are reading below grade level; and (2) are identified for Title I school improvement or have the highest numbers or percentages of students from low-income families.

With the remaining 20 percent of their funds, States may use up to 65 percent for teacher professional development in reading instruction, up to 25 percent for technical assistance for LEAs, and up to 10 percent for planning, administration, and reporting. States must report to the Department on an annual basis regarding their implementation of the program and must submit a midpoint progress report to the Department at the end of the third year of the grant. The expert peer review panel reviews States' progress reports, and, if the Department determines that a State has made insufficient progress, the Department may withhold program funds from the State.

The Department may reserve not more than \$25 million or 2.5 percent, whichever is less, of the appropriation for national activities, including an evaluation of the program and technical assistance, and must reserve an additional \$5 million for information dissemination activities carried out by the National Institute for Literacy (NIFL).

Beginning in fiscal year 2004, if the amount appropriated for the program exceeds the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2003 (\$993.5 million), the Department is required to reserve \$90 million or 10 percent of the excess amount, whichever is less, for Targeted Assistance Grants (TAGs) to States. For States that successfully compete for those funds, the amount of each State's TAG award is based on its relative share of children counted under the Title I formula. The Department awards these grants to States in which: (1) for 2 consecutive years, an increasing percentage of 3rd graders in specified groups have reached the proficient level in reading; and (2) for those same 2 years, the reading skills of 1st, 2nd, and 3rd graders have improved based on reading assessments in the LEAs and schools being served. SEAs may continue to receive these competitive grants in subsequent years only if they are able to demonstrate that they continue to meet these criteria. States that receive a Targeted Assistance Grant must award 100 percent of the funds competitively to LEAs that meet the same criteria. In September 2005, the Department awarded the first TAG to Massachusetts, the only State that was able to demonstrate that it satisfied the criteria of reading improvement for the 2004 grant year. In September 2006, the Department awarded the second TAG to Tennessee, which was the only State that met the criteria for the 2005 grant year.

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 for 15 months through September 30 of the following year.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Reading first State grants

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$993,500
2004.....	1,023,923
2005.....	1,041,600
2006.....	1,029,234
2007.....	1,018,692

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2008, the Administration requests \$1 billion for the Reading First State Grants program, the same as the 2007 level. The 2008 request would continue strong support for Reading First, an important component of the No Child Left Behind Act, and enable States to make subgrants to additional LEAs and schools.

The Reading First State Grants program is one of the Administration's highest priorities for education because of compelling evidence that far too many young people are struggling through school without having mastered reading, the most essential and basic skill. The Reading First State Grants program is a comprehensive, nationwide effort to implement the findings of high-quality scientifically based reading research on classroom reading instruction. Scientifically based reading research applies rigorous and objective procedures to obtain knowledge about reading development, reading instruction, and reading difficulties in young children. In 2000, the National Reading Panel, after reviewing over 10,000 studies on reading, identified five instructional components essential to a child's learning to read – phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary development, fluency, and comprehension. Reading First emphasizes instruction based on these instructional components and, thus, is helping our Nation's schools reach the President's goal of ensuring that every child can read at grade level or above by the end of third grade.

Although Reading First State Grants currently supports programs in approximately 1,700 districts, the need for intensive, targeted reading instruction at the early elementary grades continues. At its current funding level, the Reading First State Grants program reaches only about 6 percent of the children most at risk for academic failure due to weak reading skills. On the 2005 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 61 percent of all fourth graders in high-poverty schools (schools where more than 75 percent of the students were eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch) scored below the "basic" reading level. Research shows that students who fail to read well by fourth grade have a greater likelihood of dropping out and of a lifetime of diminished success. For these reasons, providing consistent support for reading success from the earliest age has critically important benefits. The Reading First State Grants program is specifically designed to improve reading gains, reduce the number of children who fall behind in reading, provide additional support to children who are struggling with reading, and reduce the number of children referred to special education programs based on low reading scores. Initial performance data from Reading First schools demonstrate increases in the reading abilities of every subgroup and indicate that Reading First works as intended.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Reading first State grants

Also, the Department's National Center for Education Statistics is conducting the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, which follows the academic progress of children from kindergarten through 5th grade, providing information about children's reading achievement in early elementary school. The study found, for example, that the differences in children's reading skills and knowledge that are usually seen in later grades appear to be present as children begin school and persist after 1 or 2 years of school. The Reading First State Grants program was designed to address this problem by ensuring that young children receive the instructional assistance that they need before gaps in skills and knowledge widen.

The Reading First program was rated "Effective" by the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) during the 2006 rating cycle. The PART rating reflects the program's early performance data that show clear early reading gains after only a few years of program implementation. Those early results provide additional justification for continuation of the program at the requested level.

As a preliminary plan, the Department would reserve \$25 million of program funds to evaluate the effectiveness of the program and for technical assistance activities. Of these funds, the Department would use approximately \$7 million for program evaluation. The Department is required to conduct a 5-year evaluation of the program that identifies the effects of SEA and LEA activities on improving reading instruction. The final report from this impact evaluation will be available in 2008, with an interim report in 2007. In 2006, the Department released the results of an implementation study comparing survey data from Reading First schools and non-Reading First, Title I schools with comparable demographic characteristics.

Technical assistance activities supported with fiscal year 2008 funds will continue to address the needs of States, districts, and schools as they build their capacity to implement high-quality reading instruction that reflects scientifically based reading research and meet the challenges of implementing the program. For example, the National Center for Reading First Technical Assistance provides technical assistance to States and LEAs through national and regional conferences, institutes, and seminars; training and professional development; on-site, telephone, and e-mail consultations; products and materials; and links to national reading experts. An additional technical assistance project focuses on implementing scientifically based reading instruction in LEAs that do not meet Title I adequate yearly progress goals in reading. These LEAs are likely to be eligible for Reading First State Grant funds, but may lack the knowledge and expertise in scientifically based reading instruction to implement Reading First State Grant subgrants successfully.

Also, as required by statute, the Department would reserve \$5 million for the National Institute for Literacy, and \$2.5 million for Targeted Assistance Grants (TAGs), which are competitive grants to States that demonstrate progress in reading achievement.

The Reading First State Grants program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2008 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal. For the reauthorization, the Administration is proposing minor amendments to increase accountability in

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Reading first State grants

large LEAs; improve targeting of program funds to the schools most in need of support; and increase flexibility in the Targeted Assistance Grants program.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Range of awards	\$2,463- 144,887	\$2,440- 135,684	\$2,440- 135,702
Average State grant	19,161	18,769	18,769
Amount for Outlying Areas	5,146	5,093	5,093
Amount for BIA	5,146	5,093	5,093
Evaluation and technical assistance	25,000	25,000	25,000
Information dissemination (National Institute for Literacy)	5,000	5,000	5,000
Targeted assistance grants (TAGs)	3,573	2,520	2,520
Peer review of new award applications (for TAGs)	36	6	6

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents 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 FY 2008 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Goal: To improve kindergarten through third grade student achievement in reading by supporting State and local educational agencies in establishing reading programs that are based on scientifically based reading research.

Objective: *To increase the percentage of students who learn to read proficiently by the end of third grade.*

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Reading first State grants

Measure: The percentage of grade 1 students in Reading First schools who meet or exceed proficiency in reading on Reading First outcome measures of fluency will increase.

Year	Target	Actual
2004		43
2005		50
2006	45	
2007	52	
2008	54	

Assessment of progress: Performance against this measure improved significantly between 2003 and 2004. The data are from the 29 States that had implemented their Reading First programs to the extent where they could capture this information. As more States move to full implementation, the number of States reporting for this indicator will increase. The 2006 performance target is based on data from 2004 State performance reports. The 2007 and 2008 targets reflect the most recent performance data available.

Measure: The percentage of grade 3 students in Reading First schools who meet or exceed proficiency in reading on Reading First outcome measures of fluency will increase.

Year	Target	Actual
2004		36
2005		39
2006	38	
2007	41	
2008	43	

Assessment of progress: Performance against this indicator improved between 2003 and 2004. The 2004 data are from the 29 States that had implemented their Reading First programs to the extent where they could capture this information. As more States move to full implementation, the number of States reporting for this indicator will increase. The 2006 performance target is based on data from 2004 State performance reports. The 2007 and 2008 targets reflect the most recent performance data available.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Reading first State grants

Measure: The percentage of grade 2 students in Reading First schools that meet or exceed proficiency in reading on Reading First outcome measures of fluency will increase.										
Year	Target					Actual				
	Econ. Disadv.	LEP	African Amer.	Hispan.	Students With Disabil.	Econ. Disadv.	LEP	African Amer.	Hispan.	Students With Disabil.
2004						33	27	34	30	17
2005						39	32	37	39	23
2006	35	29	36	32	19					
2007	41	34	39	41	25					
2008	43	36	41	43	27					

Assessment of progress: Performance against this indicator improved markedly between 2003 and 2004 for all the targeted groups. The 2004 data are from the 29 States with data available. As more States move to full implementation, the number of States reporting for this indicator will increase. The 2006 performance target is based on data from 2004 State performance reports. The 2007 and 2008 targets reflect the most recent performance data available.

Measure: The number of States reporting an increase in the percentage of grade 3 students in Reading First schools who meet or exceed proficiency on Reading First measures of reading comprehension will increase.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		7
2005		19
2006	12	
2007	24	
2008	29	

Assessment of progress: The 2004 performance data is based on information from the 10 States that had 2 consecutive years of reading comprehension data. In 2005, 23 States provided data for this measure through annual State performance reports. As more States move to full implementation, the number of States reporting for this indicator will increase. The 2006 performance target is based on 2004 data. The 2007 and 2008 targets reflect the most recent performance data available.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Reading first State grants

Measure: The number of States reporting an increase in the percentage of grade 2 students in Reading First schools who meet or exceed proficiency on Reading First measures of reading comprehension will increase.

Year	Target					Actual				
	Econ. Disadv.	LEP	African Amer.	Hispan.	Students With Disabil.	Econ. Disadv.	LEP	African Amer.	Hispan.	Students With Disabil.
2004						4	5	5	5	2
2005						14	6	16	9	12
2006	7	10	10	10	5					
2007	19	15	21	15	17					
2008	24	20	26	20	22					

Assessment of progress: The 2004 performance data are from the 5 States that had the 2 years of reading comprehension data needed to show an increase. In 2005, 19 States provided data for this measure through annual State performance reports. As more States move to full implementation, the number of States reporting for this indicator will increase. The 2006 performance target is based on 2004 data. The 2007 and 2008 targets reflect the most recent data available.

Measure: Reading achievement in Reading First Schools: Increased percentages of third-grade students will read at grade level or above in schools participating in Reading First programs, as measured by meeting or exceeding the proficient level in reading on State assessments in reading.

Year	Target	Actual
2004		21
2005		27
2006	15	
2007	32	
2008	37	

Assessment of progress: The 2004 performance data are from the 22 States with the proficiency data needed to show an increase. In 2005, 42 States provided data for this measure. By 2006, the Department anticipates that all States will report for this indicator. The 2006 performance target is based on 2004 data. The 2007 and 2008 targets reflect the most recent data available.

Efficiency Measure

The Department's efficiency measure for the Reading First State Grants program is the number of days that States take to respond in writing to the issues identified during on-site monitoring visits. For fiscal year 2004, the average time between the Department's transmission of a monitoring report and a State's response was 83 days. For fiscal year 2005, the number of

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Reading first State grants

days States took to respond dropped to an average of 65. Targets of 60, 55, and 50 days have been set for 2006, 2007, and 2008, respectively.

Other Performance Information

Though the PART review was positive (based, in particular, on the program's strong performance data), the Department's Inspector General released a report in September 2006 on the program's grant application process that raised questions about the implementation of the program. In response to the report, the Department has reassigned staff, spoken to States and other involved parties to solicit feedback on the grant application process, and reviewed all program activities to ensure that the Department is fully responsive to the concerns raised in the report.

Fiscal year 2008 funds will continue to fund an evaluation being conducted by the Institute for Education Sciences that uses an experimental design to measure the impact of the Reading First State Grants program on student reading achievement. A second evaluation, conducted by the Department's Policy and Program Studies Service, examined Reading First implementation by comparing survey data from Reading First schools to non-Reading First Title I schools. The final report found that teachers in Reading First schools spent more classroom time on reading, that Reading First teachers received more professional development than Title I teachers, and that Reading First schools were more likely to have adopted an intervention program for struggling readers. In addition to these studies, two new evaluations are exploring: (1) teacher preparation with regard to the essential components of reading instruction; and (2) the impact of Reading First on referrals to special education services.

An external study of the Reading First State Grants program conducted by the nonpartisan Center on Education Policy found that State and local education officials believe that the program has been effective. According to the study's survey results, over 90 percent of Reading First-funded school district respondents that reported gains in reading achievement stated that the interventions and assessments implemented with support from the Reading First program have had a direct, positive effect on student achievement in reading.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The Reading First State Grants program was rated "Effective" by the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) during the 2006 rating cycle. The PART rating of "Effective" is a favorable assessment that reflects the program's early performance data that show clear early reading gains after only a few years of implementation. The only significant weakness identified through the PART process is that the Department does not yet have results of a large-scale evaluation that demonstrates that Reading First is effective and achieving results. A survey-based implementation study released by the Department in 2006 showed that the characteristics of Reading First schools and teachers are more likely to lead to successful early reading instruction than those of non-Reading First Title I schools. The more comprehensive impact evaluation examining student outcomes will be completed in 2008.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Reading first State grants

The PART review recommended that the Department add a performance measure on third-grade reading proficiency based on State assessments, pursue targeted professional development activities to ensure that all subgroups of students in Reading First schools receive instruction to enable them to read on grade level, and complete impact evaluation activities and disseminate findings regarding the effectiveness of various instructional techniques that can be used in Reading First and other reading programs.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early reading first

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I, Part B, Subpart 2)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$103,118	\$117,666	+\$14,548

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; however, reauthorizing legislation is sought.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program supports local efforts to enhance the school readiness of young children, particularly those from low-income families, through scientific, research-based strategies and professional development that are designed to enhance the verbal skills, phonological awareness, letter knowledge, and pre-reading skills of children from birth through age 5. Through the understanding and use of an increasingly complex and rich spoken vocabulary, developed in part through teacher-read stories, children begin to build a strong foundation for learning to read. Program activities also help to prepare staff in preschool programs, through professional development and other support, to provide high-quality language, literacy, and pre-reading activities, using scientifically based research, for preschool-aged children.

The Early Reading First program provides competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) that are eligible to receive a Reading First State Grants subgrant and to public or private organizations or agencies that are located in eligible LEAs. Public or private agencies that apply for an Early Reading First grant must do so on behalf of at least one program that serves preschool-aged children. The Department may award these grants for up to 6 years.

The program's goals are to: (1) provide professional development for teachers, based on scientific research, to enhance children's language, cognitive, and early reading skills; (2) provide preschool-age children with cognitive learning opportunities and high-quality language and literature-rich environments; (3) integrate materials, activities, and instruction that are grounded in scientifically based reading research to support the development of young children's vocabulary, their ability to hear sounds that make up words, their understanding of how print and books work, and their alphabetic knowledge; (4) use screenings and assessments to determine the skills children are learning in order to prevent reading failure; and (5) improve all aspects of an instructional program, including materials, activities, tools, and assessments.

The Department is required to conduct an independent evaluation of this program to determine its effectiveness. The evaluation, for which up to \$3 million is authorized over a 4-year period, must examine how grantees are improving the prereading skills of preschool children, the

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early reading first

effectiveness of the professional development provided to teachers, how early childhood teachers are being prepared with scientifically based reading research on early reading development, which activities and instructional practices are most effective, and how grantees are integrating instructional materials and activities into preschools.

