

Archived Information

Department of Education

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Fiscal Year 2008 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language.....	C-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	C-2
Amounts Available for Obligation.....	C-4
Obligations by Object Classification.....	C-5
Summary of Changes.....	C-6
Authorizing Legislation.....	C-8
Appropriations History.....	C-10
Significant Items in FY 2007 Appropriations Reports.....	C-11
Summary of Request.....	C-12
Improving teacher quality:	
Improving teacher quality State grants.....	C-15
Early childhood educator professional development.....	C-23
Mathematics and science partnerships.....	C-27
Educational technology State grants.....	C-31
21 st Century community learning centers.....	C-37
State grants for innovative programs.....	C-43
Javits gifted and talented education.....	C-48
Foreign language assistance.....	C-51
State assessments.....	C-55
Education for homeless children and youths.....	C-63
Education for Native Hawaiians.....	C-68
Alaska Native education equity.....	C-72
Training and advisory services.....	C-75
Rural education.....	C-79
Supplemental education grants.....	C-87
Comprehensive centers.....	C-90
State Tables.....	C-96

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

For carrying out school improvement activities authorized by title II, part B of title IV, subpart 9 of part D of title V, and parts A and B of title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 ("ESEA"); the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002; the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003; and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, \$4,698,276,000, of which \$3,158,151,000 shall become available on July 1, 2008, and remain available through September 30, 2009,¹ and of which \$1,435,000,000 shall become available on October 1, 2008, and shall remain available through September 30, 2009,² for academic year 2008-2009: Provided, That \$411,630,000 shall be for State assessments and related activities authorized under sections 6111 and 6112 of the ESEA:³ Provided further, That \$56,256,000 shall be available to carry out section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002:⁴ Provided further, That \$23,755,000 shall be available to carry out part D of title V of the ESEA:⁵ Provided further, That no funds appropriated under this heading may be used to carry out section 5494 under the ESEA:⁶ Provided further, That \$18,001,000 shall be available to carry out the Supplemental Education Grants program for the Federated States of Micronesia and for the Republic of the Marshall Islands:⁷ Provided further, That up to 5 percent of these amounts may be reserved by the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands to administer the Supplemental Education Grants programs and to obtain technical assistance, oversight and consultancy services in the administration of these grants and to reimburse the United States Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for such services.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, Division B, 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.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<u>¹ ... of which \$3,158,151,000 shall become available on July 1, 2008, and remain available through September 30, 2009...</u>	This language provides for a portion of funds to be appropriated on a forward-funded basis for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, Mathematics and Science Partnerships, 21 st Century Community Learning Centers, State Assessments, Education for Homeless Children and Youths State Grants, and Rural Education.
<u>² ... and of which \$1,435,000,000 shall become available on October 1, 2008, and shall remain available through September 30, 2009...</u>	This language provides that a portion of funds for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants is available in on an advance-funded basis.
<u>³ Provided, That \$411,630,000 shall be for State assessments and related activities authorized under sections 6111 and 6112 of the ESEA:</u>	This language earmarks the amount requested for the State Assessments program at a level that would require States to comply with the Title I assessment requirements.
<u>⁴ Provided further, That \$56,256,000 shall be available to carry out section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002:</u>	This language earmarks funds for the Comprehensive Centers program.
<u>⁵ Provided further, That \$23,755,000 shall be available to carry out part D of title V of the ESEA:</u>	This language earmarks funds for the Foreign Language Assistance program.
<u>⁶ Provided further, That no funds appropriated under this heading may be used to carry out section 5494 under the ESEA:</u>	This language prohibits funds appropriated for the Foreign Language Assistance program from being used for Elementary School Foreign Language Incentive Grants.
<u>⁷ Provided further, That \$18,001,000 shall be available to carry out the Supplemental Education Grants program for the Federated States of Micronesia and for the Republic of the Marshall Islands:</u>	This language earmarks funds for Supplemental Education Grants to the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><u>⁸ Provided further, That up to 5 percent of these amounts may be reserved by the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands to administer the Supplemental Education Grants programs and to obtain technical assistance, oversight and consultancy services in the administration of these grants and to reimburse the United States Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for such services.</u></p>	<p>This language allows the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands to reserve up to 5 percent of their Supplemental Education Grants funds for administration and for technical assistance, oversight, and consultancy services for these grants and to reimburse the United States Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for these services.</p>

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

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

	2006	2007	2008
Discretionary authority:			
Annual appropriation	\$5,308,564	0	\$4,698,276
Across-the-board reduction	-53,086	0	0
CR annual rate.....	<u>0</u>	<u>\$5,265,313</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, appropriation.....	5,255,479	5,265,313	4,698,276
Transfer to Safe Schools and Citizenship Education for: National activities (Project SERV).....			
	<u>0</u>	<u>-4,832</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, comparable discretionary appropriation.....	5,255,479	5,260,481	4,698,276
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	-1,435,000	-1,435,000	-1,435,000
Advance from prior year	<u>1,435,000</u>	<u>1,435,000</u>	<u>1,435,000</u> ¹
Subtotal, comparable budget authority	5,255,479	5,260,481	4,698,276
Unobligated balance, start of year	55,804	45,943	0
Recovery of prior-year obligations	565	0	0
Unobligated balance, expiring.....	-123	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year	<u>-45,943</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations	5,265,782	5,306,424	4,698,276

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.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Obligations by Object Classification
(\$000s)

	2006	2007	2008
Other contractual services:			
Advisory and assistance services	\$12,752	\$14,138	\$12,257
Other services	21,139	22,365	20,475
Peer review	547	337	163
Subtotal	34,438	36,840	32,895
Grants, subsidies, and contributions	<u>5,231,344</u>	<u>5,269,584</u>	<u>4,665,381</u>
Total, direct obligations.....	5,265,782	5,306,424	4,698,276

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Summary of Changes
(\$000s)

2007	\$5,260,481
2008	<u>4,698,276</u>
Net change.....	-562,205

	<u>2007 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
Increases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
Increase for Foreign Language Assistance to support additional competitive grants to States and school districts in order to increase the quality and quantity of foreign language instruction in the United States.	\$21,755	<u>+\$2,000</u>
Subtotal, increases		+2,000
Decreases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
Decrease funding for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants to shift funds to the Teacher Incentive Fund program in the Innovation and Improvement account.	100,000	-100,000
Eliminate funding for Early Childhood Educator Professional Development because the Administration proposes to consolidate these funds into the Early Reading First program in the Education for the Disadvantaged account.	14,548	-14,548
Eliminate funding for Educational Technology State Grants because it is a narrow categorical program that has limited impact and for which there is little or no evidence of effectiveness.	273,062	-273,062
Eliminate funding for State Grants for Innovative Programs because there is little or no evidence of effectiveness.	99,183	-99,183
Eliminate funding for Javits Gifted and Talented Education because it is a small, narrow categorical program that has limited impact and for which there is little or no evidence of effectiveness.	9,596	-9,596

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Summary of Changes—continued (\$000s)

	<u>2007 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
Decreases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
Eliminate funding for Education for Native Hawaiians because it is a narrow categorical program that is duplicative of other programs.	\$33,908	-\$33,908
Eliminate funding for Alaska Native Education Equity because it is a narrow categorical program that is duplicative of other programs.	33,908	<u>-\$33,908</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-564,205
Net change		-562,205

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Authorizing Legislation (\$000s)

Activity	2007 Authorized	2007 Estimate	2008 Authorized	2008 Request
Improving teacher quality (<i>ESEA II</i>):				
Improving teacher quality State grants (<i>Part A</i>)	Indefinite	\$2,887,488	Indefinite ¹	\$2,787,488
Early childhood educator professional development (<i>Section 2151(e)</i>)	Indefinite	14,548	Indefinite ²	0
Mathematics and science partnerships (<i>Part B</i>)	Indefinite	182,124	Indefinite ¹	182,124
Educational technology State grants (<i>ESEA II-D-1 and 2</i>)	Indefinite ³	273,062	Indefinite ^{2,3}	0
21 st Century community learning centers (<i>ESEA IV-B</i>)	\$2,500,000	981,180	\$2,500,000	981,180
State grants for innovative programs (<i>ESEA V-A</i>)	600,000	99,183	600,000	0
Javits gifted and talented education (<i>ESEA V-D-6</i>)	(4)	9,596	(2, 4)	0
Foreign language assistance (<i>ESEA V-D-9</i>)	(4)	21,755	(4)	23,755
State assessments (<i>ESEA VI-A-1</i>)	Indefinite	411,630	Indefinite ¹	411,630
Education for homeless children and youths (<i>McKinney-Vento Act, Title VII-B</i>)	Indefinite	61,878	Indefinite ¹	61,878
Education for Native Hawaiians (<i>ESEA VII-B</i>)	Indefinite ⁵	33,908	Indefinite ^{2, 5}	0
Alaska Native education equity (<i>ESEA VII-C</i>)	Indefinite ⁶	33,908	Indefinite ^{2, 6}	0
Training and advisory services (<i>CRA IV</i>)	Indefinite	7,113	Indefinite	7,113
Rural education (<i>ESEA VI-B</i>)	Indefinite ⁷	168,851	Indefinite ^{7, 8}	168,851
Supplemental education grants (<i>Compact of Free Association Act</i>)	18,913 ⁹	18,001	19,190 ⁹	18,001
Comprehensive centers (<i>Educational Technical Assistance Act, Section 203</i>)	Indefinite	56,256	Indefinite	56,256

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Authorizing Legislation—continued (\$000s)

Activity	2007 Authorized	2007 Estimate	2008 Authorized	2008 Request
<u>Unfunded authorizations:</u>				
National teacher recruitment campaign <i>(ESEA Section 2151(a))</i>	Indefinite	0	Indefinite ²	0
Special education teacher training <i>(ESEA Section 2151(d))</i>	Indefinite	0	Indefinite ²	0
Teacher mobility <i>(ESEA Section 2151(f))</i>	<u>Indefinite</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>Indefinite²</u>	<u>0</u>
Total definite authorization	\$3,118,824		\$3,119,190	
Total appropriation		\$5,260,481		\$4,698,276
Portion of request subject to reauthorization				4,616,906
Portion of request not authorized				81,370

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

² The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2008. The Administration is not seeking reauthorizing legislation.

³ Section 2404 of the ESEA requires that from the funds appropriated for Subparts 1 and 2 of Part D, at least 98 percent is to be used to carry out Subpart 1 and not more than 2 percent is to be used to carry out Subpart 2. In addition, of the total amount available to carry out Subpart 2 in fiscal years 2002 through 2007, not more than a total of \$15,000 thousand may be used to carry out Section 2421(a).

⁴ A total of \$675,000 thousand is authorized in fiscal year 2007 to carry out all Title V, Part D activities.

⁵ Of the amount available to carry out Sections 7204 and 7205, \$500 thousand is to be reserved for a direct grant to the Native Hawaiian Education Council to carry out Section 7204.

⁶ Of the amount appropriated for Part C, not less than \$7,000 thousand is to be used to support activities specified in Section 7304(d)(2).

⁷ The amount appropriated to carry out Title VI, Part B is to be distributed equally between Subparts 1 and 2.

⁸ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; however, additional authorizing language is sought.

⁹ The Compact of Free Association Act authorizes \$12,230 thousand for the Federated States of Micronesia and \$6,100 thousand for the Republic of the Marshall Islands for fiscal year 2005 and an equivalent amount, as adjusted for inflation (calculated as two thirds of the percentage change in the U.S. Gross Domestic Product Implicit Price Deflator, or 5 percent, whichever is less in any 1 year) for each of the succeeding fiscal years through 2023. The 2007 and 2008 authorizations are calculated based on inflation estimates as of February 6, 2006.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Appropriations History (\$000s)

	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
1999	\$1,475,800	\$1,542,334	\$1,655,188	\$2,811,134
2000	2,722,534	3,115,188	2,961,634	3,026,884
(2000 Advance for 2001)	0	(1,638,000)	(1,239,750)	(1,515,000)
2000 Rescission	0	0	0	-20,000
2001	3,869,034	3,165,334	4,672,534	4,869,084
(2001 Advance for 2002)	(1,515,000)	(1,515,000)	(2,915,000)	(1,765,000)
2002	6,338,794	7,653,084	8,754,514	7,837,473
(2002 Advance for 2003)	0	(1,960,000)	(1,765,000)	(1,765,000)
2003	6,784,484	7,347,584	7,788,329	8,001,159
(2003 Advance for 2004)	(1,765,000)	(2,265,000)	(1,765,000)	(1,765,000)
2003 Technical amendment	0	0	0	546
2004	5,042,834	5,797,637	5,731,453	5,800,496
(2004 Advance for 2005)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)
2005	5,940,493	5,661,401	5,730,632	5,619,657
(2005 Advance for 2006)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)
2006	5,332,219	5,393,765	5,457,953	5,255,478
(2006 Advance for 2007)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)
2007	4,973,158			5,260,481 ¹
(2007 Advance for 2008)	(1,435,000)			(1,435,000) ²
2008	4,798,276			
(2008 Advance for 2009)	(1,435,000)			

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.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Significant Items in FY 2007 Appropriations Reports

Foreign Language Assistance

Senate Committee: The Committee intends for funding available under this program to promote the goal of well-articulated, long-sequence language programs that lead to demonstrable results for all students. The Committee directs the Department not to make grants to schools that are replacing current traditional language programs with critical needs language instruction.

Response: The Department intends to highlight the Committee's concern in the grant application package for the FY 2007 competition. The Department will not make grants to schools that would use the funds to replace instruction in traditionally taught languages with instruction in critical-need languages.

Alaska Native Education Equity

Senate Committee: The Committee bill includes language that allows funding provided by this program to be used for construction. The Committee expects the Department to use some of these funds to address the construction needs of rural schools.

Response: Under the Elementary and Secondary Act, Section 7304(a)(2), construction is not an allowable activity. The Department will invite applications that include construction activities, only if the 2007 appropriations law authorizes this activity.

Comprehensive Centers

Senate Committee: The Committee directs the Department to inform the Comprehensive Centers that the assistance they provide must be based on scientifically based research and used, among other activities, to help States, school districts, and schools better use the school improvement funds available under the 4 percent school improvement set-aside and \$100 million School Improvement Grants program available under the Education for the Disadvantaged account, so that schools identified as in need of improvement can undertake the fundamental changes in instructional practices and the learning environment that scientifically based research demonstrates will lead to improved student achievement.

Response: The Department closely monitors the activities of the Comprehensive Centers and will make them aware of the Committee's concerns. The Department will continue to emphasize the imperative to provide assistance that is based on scientifically based research that supports practices with a high likelihood of improving student achievement and ensuring that States use their available funds on the most effective practices available. The Department will encourage the centers to focus their assistance specifically on school improvement efforts.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2008 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST

(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
School Improvement Programs						
1. Improving teacher quality (ESEA II):						
(a) Improving teacher quality State grants (Part A)						
Annual appropriation	D	1,452,439	1,452,488	1,352,488	(100,000)	-6.9%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	1,435,000	1,435,000 ¹	1,435,000	0	0.0%
Subtotal		2,887,439	2,887,488	2,787,488	(100,000)	-3.5%
(b) Early childhood educator professional development (Part A-5, section 2151(e))	D	14,549	14,548	0	(14,548)	-100.0%
(c) Mathematics and science partnerships (Part B)	D	182,160	182,124	182,124	0	0.0%
2. Educational technology State grants (ESEA II-D-1 and 2)	D	272,250	273,062	0	(273,062)	-100.0%
3. 21st Century community learning centers (ESEA IV-B)	D	981,166	981,180	981,180	0	0.0%
4. State grants for innovative programs (ESEA V Part A)	D	99,000	99,183	0	(99,183)	-100.0%
5. Javits gifted and talented education (ESEA V-D, subpart 6)	D	9,596	9,596	0	(9,596)	-100.0%
6. Foreign language assistance (ESEA V-D, subpart 9)	D	21,780	21,755	23,755	2,000	9.2%
7. State assessments (ESEA VI-A-1)	D	407,563	411,630	411,630	0	0.0%
8. Education for homeless children and youths (MVHAA Title VII-B)	D	61,871	61,878	61,878	0	0.0%
9. Education for Native Hawaiians (ESEA VII-B)	D	33,908	33,908	0	(33,908)	-100.0%
10. Alaska Native education equity (ESEA VII-C)	D	33,908	33,908	0	(33,908)	-100.0%
11. Training and advisory services (CRA IV)	D	7,113	7,113	7,113	0	0.0%
12. Rural education (ESEA VI-B)	D	168,918	168,851	168,851	0	0.0%
13. Supplemental education grants (Compact of Free Association Act)	D	18,001	18,001	18,001	0	0.0%
14. Comprehensive centers (ETAA section 203)	D	56,257	56,256	56,256	0	0.0%
Total, Appropriation	D	5,255,479	5,260,481^{1,2}	4,698,276	(562,205)	-10.7%
Total, Budget authority	D	5,255,479	5,260,481	4,698,276	(562,205)	-10.7%
Current		3,820,479 ³	3,825,481 ^{2,3}	3,263,276 ³	(562,205)	-14.7%
Prior year's advance		1,435,000	1,435,000	1,435,000 ¹	0	0.0%
Outlays	D	5,797,083	5,629,992	5,251,802	(378,190)	-6.7%

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.

² Adjusted for comparability. Excludes \$4,832 thousand available under the FY 2007 Continuing Resolution, P.L. 109-289, for Project SERV, shown in the Safe Schools and Citizenship Education account, where funds were appropriated in FY 2006 and requested in FY 2007 and FY 2008.

³ Excludes an advance appropriation of \$1,435,000 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of the following fiscal year.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Summary of Request

School Improvement Programs provide essential support for State and local efforts to implement the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB Act), President Bush's signature education reform initiative. More specifically, the activities in this account provide flexible resources to improve teacher quality, support before- and after-school programs, and pay the costs of developing and administering assessments. The account also includes a variety of smaller programs addressing particular educational needs or special populations.

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 Administration is requesting a total of almost \$4.7 billion for programs in this account, \$562.2 million less than the 2007 CR level. The reduction represents requests for the elimination of funding for the Early Childhood Educator Professional Development, Educational Technology State Grants, State Grants for Innovative Programs, Javits Gifted and Talented Education, Education for Native Hawaiians, and Alaska Native Education Equity programs. The Administration is requesting a \$2 million increase in funding for the Foreign Language Assistance program, a decrease in funding for the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program, and level funding for all other programs in the account.

The largest activity in the account is the **Improving Teacher Quality State Grants** program, which gives States and local educational agencies (LEAs) flexible resources to select the research-based strategies that best meet their particular needs for improved teaching that will help them raise student achievement in the core academic subjects. In return for this funding and flexibility, LEAs are required to demonstrate annual progress in ensuring that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects within the State are highly qualified. The Administration requests \$2.8 billion for this program in fiscal year 2008, \$100 million less than the 2007 CR level. The Administration proposes to move this \$100 million to the Teacher Incentive Fund program in the Innovation and Improvement account, in order to support additional State and local initiatives to introduce performance-based teacher and principal compensation systems and provide incentives for the most effective teachers to serve in the most challenging schools. Because most teachers are now considered to be highly qualified, it is appropriate to shift a portion of funds to the Teacher Incentive Fund in order to encourage these important reforms in compensation practices.

In addition, the Administration is seeking \$182.1 million for **Mathematics and Science Partnerships**, the same amount as the 2007 CR level, to support State and local efforts to improve students' academic achievement in mathematics and science by strengthening the content knowledge and teaching skills of elementary and secondary school teachers. This program will complement other elements of the Administration's new mathematics and science initiative, including Math Now for Elementary School Students and Math Now for Middle School Students, in the Education for the Disadvantaged account.

The Administration seeks \$411.6 million for **State Assessments**, the same amount as the CR level, to help States develop and implement the annual assessments required by the NCLB Act. Funds for State formula grants also would support the development of two new annual

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Summary of Request

assessments in reading and mathematics for the high school grades by the end of school year 2010-2011, extending to high schools the level of assessment that, in grades three through eight, has been at the center of school accountability under No Child Left Behind. The new high school testing requirements are part of the Administration's proposal for the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

The Administration is requesting level funding of \$981.2 million for **21st Century Community Learning Centers**, which supports before- and after-school academic enrichment opportunities, and \$168.9 million for **Rural Education**, which provides additional resources to rural LEAs and schools that often face unique challenges in implementing the NCLB Act. The Administration is also requesting level funding for several smaller programs in the account, including Education for Homeless Children and Youths, Training and Advisory Services, Supplemental Education Grants, and Comprehensive Centers.