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$74,512
2004.....	94,440
2005.....	104,160
2006.....	103,118
2007.....	103,118

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2008, the Administration requests \$118 million for the Early Reading First program, a \$14.5 million increase from the 2007 level, to fund a new round of competitive grants to LEAs in local communities with high numbers of low-income families and to strengthen professional development partnerships for early childhood educators. The funding increase is due to the consolidation of this program with the Early Childhood Professional Development program, a program with similar purposes, which will allow Early Reading First to focus more intently on teacher development. These grants help improve the pre-reading skills and school readiness of children from birth through age 5. Local communities implement subgrants from the Reading First State Grants program to provide seamless pre-kindergarten through grade 3 pre-reading and reading instruction. Funds in 2008 will support up to 36 new Early Reading First projects, which focus on providing cognitive learning opportunities for young children to ensure that they are well prepared for kindergarten. Young children need to develop their vocabulary, acquire the ability to hear the sounds that make up words, and learn about how print and books work, and Early Reading First projects help them develop these skills.

Research demonstrates the strong relationship between high-quality educational experiences for children before kindergarten and their later success in school. The National Research Council report, *Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children* (1998), concluded that the majority of reading problems faced by today's adolescents and adults could have been avoided or resolved in the early years of childhood. The National Center for Early Development and Learning report, *Cost, Quality and Child Outcomes* (1999), concluded that children's cognitive and social competence in the second grade can be predicted by the experiences that they had 4 years previously in child care, even after taking into account kindergarten and first-grade classroom experiences. The report also found that the populations of children that have traditionally been at risk for not doing well in school are more affected by the quality of childcare experiences than are other children.

Findings from the Department's Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, which follows the academic progress of a nationally representative sample of children from kindergarten through 5th grade and provides information about children's reading achievement in early elementary school,

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early reading first

support the need for this program. Study findings include that students' reading achievement scores in kindergarten are positively associated with their reading achievement scores in fifth grade. This finding suggests that differences in early literacy skills when children begin school may persist throughout the early years of schooling.

Early Reading First grants help to meet the challenges of preparing young children for success in school by funding projects that demonstrate the capacity to provide high-quality, research-based experiences in language and early literacy for preschool-age children. These grants improve the instruction and environment provided by programs primarily serving young children living in poverty, including preschool programs supported by the Title I program, Head Start, and publicly funded or subsidized child care.

The Early Reading First program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2008 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal. For the reauthorization, the Administration is proposing authorizing language to strengthen partnerships between preschool providers and institutions of higher education that provide professional development to early childhood educators. This change would include terminating the separate Early Childhood Educator Professional Development (ECEPD) program, transferring the resources now used to fund ECEPD to Early Reading First, and restructuring the Early Reading First statute to require that all projects have a strong educator professional development component. These changes will ensure that all the early childhood discretionary grants embody the key attributes of both programs, such as a focus on scientifically based reading readiness and high-quality professional development. In addition, consolidation of the two programs should increase efficiency and strengthen administration, as early childhood programs will no longer have to deal with two separate authorities (with their own application requirements, funding criteria, and accountability mechanisms) and the Department will be able to focus its attention on obtaining the best results from a single program.

For 2008, the Department estimates that the requested funding would support the award of 30-36 new grants, the same number as in 2007. The larger average grant size (\$3.3 million - \$3.9 million, as opposed to \$2.9 million - \$3.4 million) will allow grantees to strengthen partnerships between preschool providers and institutions of higher education that provide professional development to early childhood educators.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Number of new awards	30-36 ¹	30-36 ¹	30-36 ¹
Average award	\$2,864- 3,437	\$2,864- 3,437	\$3,269- 3,922

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early reading first

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) -- cont.

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Number of children served	8,550	8,550	8,550
Number of teachers served	700	700	700
Peer review of new award applications	\$1,031	\$1,031	\$1,031

¹The Department funded multi-year projects under this program in fiscal year 2006 entirely from the fiscal year 2006 appropriation; estimates for 2007 and 2008 assume continuation of this policy.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Department is completing a 3-year evaluation, begun in fiscal year 2003, to study the impact of early childhood programs funded by Early Reading First on children's literacy and language skills. The study is evaluating the extent to which Early Reading First contributes to literacy, language, and other outcomes for participants relative to non-participants. It is also examining whether the impact varies by program, child, and family characteristics. The Department submitted a required interim evaluation report to Congress in January 2005, outlining the evaluation design and status of the data collection activities. The final evaluation will be released in early 2007.

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the program made toward achieving program results. Achievement of targets is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2008 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by those served by this program.

Goal: To support local efforts to enhance the early language, literacy and prereading development of preschool-aged children through strategies and professional development based on scientifically based reading research.

Objective: *Preschool-aged children will attain the necessary early language, cognitive and prereading skills to enter kindergarten prepared for continued learning, including the age-appropriate development of oral language and alphabet knowledge.*

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early reading first

Measure: The percentage of preschool-aged children participating in Early Reading First (ERF) programs who achieve age-appropriate oral language skills as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		56
2005	57	67.9
2006	58	
2007	59	
2008	60	

Measure: The number of letters ERF children can identify, measured by the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		15
2005	16	16
2006	17	
2007	18	
2008	20	

Assessment of progress: The first full year of implementation for the Early Reading First program was the 2003-2004 school year, and not all grantees used the specific assessments named in the GPRA measures. Beginning with the 2004-2005 grant year, all grantees are required to report on the measures in their annual grantee performance reports. The program added an impact measure, the percent of 4-year old children participating in Early Reading First programs who achieve significant learning gains on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Data, beginning with 2005 grantees. Data from the 2006 performance reports should be available by February 2007.

Efficiency Measure

The Department recently established a program efficiency measure to assess the cost per preschool-aged child participating in Early Reading First programs who achieves significant gains in receptive language on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III. The Department expects to have baseline data for this measure in February 2007.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The Early Reading First program was rated “Moderately Effective” by the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) during the 2006 rating cycle. The program received high scores for purpose, planning, and management but weaknesses were cited in program results and accountability measures.

The PART review recommended that the Department collect data for the performance new measures, develop a measure of kindergarten readiness by requiring entities that receive a

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early reading first

grant for a second 3-year period to collect former participants' academic achievement in kindergarten, and update the grantee performance data on the program's website as data become available. The Department will implement these recommendations by collecting and posting on the program's website the data on each current performance measure, and assessing the feasibility of collecting data on participants' kindergarten readiness.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I, Part E, Section 1502)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$31,596	\$100,000	+\$68,404

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; however, additional authorizing legislation is sought.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Striving Readers program supports competitive grants to implement and evaluate reading interventions for middle- or high-school students reading significantly below grade level. This program complements the Reading First State Grants program, which provides comprehensive reading instruction for children in kindergarten through third grade that is grounded in scientifically based reading research. Projects focus on the implementation and evaluation of strategies to improve the reading achievement of students reading 2 or more years below grade level, including professional development in reading instruction for secondary-school teachers in the core academic subjects and the implementation of reading curricula that are appropriate for teenage students.

The Department makes awards to local educational agencies (LEAs) eligible to receive funds under Part A of Title I that have one or more high schools or middle schools with significant numbers of students reading below grade level or at risk of not meeting Title I annual yearly progress requirements. Eligible LEAs may also apply in partnership with institutions of higher education and public or private, nonprofit or for-profit organizations. State educational agencies (SEAs) may apply on behalf of eligible LEAs and in partnership with other entities. Awards are for up to 5 years; recipients conduct rigorous evaluations, including the use of an experimental research design by selected grantees. In addition, conference report language accompanying the Department's fiscal year 2005 appropriation directed the Department to balance grants between projects serving middle schools and projects serving high schools, and Senate report language accompanying the 2006 bill encouraged continuation of that policy.

The Department awarded the first eight grants under the program in February 2006. In conducting the first competition, the Department established two absolute priorities: (1) grantees will use program funds only to serve students who attend schools eligible to receive funds under Part A of Title I and are in grades 6 through 12; and (2) grantees will (a) implement school-level strategies designed to increase reading achievement by integrating enhanced literacy instruction throughout the curriculum and the entire school, (b) implement an intensive, targeted intervention for students reading at least 2 years below grade level, and (c) carry out a rigorous, independent evaluation of the project that must include an evaluation of the targeted intervention and must use an experimental research design.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

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

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	0
2004.....	0
2005.....	\$24,800
2006.....	29,700
2007.....	31,596

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Striving Readers program was funded in fiscal years 2005 – 2007 under ESEA Section 1502, the Title I demonstration authority. The ESEA is subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2008 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal. In the upcoming reauthorization of ESEA, the Administration will pursue establishment of a specific authority for the program. The Administration is also considering options that would target funds to Title I-eligible middle and high schools that have been identified for improvement in reading for students in grades 6-12, and creating a national research panel to review evidence on scientifically based adolescent literacy strategies.

The Administration requests \$100 million for the fourth year of funding for the Striving Readers initiative, a \$68 million (216.5 percent) increase over the 2007 level. Although many early elementary-school students are now receiving research-based reading instruction through the Reading First State Grants program, students who are currently in secondary school are generally not able to benefit from comparable high-quality instruction. Significant advances have been made in understanding the abilities young children must acquire in order to develop beginning reading skills and the conditions under which those skills are most effectively taught, but much less evidence is available on how these abilities are best acquired and taught during secondary school. One-fourth of the Nation's 8th-graders who take the National Assessment of Educational Progress cannot read at the basic level, which means that they have reading problems that interfere with their ability to complete coursework necessary in preparing for college or the workforce, undermine their motivation to finish high school, and contribute to behavioral and emotional problems. Middle and high schools do not routinely teach reading and have no proven strategies and models to bring to bear on this serious problem.

Many of these secondary school students are now struggling to improve their ability to read and are at risk of dropping out of school, in part because of frustration about their poor reading skills. A 1999 study by Andrew Sum, *Literacy in the Labor Force: Results from the Adult Literacy Survey*, underscores the concern about the future of students who drop out of school because they are poor readers. The study found that prose literacy is highly correlated with future

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

earnings and with the probability of earning a high school diploma and earning a higher education degree.

Too many of the Nation's high school students are unable to read at a level that would enable them to meet challenging State academic content and student performance standards. For example, a 2002 study done by researchers at the Johns Hopkins Center for Social Organization of Schools estimates that up to one-third of entering ninth-grade students need additional help in reading. The problem is even worse in high-poverty high schools. The same report found that about half of freshmen students attending regular high school in Philadelphia began their freshman year 3 or more years behind grade level in reading achievement. Further, in 8 of the 22 high schools studied in Philadelphia, less than 30 percent of the freshmen were within 2 years of the expected grade level in reading. In addition, the Secretary's Commission on Higher Education reported that, according to the National Assessment of Adult Literacy, many college graduates have literacy problems.

The 2008 request would fund the continuation of the grants first made in 2006 and also support approximately 20 new awards to enable more local school districts to implement and evaluate demonstration reading intervention programs for secondary-school students with difficulties in reading. In addition, the Department will continue to reserve a portion of funds to work with local evaluators in order to ensure that the local evaluations are rigorous and are carried out consistent with the evaluation plan proposed in the application. The Department will also begin an independent evaluation of the program.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Amount for local awards	\$29,450	\$34,400	\$98,000
Continuation	29,450	34,400	29,000
New	0	0	69,000
Total number of grants			
Continuation	8	8	8
New	0	0	20
Peer review of new award applications	0	0	\$1,000
Evaluation	\$250	\$250	\$1,000

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The performance measures for the Striving Readers program are: (1) the percentage of adolescent students reading significantly below grade level who demonstrate a gain in their reading achievement, at a minimum of one grade level or its equivalent after participating in an intensive intervention over an academic year; and (2) the percentage of students in schools

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

participating in the Striving Readers program who score at or above proficiency on their State's assessment of reading or language arts. Grantees will report on progress toward meeting the performance measures in their annual performance reports, and will submit the first year of performance data in February 2007. In addition, all grantees will conduct rigorous evaluations, using an experimental research design, of their targeted interventions to determine the effectiveness of the intervention. In August 2006, the Department awarded a contract to provide technical assistance to local evaluators that are conducting experimental or high-quality quasi-experimental evaluations of Striving Readers programs in order to ensure their rigor.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Math now for elementary school students

(Proposed legislation)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
0	\$125,000	+\$125,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Math Now for Elementary School Students initiative would provide competitive grants to partnerships to improve instruction in mathematics for students in kindergarten through 6th grade. Grantees would implement mathematics programs that reflect the best available evidence on mathematics instruction, to enable all students to reach grade-level achievement standards and prepare them to enroll in and pass algebra courses. Grantees would use the funds to expand the use of proven practices in mathematics instruction, including those recommended by the National Mathematics Panel, to help teachers prepare all students in algebraic concepts so that every student can take and pass algebra in secondary school. In addition, the Administration is recommending that the program be included, under a specific authorization, in the upcoming reauthorization for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Awards would be made on a competitive basis to a high-need local educational agency (LEA); a State educational agency (SEA); or a partnership of one or more eligible LEAs or SEAs, or both, that may also include one or more institutions of higher education, non-profit organizations, and for-profit organizations. A "high-need LEA" would be defined as one with schools: (1) with significant numbers or percentages of students whose mathematics skills are below grade level; (2) that are not making adequate yearly progress under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; or (3) in which students are receiving instruction in mathematics from teachers who do not have expertise in mathematics.

LEAs and other grantees would use funds to: (1) implement mathematics instructional materials that involve intensive and systemic instruction and are based on the best available evidence on mathematics instruction; (2) provide professional development to teachers and administrators on the implementation of new materials and the content of those materials; and (3) adopt and use mathematics assessments for students in kindergarten through grade 2 that are aligned with the mathematics content that will be taught, and the assessments administered by the State under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, in order to determine students' progress and the areas in which they need help in learning mathematics. The Department would give priority to projects that will implement statewide strategies for improving mathematics instruction and raising mathematics achievement in elementary school.

The Department would also use program funds to conduct an independent evaluation of the program that includes an assessment of its impact on student achievement. Funds also may be

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Math now for elementary school students

used to provide technical assistance to prospective applicants and grantees. Grantees would be required to submit specified, disaggregated data to the Department, including mathematics test scores and information about the percentage of students in the schools in the LEA who enroll in and pass algebra courses.

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2008, the Administration is requesting \$125 million for Math Now for Elementary School Students, a key component of the President's American Competitiveness Initiative. This program would help ensure that more students are prepared to take and pass challenging mathematics and science courses in middle school, high school, and college. It is crucial for elementary-school students to receive a solid education in arithmetic and algebraic concepts so that they are prepared to take challenging mathematics courses in secondary school, beginning with algebra.

According to the National Science Foundation, only 7 percent of elementary-school teachers majored or minored in mathematics or mathematics education, and 40 percent of elementary- and middle-school teachers of mathematics report that they do not feel qualified to teach the content they teach. In addition, results from a follow-up study to the Third International Mathematics and Science Study by Edward Silver of the University of Pittsburgh suggest that kindergarten through grade 8 mathematics curricula in the United States tend to be unfocused and repetitive. Based on an examination of basal texts, pre-algebra texts, and algebra texts commonly used in grade 8, Silver also found the U.S. mathematics curricula not very demanding. Especially in non-algebra classes, teachers were preoccupied with arithmetic at the expense of algebra, geometry, and measurement. In addition, in all courses, even algebra courses, teachers tended to pay excessive attention to low-level knowledge and skills rather than conceptual understanding or complex problem solving. It is crucial for elementary teachers to receive the assistance they need to overcome these problems and improve mathematics instruction so that students are prepared to take and pass algebra and other high-level mathematics courses in secondary school.