The Administration requests \$23.8 million for the **Foreign Language Assistance** program, an increase of \$2 million over the fiscal year 2007 level. The Administration's request for a funding increase reflects the need to encourage fluency in languages critical to our national security, in addition to the languages traditionally taught. The Department would again give a competitive priority to projects that would support the teaching and learning of critical foreign languages in order to promote national security and economic development.

The budget includes eliminations and decreases aimed at reducing duplication and making resources available for higher-priority activities. Educational Technology State Grants, State Grants for Innovative Programs, Javits Gifted and Talented Education, Education for Native Hawaiians, and Alaska Native Education Equity would be eliminated because they are narrowly focused programs that have limited impact. In addition, funding for Early Childhood Educator Professional Development would be shifted to Early Reading First, in the Education for the Disadvantaged account, in order to consolidate funding for two similar programs.

The Administration's reauthorization proposal includes changes to improve programs in the account, including changes responding to the findings of PART reviews. The reauthorization proposal would also repeal the authorizations of programs for which no funds are requested.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

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

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
Annual appropriation	\$1,452,488	\$1,352,488	-\$100,000
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	<u>1,435,000</u>	<u>1,435,000</u> ²	<u>0</u>
Total	2,887,488	2,787,488	-100,000

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; reauthorizing 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

This program provides funds to State educational agencies (SEAs) and local educational agencies (LEAs) to develop and support a high-quality teaching force through activities that are grounded in scientifically based research. The program gives States and LEAs a flexible source of funding with which to meet their particular needs in strengthening the skills and knowledge of teachers and administrators to enable them to improve student achievement in the core academic subjects. In return for this flexibility, LEAs are required to demonstrate annual progress in ensuring that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects within the State are highly qualified and that increasing numbers of teachers are receiving high-quality professional development.

The Department distributes program funds to the States by formula. Each State first receives the amount of funds that it received from the antecedent Eisenhower Professional Development State Grants and Class Size Reduction programs in fiscal year 2001. Remaining funds are then allocated to States by formula based 35 percent on States' relative share of the population aged 5 to 17 and 65 percent on States' relative share of poor children aged 5 to 17, with each State receiving at least one-half of 1 percent of these remaining funds. The Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Outlying Areas each receive one-half of 1 percent of the appropriation.

Each State allocates 95 percent of its funds for Subgrants to Local Educational Agencies; 2.5 percent or the State's share of \$125 million, whichever is less, for Subgrants to Eligible Partnerships; and the remainder for State-level activities. States may use their State-level funds for a variety of activities, including the reform of teacher and principal certification or licensing requirements, teacher mentoring, creation or improvement of alternative routes to certification, teacher recruitment and retention programs, tenure reform, professional development for teachers and principals, technical assistance to LEAs, activities to promote reciprocity of teacher and principal certification or licensing, performance-based compensation systems, and pay differentiation programs.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

The State awards Subgrants to Local Educational Agencies using a formula that is similar to the one that the Department uses for State allocations, except that, after LEAs receive the amount equivalent to their 2001 allocations from the Eisenhower Professional Development State Grants and Class Size Reduction programs, remaining funds are then allocated to LEAs by a formula based 20 percent on LEAs' relative share of the population aged 5 to 17 and 80 percent on LEAs' relative share of poor children aged 5 to 17. In addition to using these funds for professional development and class-size reduction, LEAs may use program funds for other activities to improve teacher quality, including teacher and principal recruitment and retention initiatives, signing bonuses and other financial incentives, teacher and principal mentoring, reforming tenure systems, merit pay, teacher testing, and pay differentiation initiatives.

Subgrants to Eligible Partnerships are awarded competitively by the State agency for higher education working in conjunction with the SEA. Eligible partnerships must include an institution of higher education and the division of the institution that prepares teachers and principals, a school of arts and sciences, and a high-need LEA; other entities are allowable members of the partnership. Partnerships that receive a subgrant must use the funds to provide professional development in the core academic subjects to teachers, highly qualified paraprofessionals, and, if appropriate, principals.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) required all SEAs that receive Title I, Part A funds to develop a plan to have all teachers of core academic subjects highly qualified no later than the end of the 2005-2006 school year. In addition, each LEA within these States must ensure that all teachers of core academic subjects hired after the first day of the 2002-2003 school year and teaching in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds meet the "highly qualified" requirement.

The requirement that teachers be highly qualified applies to all public elementary or secondary school teachers employed by a local educational agency who teach a core academic subject. "Highly qualified" means that the teacher: (1) has obtained full State certification as a teacher; (2) holds a minimum of a bachelor's degree; and (3) has demonstrated subject-matter competency in each of the academic subjects in which he or she teaches.

This is a forward-funded program that includes advance appropriations. A portion of the funds becomes available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remains available for 15 months through September 30 of the following year. The remaining funds become available on October 1 of the fiscal year following the appropriations act and remain available for 12 months, expiring at the same time as the forward-funded portion.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$2,930,825
2004.....	2,930,126
2005.....	2,916,605
2006.....	2,887,439
2007.....	2,887,488

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2008, the Administration is requesting approximately \$2.8 billion for the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program, \$100 million less than the 2007 level. The Administration proposes to move this \$100 million to the Teacher Incentive Fund program (in the Innovation and Improvement account), in order to support additional State and local initiatives to introduce performance-based teacher and principal compensation systems and provide incentives for the most effective teachers to serve in the most challenging schools. Because most teachers are now considered to be highly qualified, it is appropriate to shift a portion of funds to the Teacher Incentive Fund in order to encourage these important reforms in compensation practices.

Although the budget would move \$100 million to the Teacher Incentive Fund program, it would continue provision of a significant amount of funding for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants. Using the resources available through this program, States and LEAs can implement high-quality recruitment, professional development, and induction programs and other strategies to ensure that our Nation's schools are staffed with fully qualified teachers who are prepared to help all children succeed academically. The requested funds will help maintain the momentum for ensuring that all children are taught by teachers who have expertise in the subjects they teach and the skills needed to teach effectively.

A 2005 report by the Government Accountability Office found that data reported by 47 States indicate that, during the 2003-2004 school year, nearly all of their core academic classes were being taught by teachers who met the highly qualified teacher requirements. However, challenges remain. Data for most States suggest that core academic classes in low-poverty schools were more likely to be taught by teachers who met the requirements than were classes in high-poverty schools. The data also suggest that a higher percentage of elementary school classes were taught by highly qualified teachers than were secondary classes.

It is crucial for all students to be taught by highly qualified teachers who are fully credentialed and knowledgeable about the subjects they teach. Research by Eric Hanushek of Stanford University indicates that the quality of classroom teachers is the most important factor under school control that affects student achievement. In addition, value-added assessment studies by William Sanders of the SAS Institute indicate that individual teachers make a significant difference in student achievement. In a 1996 study of two school districts in Tennessee, Sanders found that children assigned to three effective teachers in a row scored at the 83rd percentile in mathematics assessments at the end of 5th grade, while children assigned to three ineffective teachers in a row scored only at the 29th percentile.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

The Department continues to work with States and school districts to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified, especially by encouraging school districts to make high-quality professional development available to their teachers so that they can continue to develop and expand on their knowledge and skills as their careers progress. High-quality professional development is a central and indispensable element of the larger effort to help all students achieve. Research indicates that such professional development can contribute to improvements in teachers' skills and practice and, thereby, raise student achievement.

The Department recently completed a 3-year cycle of monitoring visits to all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. These visits helped the Department ensure that States are implementing the program correctly and provided information on the States' progress in meeting the highly qualified teacher requirement. Information collected from the visits indicates that States have made changes as a result of the highly qualified teacher requirement, including changing their certification requirements, usually by requiring more content knowledge and having teacher candidates pass a written examination; establishing more alternative certification programs; requiring institutions of higher education to improve their teacher education programs so that more graduates will be highly qualified; requiring secondary-school teachers to have a major in the subjects they teach; allowing fewer emergency teaching certificates; encouraging dual certification, especially elementary certification with certification to teach special education or English as a second language; implementing incentive systems to attract and retain highly qualified teachers; and making teacher recertification requirements more content related. However, Department staff found that many LEAs have had difficulty ensuring that their special education and secondary mathematics and science teachers were highly qualified, mostly because the supply of such teachers is so low. Other groups of teachers for which LEAs have had difficulty meeting the highly qualified teacher requirement have included secondary teachers in rural areas and middle-school teachers.

After reviewing States' progress in meeting the highly qualified teacher requirement in the spring of 2006, the Department asked States to submit revised State plans for reaching the requirement of having all teachers highly qualified by the end of the 2006-2007 school year. These plans have now been reviewed by peer reviewers, and the Department soon will begin a new round of monitoring based on the revised plans.

Another Department strategy is to continue developing the knowledge base on teacher effectiveness. To support this strategy, the Department intends to reserve up to \$13.9 million (one-half of 1 percent) of the fiscal year 2008 appropriation primarily to continue evaluation studies. Some evaluation funds may also be used to help disseminate and implement findings from evaluations.

The Improving Teacher Quality 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.

Specifically, the Administration is working on a proposal that would eliminate the "high objective uniform State standard of evaluation" (HOUSSE) option for States to use in determining a

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

veteran teacher's highly qualified status. Under the proposal, to be highly qualified, an experienced teacher would have to: (1) hold a bachelor's degree, be certified, and pass a subject knowledge and teaching skills test if he or she is an elementary-school teacher, or (2) hold a bachelor's degree, be certified, and either pass an academic subject test or complete coursework in the subjects he or she teaches if he or she is a secondary-school teacher.

The HOUSSE provision allowed States to develop less rigorous standards for their experienced teachers to become highly qualified; for example, many States allowed a teacher's experience to count significantly toward their HOUSSE rating. The Administration believes that all students deserve to be taught by teachers who have mastered the subjects that they teach. Eliminating the HOUSSE option will help ensure that content knowledge is the primary criterion in determining whether a teacher is highly qualified.

In addition, the Administration is considering an amendment that would require SEAs and LEAs to give highest priority for using their program funds to activities that will strengthen teacher quality in mathematics, science, or critical foreign languages. The No Child Left Behind Act eliminated the previous authorization's focus on mathematics and science, allowing States and districts to use program funds for professional development in any of the core academic subjects and in pedagogy and for other teacher quality activities. The Administration believes that mathematics, science, and critical foreign languages are vitally important and that States and school districts should focus their Improving Teacher Quality State Grants funds in these subjects.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Range of awards to States	\$13,752- 335,451	\$13,752- 332,049	\$13,259- 319,156
Average State grant	54,698	54,698	52,804
Amount for Outlying Areas	14,365	14,365	13,868
Amount for BIA	14,365	14,365	13,868
Evaluation	14,437	14,437	13,937

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Department is currently using Improving Teacher Quality State Grants evaluation funds to conduct rigorous impact studies in three major areas. A study of pre-service training will identify different models of teacher training, including models of alternative certification, to compare the performance of students taught by teachers who have received different types of preparation. This study will shed light on the aspects of teacher training that best support student achievement. The report is due in the summer of 2007. A study of teacher professional development activities will identify and then test promising approaches to in-service training.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

The evaluation will examine the extent to which particular professional development activities change teaching practices in ways that research evidence suggests are effective in improving student achievement in reading. An interim report is expected in the summer of 2007, and the final report should be available in the summer of 2008. Finally, another project will help identify models of a promising teacher retention strategy-induction programs and develop a framework for a future evaluation of these approaches. The report is due in the fall of 2007.

The Department is using evaluation funds to conduct two cross-cutting studies of NCLB implementation that include an examination of how SEAs and LEAs are using Improving Teacher Quality State Grants funds as well as addressing the broader question of how States, districts, and schools are implementing the NCLB requirements for improving the qualifications of teachers and paraprofessionals. One of the studies is also collecting data on the professional development experiences of a nationally representative sample of teachers. The first report should be available in the spring of 2007.

These studies will produce different kinds of data to measure the program's performance and provide information about the implementation of research-based models to improve teacher quality. The descriptive studies and the NCLB consolidated report will provide outcome/implementation data about the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program, and the three impact studies will provide impact data about research-based models that States and LEAs can use to improve the quality of their teaching force.

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.

The Department established performance measures to assess the overall annual performance of the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program. Those measures gauge the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in high-poverty schools and by highly qualified teachers in elementary and secondary schools. These data are being collected through ESEA annual State performance reports for the years 2004 through 2006. The Education Data Exchange Network will collect the same data starting in 2007.

Goal: To improve teacher and principal quality and increase the number of highly qualified teachers in the classroom and highly qualified principals and assistant principals in schools.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

Objective: Show an annual increase in the percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers.

Measure: The percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in high-poverty schools.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003		74
2004		86
2005	90	90
2006	95	
2007	100	
2008	100	

Measure: The percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in elementary schools.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003		85
2004	89	91
2005	90	93
2006	95	
2007	100	
2008	100	

Measure: The percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in secondary schools.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003		80
2004	85	88
2005	85	89
2006	92	
2007	100	
2008	100	

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report

Assessment of progress: The data reported through the Consolidated State Performance Report indicate that States are 90 percent of the way toward having all classes (including those in high-poverty schools) taught by highly qualified teachers. However, the Department is not entirely confident that all States are reporting accurately on the highly qualified status of their teachers, particularly special education teachers. During monitoring visits to States over the past 3 years, the Department found that many States were confused about the definition of “highly qualified teacher.” Most States are now using the correct definition, although the Department recently put conditions on the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants grant awards for nine States. Department staff continue to work with all States to ensure that they are implementing the law correctly and collecting data accurately.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

Efficiency Measure

The efficiency measure for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants focuses on decreasing the average number of days between the date of the monitoring visit and the date that the Department sends the monitoring report to the State. The baseline for this measure is 83 days in 2005; the 2006 data should be available in 2007.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

While the first outcome of the program's review with the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART), in 2003, was "Results Not Demonstrated," the program underwent a second PART review in 2005 with significantly improved results and a "Moderately Effective" rating. The second review found that the Department had made good progress in administering the program, providing useful technical assistance to help States and districts meet program requirements, and initiating rigorous program evaluations. The review encouraged the Department to continue to monitor States' and school districts' implementation of the program and their progress toward meeting the highly qualified teacher requirements. The second PART also called for the Department to develop a meaningful efficiency measure for the program. In response, the Department has established a measure that tracks the number of days it takes the Department to send a monitoring report to States after formal monitoring visits.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Early childhood educator professional development

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title II, Part A, Subpart 5, Section 2151(e))

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$14,548	0	-\$14,548

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

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Early Childhood Educator Professional Development program provides competitive grants, of up to 4 years, to improve the knowledge and skills of early childhood educators and caregivers who work in communities that have high concentrations of children living in poverty in order to promote school readiness (including reading readiness) and better learning outcomes for these children. This high-quality professional development helps educators and caregivers to develop children's skills and prevent them from encountering reading difficulties once they enter school.

The Department makes competitive grants to partnerships consisting of entities providing professional development for early childhood and family literacy caregivers and educators. Partnership members may include institutions of higher education; State and local educational agencies; agencies administering human services programs, child-care programs, Even Start, and Head Start programs; private organizations; and, to the extent feasible, an entity with demonstrated experience in providing training to early childhood educators about identifying and preventing behavior problems and working with children who are, or are suspected to be, victims of abuse.

Partnerships are required to serve early childhood education or family literacy programs in "high-need" communities, which are defined as communities where at least 50 percent of children live in poverty or that are among the 10 percent of communities in a State that have the greatest number of children living in poverty. The Department has also sought applications from entities that serve young children with limited English proficiency, disabilities, or other special needs.

In 2005 and 2006, the Department undertook changes to strengthen the program by increasing the length and average size of grants as well as by placing emphasis on the strength of projects' evaluation designs. Together, these changes will allow the most recent grantees to complete rigorous quasi-experimental evaluations of their projects and thereby contribute valuable data

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Early childhood educator professional development

regarding the effectiveness of professional development curricula available for early childhood educators.

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$14,902
2004.....	14,814
2005.....	14,696
2006.....	14,549
2007.....	14,548

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Early Childhood Educator Professional Development (ECEPD) program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act 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. However, the funds currently supporting ECEPD would continue to be used for early childhood education. This request reflects the Administration's reauthorization proposal to consolidate Early Reading First (ERF) and ECEPD into a strengthened ERF program and to request, for fiscal year 2008, the combined level of 2007 resources under ERF (in the Education for the Disadvantaged account). The restructured ERF program would 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 on obtaining the best results from a single program.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Number of new projects	3 ¹	3-6 ¹	0
Average award	\$2,500- 3750	\$2,400- 3,600	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$145	\$145	0

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

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Early childhood educator professional development

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act requires grantees to submit annual performance reports based on “achievement indicators” established by the Department; this requirement began with the fiscal year 2002 grantees. The Department published the following achievement indicators in the Federal Register on March 31, 2003 (FR 15646-16548):

- Increasing numbers of hours of high-quality professional development will be offered. (In order to be considered “high-quality,” professional development must be ongoing, intensive, classroom-focused, and based on scientific research on cognitive and social development in early childhood and effective pedagogy for young children.)
- Early childhood educators who work in early childhood programs serving low-income children will participate in greater numbers, and for increasing numbers of hours, in high-quality professional development.
- Early childhood educators will demonstrate increased knowledge and understanding of effective strategies to support school readiness that are based on scientific research on cognitive and social development in early childhood and effective pedagogy for young children.
- Early childhood educators will more frequently apply research-based approaches in early childhood pedagogy and child development and learning domains, including using a content-rich curriculum and activities that promote language and cognitive development.
- Children will demonstrate improved readiness for school, especially in the areas of appropriate social and emotional behavior and early language and literacy competencies.

The Department has analyzed the reports from fiscal year 2002 and 2003 grantees, and is in the process of analyzing those from fiscal year 2004 and 2005 grantees. Although many of the early recipients showed some gains in measures of teacher preparedness and children’s improvement in early reading skills, grantees used a wide array of assessment instruments and these grantees’ results are difficult to aggregate. In order to improve the quality of aggregated data, the Department encouraged grant applicants from 2004 onward to utilize common assessments. In addition, the fiscal year 2005 competition reduced the number of grants and increased the length of the grant implementation period from 2 to 3 years, so that more rigorous evaluation models could be applied. The fiscal year 2006 competition added a competitive priority for the use of scientifically based evaluation methods, which will allow program participants and the Department to determine whether grantees produce meaningful effects on student achievement and teacher performance. Performance data will be available in March 2007 on two measures: (1) the percentage of children who demonstrate improved readiness for school in early language; and (2) the percentage of children who demonstrate improved readiness for school in literacy.

In addition, the Department is evaluating the ECEPD program to determine the following: (1) the characteristics of high-quality professional development for early childhood educators; (2) whether teachers in the ECEPD program participate in high-quality, research-based

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Early childhood educator professional development

professional development; and (3) what grantee evaluations reveal about the quality and effects of the ECEPD program. The study will also examine how ECEPD project results might inform kindergarten teachers who work with students lacking early reading skills. The Department awarded a contract for this evaluation in September 2005, and expects to release the final report by December 2007.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Mathematics and science partnerships

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

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$182,124	\$182,124	0

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

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program supports State and local efforts to improve students' academic achievement in mathematics and science by promoting strong teaching skills for elementary and secondary school teachers, including integrating teaching methods based on scientifically based research and technology into the curriculum. Grantees may also use program funds to develop more rigorous mathematics and science curricula that are aligned with challenging State and local content standards; establish distance learning programs for mathematics and science teachers; and recruit individuals with mathematics, science, and engineering majors into the teaching profession through the use of signing and performance incentives, stipends, and scholarships. Professional development can include summer workshops, or institutes and programs, that bring mathematics and science teachers into contact with working scientists, mathematicians, and engineers in order to expand teachers' subject-matter knowledge.