Educators have long viewed algebra as a "gateway" course to advanced mathematics and science courses in high school, yet most students do not take algebra in middle school. Students who take the National Assessment of Educational Progress are asked background questions about their course taking. In 2004, only 29 percent of 13-year-olds reported that they were enrolled in an algebra course. Although this percentage is higher than in previous years, the number of eighth graders taking algebra is still well below what is needed if the Nation is to graduate a sufficient number of students with high-level mathematics skills. Moreover, students from higher-income families are almost twice as likely as lower-income students to take algebra in middle school and geometry in high school. In order to be successful in algebra and higher-level mathematics courses beginning in middle school, students need a firm foundation in mathematics at the elementary level. The Math Now for Elementary School Students program will prepare students early on for a more rigorous secondary-school mathematics curriculum.

In addition, the National Mathematics Panel will be releasing its recommendations for improving mathematics instruction in a preliminary report in March 2007 and a final report in February

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Math now for elementary school students

2008. Math Now for Elementary School Students would provide the support needed to translate the Panel's findings into action for high-need schools and LEAs.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>
Number of awards	100-125
Average award	\$985-1,231
Peer review of new award applications	\$1,250
Evaluation	\$625

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Department has not yet developed specific performance measures for the Math Now for Elementary School Students program. However, grantees would be required to report disaggregated performance data for the program, including data on the percentage of students in participating LEAs who take and pass algebra courses. The Department will construct performance measures and targets that draw on the data from these reports. In addition, the Department will conduct a national evaluation of the program.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Math now for middle school students

(Proposed legislation)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
0	\$125,000	+\$125,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Math Now for Middle School Students initiative would provide competitive grants to partnerships to improve the mathematics achievement of middle-school students whose achievement is significantly below grade level and to enable them to reach challenging State achievement standards. Funds would support comprehensive mathematics initiatives that are based on the best available evidence on mathematics instruction for middle-school students, including recommendations from the National Mathematics Panel, and that improve the quality of mathematics instruction, provide intensive interventions to middle-school students whose achievement is significantly below grade level, and help build a strong, scientific research base for identifying and replicating strategies that improve adolescent mathematics skills. In addition, the Administration is recommending that the program be included, under a specific authorization, in the upcoming reauthorization for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Awards would be made on a competitive basis to a high-need local educational agency (LEA); a State educational agency (SEA); or a partnership of one or more eligible LEAs or SEAs, or both, that may also include one or more institutions of higher education, non-profit organizations, and for-profit organizations. A "high-need LEA" would be defined as one with schools: (1) with significant numbers or percentages of students whose mathematics skills are below grade level; (2) that are not making adequate yearly progress under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; or (3) in which students are receiving instruction in mathematics from teachers who do not have expertise in mathematics. The Department would give priority to projects that would implement statewide strategies for improving mathematics instruction and raising mathematics achievement in middle school.

Grantees would use funds to: (1) implement interventions that reflect the best available evidence on teaching middle-school mathematics and that involve intensive and systemic instruction; (2) conduct continuous progress monitoring, including adopting and using assessments in order to measure middle-school students' progress; and (3) provide professional development for administrators and teachers of middle-school students that targets important mathematics content knowledge and effective practices.

The Department would use program funds to conduct an independent evaluation of the program that includes an assessment of the impact of the program on student achievement. Funds also may be used to provide technical assistance to prospective applicants and grantees. Grantees

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Math now for middle school students

would be required to submit specified, disaggregated data to the Department, including mathematics test scores and the percentage of students in the schools in the LEA who enroll and pass algebra courses.

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2008, the Administration is requesting \$125 million for Math Now for Middle School Students, a key component of the President's American Competitiveness Initiative. This program would help improve the instruction that middle school students receive in mathematics and prepare them for higher-level mathematics courses, including middle-school algebra.

It is crucial for middle-school students to take and pass algebra courses so that they are ready for higher-level mathematics courses in high school. Educators have long viewed algebra as a "gateway" course to advanced mathematics and science courses in high school, yet most students do not take algebra in middle school. Students who take the National Assessment of Educational Progress are asked background questions about their course taking. In 2004, only 29 percent of 13-year-olds reported that they were enrolled in an algebra course.

American students' performance on international mathematics assessments provides a compelling rationale for an intensive, targeted initiative to strengthen the mathematics skills of our middle-school students, especially low-achieving students. For example, the 2003 Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) focused on the performance of 15-year-olds in mathematics literacy and problem solving. Results of that study suggest that American high-school students continue to lag behind students elsewhere in mathematics and that the learning gap between American students and students in other countries is widening. On the PISA assessment, the United States ranked 24th out of 29 countries belonging to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, which represents the world's most advanced countries. In addition, in the 2004 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), the percentage of 17-year-olds who successfully performed moderately complex mathematical procedures and reasoning showed no measurable change from 1999 and 2004; also, no change was found for the highest performance level.

Moreover, middle- and even high-school teachers' knowledge and skills in mathematics are frequently below the levels needed to ensure that these teachers will be able to raise the performance of their students. National Center for Education Statistics data show that, during the 1999-2000 school year, the most recent year for which data are available, a low percentage of certified middle-school mathematics teachers had an undergraduate major or graduate degree in mathematics. During that year, only 45.4 percent of middle-school (grades 5-9) mathematics teachers were fully qualified (both State certification and a major or minor in mathematics), while 34.9 percent were under-qualified (State certification without a major or minor in mathematics), 16.6 percent were unqualified (neither State certification nor a major or minor in mathematics), and 3.2 percent were not State-certified but had majored or minored in mathematics. These data demonstrate the need for the teacher professional development that would be provided through this program.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Math now for middle school students

The need to provide students with additional assistance is particularly important in high-poverty schools. A 2002 study done by researchers at the Johns Hopkins Center for Social Organization of Schools reports that “In almost every State, there is at least a 35 percentage point difference between the percent of white eighth graders and the percent of eighth graders in the State’s largest minority groups scoring at the basic level in mathematics on the NAEP test.” The same study also reports that about half of all students who attend non-selective public high schools in Philadelphia begin their freshmen year 3 or more years behind grade level in mathematics achievement. These findings lend further support for funding the Math Now for Middle School Students program, which would support the mathematics instruction that these students need. In addition, the National Mathematics Panel will be releasing its recommendations for improving mathematics instruction in a preliminary report in March 2007 and a final report in February 2008; Math Now for Middle School Students would serve as a vehicle to translate the Panel’s recommendations into action to better serve our middle-school students who are most in need of research-based instruction.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>
Number of awards	100-125
Average award	\$985-1,231
Peer review of new award applications	\$1,250
Evaluation	\$625

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Department has not yet developed specific performance measures for the Math Now for Middle School Students program. However, as discussed above, grantees would be required to report disaggregated performance data for the program, including data on the percentage of students in participating LEAs who take and pass algebra courses. The Department will construct performance measures and targets that draw on the data from these reports. In addition, the Department will conduct a national evaluation of the program.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even start

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title 1, Part B, Subpart 3)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$111,584	0	-\$111,584

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008. The Administration is not seeking reauthorizing legislation.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Even Start program supports projects that provide educational services to low-income families, including parents eligible for services under the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act and their children from birth through age 7. The program aims to improve the educational opportunities of children and their parents in low-income areas by integrating early childhood education, adult education, and parenting education into "family literacy" programs.

The Department allocates Even Start funds to States based on their relative shares of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I, Part A funds. State educational agencies (SEAs) make competitive subgrants to partnerships of local educational agencies and other organizations, giving priority to proposals that target areas designated as empowerment zones or enterprise communities or that propose to serve families in other high-poverty areas.

The statute also requires that subgrantees be representative of urban and rural areas of the State and that local projects assume an increasing share of program costs over the 4-year subgrant period, beginning with 10 percent in the first year and ending with 40 percent in the fourth. For projects receiving subsequent grants, the match is 50 percent in years 5 through 8 and 65 percent after 8 years.

An SEA may reserve up to 6 percent of its allocation for providing technical assistance for program improvement and replication through subgrants or contracts; for developing indicators of program quality and monitoring, evaluating, and improving programs based on the State's indicators; and for providing assistance to subgrantees to improve the quality of family literacy services that they provide under the program. An SEA may also use up to half of this reservation for program administration.

Six percent of the annual appropriation is set aside at the national level for programs serving migrant children, the Outlying Areas, and Indian tribes and tribal organizations if the appropriation for the program exceeds \$200 million. When the appropriation is \$200 million or less, the set-aside is 5 percent. The Department is also required to fund a grant for an Even Start project in a women's prison. Up to 3 percent is reserved at the Federal level for evaluation and technical assistance. In addition, in years in which the appropriation exceeds the amount

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even start

appropriated for the preceding fiscal year, the Department is required to reserve \$2 million, or 50 percent of the excess, whichever is less, for the National Institute for Literacy (NIFL) to carry out scientifically based research on family literacy. When the appropriation is the same as or less than the preceding year's appropriation, the Department may only reserve sufficient funds for NIFL to continue multi-year research projects. The statute also authorizes \$1 million for competitive grants to States for Even Start statewide family literacy initiatives in years when the appropriation increases over the previous year.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$248,375
2004.....	246,910
2005.....	225,095
2006.....	99,000
2007.....	111,584

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Even Start program is authorized by the ESEA and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The Administration is not recommending reauthorization for this program and, accordingly, the budget provides no funding for it. The request continues the Administration's policy to support high-priority early learning programs, such as Reading First State Grants and Early Reading First, that are better focused on achieving the President's literacy goals for young children.

National evaluations of Even Start provide strong justification for terminating the program. Three national evaluations show that Even Start projects did not effectively increase the literacy skills of participating children and their parents. Like the previous evaluations, the final report from the most recent rigorous evaluation of Even Start (Third National Even Start Evaluation: Program Impacts and Implications for Improvement, 2003) concluded that, while Even Start participants made gains, they did not perform better than those in the comparison group that did not receive services. Moreover, the scores of Even Start participants after 1 year of participation in the program were very low. For example, Even Start children scored at the 6th percentile when tested at the end of the program on a measure of vocabulary knowledge, and Even Start parents scored at the 3rd-grade level when tested at the end of the program on a measure of reading comprehension.

The key premise underlying the Even Start program is that the integration of the four core instructional components of adult education, parenting education, parent-child activities, and early childhood education adds value to the individual components. This premise, while

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even start

appealing, remains unproven. The extent to which family literacy programs can enhance parent literacy and parenting skills is unknown.

Although the Even Start program has increased its focus on providing high-quality, research-based early childhood education, the Reading First State Grants and Early Reading First programs are better structured to implement proven research directly and effectively. For example, the Reading First State Grants program is implementing comprehensive reading instruction using scientifically based reading research for children in kindergarten through third grade. The Early Reading First program aligns closely with the Reading First State Grants program by supporting local efforts to enhance the school readiness of preschool-aged children, through scientific, research-based strategies and professional development that are designed to enhance verbal skills, phonological awareness, letter knowledge, and pre-reading skills. By implementing scientifically based reading instruction for preschool and school-aged children, these programs will, over time, will help the Nation's schools move closer to reaching the President's goal of ensuring that every child can read at grade level or above by the end of third grade.

The Administration's request to eliminate funding for this program is also supported by the findings and "Ineffective" rating given the program in the 2002 Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) assessment.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Funding:			
Amount distributed to States	\$89,080	\$99,657	0
Average State award	1,713	1,916	0
Range of State awards	445-11,910	498-12,342	0
Evaluation and technical assistance	2,970	3,348	0
Set-aside for migrant children, the			
Outlying Areas, and Indian tribes	4,900	5,523	0
Peer review of new award applications	50	56	0
Set-aside for family literacy research			
(NIFL)	2,000	2,000	0
Statewide family literacy initiatives	0	1,000	0

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even start

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) – cont.

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Projects:			
Number of State-awarded projects	443	496	0
Indian tribes projects:			
Continuation	14	14	0
Migrant projects:			
New	10	0	0
Continuation	<u>13</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>0</u>
Total projects	480	533	0
Number of children served	26,501	29,648	0
Number of adults served	18,689	20,908	0

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents 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 the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

In 2000, the Literacy Involves Families Together Act amended the Even Start statute to require each State to establish indicators of program quality for the Even Start programs operating within the State. Although each State's set of indicators is unique, all States must focus on education outcomes for adult and child participants. For adults, States must include measures of: achievement in the areas of reading, writing, English-language acquisition, problem-solving, and numeracy; secondary school or general equivalency diploma (GED) receipt; and entry into postsecondary education, a job retraining program, or employment or career advancement, including the military. For child participants, States must include measures of: improvement in the ability to read on grade level or reading readiness; school attendance; and grade retention and promotion. Program performance is currently examined through three vehicles: State requirement to establish quality indicators, targeted technical assistance activities, and required national evaluations of the Even Start program.

Goal: To help break the cycle of poverty and illiteracy by improving the educational opportunities of the Nation's low-income families through a unified family literacy program that integrates early childhood education, adult literacy and adult basic education, and parenting education.

Objective: The literacy of participating families will improve.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even start

Measure: The percentage of Even Start adults who achieve significant learning gains on measures of reading/English language acquisition, as measured by the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS) and the Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE).

Year	Target	Actual
2003		70
2004	70.7	60.5
2005	71.4	63.8
2006	72.1	
2007	70.9	

Assessment of progress: The Department analyzed data collected through the 2004 State Consolidated Performance Report from the 2002-2003 school year to establish baselines. However, States utilized a wide variety of assessment instruments, and very few States submitted data in a format that could be aggregated across States. Targets for future years are based upon data from the 11 States that utilized common assessments and provided complete data. In the States reporting adult learning gains on measures of English language acquisition for 2003, approximately 70 percent of participating adults showed improvement. In 2004 and 2005, when more States provided data, reported performance decreased.

Measure: The percentage of Even Start adults with a high school completion goal who earn a high school diploma.

Year	Target	Actual
2003		59
2004	59.6	44.6
2005	60.2	47.2
2006	60.8	
2007	60.8	

Assessment of progress: The Department analyzed data collected through the 2004 State Consolidated Performance Report from the 2002-2003 school year to establish baselines. Targets for future years are based upon data from the 12 States that provided complete data for 2003. In those States, approximately 59 percent of participating adults were successful. In 2004 and 2005, when more States provided data, reported performance decreased.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even start

Measure: The percentage of Even Start adults with a high school completion goal who earn a General Equivalency Diploma (GED).		
Year	Target	Actual
2003		44.6
2004	44.4	80.2
2005	44.9	57.9
2006	45.3	
2007	45.3	

Assessment of progress: The Department analyzed data collected through the 2004 State Consolidated Performance Report from the 2002-2003 school year to establish baselines. Targets for future years are based upon data from the 12 States that provided complete data on GED attainment in the 2002-2003 report. Fluctuations in data from 2004 and 2005 may reflect the inclusion of data from more States each year.

Measure: The percentage of Even Start children who are entering kindergarten achieving significant gains on receptive language, as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT – III).		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		82.9
2005	83.7	79.8
2006	84.6	
2007	84.6	

Assessment of progress: The Department analyzed data collected through the 2004 State Consolidated Performance Report from the 2002-2003 school year to establish baselines.

Other Performance Information

The 2003 report, *State Administration of the Even Start Family Literacy Program: Structure, Process and Practices*, showed very little consistency across States in the measures, standards, and subgroups used in States' indicators of program quality. In response to this report, the Department is focusing its technical assistance on strengthening each State's indicators of program quality through the following activities: (1) a peer review of each State's indicators to ensure that they reflect high standards and use appropriate assessment tools, and that States use their indicators to monitor and improve local Even Start programs and participant literacy achievement results; (2) an overall assessment of the quality of each State's performance measurement system; and (3) assistance to States in revising performance measures and using indicators to monitor and improve local Even Start programs.

In addition, the statute requires the Department to conduct independent evaluations to determine the performance and effectiveness of Even Start programs. Two of these evaluations employed a rigorous experimental design model in which families who wished to enroll in Even Start were randomly assigned either to participate in the program or to become part of the control group. Both experimental evaluations showed that, although Even Start adult and child

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even start

participants made gains in literacy assessments and on other measures, these gains were not larger than those achieved by members of the control group. The third national Even Start evaluation found that, while the early childhood classroom experiences provided by Even Start projects in the study were of overall good quality, there was not sufficient emphasis on language acquisition and reasoning to produce measurable impacts on literacy assessments.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

Even Start was among the programs rated in 2002 using the “Program Assessment Rating Tool” (PART). The PART identified Even Start as “Ineffective,” based on findings from the three major national evaluations.