The Department awards 3-year grants directly to partnerships on a competitive basis when the appropriation for the program is less than \$100 million. If the appropriation reaches or exceeds \$100 million, as has been the case since fiscal year 2003, the Department provides grants to States by formula based on the number of children aged 5 to 17 who are from families with incomes below the poverty line, and States then award the funds competitively to partnerships. Eligible partnerships must include the State educational agency (if the Department is awarding the grants directly to partnerships); an engineering, mathematics, or science department of an institution of higher education (IHE); and a high-need local educational agency (LEA). In addition, partnerships may include another engineering, mathematics, science, or teacher training department of an IHE; additional LEAs, public charter schools, public or private elementary or secondary schools; a business; or a nonprofit or for-profit organization of demonstrated effectiveness in improving the quality of mathematics and science teachers.

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

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Mathematics and science partnerships

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$100,344
2004.....	149,115
2005.....	178,560
2006.....	182,160
2007.....	182,124

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2008, the Administration is requesting \$182.1 million for the Mathematics and Science Partnerships program, the same amount as the 2007 level. Funding at this level will complement the more targeted mathematics and science education initiatives in the President's American Competitiveness Initiative, such as Math Now for Elementary School Students and Math Now for Middle School Students, and allow funded partnerships to continue actions to improve students' mathematics and science achievement.

Improving American students' achievement in mathematics and science is vital to ensuring the economic well being of our country. For the United States to remain competitive in the global economy, build and maintain a highly skilled workforce, and nourish technological innovation, we must improve mathematics and science teaching and learning. Department of Labor/Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) projections indicate that over 80 percent of the fastest-growing occupations are dependent on knowledge of mathematics and science. BLS data released in 2005 projecting the 10 fastest-growing occupations between 2004 and 2014 indicate that the health care and computer fields (both of which require a strong background in mathematics and science) will experience the most growth in the coming years. In addition, students from many other advanced countries continue to outperform American students on international assessments, such as the 2003 Program for International Student Assessment and the 2003 Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study.

Results from a 2006 American Council on Education poll suggest that public apathy towards mathematics and science education is also a concern. The results indicate that only 31 percent of Americans believe that mathematics and science classes offered to students not majoring in those fields are "very relevant" to life after graduation. Only 54 percent believe that all students should have to take more mathematics and science courses.

Mathematics and Science Partnerships helps to address these concerns by focusing on teaching and learning in mathematics and science that is based on scientifically based research. Funding will continue to allow partnerships to offer professional development and curricula that will help American students to compete in the global, high-tech economy.

The Mathematics and Science Partnerships 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.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

A concern that the Administration is considering addressing through reauthorization is that the statute does not carefully focus support on teachers from the most needy schools. The law requires that LEAs that participate in the partnerships be high need. However, because there is no definition of "high-need LEA," most States use a district's level of poverty or low student achievement to determine if it is high need. Because only the district must be high need, and not the participating schools in the district, the Department is finding that often teachers from the more advantaged schools in the LEA participate in the program, especially because program participation is often voluntary for teachers. While the Department has been encouraging LEAs to focus on the most needy schools, there is no legal authority to require LEA cooperation. The reauthorization proposal may require LEAs to carry out their grant activities in high-need schools.

In addition, the program statute lacks a requirement for subgrantees to conduct rigorous, high-quality evaluations. The Administration may recommend that such a requirement be included in the reauthorized legislation.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Amount distributed to States	\$181,249	\$181,213	\$181,213
Range of State formula grants	906- 25,056	906- 23,630	906- 23,630
Average State formula grant	\$3,486	\$3,485	\$3,485
Evaluation	\$911	\$911	\$911

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Department is using evaluation funds to collect and analyze descriptive data annually from partnerships supported by the program. Partnerships also provide a narrative description of their activities annually; these narratives contain information about teacher participation, growth in teacher content knowledge, and student learning. In addition, States complete a survey every year describing their activities to award subgrants and submit a list of their subgrantees and copies of their applications to the Department.

The Department has hired a contractor to aggregate data supplied by partnerships. The contractor and Department staff have been working closely with States and partnerships to ensure that data are consistent across States and projects. A particular challenge has been aggregating data from projects that vary widely in terms of the length of the professional development provided, the number of teachers served, the grade levels taught by the teachers served, and whether the projects focus on mathematics, science, or a combination of the two.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Mathematics and science partnerships

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.

The Department established the following measures to assess the performance of the Mathematics and Science Partnerships program: (1) the percentage of MSP teachers who significantly increase their content knowledge, as reflected in project-level pre- and post-assessments; (2) the percentage of students in classrooms of MSP teachers who score at the basic level or above in State assessments of mathematics or science; (3) the percentage of students in classrooms of MSP teachers who score at the proficient level or above in State assessments of mathematics or science; (4) the percentage of MSP projects that use an experimental or quasi-experimental design for their evaluations; and (5) the percentage of MSP projects that use an experimental or quasi-experimental design for their evaluations that are conducted successfully and that yield scientifically valid results. Baseline data and targets will be available in 2007. Data will come from annual performance reports and program evaluations.

Efficiency Measure

The Department has established one efficiency measure for the Mathematics and Science Partnerships program: The percentage of SEAs that submit complete and accurate data on program performance measures in a timely manner. The baseline and targets for this measure should be available later in 2007.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The Administration completed a PART review of this program in 2006. Although the PART review found that the program generally has a strong purpose and design and is well managed, the lack of baseline data for the program's performance measures and efficiency measure and the lack of a strong evaluation resulted in a rating of "Results Not Demonstrated" for the program. The Department recently revised the program's performance measures as a result of the PART review, and the program should have baseline data for these measures, as well as the efficiency measure, later in 2007.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Educational technology State grants

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title II, Part D, Subparts 1 and 2)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite ^{1,2}

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$273,062	0	-\$273,062

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

² Section 2404 of the ESEA requires that, from the funds appropriated for Subparts 1 and 2 of Part D of Title II, at least 98 percent be used to carry out Subpart 1 (State and Local Technology Grants) and not more than 2 percent be used to carry out Subpart 2 (National Technology Activities).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Educational Technology State Grants program supports State, district, and school efforts to integrate technology into curricula to improve teaching and learning. Local educational agencies (LEAs) use their funds for: (1) professional development to promote the integration of technology into curricula and instruction; (2) public-private partnerships to increase students' and teachers' access to technology; (3) distance learning strategies that deliver academic courses and curricula to areas that otherwise would not have access to those courses and curricula; (4) purchasing effective curricula that use technology; (5) efforts to use technology to improve communication with parents; (6) the preparation of teachers to serve as technology experts in their schools; (7) acquiring and maintaining hardware, software, and connectivity linkages; (8) developing and implementing information technology courses; and (9) using technology to collect, manage, and analyze data. Unless an LEA can demonstrate to the satisfaction of its State educational agency (SEA) that it already provides high-quality professional development on the integration of technology into curricula, it must use at least 25 percent of its formula allocation for that professional development.

Of the total appropriation, the Department first reserves: (1) three-quarters of 1 percent for schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs; (2) one-half of 1 percent for grants to the Outlying Areas; and (3) up to 2 percent for national activities. The remaining funds are allocated to States in proportion to each State's share of funds received that year under Part A of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), except that no State may receive less than one-half of 1 percent of the amount available for all States.

Each SEA must distribute at least 95 percent of its allocation to LEAs. Under the authorizing statute, the SEA uses 50 percent of the amount available to make competitive grants to high-need LEAs (defined as an LEA that (1) has among the highest rates of poverty in the State and (2) operates at least one school identified for improvement under Title I or has a substantial

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Educational technology State grants

need for assistance in acquiring and using technology) or to partnerships that include at least one high-need LEA and at least one other entity with expertise in integrating technology effectively into curricula. In making competitive awards, an SEA must give priority to applications from LEAs that receive formula allocations too small to carry out the purposes of the program effectively and must ensure that all awards are of sufficient size and duration to support the purposes of the program effectively. The SEAs distribute the remaining 50 percent to LEAs through a formula based on each LEA's share of funds under ESEA Title I, Part A. However, fiscal year 2006 appropriations language permits an SEA to award all of the funds competitively. An SEA may also reserve up to 5 percent of its allocation for administrative expenses, including the costs of conducting the competition, and for State-level activities such as providing technical assistance to grantees and establishing or supporting public-private partnerships to acquire educational technology for high-need LEAs.

To receive funding, each State is required by statute to develop a statewide, long-range educational technology plan. Each plan is required to include descriptions of, among other things: (1) the SEA's goals for using advanced technology to improve student academic achievement; (2) how the SEA will take steps to ensure that all teachers and students in the State have increased access to technology; and (3) the State's strategies for using technology to increase parental involvement.

In addition, the Department may reserve up to 2 percent of the amount appropriated for the program for national activities. The Department has used these funds to conduct a required study on the conditions and practices under which educational technology: (1) is effective in improving student achievement; and (2) increases the ability of teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction. Additionally, the Department has used these funds to publish a National Education Technology Plan, host summits on educational technology issues, and support research in the area of educational technology. Lastly, the Department funded awards to 10 States to design, conduct, and publish high-quality evaluations of educational technology programs. These evaluations will help inform the research community, SEAs, and LEAs about successful strategies, potential problems, and outcomes of educational technology programs.

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$695,947
2004.....	691,841
2005.....	496,000
2006.....	272,250
2007.....	273,062

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Educational technology State grants

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Educational Technology State Grants 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 and, accordingly, the budget provides no funding for it. The request is consistent with the Administration's policy to increase resources for high-priority programs by eliminating categorical programs that have a narrow or limited effect.

Schools today offer a greater level of technology infrastructure than just a few years ago. In 2005, 94 percent of schools reported that they had access to the Internet in instructional rooms compared with only 3 percent in 1994. Further, the ratio of students per instructional computer with Internet access fell from 12 to 1 in the fall of 1998 to 3.8 to 1 in the fall of 2005. Upgraded infrastructure now permits most teachers to access technology in their classrooms. While many districts continue to have technology-related needs, particularly in training teachers to integrate technology effectively into instruction and in developing curricula that reflect such integration, these needs can and should more appropriately be met with other resources. There is no longer a significant need for a Federal formula grant program targeted specifically on (and limited to) education technology.