The PART also identified other weaknesses in the program, including reliance on output measures (hours of service provided) rather than outcomes (whether children read at grade level). In response to these findings, the Department revised the program performance measures to focus on outcomes. In addition, program staff improved monitoring through implementation of a standardized rubric and now provide regional training sessions on the four program components.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Literacy through school libraries

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I, Part B, Subpart 4)

FY 2008 Authorization: Indefinite ¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$19,486	\$19,486	0

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Literacy Through School Libraries program helps local educational agencies (LEAs) provide students with increased access to up-to-date school library materials and professionally certified school library media specialists. LEAs use their funds to: (1) acquire school library media resources; (2) acquire and use technology that can help to develop the information retrieval and critical thinking skills of students; (3) facilitate Internet links and other resource-sharing networks; (4) provide professional development for school library media specialists and activities that foster increased collaboration between school library media specialists, teachers, and administrators; and (5) provide students with access to school libraries during non-school hours.

At appropriation levels of less than \$100 million, the Department makes competitive 1-year awards directly to eligible LEAs. To be eligible for an award, an LEA must have a child-poverty rate of at least 20 percent. If the appropriation is \$100 million or more, funds would be allocated to State educational agencies (SEAs) by formula based on each State's share of funds provided under Part A of Title I for the previous year. SEAs would then award at least 97 percent of their allocations competitively to eligible LEAs. To be eligible to compete for a grant from its SEA, an LEA would be required to have a child-poverty rate that is at least 15 percent or is greater than the statewide average poverty rate for LEAs.

One-half of 1 percent of the amount appropriated is reserved for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and an equal amount for the Outlying Areas. The Department may use up to 1 percent of the appropriation for evaluation activities.

An LEA receiving assistance under the program is required to report annually on: (1) how it used program funds; and (2) the extent to which the LEA has increased the availability of, and access to, up-to-date school library media resources in its schools. In addition, the Department is required to conduct biennial evaluations of the program.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Literacy through school libraries

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$12,419
2004.....	19,842
2005.....	19,683
2006.....	19,486
2007.....	19,486

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2008, the Administration proposes \$19.5 million, the same as the 2007 level, for the Literacy Through School Libraries program. The request recognizes the strategic role that school libraries can play in making information available to all students, training students and teachers about how to obtain and make use of information, and increasing access for low-income students to technology and information. At the request level, the Department would make approximately 75 to 85 new 1-year grants to LEAs, serving an estimated 600 schools in those LEAs.

This program supports a central goal of the Administration and of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001—enabling all children to read well. Compelling evidence indicates that far too many young people are struggling through school without having mastered reading, the most essential and basic skill. On the 2005 National Assessment of Educational Progress, 54 percent of all fourth graders in high-poverty schools scored below the "basic" reading level. Research shows that students who fail to read well by fourth grade have a greater likelihood of dropping out and of a lifetime of diminished success. For these reasons, providing consistent support for reading success from the earliest age has critically important benefits.

The Literacy Through School Libraries program addresses specifically the problem of access to printed materials and high-quality school libraries for schools that serve concentrations of poor students. Children who attend these schools have less access to the types of services and materials that seem to raise student achievement. The 2004 National Center for Education Statistics report, *School Library Media Centers: Selected Results From the Education Longitudinal Study of 2002*, found that high-poverty schools (those in which more than 50 percent of the students are eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch) are more likely than wealthy schools (those with less than 20 percent of students so eligible) to have libraries with fewer than 8,000 books and to have expended no funds for computer hardware for the school library in the 2000-2001 school year.

Several studies have correlated significant library investment with improved student achievement in general and with improved literacy in particular. Analyses of national and State assessment data have also found correlations between student performance on those assessments and the use and quality of school library media centers. For example, an analysis of 1994 National Assessment of Educational Progress data found that States with reading scores above the national average were more likely to have schools where students had greater access to library media specialists and that those students used library resources more

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Literacy through school libraries

frequently. State-level studies have shown comparable findings. A 2003 analysis of achievement data in North Carolina found that scores on standardized reading and English tests tended to increase when, among other things, libraries in schools: (1) were open more hours during the week; (2) had newer books; and (3) subscribed to online periodical services and CD ROM services. A 2000 study by Keith Curry Lance found that Colorado achievement test scores averaged 10 to 15 percent higher in elementary schools and 18 percent higher in middle schools with well-developed library media programs.

The Literacy Through School Libraries program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2008 under reauthorized legislation. At this time, the Administration is not planning to propose major changes in the program.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Amount for local awards	\$18,902	\$18,902	\$18,902
Number of awards	78	75-85	75-85
Number of schools served	600	600	600
Amount for peer review of applications	\$195	\$195	\$195
Amount for evaluation	\$195	\$195	\$195
Amount for the Bureau of Indian Affairs	\$97	\$97	\$97
Amount for the Outlying Areas	\$97	\$97	\$97

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

In 2005, the Department completed an evaluation of the program to determine: (1) how districts allocate grant funds and target them to schools with the greatest need for improved library resources; (2) how funds are used (e.g., to buy books, improve technology, increase library hours, or provide professional development for library and reading staff); and (3) the effects of the program on staff collaboration and coordination. The study addressed these questions by examining data from grantee performance reports and a school library survey of grantees and matched comparison schools. Key findings of the study include:

- Nineteen (19) percent of grantee schools, but only 11 percent of the matched comparison nongrant schools, were identified for Title I school improvement, suggesting that school districts are allocating program funds to those schools with the

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Literacy through school libraries

greatest academic need. However, the study also found that 58 percent of school districts receiving grants are providing program funds to all schools in the district.

- Compared to nongrantees, grantees were more likely to identify needs with regard to having up-to-date materials (97 percent of grantees versus 83 percent of nongrantees), having the library open for more hours (68 percent versus 36 percent), and having more time for planning with teachers (61 percent versus 44 percent). Nongrantees did not have any area of need that was greater than grantee need by a statistically significant amount.
- Receipt of the grants appears to have resulted in major changes in the school libraries, bringing them up to a level of equality with, and sometimes helping them to surpass, the nongrantees.
- Grantees showed significant increases in the number of days that the library was open in the summer and an increase in library usage.
- Grantees started out the grant year with no significant difference from nongrantees in their levels of expenditures, but had much higher expenditures after receiving the grant. Thus, the grants resulted in large increases in expenditure at the school level and did not appear to supplant local spending for school libraries.
- Grantees acquired substantially more books in the grant year than did nongrantees (with means of 1,250 and 730 books, respectively), putting them in a position of rough equality in the size of their book collections.
- Districts that received grants spent 68 percent of the grant money on school library media sources, including books. Districts spent 11 percent of funds on the acquisition of advanced technology and 11 percent on operating the library during nonschool hours.
- Grantees were more likely to have professional development activities related to school libraries than nongrantees and to cover methods of collaboration as part of their professional development activities.
- Grantees were more likely than nongrantees to report collaboration between library staff and classroom teachers on reading or language arts (70 percent versus 59 percent), though not in other subject areas. Grantees were more likely to work with classroom teachers in curriculum development (67 percent versus 55 percent).

A new 2-year evaluation, covering the same issues, began in the fall of 2005 and data should be available in the fall of 2007.

Performance Measure

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Literacy through school libraries

cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2008 and future years and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Goal: To improve the literacy skills and academic achievement of students by providing students with increased access to up-to-date school library materials and resources.

Objective: *Enhance the school library media collection at grantee schools and districts to align with curricula.*

Measure: The difference in rate of increase between participating and non-participating schools in the Literacy Through School Libraries program.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003		
2004		25
2005	27	
2006	29	
2007	31	
2008	32	

Assessment of progress: Data for this measure was not collected in 2005. The Department plans to have the 2006 data later this year.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Promise scholarships

(Proposed legislation)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
0	\$250,000	+\$250,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

In order to expand the educational opportunities available to students from low-income families who are enrolled in persistently low-performing schools, the Administration proposes to include, in the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Promise Scholarships program. This new program would provide those students with scholarships that they can use to pay tuition, fees, and other costs (including transportation costs) at private or out-of-district public schools, or to purchase intensive supplemental educational services. These scholarships would supplement the aid made available through the Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Under the Administration's reauthorization proposal for Title I, low-income students attending schools in restructuring status (schools that have not made adequate yearly progress for at least 5 years) would be entitled to transfer to another public or private school, and would be able to use, as tuition payment, the district's per-child allocation for Title I as well as, for a student with disabilities, the per-child allocation under Part B of IDEA. The additional funding from the Promise Scholarships program would ensure that eligible students have sufficient resources to attend available private or public schools, or to obtain a more intensive level of supplemental services.

Under the proposal, the Department would provide formula grants to States based on their relative shares of low-income students enrolled in schools in restructuring status in the most recent year for which counts of those students are available. States, in turn, would allocate funds to local educational agencies (LEAs), based on the same formula or using another methodology approved by the Department. (For example, a State might wish to concentrate funds on LEAs that are likely to have large numbers of slots in private and out-of-district public schools or have a large number of schools in restructuring.) LEAs receiving funds would then use them to provide scholarships directly to eligible students. If an LEA received insufficient funding to serve all eligible students who apply for a scholarship, it would give priority to students whose schools are in at least the second year of restructuring.

Parents who choose to send their child to a private school or an out-of-district public school would receive a \$2,500 scholarship, in addition to, as noted above, the LEA's Title I per-student allocation and, if the student is disabled, the LEA's IDEA allocation. In most cases, the total scholarship would equal at least \$4,000 per student. Students would use those funds to pay tuition, fees, and other costs (including transportation expenses) of attending the new school. In

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Promise scholarships

no cases could a scholarship exceed those costs. Scholarship recipients would be required to take State assessments or a nationally normed test in each grade and subject required under Title I.

Parents who choose to obtain intensive supplemental educational services (SES) would receive up to \$3,000 and would use those funds for tutoring assistance provided by eligible entities. Students who receive supplemental educational services under this program would not be able to receive similar services paid from the funds set aside under an LEAs allocation under Part A of Title I; LEAs would use their Title I SES funds to serve other eligible students in the districts (those attending schools in school improvement or corrective action status, but not in restructuring).

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

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2008, the Administration requests \$250 million for the proposed Promise Scholarships program, an amount sufficient to provide scholarships and tutoring assistance to at least 100,000 students. The number of schools entering restructuring under Title I – schools that have not made adequate progress for at least 5 years – is growing. Approximately 1,065 schools were identified for restructuring in 2004-05, and, based on preliminary data, the Department estimates that 2,000 schools were identified during the 2005-06 school year. By 2008-09, the school year in which fiscal year 2008-appropriated funds will be used, a reasonable projection is that the number of schools in restructuring will approach 5,000.

The Administration, in the ESEA reauthorization and in the 2008 budget, is making efforts to turn around restructuring schools a high priority. The budget includes \$500 million for Title I School Improvement Grants, much of which would be used to assist schools in restructuring status. But while restructuring efforts are underway, students attending persistently low-performing schools must have the opportunity to pursue other educational opportunities. Though current law requires LEAs to provide students who attend schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring the option of attending a higher-performing public school, many LEAs, particularly urban LEAs, may face obstacles in providing students with the opportunity to attend more effective schools within the district. For example, the July 2004 report *NCLB: A Step Ahead* by the Public Affairs Research Council of Louisiana found that Federal and State accountability requirements called for over 40 percent of the schools in Orleans Parish to offer school-choice options to parents. However, most schools chosen to accept transfers generally did not have substantially higher achievement levels than the schools required to offer choice. As a result, few attractive options were available to parents.

For its December 2004 report on local implementation of the ESEA school choice provisions, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) visited eight LEAs to obtain information on their implementation of the choice provisions. The GAO found that, while the LEAs offered each parent at least two schools as transfer options, many of the schools offered as transfer options

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Promise scholarships

had not met State goals in the prior year and were themselves at risk of having to offer choice the following year. For example, in Memphis, 29 of the 37 Title I schools offered as transfer options had not met State performance goals in the previous year. Further, according to the National Assessment of Title I, only 1 percent of eligible students have exercised the choice option under Title I, in many cases because the options available to them have been so limited.

In addition, while many students attending schools identified for restructuring receive SES, the services tend to be of limited duration. The Department's 2004 *Early Implementation of the Supplemental Educational Services Provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act: Year One Report* found that the median number of hours of tutoring services purchased per student was about 40 hours. Promise Scholarships would address that concern by enabling students from low-income households to receive intensive, sustained services. Based on data from the *Early Implementation* report, the proposed scholarship of \$3,000 would enable a parent to obtain an average of 136 hours of tutoring for his or her child. Parents could use the funds for after-school or summer school programs.

Because the current choice options available to students in restructuring schools tend to be so limited, it is appropriate, indeed essential, to make expanded opportunities available, including private schools and out-of-district public schools, as well as enhanced supplemental services, and to ensure that low-income students have the resources to take advantage of those options.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>
Average award to States	\$4,808
Number of students served	100,000
Evaluation	\$1,250

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Program performance would be assessed through a national evaluation and annual grantee performance reports. Indicators of the program's success would include the academic achievement of students who take advantage of the scholarship and enhanced SES options.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Opportunity scholarships

(Proposed legislation)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
0	\$50,000	+\$50,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

As part of the effort to provide a wider array of educational opportunities to students from low-income families who are enrolled in persistently low-performing schools, the Administration proposes to include, in the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Opportunity Scholarships program. The Opportunity Scholarships program would provide competitive grants to support local efforts to enable students from low-income households who attend a school identified for school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) to attend a private or out-of-district public school or to receive intensive, sustained tutoring assistance. The program would complement the proposed Promise Scholarships program, which would provide formula grants to State and local educational agencies (LEAs) to expand the opportunities available to low-income students enrolled in restructuring schools.

The Department would make competitive awards to States, local educational agencies (LEAs), and public or private nonprofit organizations (including community- and faith-based organizations and mayor's offices). In making awards, priority would be given to applicants that propose to serve students in LEAs that operate large numbers or percentages of schools that have been identified for school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. Parents of eligible students would have the choice of (1) receiving a scholarship to use to send their child to the private or out-of-district public school of their choice; or (2) access for their child to intensive, sustained supplemental educational services (SES). Parents who choose to send their child to a private school would receive a scholarship equal to the sum of tuition, fees, and costs, including necessary transportation expenses for the new school, or the average per-pupil expenditure of public schools in the state where the recipient resides, whichever is less. In awarding funds, grantees would provide a priority for scholarships to enable parents to send their child to the school of their choice. The Department would provide a priority for applications that propose to augment the Federal scholarships with additional funds in order to ensure that parents can pay the tuition and fees at the school of their choice.

Parents who choose to obtain SES would receive up to \$3,000 and would use those funds for supplemental educational services from private providers. Students who receive supplemental educational services under this program would not be able to receive similar services paid from the funds set aside under an LEAs allocation under Part A of Title I; LEAs would use their Title I

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Opportunity scholarships

SES funds to serve other eligible students in the districts (those attending schools in school improvement or corrective action status, but not in restructuring).

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2008, the Administration is requesting \$50 million for the Opportunity Scholarships program. At the request level, services would be provided to approximately 14,000 children.