Districts can use other Federal program funds to implement education technology and integration activities. For example, under the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program, LEAs may use their funds to implement professional development activities that train teachers and principals to integrate technology into curricula and instruction in order to improve teaching, learning, and technology literacy. Districts may also choose to support the acquisition of technology with funds received under Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs), which provides supplemental education funding to LEAs and schools, particularly those in high-poverty areas, to help raise the achievement of disadvantaged students so that they can meet challenging State academic standards.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Amount for State grants	\$263,470	\$267,601	0
Range of awards	\$1,317-34,986	\$1,321-32,727	0
Amount for BIA	\$2,001	\$2,007	0
Amount for Outlying Areas	\$1,334	\$1,338	0
National activities set-aside	\$5,445	\$5,461	0

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Educational technology State grants

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

To assess the extent to which States and districts have created conditions for schools and teachers to use technology effectively in improving teaching and learning, the Department is conducting a national evaluation, the National Educational Technology Trends Study (NETTS). NETTS is addressing three primary research areas: (1) student and teacher access to technology; (2) teacher preparedness to use technology effectively in their classrooms; and (3) effective integration of technology into curriculum and instruction. In addition, the study is examining: (1) differences in State strategies for using program funds; (2) the types of activities that local grantees are carrying out with program funds; and (3) the targeting of program funds. From this information, the study will develop State profiles that provide basic information concerning State policies and practices with regard to educational technology and on the distribution of program funds. The NETTS State Strategies and Practices report will be available in the spring of 2007. The State report will be followed by the final NETTS report, which will provide trend data from all survey years as well as analysis of implementation strategies at the State, district, and school levels. The final NETTS report will be available in the summer of 2008.

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 primary goal of the Educational Technology State Grants program is to improve the academic achievement of students, particularly students who attend high-poverty or low-performing schools, through the use of technology in schools. The Department has established several performance measures to assess the extent to which LEAs receiving substantial amounts of program funds are able to demonstrate that: (1) they have fully and effectively integrated technology into curriculum; (2) teachers have met the State technology standards; and (3) students have met their State's technology literacy standards by the eighth grade. The Department is collecting data for these measures through the *EDFacts* data collection, grantee performance reports, and through the NETTS surveys. Baseline data for annual and long-term performance measures will be available in the fall of 2007.

Goal: To facilitate the comprehensive and integrated use of educational technology into instruction and curricula to improve teaching and student achievement.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Educational technology State grants

Objective: To help ensure that students and teachers in high-poverty, high-need schools have access to educational technology comparable to that of students and teachers in other schools.

Measure: The percentage point difference in Internet access between classrooms in high- and low-poverty schools.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003		5
2005	0	5
2006	0	
2007	0	

Assessment of Progress: Low-poverty schools are defined as schools with less than 35 percent of their students eligible for free or reduced-price lunches. High-poverty schools are defined as schools with 75 percent or more of their students eligible for free or reduced-price lunches. The target for this measure is to have no difference in Internet access between high- and low-poverty schools. Historical data collected by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) have been provided for 2003 and 2005; the reported differences are not statistically significant. Future performance data will be collected through Annual Grantee Performance Reports using *EDFacts/EDEN* and through the National Center for Education Statistics, *Internet Access in Public Schools and Classrooms Survey*. The Educational Technology State Grant program is proposed for termination in fiscal year 2008.

Efficiency Measure

The Department has developed an efficiency measure to assess the timeliness of the Department's monitoring process, specifically the percentage of monitoring reports that the Department sends within 45 days after a monitoring visit (both on-site and virtual). Baseline data for the efficiency measure will be available in the fall of 2007.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The Educational Technology State Grants program was assessed with the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) in 2005 and received a rating of "Results Not Demonstrated." The PART review noted several areas, in which improvements were needed, such as data collection and evaluation.

In response to the PART finding that the program lacked sufficient data to demonstrate effectiveness and accountability, the Department established several annual, long-term, and efficiency measures to evaluate the impact of the program on student achievement and classroom practices. Baseline data for these measures will be collected through *EDFacts*, grantee performance reports, and the NETTS surveys. Beginning in fall 2007, the Department will receive grantee performance reports after which performance targets will be developed. The Department had also taken steps to address the lack of impact data by funding NETTS, which is examining program implementation strategies by States, LEAs, and schools and will also explore the impact of classroom technology on student achievement.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

The PART also recommended that the Department strengthen its ongoing work with States to improve accountability and overall program performance. The Department made concerted efforts to enhance communication with program grantees and recently initiated a formal monitoring process, which includes virtual monitoring visits for all grantees and sub-grantees, to ensure that program goals and purposes are understood fully, data reporting is accurate, stakeholders are collaborating effectively, and program funds are used appropriately. The initial round of monitoring visits began in December of 2006 and will continue through 2007.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

21st Century community learning centers

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

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): \$2,500,000 ¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$981,180	\$981,180	0

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

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The 21st Century Community Learning Centers program enables communities to establish or expand centers that provide activities offering significant extended learning opportunities, such as before- and after-school programs, for students and related services to their families. Centers must target their services primarily to students who attend schools eligible to operate a schoolwide program under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (which are schools with at least a 40 percent child poverty rate) or other schools that serve a high percentage of students from low-income families. In addition to extended learning opportunities, program funds may be used to provide art and music education activities, recreational activities, telecommunications and technology education programs, expanded library service hours, parental involvement and family literacy programs, and drug and violence prevention activities.

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

Each State educational agency (SEA) must award at least 95 percent of its allocation competitively to local educational agencies (LEAs), community-based organizations, faith-based organizations, or other public or private entities that can demonstrate experience, or the promise of success, in providing educational and related activities. In making awards, States give priority to applications that: (1) propose to target services to students who attend schools identified as in need of improvement under Title I; and (2) are submitted jointly by at least one LEA that receives funds under Part A of Title I and at least one community-based organization or other public or private entity. States must make awards of at least \$50,000 per year and for a period of 3 to 5 years.

An SEA may reserve up to 2 percent of its allocation for administrative expenses, including the costs of conducting its grants competition. In addition, an SEA may reserve up to 3 percent of

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

its allocation for: (1) monitoring of programs; (2) providing technical assistance and training; and (3) evaluating the effectiveness of the program.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$993,500
2004.....	999,070
2005.....	991,077
2006.....	981,166
2007.....	971,354

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$981.2 million for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLCs) program in fiscal year 2008, the same as the 2007 level. The request reflects the importance of after-school and other extended learning programs in enabling schools to meet the objectives of No Child Left Behind.

The program supports local communities in providing students, particularly students who attend schools that have been identified as in need of improvement under Title I, with academic enrichment that helps reinforce classroom learning. It provides a significant opportunity to improve the quality of the 9,600 after-school centers supported annually with program funds.

At the request level, the Department would reserve a total of \$9.7 million for national technical assistance and evaluation activities, which are a key part of the Department's strategy for promoting successful outcomes for after-school programs. The initial findings from the Department's rigorous evaluation of the antecedent program provided strong direction for technical assistance strategies that focus on increasing the academic achievement of participants. For 2008, the Department would support technical assistance on promoting academic achievement through after-school programs; utilize a network of experts to observe programs and share perspectives that will increase knowledge about effective program implementation; and make information available to States and local after-school providers on research and best practices in content-area instruction (in reading and literacy, mathematics, science, and the arts).

The Department also helps grant recipients focus on program improvement through annual summer institutes that help grantees implement better programs that attract and retain participants. At these institutes, grantees share ideas, make contacts with Federal resource providers, and learn about evaluations and examples of projects with high-quality content area instruction during after-school hours. Another technical assistance strategy is to continue strong coordination with the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, which is expanding its own efforts on behalf of after-school programs.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

21st Century community learning centers

The 21st Century Community Learning Centers 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 is currently planning to propose that the program be reauthorized with no significant changes.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Amount distributed to States	\$961,542	\$961,556	\$961,556
Average State award	18,491	18,491	18,491
Range of State awards	4,808-131,321	4,808-127,687	4,808-119,527
Reservation for State activities and administration	48,077	48,078	48,078
National activities and evaluation	\$9,812	\$9,812	\$9,812
Amount for Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Outlying Areas	\$9,812	\$9,812	\$9,812
Students served	1,282,000	1,282,000	1,282,000
Number of centers supported	9,600	9,600	9,600

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

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

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

21st Century community learning centers

Measure: The percentage of regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring.

Year	Target			Actual		
	Elementary Math	Middle or High School Math	Total Math	Elementary Math	Middle or High School Math	Total Math
2003	45	45	45	43	36	40
2004	45	45	45	43	38	41
2005	45	45	45	39.65	36.78	38.82
2006	46	46	46			
2007	47	47	47			
2008	48	48	48			

Measure: The percentage of regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring.

Year	Target			Actual		
	Elementary English	Middle or High School English	Total English	Elementary English	Middle or High School English	Total English
2003	45	45	45	45	37	42
2004	45	45	45	47	41	45
2005	45	45	45	42.18	39.79	41.47
2006	46	46	46			
2007	47	47	47			
2008	48	48	48			

Assessment of progress: In order to assess the performance of students regularly participating in the program, the Department measures: achievement through test scores, grades, or teacher reports; behavior through school attendance and decreased disciplinary actions or other adverse behaviors; and the success of program providers in meeting the objective of offering high-quality enrichment opportunities that positively affect student outcomes. Data for these measures come from annual performance reports. The next update will be available in spring 2007. According to data States submitted through the 21st CCLC Profile and Performance Information Collection System, the Department did not make progress toward the 2005 target of 45 percent. Grades of regular attendees did not improve over 2004 and are not on target.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

21st Century community learning centers

Measure: The percentage of students with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior.						
Year	Target			Actual		
	Elementary	Middle or High School	Overall	Elementary	Middle or High School	Overall
2003	75	75	75	77.60	76.10	77.50
2004	75	75	75	61.20	65	64.08
2005				71.48	68.05	71.08
2006	67	67	67			
2007	75	75	75			
2008	75	75	75			

Assessment of progress: The Department changed the method of data collection for this measure in 2004, when data from State grantees were collected for the first time. Hence, data from 2004 and 2005 are not comparable to 2003 data, which the Department collected from grantees that received direct competitive grants awarded by the Department; therefore, no targets were set for 2005. According to data that grantees submitted to the 21st CCLC Profile and Performance Information Collection System, the Department did make progress on this measure between 2004 and 2005.