There is significant demand for programs that provide parents with the option of sending their child to a higher-performing school. Demand may be so high in some areas that public and private scholarship programs that enable low-income parents to send their children to public, private, or charter schools of their choice are generally able to serve only a small portion of those seeking assistance. For example, in the first year of operation of the federally funded school voucher program in the District of Columbia, the Washington Scholarship Fund (WSF), the grantee under the program, received more than 2,600 applications for 1,200 spots available for the 2004-05 school year. The program received more than twice as many applications as spots available despite the fact that WSF had only 79 days to enlist private schools to participate, inform parents, and process applications. The program continued to generate significant demand in its second year; more than twice as many students applied for scholarships for the 2005-06 school year than could be accommodated through the program.

Further, a growing body of evidence shows that providing parents and students with expanded choice options can improve the academic performance of the students exercising choice and the performance of schools at risk of losing students. For example, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) identified three studies for its September 2002 report, *School Vouchers: Characteristics of Privately Funded Programs*, that were rigorous enough to meet its criteria for inclusion. GAO reported that these rigorous evaluations “provide some evidence that African American students who used vouchers to attend private schools showed greater improvements in math and reading than students in the comparison group.” Further, the studies also found “that parents of voucher users of all racial and ethnic groups were consistently more satisfied with their children’s education than parents of comparison group students.”

In addition, while many students attending schools identified for restructuring receive SES, the services tend to be of limited duration. The Department’s 2004 *Early Implementation of the Supplemental Educational Services Provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act: Year One Report* found that the median number of hours of tutoring services purchased per student was about 40 hours. Opportunity Scholarships would address that concern by enabling students from low-income households to receive intensive, sustained services. Based on data from the *Early Implementation* report, the proposed scholarship of \$3,000 would enable a parent to obtain an average of 136 hours of tutoring for his or her child. Parents could use the funds for after-school or summer school programs.

As a preliminary plan, in fiscal year 2008, the Department would reserve approximately \$1 million to carry out an evaluation, using a rigorous research design, to determine the effectiveness of this new program.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Opportunity scholarships

As is discussed under the Promise Scholarships program, the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal would enhance the educational options available to students attending restructuring schools by requiring those schools to offer private school scholarships to their low-income students. The Administration believes that the ESEA reauthorization should include both that proposal and Opportunity Scholarships because the two initiatives complement one another and, taken together, would markedly expand the options available to eligible students. The Promise Scholarships program would be administered through formula grants to LEAs that have students in restructuring schools. It would be a necessary component of a policy that gives all low-income students a real opportunity to get a better education while their schools are taking actions to restructure and improve. Opportunity Scholarships would be open to a broader range of entities that want to expand school choice options in their communities, including private, non-profit organizations, mayors' offices, and States, and may also spark innovative new ways for offering choice (both public and private) and SES. In addition, grant recipients would be able to provide Opportunity Scholarships to a wider category of students – not just those in restructuring schools, but also those in schools undergoing improvement and corrective action. These elements of the proposal would allow a broader range of choice initiatives to be tested and evaluated.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>
Amount for grants	\$48,500
Number of grants	15-100
Number of children participating	14,000
Peer review of new award applications	\$500
National evaluation	\$1,000

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Program performance would be assessed through a national evaluation and annual grantee performance reports. Indicators of the program's success would include the academic achievement of students who take advantage of the two options.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

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

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite ¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$380,295	\$380,295	0

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; however, additional authorizing legislation is sought.

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 challenging 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 problems that result from repeated moves. The program statute encourages activities to promote coordination of needed services across States and encourage greater access for migratory children to services available under the Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) and other programs authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), so that MEP funds can be used for services not already available from those programs to meet the unique needs of migrant students. The most recent child-count data reported by States indicate that, in the 2004-2005 school year, 745,196 migrant children ages 3 to 21 were eligible to receive services. 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) crosses school district boundaries; (2) is made for purposes of obtaining work in agriculture or fishing; (3) is a change of residence, but not a permanent one; and (4) was made in the preceding 36 months.)

Beginning with fiscal year 2003, every State receives at least 100 percent of the amount that it received through the program in fiscal year 2002. All funds in excess of the fiscal year 2002 appropriation are allocated through a statutory formula based on each State's per-pupil expenditure for education, its count of eligible migratory students aged 3 through 21 residing within the State in the previous year, and its count of students who received services in summer or intersession programs provided by the State.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

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.

In response to a statutory requirement that the Department assist States in developing effective methods for the electronic transfer of student records, the Department has begun development of the Migrant Student Record Exchange System (MSIX), which will link the diverse State systems already in place. In April 2003, the Department provided a report to Congress, *Maintenance and Transfer of Health and Educational Information for Migrant Students by the States*, that included findings and recommendations regarding the maintenance and transfer of health and educational information for migratory students by the States and included 75 data elements for MSIX. The initial pilot for MSIX is underway and the Department expects that the system will be operational by the beginning of calendar year 2008. When completed, MSIX will enable 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. In addition, the Department intends to publish a *Federal Register* notice that will include the final specifications (technical requirements and data definitions) for the system in 2007.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$395,413
2004.....	393,577
2005.....	390,428
2006.....	386,524
2007.....	380,295

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2008, the Administration requests \$380.3 million for the Title I Migrant Education program, the same as the 2007 level, to support programs promoting coordination of Federal resources for migratory children and to provide services that address their unique needs. The request will allow States to continue to meet the costs of identifying highly mobile migratory children and youth and provide special support services and learning arrangements that meet the needs of an especially disadvantaged, hard-to-serve population. Data for 2003-04 indicate that about 10,158 project sites offered services to about 488,274 migrant children during the regular school year and almost 354,117 migrant children at 1,494 summer or intersession programs. Services include supplemental instruction in reading, math, and other academic areas, as well as support services such as counseling, health services, and (especially in the summer) transportation.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

The poverty and mobility (and often limited English proficiency) of the migrant student population combine to result in a need for educational services that goes well beyond services traditionally supported with State and local education budgets. Migrant children, by definition, move across school district and State boundaries, and this movement, connected to the production of food distributed in interstate commerce, provides a classic rationale for Federal intervention. The 2002 report from the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, *Student Mobility in Rural Communities*, noted that highly mobile students are more likely to be retained in grade and to demonstrate lower academic achievement than their more stable counterparts. Without Federal legislation and support, school districts have historically been unlikely to: (1) find and enroll migrant children; (2) provide the normal range of services to children who live in their communities and attend their schools for brief periods of time; or (3) grapple with the school interruption problems faced by migrant children and their needs for special summer programs.

The Migrant program pays costs not usually covered by regular Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs), since no single school district or State is responsible for the education of these most highly mobile children. These special costs include those associated with serving out-of-school teenagers and "emancipated youth" who travel without a parent or guardian to obtain migratory work in the fields and in processing plants. Moreover, 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; thus, these schools are likely to depend heavily on the receipt of Title I funds to support their program of special services to migrant students.

The results of the 2006 Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) review of the Migrant Education program also support the Administration's funding request. The PART review rated the program as "Adequate," with high scores for purpose, planning, and management, but weaknesses cited in program results and accountability measures. The PART noted that, although the Inspector General found inaccuracies in the identification and counting of eligible migrant students in a number of States, the Department has taken concrete steps to hold partners accountable and promote specific corrective actions to eliminate management problems. (The Inspector General findings and the Department's response are described in more detail under Follow Up on PART Findings and Recommendations.)

From the 2008 request, \$370.3 million would support the basic State Grants program. In addition, as a preliminary plan, the Department would reserve \$10 million for migrant coordination activities, including \$3 million for consortium incentive grants. Incentive grants must be used for additional direct services to migrant students. State consortia receiving these grants will focus on priority areas for improving services to migrant students, such as identifying migrant students or coordinating student assessment systems across States and LEAs to measure the performance of migrant students. Also, as a preliminary plan, the Department plans would use \$5 million of migrant coordination funds in fiscal year 2008 to continue implementation of the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX).

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

The remaining 2008 coordination funds would support projects across States to identify and recruit migratory children, and carry out other "networking" and training projects to serve migratory children more effectively and efficiently. For example, the Department would continue supporting a Migrant Education Resource Center, which will be initiated with fiscal year 2006 funds. The Center will support: (1) the provision of technical assistance and support for the identification and recruitment of migrant students; (2) the establishment of a peer-to-peer network to improve the skills of migrant educators; and (3) the creation of a web-based library to enable State and local migrant educators to share locally developed products designed to improve the performance of migrant students.

The Migrant Education program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2008 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal. The PART noted problems and inefficiencies in the program statute that the Administration will address during reauthorization, especially with regard to the formula provisions that are cumbersome, difficult to interpret, and based on child counts from fiscal year 2001. The Administration will propose ways to improve and simplify the State allocation formula and to improve targeting of funds with formula changes that would respond to shifts in State counts of migrant students. The Administration will also propose changes to improve targeting of services to migrant students.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Number of students served (unduplicated count)	730,300	730,300	730,300
SEA program:			
Amount for State grants	\$376,524	\$370,295	\$370,295
Average State award	\$7,241	\$7,121	\$7,121
Coordination activities:			
Consortium incentive grants	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000
Migrant student information exchange	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000
Other inter- and intra-State activities	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2008 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 will contribute to improved school performance of migrant children.*

Measure: The number of States meeting an annually set performance target in reading at the elementary school level for migrant students.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003	10	11
2004	14	19
2005	16	23
2006	18	
2007	20	
2008	22	

Measure: The number of States meeting an annually set performance target in reading at the middle school level for migrant students.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003	11	10
2004	15	10
2005	17	14
2006	19	
2007	21	
2008	23	

Measure: The number of States meeting an annually set performance target in mathematics at the elementary school level for migrant students.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003	14	16
2004	18	19
2005	20	26
2006	22	
2007	24	
2008	26	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

Measure: The number of States meeting an annually set performance target in mathematics for middle school migrant students.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003	8	9
2004	12	10
2005	14	14
2006	16	
2007	18	
2008	20	

Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Assessment of progress: The Department has established 50 percent as the initial target for the percentage 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. The number of States reporting at least 50 percent of migrant students performing at the proficient or above level on State reading and mathematics assessments in the elementary and middle school grades increased between FY 2004 and FY 2005. In fiscal year 2005, 23 States met or exceeded the target in reading in the elementary grades; 26 did so for mathematics in the elementary grades; and 14 did so for mathematics in the middle school grades. States lagged behind the target for reading in the middle school grades; while the target was for 17 States to report at least 50 percent of migrant students performing at the proficient or above level on State mathematics assessments in those grades, only 14 States did so.

The Department developed two new measures to help track changes in: (1) the percentage of migrant students who drop out of secondary school (grades 7 – 12); and (2) the number of States showing an increase in the percentage of migrant students who graduate from high school. While recent data are not available, the high school graduation rate of migrant students was estimated at about 45-50 percent in a report for the *Migrant Attrition Project*, conducted in 1987 by the State University of New York at Oneonta. This rate was among the lowest of any student population in the country. The Department currently is reviewing graduation rate data provided by States for fiscal year 2003 to determine if those data are useable for performance measurement purposes.

In addition, the Department has hired an independent contractor to analyze the data related to the Migrant program provided by States in their ESEA Consolidated State Performance Reports. The project includes a trend analysis of the academic performance of migrant students in school years 2002-2003, 2003-2004, and 2004-2005. The analyses that the contractor will conduct include: (1) analyzing how the performance of migrant students compares to other students on State assessments; (2) determining whether the academic achievement of migrant students meets the goals set by States; and (3) calculating the change in migrant student proficiency over time. Findings and data from the analysis will be available in late 2007.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

Efficiency Measures

The Department recently established an efficiency measure associated with the transfer of migrant student records, but since the MSIX system has not yet been implemented, there are no baselines and targets for the measure. The new measure will focus on the MSIX reporting of migrant students' health and education records over a 4-year period from FY 2007 until FY 2010. 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. The efficiency measure will assess annual changes in the percentage of actively migrating students for which the system has consolidated records that reflect a complete history of school and health information.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The 2006 Migrant Education PART review, which rated the program as "Adequate," found that the program is on track to meet its long-term performance measures. The review noted, however, that the Department's Office of the Inspector General found inaccuracies in States' identification and counting of eligible students. In response, the Department is completing a national audit of State child eligibility determinations. The Department is also developing a plan to review the reliability and validity of States' reported defect rates and is providing States with technical assistance and support in the proper and timely identification and recruitment of eligible migrant children. The Department is also developing new regulations to address eligibility definitions and determinations. In addition, the Department is working with auditors to resolve findings and clarify eligibility and program requirements.

Although the MSIX records system is still under development, the Department is using the *EDFacts* system, the system through which all States report student achievement and other data, to review migrant student achievement data across States, comparing such data against other student groups, and analyzing the data to determine what types of schools migrant students are attending and what types of services they are receiving, to gain a better understanding of the types of services that may be most effective for improving student performance, and to develop strategies and services that will lead to higher student performance.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

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

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite ¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$49,797	\$49,797	0

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program provides financial assistance to State educational agencies (SEAs) for educational services to neglected and delinquent (N and D) children and youth under age 21 in State-run institutions for juveniles and in adult correctional institutions. 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, this program requires institutions to gear their services to the high State standards that all children are expected to meet. All juvenile facilities may operate institutionwide education programs in which they use Title I funds in combination with other available Federal and State funds; the institutionwide 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 allocation for projects to help N and D participants make the transition from State institutions to locally operated programs or to support the successful re-entry of youth offenders into postsecondary and vocational 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.

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.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$48,682
2004.....	48,395
2005.....	48,600
2006.....	49,797
2007.....	49,797

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Neglected and Delinquent (N and D) program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2008 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal. The Administration does not anticipate recommending changes to the Subpart 1 State Agencies program.

For 2008, the Administration requests \$49.8 million for the N and D program, the same as the 2007 level. This request will provide sufficient resources to maintain services for an estimated 123,000 participants that will help them return to school and obtain employment after they are released from State institutions.

From the 2008 request, the Department would reserve approximately \$1.25 million to continue technical assistance and other activities provided through the National Evaluation and Technical Assistance Center for Children who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk. 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 used by other agencies to support N and D youth; and (3) providing technical assistance, using experts and practitioners, to State agencies.

This program supports the Administration's goal of significantly improving achievement in reading and math for all students. An evaluation of the program (2000) showed that over 80 percent of participating institutions provided reading and math instruction. In terms of academic achievement, the youth served by this program are, on average, 3 years behind in grade level and generally lack job skills. A 1996 study conducted by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) found that, while most of the inmates in America's prisons will eventually be paroled, two-thirds do not have the literacy skills needed to function in society. The findings of the ETS report show the importance of educating and preparing neglected and delinquent youth for further education or to enter the workforce.

The population served by this program is extremely disadvantaged and isolated. Most have experienced failure in school before entering the program and need skills that will help them reenter school or obtain a job after release. An earlier evaluation of the program (1991) showed that: (1) about half of program participants enrolled in school when they left the institution, but many subsequently dropped out; and (2) most participants found jobs after being released, but they were typically low-paying, and about two-thirds of the employed youth had more than one

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

job. According to the Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the number of delinquency cases processed by juvenile courts increased 6 percent between 1993 and 2002.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Number of participating institutions	1,082	1,082	1,082
Estimated number of students served	110,000	110,000	110,000
Average Federal contribution			
Per child (whole dollars)	\$441	\$441	\$441
National activities	\$1,250	\$1,250	\$1,250

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2008 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.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003		8.0
2004	8.4	Not Collected
2005	8.8	10.57
2006	8.8	
2007	11.65	
2008	12.24	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

Assessment of progress: The Department is required by statute to collect performance information for the Neglected and Delinquent program no less than once every 3 years. The 2003 data shown above come from a sample of six States in which the Department collected performance data during monitoring activities. The 2005 data were collected by the Department through the Consolidated State Performance Reports from 45 States; in that year the program exceeded the performance target. Beginning in 2005, the Department will collect these data annually.

Measure: The percentage of neglected or delinquent students earning high school course credits.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		41.52
2006		
2007	46.06	
2008	48.37	

Assessment of progress: The 2005 data were collected by the Department through the Consolidated State Performance Reports from 42 States and created a baseline against which 2007 and 2008 targets were set. States reported counts for students between the ages of 11 and 21. The data for this new measure will be updated annually starting in July 2007.

The Department also created an additional measure tracking the increase in the academic skills of N and D participants. A baseline and targets will be set when data become available in July 2007.

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 *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. The Department's collection of future years' N and D data through the *EDFacts* electronic data system should improve the quality and consistency of student data.

Follow-Up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The N and D program was among those evaluated with the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) in 2005. Although the PART evaluation noted a significant need for the program, it received the rating of "Results Not Demonstrated," due mainly to the lack of grantee performance data, including data relating to student outcomes, such as earning high school

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

course credits or attaining a high school diploma or GED. The Department is working to improve the collection and reporting of N and D program data through the new *EDFacts* electronic data system. The Department also has worked closely with the N and D technical assistance provider to collect improved grantee data and continues to provide support to States to facilitate this process.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive school reform

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

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite ¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$10,133	0	-\$10,133

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008. The Administration is not seeking reauthorizing legislation.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) program provides schools with funding to develop or adopt, and implement, comprehensive school reforms, grounded in scientifically based research and effective practices, that will help enable children in participating schools to meet challenging State standards. These reforms must be structured to address 11 critical elements included in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). The elements establish, among other things, that each participating school must base its proposed reforms on a comprehensive design that employs innovative strategies and methods based on reliable research and practice, aligns reforms with the school's regular program and a school needs assessment, and uses high-quality external technical support and assistance from entities with experience and expertise in schoolwide reform and improvement.

If funds are appropriated for CSR grants to States, as last occurred in fiscal year 2005, the Department allocates those funds based on the States' relative shares of the previous year's Title I Basic Grants funds. Each State educational agency (SEA) may reserve up to 5 percent of its allocation for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance. The SEA must use at least 95 percent of its allocation to make competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) eligible for funds under Title I, Part A, which then use these funds to implement comprehensive school reform programs in schools with Title I programs. The amount of an award must be at least \$50,000 for each school. Grants are renewable for up to 3 years.

In making awards, SEAs are required to give priority to LEAs that: (1) propose to use program funds in schools identified for improvement or corrective action under Title I; and (2) demonstrate a commitment to helping schools effectively implement and sustain the comprehensive reforms. In applying to SEAs for funds, LEA applicants must identify the Title I-eligible schools and the levels of funding they would receive, and describe the reforms to be implemented and how the LEA will provide technical assistance and evaluate reform implementation and results.

The Department may reserve up to 1 percent of the appropriation for grants to Bureau of Indian Affairs schools and the Outlying Areas and up to 1 percent to conduct national evaluation

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive school reform

activities. The Department also may reserve up to \$7.05 million to carry out “quality initiatives.” The quality initiatives authorized are: (1) a public-private effort to assist States, LEAs, and schools in making informed decisions in approving or selecting providers of comprehensive school reform; and (2) activities to (a) foster the development of comprehensive school reform models; and (b) provide effective capacity building for comprehensive school reform providers to expand their work in more schools, ensure quality, and promote financial stability.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$233,473
2004.....	233,613
2005.....	205,344
2006.....	7,920
2007.....	10,133

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for the Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) program in 2008. The 2007 CR is not expected to provide support for State grants and provides a total of only \$10.1 million for the program, for funding for the Comprehensive School Reform Clearinghouse and for Quality Initiatives grants. The Department would “front-load” funds for the new Quality Initiatives grants. Beginning in fiscal year 2006, by providing funding only for the quality initiatives and the CSR Clearinghouse, the Congress essentially initiated a phase-out of the CSR program while ensuring that school districts (as they spend down the funds remaining from previous years) would have access to technical assistance resources to help them achieve the best results through their projects. In fiscal year 2008, this technical assistance will no longer be needed.

In addition, the outcome of the program’s review with the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) supports the policy of redirecting resources to more promising programs, such as Title I Grants to LEAs. Although the program received a PART rating of “Adequate” in 2002, the assessment found the program to be redundant with the Title I Grants to LEAs program because CSR provides duplicative support for activities that LEAs can carry out with their Title I, Part A funds.

The Comprehensive School Reform program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The Administration is not recommending reauthorization for this program.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive school reform

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Quality initiatives	\$6,470	\$8,596	0
CSR Clearinghouse	1,450	1,537	0

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Little rigorous evaluation evidence is available to document that comprehensive school reforms are effective interventions for improving student achievement. The 1999 study by the American Institutes for Research, *An Educators' Guide To Schoolwide Reform*, found that only 3 of 24 comprehensive approaches had "strong evidence of positive effects on student achievement." (For the *Educators' Guide* study, a comprehensive reform approach showed positive effects on student achievement when at least four studies of the approach, using rigorous methodologies, reported some positive effects on student achievement, with at least three of the studies showing effects that are educationally (or statistically) significant.)

The November 2002 report, *Comprehensive School Reform and Student Achievement: A Meta-Analysis*, produced by the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk, found that only 3 of the 29 most widely implemented comprehensive reforms could be included in the category "strongest evidence of effectiveness." In that report, a reform was considered more effective if, in a large number of studies that used comparison groups or third-party comparison designs and that took place in schools and States across the Nation, the reform demonstrated statistically significant and positive achievement.

The Department's national evaluation of the (pre-No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)) CSR Demonstration program, begun in 1999, addressed three research questions to assess the effectiveness of the program: (1) whether CSR targeted funds to schools with the greatest need; (2) how CSR schools implemented the nine components of comprehensive reform outlined in the appropriations report establishing the program; and (3) whether student achievement improved in the schools receiving program funds.

The data from this evaluation indicate that CSR funds were well targeted. Schools receiving CSR funds were more likely to serve concentrations of low-income, minority, or limited English proficient students than schools not receiving program funds and also were more likely than non-CSR schools to be identified for improvement under Title I of the ESEA. However, the program has been less successful in getting programs to implement effectively the nine program components called for in the initial legislation. For example, while CSR schools were more likely than schools not receiving CSR funds to adopt an external reform model, CSR and non-CSR schools were equally likely to have implemented other elements of a comprehensive reform program identified in the CSR statute (such as establishment of a school reform plan, establishment of measurable goals, and coordination of resources). In addition, case studies in 18 CSR sites conducted from 2000 to 2002 showed varying degrees of success in implementing

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive school reform

the nine components. In one-third of the schools studied, implementation was uneven or faltering, and in three other schools the implementation was minimal or stalled completely. Further, fidelity to the model, as judged by the model developer, was considered “high” in less than half of the schools.

The final report of the national evaluation of the pre-NCLB CSR program, *Implementation and Early Outcomes of the CSR Program* (2004), found no evidence of a relationship between CSR funding and improved student achievement. While CSR schools made gains in reading and mathematics in about one-quarter of the States, States with significant improvement in student achievement for CSR schools also had significant growth in achievement for non-CSR schools. However, the report also noted that the time frame covered by this achievement analysis was too short (only 1-2 years) to expect large effects from the CSR program and that further research was needed.

A second evaluation, begun in 2002, is collecting data over a 5-year period to examine program implementation and student achievement trends in schools receiving CSR grants awarded since enactment of the NCLB Act. The first report from this evaluation, the Longitudinal Assessment of Comprehensive School Reform Implementation and Outcomes, found that CSR funds are strongly targeted to high-poverty schools and low-performing schools. CSR schools were more likely than other schools to report implementing several reform components; for instance, CSR schools reported that they provided more professional development opportunities for their teachers than did non-CSR schools. However, CSR schools were also less likely than non-CSR schools to receive district support for school reform efforts, discretionary district and State funds to support school reform, or district-funded professional development. CSR schools did receive more support from reform program developers, and it appears that districts may choose to focus their own assistance on non-CSR schools that may lack this external support.

Performance Measures

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

The Department has established the following performance measure for the CSR program: The percentage of CSR schools that have or have had a CSR grant and made adequate yearly progress (AYP). In 2004, 67 percent of CSR schools achieved AYP in reading and 69 percent of CSR schools achieved AYP in mathematics. For 2005 and 2006, the targets for this measure are 68 percent in reading and 70 percent in mathematics; 2005 data will be available later in 2007.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The Comprehensive School Reform program was among the programs rated in 2002 with the PART. While the program received a rating of “Adequate,” the PART identified several weaknesses, including lack of positive national evaluation findings demonstrating program

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive school reform

effectiveness in raising student achievement in schools receiving support. The PART also found the CSR program to be redundant of Title I LEA Grants. The findings of that PART assessment are still applicable. In response to these findings and the follow-up action recommended in the PART, the Administration has presented to Congress proposals to eliminate the program and proposes to complete the phase-out of the program.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Evaluation

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

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite ¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$9,327	\$9,327	0

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) authorizes a separate appropriation for 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 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.

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB Act), which reauthorized Title I evaluation activities under Section 1501 of the ESEA, provided detailed requirements for the 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 new standards and assessments required by the new 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 new choice and supplemental service options.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Evaluation

An interim National Assessment report was submitted to Congress in April 2006 and a second report will be completed in spring 2007. The Department also is planning to issue a third report in 2008.

The NCLB Act also authorized an Assessment Evaluation, under section 1503, to examine the assessments used for State accountability purposes and for making decisions about the promotion and graduation of students.

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$8,842
2004.....	8,790
2005.....	9,424
2006.....	9,330
2007.....	9,327

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$9.3 million for Title I evaluation in fiscal year 2008, the same as the 2007 level, to support ongoing Title I evaluation activities consistent with the Department's evaluation plan for major programs.

A central principle of the NCLB Act is that States, districts, schools, and teachers adopt instructional practices backed by evidence of effectiveness from scientifically based research. This principle has created a demand for rigorous evaluation evidence currently unavailable for most education program and instructional areas.

For this reason, the Department's evaluation strategy for Title I features a strong emphasis on evaluation studies that are designed to produce rigorous scientific evidence on the effectiveness of education programs and practices, including practices critical to the effective use of Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies.

The National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), located within the Department's Institute of Education Sciences, is conducting a set of evaluation studies designed to answer questions on program effectiveness. Whenever possible, these studies are using trials in which schools, teachers, or students are randomly assigned to an educational program or to a control condition. Such experimental designs are the most reliable and accurate method of determining the impact of an educational intervention. The goal is to produce high-quality scientific evidence on program effectiveness that may be used by States, districts, and schools to meet the NCLB Act requirement that Federal education funds support scientifically based methods of educational improvement.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Evaluation

Most 2008 funds would be divided between three ongoing NCEE impact evaluations:

- \$1.7 million for the Evaluation of Reading Comprehension Interventions, a 5-year study launched in 2004 that will examine the impact of selected reading interventions on student achievement and content knowledge in social studies and science. This \$18 million study is using a random assignment design involving approximately 100 schools and 6,000 students in grades 3-5. Reading comprehension interventions were piloted in the 2005-2006 school year and implemented in the 2006-2007 school year, with an interim report due in spring 2008 and a final report due in September 2009.
- \$5.0 million for the Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Math Curricula, a 4-year study begun in 2005 that will examine the impact of selected commercially available math curricula on student achievement. The evaluation began in the 2006-07 school year with curricula implemented in the first grade. The curricula will be implemented in the first and second grades during the 2007-08 school year and extended to the third grade in the 2008-09 school year. This \$14 million study will produce interim reports in spring 2008 and spring 2009, with a final report in spring 2010.
- \$2.0 million for the Impact Study of Supplemental Educational Service Providers expected to begin in fiscal year 2007. This study would evaluate the relative effectiveness of different types of supplemental service providers (e.g., LEAs, for-profit and non-profit organizations) to improve student achievement. A random assignment evaluation design would be implemented in a diverse sample of districts. In addition, the study would explore the feasibility of estimating the impact on student achievement of students receiving any type of supplemental instruction versus similar students who did not receive such services.

The 2008 request also would continue to fund quick-turnaround activities and analyses related to the implementation and effectiveness of Title I that would inform the upcoming ESEA reauthorization.

Title I Evaluation is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2008 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal. Currently, the Administration is not planning to propose any substantive changes to the authorization for Evaluation.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Evaluation

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
<u>Impact Studies</u>			
Technical Support for the Independent Review Panel	\$160	\$160	0
Closing the Reading Gap	50	0	0
Impact Evaluation of Reading Comprehension Interventions	4,000	3,214	\$1,728
Impact Evaluation of Math Curricula	3,970	3,400	5,046
Impact Study of Supplemental Service Providers	0	2,000	2,000
<u>Implementation Studies</u>			
Study of State Implementation of Accountability and Teacher Quality Under NCLB	\$350	0	0
State Education and Accountability Indicators and Participation Data	142	0	0
Migrant Reports	120	0	0
Evaluation of Achievement Outcomes for SES Waiver Districts	310	0	0
Adequacy of NAEP State Samples	125	0	0
Quick turnaround tasks	63	\$513	\$513
Printing	<u>40</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>40</u>
Total	9,330	9,327	9,327

NOTE: Reflects preliminary estimates for fiscal years 2007 and 2008 pending final approval of Evaluation spending plans.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education – High school equivalency and College assistance migrant programs (Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part A, Subpart 5, Section 418A)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
High school equivalency program	\$18,550	\$18,550	0
College assistance migrant program	<u>15,377</u>	<u>15,377</u>	<u>0</u>
Total program funds	33,926	33,926	0

¹ The Higher Education Act expires June 30, 2007. This program is expected to be authorized in FY 2007 through appropriations language. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2008.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

These programs provide 5-year grants to institutions of higher education (IHEs) and to private nonprofit organizations to support educational programs designed for students who are engaged in, or whose families are engaged in, migrant and other seasonal farmwork. In making awards under both programs, the Department is required to consider applicants' prior experience in operating HEP and CAMP projects.

Projects funded under the High School Equivalency Program (HEP) recruit migrant students aged 16 and over and provide academic and support services (including counseling, health services, stipends, and placement) to help those students obtain a high school equivalency certificate and subsequently to gain employment or admission to a postsecondary institution or training program.

Projects funded by the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) provide tutoring, academic assistance, and counseling services, as well as stipends, tuition, and room and board, to first-year, undergraduate migrant students and assist those students in obtaining student financial aid for their remaining undergraduate years.

HEP projects, located in college or university settings, operate residential and commuter programs of instructional services for out-of-school migrant youth. All CAMP projects use an on-campus residential design and provide a high level of support services in order to assist participants, virtually all of whom have had no prior contact with a college campus, to adjust to life at an institution of higher education. Alternatively, some HEP projects employ a commuter model in which students attend GED classes after work.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education – High school equivalency and College assistance migrant programs

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

	<u>HEP</u> (\$000s)	<u>CAMP</u> (\$000s)
2003.....	\$23,347	\$15,399
2004.....	18,888	15,657
2005.....	18,737	15,532
2006.....	18,550	15,377
2007.....	18,550	15,377

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2008, the Administration requests a total of \$33.9 million for the High School Equivalency (HEP) and College Assistance Migrant (CAMP) programs, the same as the 2007 level. The request would provide sufficient funding to cover all HEP and CAMP continuation grants. To improve the quality of applications for the HEP and CAMP program, the Department continues to expand efforts to assist potential applicants by providing information about the program, through quarterly inter-agency meetings, to other Federal agencies that serve the migrant and farmworker community.