Other Performance Information

Current scientific evidence is inconclusive regarding the effectiveness of after-school programs. However, although almost no past studies employed rigorous evaluation designs of after-school programs, some studies did report some positive effects.

The report of the rigorous evaluation of the antecedent program revealed weaknesses in program implementation. Program participants did not attain higher levels of achievement as measured by reading test scores or grades in mathematics, science, social studies, and English compared to students in the control group. The study also found that elementary school students who participated in the program were more likely to feel safe after school, but were also more likely to engage in negative behaviors.

The 21st Century program under the No Child Left Behind Act reauthorization, unlike the antecedent authorization, focuses on promoting students' academic achievement. In 2003, the Department began a rigorous impact evaluation of the new program, supported by national activities funds. This study: (1) is developing two after-school interventions (one each in math and reading) that are based on sound theory or that have scientific evidence in a related area; and (2) will rigorously test their effectiveness through experimental studies. The first report for this project is expected in the summer of 2007.

In addition to the impact evaluation, the Department is examining how States and communities are implementing after-school programs funded through 21st Century grants. This study focuses on how, and to what extent, funds support high-quality programs that emphasize academic content. The study also examines project activities to improve academic outcomes and maintain student engagement in programs, and how they link with State and Federal education goals. The first report from this evaluation will be available in fall 2007.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

21st Century community learning centers

Efficiency Measures

The Department's efficiency measure for the 21st Century program is the number of days it takes for the Department to send the State a report after an on-site or virtual monitoring visit. The Department will report baseline data in 2007.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The 21st Century Community Learning Centers program was among the programs rated with the PART in 2003. The program received an "Adequate" rating, with high scores for purpose, planning, and management but weaknesses cited in program results and accountability measures. The PART review credited the program's strong evaluation component and provision of technical assistance responding to evaluation findings.

The PART review contained a number of recommendations related to program accountability and technical assistance:

- The review recommended that the Department hold States accountable for meeting program performance goals. In response to this recommendation, the Department implemented an aggressive and detailed system for monitoring States. Program staff review States' criteria for awarding subgrants to LEAs to ensure that the States are directing program resources where they are most needed and to ensure that activities are aligned with ESEA purposes. The Department also developed an online evaluation/assessment system, the 21st CCLC Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS), to collect program impact data on academic achievement and behavioral outcomes. A descriptive study, to be completed in 2007, will provide information on States' use of their administrative funds and on how States implement the program focus on academic enrichment. In addition, the program office conducts semi-annual meetings with States and annual meetings with subgrantees to provide technical assistance on implementing high-quality after-school programs.
- The review recommended that the Department implement a technical assistance strategy to identify and disseminate promising and proven instructional practices in various academic areas. In response, the program office began conducting annual summer Institutes to provide technical assistance on implementing high-quality after-school programs. It also established a project—the Partnership for Quality After-School Learning—to identify and disseminate information on high-quality after-school programs in reading, mathematics, science, and the arts.
- Finally, the review recommended that the Department ensure that the program has a data collection and evaluation system that will allow it to analyze whether State and school district performance goals are being met. In response to this recommendation, the program office developed the PPICS system, an online annual performance reporting system to collect subgrantee performance data.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

State grants for innovative programs

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

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$99,183	0	-\$99,183

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

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program awards grants to State and local educational agencies (LEAs) for projects designed to support the reform of elementary and secondary education. Up to 1 percent of the total appropriation is reserved for the outlying areas. The remaining funds are awarded to States through a formula based on school-aged population. States must allocate at least 85 percent of their funds to local districts under State-determined formulas that must be based on enrollment as well as other factors, such as low-income status or population sparsity, that give greater weight to children who are more expensive to educate. However, 100 percent of the funds that a State receives beyond what it received in fiscal year 2002 (50 percent for small States) must be distributed to LEAs.

The State educational agency (SEA) may use the funds it retains at the State level for administration and other activities, including the support of charter schools, statewide education reforms, technical assistance, yearly student assessments, implementation of State and local achievement standards, independent analyses to measure and report on student achievement, urgent school renovation, activities authorized under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, technology activities related to school renovation, and charter school facility financing.

LEAs may use program funds for a variety of activities, including professional development and class-size reduction activities; charter schools; community service programs; consumer, economic, and personal finance education; public school choice; programs to hire and support school nurses; school-based mental health services; alternative education programs; prekindergarten programs; academic intervention programs; programs for CPR training in schools; smaller learning communities programs; activities to advance student achievement; programs and activities that use "best practice" models; same-gender schools and classrooms; service-learning activities; school safety programs; Title I supplemental educational services; magnet schools; dropout prevention; gifted and talented education; and parental and community involvement.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

State grants for innovative programs

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

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$382,498
2004.....	296,549
2005.....	198,400
2006.....	99,000
2007.....	99,183

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

State Grants for Innovative Programs 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 and, accordingly, the budget provides no funding for it. This request is consistent with the Administration's intent to increase resources for targeted, high-priority programs that are able to demonstrate results.

The 2005 Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) review of this program found that, although the program provides a flexible source of funding for States and school districts to use in implementing education reforms, it is somewhat duplicative of many other Federal, State, and local education programs and is not sufficiently targeted to meet the needs of students in high-need schools. In addition, because of the numerous and diverse allowable uses of funds, it is difficult to set performance expectations for grantees, measure performance, and hold States and school districts accountable for performance. Based on these findings, the Administration is requesting that funds be provided to support programs that are designed to target more effectively funds to students most in need, that address other national priorities and that have effective mechanisms for measuring, and holding grantees accountable for, performance.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Range of awards	\$492 – 12,322	\$492 – 12,444	0
Average State grant	1,891	1,894	0
Amount for Outlying Areas	693	694	0

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

State grants for innovative programs

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Under the antecedent Title VI Innovative Education Program Strategies program, the Department established a performance goal to measure the extent to which funds allocated to LEAs were used for local reform efforts other than the purchase of instructional and educational materials. Analyses of States' consolidated performance reports showed that, from 1997-2001, the most common use of funds (over half of the States' allocations) was for the acquisition and use of instructional and educational materials, including library materials and software. Other uses included expanding the use of technology, improving higher-order thinking skills of disadvantaged elementary and secondary school students, and dropout prevention. State data reported to the Department indicated that schools slightly decreased the amount of program funds spent on books, computer hardware and software, and other educational materials from 43 percent of funds in fiscal year 1996 to 40 percent in fiscal year 1999. This program has not been formally evaluated since the early 1990s; it is difficult to evaluate broad block-grant programs such as State Grants for Innovative Programs because there is not a focused program purpose and there are numerous, often unrelated, allowable uses of funds.

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.

Following the 2002 reauthorization, the Department established one performance measure for the program that looks at whether LEAs that direct program funds to activities designated as strategic priorities by the Department are more likely to achieve Title I adequate yearly progress (AYP) than those LEAs that use funds for other activities. Activities that the Department considered to be strategic priorities are those that: (1) support student achievement and enhance reading and mathematics; (2) improve the quality of teachers; (3) ensure that schools are safe and drug free; and (4) promote access for all students.

In response to the 2005 PART review, the Department established two more performance measures for the program: (1) the percentage of funds that LEAs use for the four strategic priorities; and (2) the percentage of LEAs that complete a credible needs assessment.

Goal: To support State and local programs that are a continuing source of innovation and education improvement.

Objective: *To encourage States to use flexibility authorities in ways that will increase student achievement.*

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

State grants for innovative programs

Measure: The percentage of districts targeting program funds to Department-designated strategic priorities that achieve AYP.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003		65
2004	68	69
2005	69	69
2006	70	
2007	71	
2008	72	

Measure: The percentage of combined funds that districts use for the four Department-designated strategic priorities.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003		
2004		
2005		91
2006	92	
2007	93	
2008	94	

Measure: The percentage of districts that complete a credible needs assessment.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003		
2004		
2005		100
2006	100	
2007	100	
2008	100	

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report

Assessment of progress: The first performance measure demonstrates that LEAs that target funds to the Department's four strategic priorities are making some progress in achieving AYP. The second measure does not yet have a second year of actual data, so it is difficult to determine progress against this measure.

The Department has concerns about the accuracy of State reporting on the third measure. The Department has begun collecting local needs assessments during monitoring visits to determine if they are indeed complete and credible. Early indications are that many of the assessments are, at best, very cursory. For example, in one State, LEAs "assess" their needs by checking off areas of need on a form provided by the SEA. In another State, officials from the SEA noted in a monitoring report that a school district did not seem to have completed a needs assessment. On the other hand, information provided by a school district in Nebraska indicates that some individual schools within the district do undertake detailed needs assessments, using achievement data and school climate surveys, and then set achievement goals based on those analyses.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

State grants for innovative programs

Efficiency Measures

The efficiency measures for State Grants for Innovative Programs focus on how quickly the Department sends monitoring reports to States after on-site and virtual monitoring visits and how quickly States respond satisfactorily to findings in the monitoring reports. The Department intends to establish baseline data and targets for these measures later in 2007.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

In 2005, the Office of Management and Budget and the Department conducted a review of the program using the PART. The review found that the program provides a very flexible source of funding that SEAs and LEAs use to implement education reforms and innovations. In addition, the program is well coordinated with related activities. However, the review also determined that the program is somewhat duplicative of other Federal, State, and local education programs. It is also not well targeted to meet the needs of children in high-need schools because the statute does not provide a specific formula for States to use when awarding subgrants that would target the funds to schools serving poor children or schools in need of improvement.