HEP and CAMP focus on finding and assisting migrant youth who have potential but who have not been able -- due to lack of positive role models, lack of outreach on the part of local school authorities, or other obstacles, such as interrupted schooling -- to complete high school or go on to postsecondary education. HEP and CAMP emphasize services to out-of-school-youth, by conducting extensive outreach in locations where these youth live and work (e.g., farms, production facilities, and labor camps) and providing services at locations and times that meet the needs of an out-of-school, working population.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
HEP:			
Number of students served	7,021	7,021	7,021
Number of awards:			
First year	10	9	0
Second year	11	10	9
Third year	17	11	10
Fourth year	0	17	11
Fifth year	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>17</u>
Total	47	47	47

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education – High school equivalency and College assistance migrant programs

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) - continued

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Funding:			
New awards	\$4,277	\$3,527	0
Peer review of new award applications	51	51	0
Continuation awards	14,222	14,972	\$18,550
Average grant award	394	394	395
Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars)	\$2,635	\$2,635	\$2,642
 CAMP:			
Number of students served	2,366	2,366	2,366
Number of awards:			
First year	9	13	0
Second year	7	9	13
Third year	14	7	9
Fourth year	0	14	7
Fifth year	<u>13</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>14</u>
Total	43	43	43
Funding:			
New awards	\$3,197	\$4,625	0
Peer review of new award applications	42	42	0
Continuation awards	12,138	10,710	\$15,377
Average grant award	357	357	358
Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars)	\$6,500	\$6,500	\$6,500

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2008 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education – High school equivalency and College assistance migrant programs

Goal: To assist migrant and seasonal farmworker students in obtaining the equivalent of a high school diploma, and, subsequently, to begin postsecondary education, enter military service, or obtain employment.

Objective: *An increasing percentage of HEP participants will complete the program and receive a GED.*

Measure: The percentage of High School Equivalency Program (HEP) participants receiving a General Educational Development (GED) credential.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003	60	63
2004	60	65
2005	65	
2006	66	
2007	67	
2008	68	

Source: Grantee Performance Reports.

Assessment of Progress: The percentage of HEP students who received a GED increased slightly between 2003 and 2004, and exceeded the target of 60 percent. Data collected for fiscal year 2005 will be available in the fall of 2007.

The Department recently implemented a new long-term measure that will require HEP grantees to track the percentage of HEP participants earning a GED who enter postsecondary education programs, career positions, or the military. The baseline for that measure is 76 percent, and it was calculated from grantee reports for 2004.

Goal: Assist migrant and seasonal farmworker students to successfully complete their first academic year of college and to continue their postsecondary education.

Objective: *All CAMP students will complete their first academic year at a postsecondary institution in good standing.*

Measure : The percentage of College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) participants completing the first year of their postsecondary program.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003		81
2004	83	84
2005	85	
2006	86	
2007	86	
2008	86	

Source: Grantee Performance Reports.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education – High school equivalency and College assistance migrant programs

Assessment of Progress: The percentage of CAMP participants who completed the first year of their program increased between 2003 and 2004 and exceeded the target for 2004 by 3 percent. Note that, because projects are funded in the fall, after the school year may have already started, data for projects completing their first year of implementation are not included in any given year. Thus, the measure reflects the percentage of participants completing the first year of their postsecondary program between the second and fifth year of the project.

Objective: *A majority of CAMP students who successfully complete their first year of college will continue in postsecondary education.*

Measure: The percentage of College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) participants who, after completing first year of college, continue their postsecondary education.		
Year	Target	Actual)
2003		95
2004	79	96
2005	80	
2006	81	
2007	82	
2008	83	

Source: Grantee Performance Reports.

Assessment of Progress: The percentage of CAMP participants who continued their postsecondary education after completing their first year of college increased slightly between 2003 and 2004. In addition, the program significantly exceeded the target of 79 percent.

Efficiency Measures

The Department has established a cost-per-participant outcome measure to assess program efficiency for HEP and CAMP. For HEP, the measure is the cost per participant earning a GED and, for CAMP, it is the cost per participant who completes his or her first year of postsecondary education and then continues that postsecondary education. The baseline for the cost per HEP participant earning a GED is \$4,980, and the baseline for the cost per CAMP participant who completes his or her first year of postsecondary education and then continues that postsecondary education is \$9,302. Baselines were calculated from data contained in grantee reports for 2004.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

In 2004, the HEP and CAMP programs received PART ratings of “Results Not Demonstrated.” While the PART acknowledged the strong management of the programs, it contained a number of recommendations focusing on program accountability and goals that address broad long-term education and employment outcomes for participants, after program services conclude.

- The PART review recommended that the Department develop a reporting and auditing system for the HEP and CAMP programs to verify locally reported data and establish effective methods for utilizing outcome data to hold grantees accountable

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education – High school equivalency and College assistance migrant programs

for performance. In response to this recommendation, the Department plans to establish data collection and reporting as a priority beginning with grantees' interim (mid-year) annual performance reports that are due this March. Department staff will review the performance reports for evidence of data completeness and accuracy. The Department plans to train staff to undertake the review and also to consider grantees' data as part of program decision-making on continuation grants.

- The PART review recommended that the Department establish long-term goals for the HEP program that address employment and postsecondary education outcomes achieved by participants who complete the program. The Department recently established a long-term outcome measure that will gauge increases in the number of HEP participants who earn a GED and then improve their employment or attend postsecondary education programs, and plans to develop a data collection strategy for the measure that will require tracking participants' employment and postsecondary attainment after they have completed HEP programs.

The HEP program will be among those that will receive help from the Department's new Data Quality Initiative, which, beginning in 2007, will provide technical assistance to selected programs to promote and improve the capacity of Department staff and grantees to obtain better program outcomes. The contractor will help program staff design and conduct grant competitions and improve data collection and reporting, and grantees may receive help to strengthen local evaluations. Among other things, the contractor will provide assistance designed to address measurement and data collection issues that are similar across small programs, including strengthening outcome measures, identifying and addressing data deficiencies, and collecting uniformly high-quality data from grantees. Department staff also may seek help from the contractor in developing strategies for addressing the new long-term measures for that will require data collection on participants' employment and postsecondary attainment after they have completed HEP program objectives.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

ESEA Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies

State or Other Area	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate	Change from 2007 Estimate
Alabama	199,115,416	192,919,634	209,038,628	16,118,994
Alaska	33,133,552	33,535,979	37,169,589	3,633,610
Arizona	260,348,295	261,506,246	285,534,367	24,028,121
Arkansas	125,531,389	121,263,568	129,522,784	8,259,216
California	1,723,482,942	1,614,040,111	1,767,657,707	153,617,596
Colorado	129,040,431	123,165,824	133,331,037	10,165,213
Connecticut	100,363,873	110,618,756	118,876,400	8,257,644
Delaware	33,835,055	33,734,244	37,398,687	3,664,443
District of Columbia	48,702,200	45,942,673	49,866,678	3,924,005
Florida	648,779,724	585,698,365	639,515,799	53,817,434
Georgia	411,618,950	407,228,179	443,327,478	36,099,299
Hawaii	45,971,523	39,302,323	41,041,683	1,739,360
Idaho	42,377,445	40,901,345	44,931,931	4,030,586
Illinois	539,609,573	588,962,751	652,227,782	63,265,031
Indiana	184,340,352	227,419,053	246,398,496	18,979,443
Iowa	64,916,992	68,486,454	73,268,450	4,781,996
Kansas	81,640,391	84,541,799	90,975,538	6,433,739
Kentucky	184,218,606	182,269,030	196,261,092	13,992,062
Louisiana	283,725,533	275,087,312	298,264,306	23,176,994
Maine	45,515,821	43,352,561	47,250,257	3,897,696
Maryland	171,998,079	186,325,814	206,300,919	19,975,105
Massachusetts	207,264,303	210,250,843	226,514,889	16,264,046
Michigan	426,804,906	456,631,028	499,236,398	42,605,370
Minnesota	109,155,732	114,398,942	123,385,391	8,986,449
Mississippi	170,367,363	171,498,594	185,338,342	13,839,748
Missouri	188,074,659	201,220,433	217,709,762	16,489,329
Montana	40,962,145	38,272,788	41,722,112	3,449,324
Nebraska	50,561,517	50,587,348	54,588,028	4,000,680
Nevada	76,711,700	79,067,824	88,390,035	9,322,211
New Hampshire	31,001,229	34,313,298	37,977,247	3,663,949
New Jersey	265,388,413	249,373,581	265,575,905	16,202,324
New Mexico	112,418,200	103,003,043	107,859,622	4,856,579
New York	1,205,156,210	1,197,912,649	1,335,800,347	137,887,698
North Carolina	292,733,019	298,502,669	325,484,673	26,982,004
North Dakota	30,068,320	29,515,240	32,712,012	3,196,772
Ohio	410,460,543	445,976,951	484,906,427	38,929,476
Oklahoma	140,733,270	126,946,163	132,885,873	5,939,710
Oregon	130,589,520	121,175,174	129,517,762	8,342,588
Pennsylvania	483,256,934	513,126,051	561,163,163	48,037,112
Rhode Island	47,135,743	49,794,725	54,372,099	4,577,374
South Carolina	177,541,284	185,909,345	202,199,121	16,289,776
South Dakota	36,391,517	36,774,654	40,914,818	4,140,164
Tennessee	205,049,300	204,430,760	222,890,446	18,459,686
Texas	1,186,021,455	1,158,899,698	1,261,370,183	102,470,485
Utah	54,086,993	57,542,690	62,766,699	5,224,009
Vermont	28,354,880	26,896,401	29,788,459	2,892,058
Virginia	208,011,647	203,782,899	220,745,238	16,962,339
Washington	175,974,827	181,353,076	195,986,375	14,633,299
West Virginia	99,180,164	88,807,631	90,874,190	2,066,559
Wisconsin	154,632,667	200,471,238	218,836,401	18,365,163
Wyoming	28,891,696	27,642,887	30,684,364	3,041,477
American Samoa	8,493,595	8,436,303	9,405,741	969,438
Guam	10,290,008	9,261,007	8,387,488	(873,519)
Northern Mariana Islands	3,476,690	3,302,855	3,550,563	247,708
Puerto Rico	451,344,832	452,317,542	536,485,011	84,167,469
Virgin Islands	11,413,246	11,336,259	12,638,938	1,302,679
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside (BIA)	88,423,341	89,761,537	100,076,270	10,314,733
Other (non-State allocations)	8,437,280	8,437,280	9,000,000	562,720
Total	12,713,125,290	12,713,233,427	13,909,900,000	1,196,666,573

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School Improvement Grants

State or Other Area	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate	Change from 2007 Estimate
Alabama	0	0	7,397,694	7,397,694
Alaska	0	0	1,554,860	1,554,860
Arizona	0	0	10,247,017	10,247,017
Arkansas	0	0	4,679,093	4,679,093
California	0	0	66,163,626	66,163,626
Colorado	0	0	4,907,463	4,907,463
Connecticut	0	0	4,247,354	4,247,354
Delaware	0	0	1,330,353	1,330,353
District of Columbia	0	0	1,758,605	1,758,605
Florida	0	0	23,167,681	23,167,681
Georgia	0	0	15,833,085	15,833,085
Hawaii	0	0	1,460,321	1,460,321
Idaho	0	0	1,719,179	1,719,179
Illinois	0	0	22,946,283	22,946,283
Indiana	0	0	8,847,902	8,847,902
Iowa	0	0	2,637,558	2,637,558
Kansas	0	0	3,582,405	3,582,405
Kentucky	0	0	7,130,958	7,130,958
Louisiana	0	0	10,540,544	10,540,544
Maine	0	0	1,683,454	1,683,454
Maryland	0	0	7,280,034	7,280,034
Massachusetts	0	0	7,980,654	7,980,654
Michigan	0	0	17,827,129	17,827,129
Minnesota	0	0	4,377,567	4,377,567
Mississippi	0	0	6,493,209	6,493,209
Missouri	0	0	7,716,232	7,716,232
Montana	0	0	1,471,180	1,471,180
Nebraska	0	0	2,082,855	2,082,855
Nevada	0	0	3,120,751	3,120,751
New Hampshire	0	0	1,349,420	1,349,420
New Jersey	0	0	9,341,736	9,341,736
New Mexico	0	0	3,757,316	3,757,316
New York	0	0	47,285,364	47,285,364
North Carolina	0	0	11,615,716	11,615,716
North Dakota	0	0	1,153,380	1,153,380
Ohio	0	0	17,138,038	17,138,038
Oklahoma	0	0	4,667,191	4,667,191
Oregon	0	0	4,932,687	4,932,687
Pennsylvania	0	0	20,020,928	20,020,928
Rhode Island	0	0	1,929,999	1,929,999
South Carolina	0	0	7,162,028	7,162,028
South Dakota	0	0	1,466,967	1,466,967
Tennessee	0	0	7,830,276	7,830,276
Texas	0	0	46,152,246	46,152,246
Utah	0	0	2,283,439	2,283,439
Vermont	0	0	1,081,435	1,081,435
Virginia	0	0	7,738,861	7,738,861
Washington	0	0	7,398,065	7,398,065
West Virginia	0	0	3,129,816	3,129,816
Wisconsin	0	0	7,728,841	7,728,841
Wyoming	0	0	1,101,489	1,101,489
American Samoa	0	0	328,475	328,475
Guam	0	0	292,914	292,914
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	123,996	123,996
Puerto Rico	0	0	18,868,002	18,868,002
Virgin Islands	0	0	441,387	441,387
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	3,494,942	3,494,942
Other (non-State allocations)	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	500,000,000	500,000,000

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Reading First State Grants

State or Other Area	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate	Change from 2007 Estimate
Alabama	18,515,368	17,798,041	17,800,494	2,453
Alaska	2,463,421	2,439,966	2,439,965	(1)
Arizona	23,986,997	23,794,850	23,798,129	3,279
Arkansas	11,753,351	10,559,364	10,560,820	1,456
California	144,886,608	135,683,621	135,702,322	18,701
Colorado	10,797,914	10,449,003	10,450,443	1,440
Connecticut	6,272,309	7,146,801	7,147,786	985
Delaware	2,463,421	2,439,966	2,439,965	(1)
District of Columbia	2,463,421	2,439,966	2,439,965	(1)
Florida	57,226,915	49,498,937	49,505,759	6,822
Georgia	32,648,233	32,843,362	32,847,888	4,526
Hawaii	3,004,594	2,439,966	2,439,965	(1)
Idaho	4,038,362	3,706,786	3,707,297	511
Illinois	37,340,923	40,872,831	40,878,464	5,633
Indiana	14,513,426	17,213,470	17,215,842	2,372
Iowa	5,585,371	5,942,348	5,943,167	819
Kansas	6,211,011	6,574,296	6,575,202	906
Kentucky	15,450,709	14,975,362	14,977,426	2,064
Louisiana	23,276,639	22,355,284	22,358,365	3,081
Maine	2,806,133	2,631,069	2,631,431	362
Maryland	11,315,638	11,852,151	11,853,785	1,634
Massachusetts	12,651,748	13,408,167	13,410,015	1,848
Michigan	28,122,292	30,622,079	30,626,300	4,221
Minnesota	8,632,773	9,157,323	9,158,585	1,262
Mississippi	15,608,492	15,724,977	15,727,145	2,168
Missouri	16,403,120	17,586,617	17,589,041	2,424
Montana	2,895,782	2,528,456	2,528,804	348
Nebraska	3,641,664	3,637,271	3,637,772	501
Nevada	6,654,775	6,737,015	6,737,943	928
New Hampshire	2,463,421	2,439,966	2,439,965	(1)
New Jersey	17,356,204	16,421,127	16,423,391	2,264
New Mexico	9,566,021	8,358,782	8,359,934	1,152
New York	71,608,894	70,634,823	70,644,559	9,736
North Carolina	27,778,935	27,940,092	27,943,943	3,851
North Dakota	2,463,421	2,439,966	2,439,965	(1)
Ohio	28,964,434	31,916,084	31,920,483	4,399
Oklahoma	13,097,641	11,453,655	11,455,234	1,579
Oregon	10,436,964	9,829,342	9,830,697	1,355
Pennsylvania	30,761,005	32,053,011	32,057,429	4,418
Rhode Island	3,068,021	3,203,796	3,204,237	441
South Carolina	15,485,112	15,856,702	15,858,888	2,186
South Dakota	2,463,421	2,439,966	2,439,965	(1)
Tennessee	19,210,710	18,890,252	18,892,855	2,603
Texas	101,108,534	100,685,726	100,699,603	13,877
Utah	5,546,262	5,812,836	5,813,638	802
Vermont	2,463,421	2,439,966	2,439,965	(1)
Virginia	16,695,489	15,870,760	15,872,948	2,188
Washington	15,507,636	15,976,362	15,978,564	2,202
West Virginia	7,120,390	6,142,370	6,143,217	847
Wisconsin	10,802,060	14,002,479	14,004,409	1,930
Wyoming	2,463,421	2,439,966	2,439,965	(1)
American Samoa	1,633,283	1,616,554	1,616,554	0
Guam	1,456,466	1,441,549	1,441,548	(1)
Northern Mariana Islands	593,275	587,199	587,198	(1)
Puerto Rico	37,305,433	35,678,886	35,551,941	(126,945)
Virgin Islands	1,463,146	1,448,160	1,448,160	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside (BIA)	5,146,170	5,093,462	5,093,460	(2)
Other (non-State allocations)	33,573,400	32,519,243	32,519,200	(43)
Total	1,029,234,000	1,018,692,427	1,018,692,000	(427)

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even Start

State or Other Area	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate	Change from 2007 Estimate
Alabama	1,380,444	1,483,752	0	(1,483,752)
Alaska	445,400	498,288	0	(498,288)
Arizona	1,801,378	2,006,132	0	(2,006,132)
Arkansas	862,476	920,542	0	(920,542)
California	11,909,704	12,341,988	0	(12,341,988)
Colorado	890,316	937,470	0	(937,470)
Connecticut	657,606	849,187	0	(849,187)
Delaware	445,400	498,288	0	(498,288)
District of Columbia	445,400	498,288	0	(498,288)
Florida	4,557,665	4,446,007	0	(4,446,007)
Georgia	2,871,704	3,140,607	0	(3,140,607)
Hawaii	445,400	498,288	0	(498,288)
Idaho	445,400	498,288	0	(498,288)
Illinois	3,746,504	4,562,420	0	(4,562,420)
Indiana	1,281,598	1,767,896	0	(1,767,896)
Iowa	445,400	528,351	0	(528,351)
Kansas	0	650,791	0	(650,791)
Kentucky	1,273,755	1,396,862	0	(1,396,862)
Louisiana	1,953,376	2,100,801	0	(2,100,801)
Maine	445,400	498,288	0	(498,288)
Maryland	1,202,981	1,446,006	0	(1,446,006)
Massachusetts	1,343,752	1,605,320	0	(1,605,320)
Michigan	2,936,830	3,544,942	0	(3,544,942)
Minnesota	741,754	883,223	0	(883,223)
Mississippi	1,142,782	1,299,185	0	(1,299,185)
Missouri	1,286,219	1,555,602	0	(1,555,602)
Montana	445,400	498,288	0	(498,288)
Nebraska	445,400	498,288	0	(498,288)
Nevada	539,433	614,227	0	(614,227)
New Hampshire	445,400	498,288	0	(498,288)
New Jersey	1,793,735	1,885,605	0	(1,885,605)
New Mexico	781,856	753,981	0	(753,981)
New York	8,390,464	9,286,183	0	(9,286,183)
North Carolina	2,047,721	2,310,103	0	(2,310,103)
North Dakota	445,400	498,288	0	(498,288)
Ohio	2,857,072	3,460,372	0	(3,460,372)
Oklahoma	968,100	937,817	0	(937,817)
Oregon	909,638	922,103	0	(922,103)
Pennsylvania	3,364,762	3,986,613	0	(3,986,613)
Rhode Island	445,400	498,288	0	(498,288)
South Carolina	1,245,185	1,446,628	0	(1,446,628)
South Dakota	445,400	498,288	0	(498,288)
Tennessee	1,440,480	1,580,875	0	(1,580,875)
Texas	8,201,738	8,849,517	0	(8,849,517)
Utah	445,400	498,288	0	(498,288)
Vermont	445,400	498,288	0	(498,288)
Virginia	1,435,601	1,565,847	0	(1,565,847)
Washington	1,213,217	1,399,479	0	(1,399,479)
West Virginia	684,782	638,817	0	(638,817)
Wisconsin	1,055,443	1,556,573	0	(1,556,573)
Wyoming	445,400	498,288	0	(498,288)
American Samoa	126,324	154,422	0	(154,422)
Guam	153,042	137,704	0	(137,704)
Northern Mariana Islands	45,886	58,292	0	(58,292)
Puerto Rico	3,183,529	3,521,306	0	(3,521,306)
Virgin Islands	169,748	207,503	0	(207,503)
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	1,485,000	1,673,763	0	(1,673,763)
Other (non-State allocations)	7,940,000	9,695,051	0	(9,695,051)
Total	99,000,000	111,584,185	0	(111,584,185)

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Promise Scholarships

State or Other Area	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate	Change from 2007 Estimate
Alabama	0	0	3,808,446	3,808,446
Alaska	0	0	661,314	661,314
Arizona	0	0	5,149,275	5,149,275
Arkansas	0	0	2,362,818	2,362,818
California	0	0	31,679,018	31,679,018
Colorado	0	0	2,406,268	2,406,268
Connecticut	0	0	2,179,666	2,179,666
Delaware	0	0	665,224	665,224
District of Columbia	0	0	893,097	893,097
Florida	0	0	11,411,867	11,411,867
Georgia	0	0	8,061,208	8,061,208
Hawaii	0	0	723,914	723,914
Idaho	0	0	807,123	807,123
Illinois	0	0	11,710,672	11,710,672
Indiana	0	0	4,537,777	4,537,777
Iowa	0	0	1,356,155	1,356,155
Kansas	0	0	1,670,430	1,670,430
Kentucky	0	0	3,585,421	3,585,421
Louisiana	0	0	5,392,268	5,392,268
Maine	0	0	844,999	844,999
Maryland	0	0	3,711,562	3,711,562
Massachusetts	0	0	4,120,485	4,120,485
Michigan	0	0	9,099,042	9,099,042
Minnesota	0	0	2,267,027	2,267,027
Mississippi	0	0	3,334,706	3,334,706
Missouri	0	0	3,992,868	3,992,868
Montana	0	0	726,716	726,716
Nebraska	0	0	992,545	992,545
Nevada	0	0	1,576,577	1,576,577
New Hampshire	0	0	676,642	676,642
New Jersey	0	0	4,839,911	4,839,911
New Mexico	0	0	1,935,295	1,935,295
New York	0	0	23,835,474	23,835,474
North Carolina	0	0	5,929,497	5,929,497
North Dakota	0	0	582,027	582,027
Ohio	0	0	8,881,971	8,881,971
Oklahoma	0	0	2,407,158	2,407,158
Oregon	0	0	2,366,823	2,366,823
Pennsylvania	0	0	10,232,709	10,232,709
Rhode Island	0	0	994,205	994,205
South Carolina	0	0	3,713,157	3,713,157
South Dakota	0	0	725,179	725,179
Tennessee	0	0	4,057,739	4,057,739
Texas	0	0	22,714,655	22,714,655
Utah	0	0	1,143,847	1,143,847
Vermont	0	0	530,385	530,385
Virginia	0	0	4,019,165	4,019,165
Washington	0	0	3,592,138	3,592,138
West Virginia	0	0	1,639,694	1,639,694
Wisconsin	0	0	3,995,362	3,995,362
Wyoming	0	0	545,105	545,105
American Samoa	0	0	172,988	172,988
Guam	0	0	154,260	154,260
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	65,301	65,301
Puerto Rico	0	0	9,038,374	9,038,374
Virgin Islands	0	0	232,451	232,451
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside (BIA)	0	0	0	0
Other (non-State allocations)	0	0	1,250,000	1,250,000
Total	0	0	250,000,000	250,000,000

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

State Agency Programs – Migrant

State or Other Area	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate	Change from 2007 Estimate
Alabama	2,053,309	2,027,000	2,026,999	(1)
Alaska	6,749,379	7,101,130	7,101,124	(6)
Arizona	6,361,944	6,501,050	6,501,045	(5)
Arkansas	5,103,179	5,214,518	5,214,514	(4)
California	125,572,327	128,587,682	128,587,583	(99)
Colorado	7,400,347	7,871,955	7,871,949	(6)
Connecticut	2,942,053	1,530,362	1,530,361	(1)
Delaware	297,574	292,846	292,846	0
District of Columbia	0	0	0	0
Florida	22,570,642	22,477,411	22,477,394	(17)
Georgia	8,277,627	8,171,571	8,171,565	(6)
Hawaii	733,507	793,998	793,997	(1)
Idaho	4,047,365	3,995,507	3,995,504	(3)
Illinois	1,904,255	1,879,858	1,879,856	(2)
Indiana	5,072,471	4,992,842	4,992,838	(4)
Iowa	1,656,368	1,792,966	1,792,965	(1)
Kansas	11,461,139	11,413,694	11,413,685	(9)
Kentucky	7,106,291	7,306,428	7,306,422	(6)
Louisiana	2,389,398	2,441,597	2,441,595	(2)
Maine	1,048,187	1,134,630	1,134,629	(1)
Maryland	520,304	539,139	539,139	0
Massachusetts	1,610,801	1,590,162	1,590,161	(1)
Michigan	8,481,562	8,454,803	8,454,796	(7)
Minnesota	1,669,626	1,648,234	1,648,233	(1)
Mississippi	1,315,566	1,298,711	1,298,710	(1)
Missouri	1,513,793	1,494,398	1,494,396	(2)
Montana	945,620	993,970	993,970	0
Nebraska	5,094,277	5,029,007	5,029,003	(4)
Nevada	222,549	233,607	233,607	0
New Hampshire	141,417	144,382	144,381	(1)
New Jersey	1,996,843	1,965,085	1,965,084	(1)
New Mexico	858,675	909,446	909,445	(1)
New York	9,382,171	9,758,642	9,758,635	(7)
North Carolina	5,893,314	5,817,806	5,817,802	(4)
North Dakota	219,233	230,186	230,185	(1)
Ohio	2,447,243	2,619,943	2,619,941	(2)
Oklahoma	1,973,573	1,942,561	1,942,560	(1)
Oregon	11,748,865	11,598,332	11,598,323	(9)
Pennsylvania	9,045,553	8,929,656	8,929,650	(6)
Rhode Island	68,131	67,258	67,258	0
South Carolina	531,730	554,038	554,037	(1)
South Dakota	809,109	826,093	826,093	0
Tennessee	526,658	567,665	567,664	(1)
Texas	56,948,381	58,192,798	58,192,753	(45)
Utah	1,722,572	1,821,625	1,821,624	(1)
Vermont	603,598	626,356	626,356	0
Virginia	778,696	766,296	766,296	0
Washington	15,338,490	15,208,559	15,208,547	(12)
West Virginia	82,195	80,783	80,783	0
Wisconsin	609,193	627,004	627,003	(1)
Wyoming	215,546	231,695	231,694	(1)
American Samoa	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	0	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0
Other (non-State allocations)	20,461,074	10,000,000	10,000,000	0
Total	386,523,720	380,295,285	380,295,000	(285)

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

State Agency Programs – Neglected and Delinquent

State or Other Area	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate	Change from 2007 Estimate
Alabama	1,007,171	1,010,858	1,010,858	0
Alaska	259,612	260,563	260,563	0
Arizona	1,997,909	2,005,223	2,005,223	0
Arkansas	363,256	395,719	395,719	0
California	2,835,780	2,811,551	2,811,551	0
Colorado	507,548	494,936	494,936	0
Connecticut	1,104,862	1,108,907	1,108,907	0
Delaware	390,173	391,602	391,602	0
District of Columbia	208,294	209,056	209,056	0
Florida	1,274,984	1,304,230	1,304,230	0
Georgia	1,285,767	1,254,935	1,254,935	0
Hawaii	166,926	166,402	166,402	0
Idaho	226,406	227,235	227,235	0
Illinois	1,367,701	1,354,819	1,354,819	0
Indiana	922,566	945,141	945,141	0
Iowa	412,587	411,947	411,947	0
Kansas	390,716	385,112	385,112	0
Kentucky	835,988	849,620	849,620	0
Louisiana	1,500,092	1,503,086	1,503,086	0
Maine	170,720	172,699	172,699	0
Maryland	944,441	962,859	962,859	0
Massachusetts	1,858,652	1,865,456	1,865,456	0
Michigan	652,373	645,409	645,409	0
Minnesota	201,314	200,920	200,920	0
Mississippi	1,452,522	1,457,839	1,457,839	0
Missouri	1,331,387	1,335,291	1,335,291	0
Montana	118,585	118,177	118,177	0
Nebraska	287,180	286,871	286,871	0
Nevada	376,841	378,220	378,220	0
New Hampshire	495,649	508,955	508,955	0
New Jersey	2,842,130	2,852,535	2,852,535	0
New Mexico	353,127	350,903	350,903	0
New York	3,441,374	3,453,973	3,453,973	0
North Carolina	1,021,847	1,025,588	1,025,588	0
North Dakota	73,084	75,143	75,143	0
Ohio	1,592,239	1,557,090	1,557,090	0
Oklahoma	374,828	376,200	376,200	0
Oregon	1,032,807	1,008,451	1,008,451	0
Pennsylvania	972,414	987,630	987,630	0
Rhode Island	560,733	562,786	562,786	0
South Carolina	1,274,750	1,289,413	1,289,413	0
South Dakota	249,631	249,914	249,914	0
Tennessee	541,564	543,546	543,546	0
Texas	3,633,576	3,510,665	3,510,664	(1)
Utah	689,281	691,805	691,805	0
Vermont	544,099	546,091	546,091	0
Virginia	771,344	798,390	798,390	0
Washington	650,105	647,330	647,330	0
West Virginia	544,796	534,989	534,989	0
Wisconsin	1,015,271	1,004,945	1,004,945	0
Wyoming	600,124	616,075	616,075	0
American Samoa	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	824,949	844,976	844,976	0
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0
Other (non-State allocations)	1,244,925	1,244,925	1,244,925	0
Total	49,797,000	49,797,001	49,797,000	(1)

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive School Reform (Title I)

State or Other Area	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate	Change from 2007 Estimate
Alabama	0	0	0	0
Alaska	0	0	0	0
Arizona	0	0	0	0
Arkansas	0	0	0	0
California	0	0	0	0
Colorado	0	0	0	0
Connecticut	0	0	0	0
Delaware	0	0	0	0
District of Columbia	0	0	0	0
Florida	0	0	0	0
Georgia	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	0	0	0	0
Idaho	0	0	0	0
Illinois	0	0	0	0
Indiana	0	0	0	0
Iowa	0	0	0	0
Kansas	0	0	0	0
Kentucky	0	0	0	0
Louisiana	0	0	0	0
Maine	0	0	0	0
Maryland	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0
Michigan	0	0	0	0
Minnesota	0	0	0	0
Mississippi	0	0	0	0
Missouri	0	0	0	0
Montana	0	0	0	0
Nebraska	0	0	0	0
Nevada	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	0	0	0	0
New Mexico	0	0	0	0
New York	0	0	0	0
North Carolina	0	0	0	0
North Dakota	0	0	0	0
Ohio	0	0	0	0
Oklahoma	0	0	0	0
Oregon	0	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	0	0	0	0
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	0	0	0
South Dakota	0	0	0	0
Tennessee	0	0	0	0
Texas	0	0	0	0
Utah	0	0	0	0
Vermont	0	0	0	0
Virginia	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0	0	0
West Virginia	0	0	0	0
Wisconsin	0	0	0	0
Wyoming	0	0	0	0
American Samoa	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	0	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside (BIA)	0	0	0	0
Other (non-State allocations)	7,920,000	10,133,000	0	(10,133,000)
Total	7,920,000	10,133,000	0	(10,133,000)