Also, the PART review found that it is difficult to evaluate the program's performance because program funds may be used for a long list of activities. In addition, because most school districts that receive State Grants for Innovative Programs funds also receive funds for other Federal and State programs, it is difficult to separate the program's effects from those of other programs. The program received a rating of "Results Not Demonstrated," on the PART, mostly because of the lack of performance data. The PART recommended that the Department add additional performance measures and develop efficiency measures for the program. To respond to these concerns, the Department added two performance measures to determine program quality and developed two efficiency measures for the program. The PART also recommended that the Department initiate formal monitoring visits to States to ensure that the program is funding effective local programs, which the Department has done. As of November 2006, program staff completed one on-site and six virtual monitoring visits. In fiscal year 2007, the Department plans to complete a combination of 15 on-site and virtual additional monitoring visits.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Javits gifted and talented education

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 6)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): \$675,000 ^{1,2}

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$9,596	0	-\$9,596

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

² A total of \$675,000 thousand is authorized to carry out all Title V, Part D activities.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Student Education program supports a program of research, demonstration projects, and other activities designed to build and enhance the ability of elementary and secondary schools to meet the educational needs of gifted and talented students. The Department awards competitive grants to State educational agencies (SEAs), local educational agencies (LEAs), institutions of higher education, and other public and private agencies and organizations.

Grants are awarded under two priorities: (1) research and development and (2) SEA/LEA capacity building. Five-year research and development grants support initiatives to develop and improve models serving students who are underrepresented in gifted and talented programs. At least half of the applications approved for funding each year must address the priority of serving populations of students who may not be identified as gifted and talented through traditional assessment methods. Three-year SEA and LEA capacity building grants support State and local efforts to improve services for gifted and talented students. The program statute mandates that funds appropriated in excess of \$7.5 million, the fiscal year 2001 level, be competitively awarded to State educational agencies or one or more local educational agencies to improve services and develop their capacity to serve gifted and talented students more effectively.

The program also supports the National Research Center for the Education of Gifted and Talented Children and Youth. Not more than 30 percent of program funds may be used to support the Center.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Javits gifted and talented education

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$11,177
2004.....	11,111
2005.....	11,022
2006.....	9,596
2007	9,596

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Javits Gifted and Talented Student Education 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 and, accordingly, the budget provides no funding for it. This recommendation is part of an overall Administration strategy to increase resources for high-priority programs by eliminating small categorical programs that have a narrow or limited effect.

The vast majority of gifted and talented education programs in the United States are carried out without Federal support. There is little evidence that, by funding a handful of programs annually, the Javits program has been effective in advancing gifted and talented education nationally, identifying the most effective practices in gifted and talented education, or bringing about improvements in the field. To the contrary, after almost a decade of operation, the effectiveness of the projects that have been funded in meeting the needs of gifted and talented students is unknown.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Research and demonstration activities			
Total amount for grants	\$4,657	\$4,657	0
Number of continuation grants	11	6	0
Average grant	\$423	\$776	0
Research and development center	\$1,741	\$1,741	0
SEA/LEA capacity-building grants			
Total amount for grants	\$3,198	\$3,198	0
Number of continuation grants	14	13	0
Average grant	\$228	\$246	0

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Javits gifted and talented education

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 the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department has established three measures to assess the impact of the program. These measures focus on the quality of project designs, professional development, and significant academic achievement in targeted student populations. Baselines for these measures were set in 2005.

The Department collects data for these measures every 2 years by convening an expert panel of scientists and practitioners to review information from a sample of annual performance reports and self-evaluations prepared by grantees. In 2005, the baseline year, 90 percent of the sampled projects received ratings of high or above for effective designs for professional development focused on gifted and talented education (measure 1) and for the quality of evidence-based project designs (measure 2). Also, reviewers rated 70 percent of sampled projects as showing evidence of significant academic gains (measure 3). Data for these measures will be collected again in 2007.

Although the panel rated 70 percent of projects (7 projects out of 10 sampled) as demonstrating significant student achievement based on standardized test scores and other project evaluation data, it noted, among other things, that the program needed better empirical measures for judging how high-ability students improve and that most project evaluations were not structured to compare achievement results with a control group. The panel urged program staff to work with the projects on developing and reporting valid and reliable student achievement data that would help measure the impact of specialized gifted and talented curricula on student learning. In response, the Department conducted site visits and additional monitoring to identify projects in need of technical assistance and is working with projects to ensure the collection of reliable achievement data in accordance with original grant proposals.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Foreign language assistance

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 9)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): \$675,000^{1, 2}

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$21,755	\$23,755	+\$2,000

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

² A total of \$675,000 thousand is authorized in FY 2008 to carry out all Title V, Part D activities.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Foreign Language Assistance program (FLAP) supports competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) and State educational agencies (SEAs) to increase the quality and quantity of foreign language instruction in the United States. Under this program, the Department makes 3-year grants to SEAs to promote systemic improvement of foreign language instruction in the State and 3-year grants to LEAs for model programs of instruction that exhibit the capability to continue beyond the grant period. At least three-quarters of the appropriation must be used for the expansion of foreign language education in the elementary grades. Grant recipients provide a 50 percent match from non-Federal sources. If the applicant demonstrates sufficient hardship, the Department may waive the matching requirement.

The statute also authorizes the “foreign language incentive” program, to make formula payments to public elementary schools that provide students with a program designed to lead to communicative competency in a foreign language. Schools receive payments on the basis of the number of elementary school students enrolled in foreign language classes for 45 minutes a day, at least 4 days a week. Although, by statute, a portion of the annual appropriation for Foreign Language Assistance is to be used for these grants, in most years, at the Administration’s request, the Congress has included appropriations language to exclude funding for the incentive program.

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$16,144
2004.....	16,546
2005.....	17,856
2006.....	21,780
2007.....	21,755

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Foreign language assistance

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Foreign Language Assistance 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 requests \$23.8 million for the Foreign Language Assistance program in fiscal year 2008, an increase of \$2 million over the fiscal year 2007 level. This \$2 million increase, coupled with \$33 million in additional targeted funding increases included elsewhere in the Department's budget, comprises the majority share of the Administration's investment in the National Security Language Initiative (NSLI). The NSLI is built around goals that address weaknesses in our teaching and learning of foreign languages, especially critical-need languages. Critical-need languages are defined as foreign languages considered most critical for national security. The Administration's request for a funding increase reflects the need to encourage fluency in languages critical to our national security. The Department would continue the policy, begun in 2006, of awarding a competitive priority to applications for projects that would support the teaching and learning of critical foreign languages in order to promote national security and economic development. Grants would be made to LEAs to develop an infrastructure of standards and curriculum for instruction in foreign languages – for example, Russian, Chinese, Korean, and Arabic – that are critical due to increased homeland security concerns and globalization of the world economy. Grants would also be made to SEAs to build States' capacity to provide critical foreign language instruction programs. The Department would, however, continue to make grants for the teaching of languages traditionally taught in our Nation's schools.

The Department's emphasis on the teaching and learning of critical foreign languages is especially important because they are not frequently taught in grades K-12, especially in a sequential program that leads to proficiency and fluency. According to a 2002 report, *Foreign Language Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools*, published by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, in partnership with the National Center for Education Statistics, only 44 percent of American high school students in 2000 were enrolled in foreign language classes. Of those students, 69 percent were enrolled in Spanish, 18 percent in French, 5 percent in German, 3 percent in Latin, 1 percent in Italian, and less than 1 percent each in Japanese and Russian. Chinese, Korean, and Arabic were taken so infrequently that the report did not include enrollment levels for those languages.

By statute, at least three-quarters of FLAP grant funds must be used for the expansion of foreign language education in the elementary grades. According to a national survey by the Center for Applied Linguistics, in 1997, only 31 percent of elementary schools (and 24 percent of public elementary schools) reported teaching foreign languages. Of those schools, 79 percent offered programs to give students an introductory exposure to the language, 21 percent offered programs having overall proficiency as one of the goals, and only 7 percent offered instruction in which fluency was the goal.

The request would continue the policy of excluding funding for the incentive program in fiscal year 2008. The Administration plans to recommend elimination of the Incentive Grants authority

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Foreign language assistance

as part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization. The Administration does not intend to recommend any other significant changes to the program through reauthorization.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
New award funding	\$13,452	\$6,933	\$3,020
Number of new awards	74	46	20
Continuation award funding	\$8,268	\$14,762	\$20,675
Number of continuation awards	56	84	119
Peer review of new award applications	\$60	\$60	\$60

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected performance information, including GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance 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: Assist local and State educational agencies in establishing, improving, or expanding foreign language study for elementary and secondary school students.

Objective: *Increase the percentage of Foreign Language Assistance program projects that report improvements in proficiency in a foreign language for students served in the project based on project-developed targets.*

Measure: The percentage of Foreign Language Assistance projects that report improvements in proficiency in a foreign language for program participants.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		65
2005	50	80
2006	75	
2007	75	
2008	75	

Assessment of progress: Before 2003, the performance measure for the Foreign Language Assistance program measured the percentage of participating students who demonstrated educationally significant progress toward achieving communicative language proficiency. Analysis of data from 51 grantee annual performance reports for 2001 revealed little evidence

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Foreign language assistance

that projects were effective in developing communicative competence in foreign languages for participating students. However, only one project established a testing regime early enough to provide valid data.

In 2003, the Department revised the performance indicator to measure the percentage of projects that report significant improvements in proficiency in a foreign language for three-quarters of students. All projects now report data for this measure. Projects typically collect data for this measure through comparisons of pre- and post-tests or portfolio assessments. Data for 2006 should be available in February 2007.

Other Performance Information

In 2004, the Department funded a contract with the Center for Applied Linguistics to produce a report that provides information for current and prospective FLAP grantees to help them write more coherent proposals and follow through with project activities in a manner that will be useful to the profession. The report included: (1) accepted definitions of foreign language program models, so that everyone uses the same terminology, (2) resources on assessment instruments for K-8 language programs to help schools select the most appropriate measures for their needs, (3) student proficiency goals that may be achieved by each instructional model, so that realistic program goals may be set, and (4) a template for an effective program evaluation and a recommended standard format for reporting progress and outcomes in the Annual Performance Report submitted by FLAP grantees.

Additionally, this program will be among the programs that receive help from the Department's new Data Quality Initiative that, beginning in early 2007, will provide technical assistance to selected programs to promote and improve the capacity of Department staff and grantees to obtain better outcome information from grant programs. 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.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

State assessments

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1)

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

Budget authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$411,630	\$411,630	0

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

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB Act), requires States to test all students annually in grades 3 through 8 and once in high school in reading and mathematics, and to develop and administer annual assessments in science for each of three grade spans specified in the law by 2007-08. Furthermore, States must assess the English proficiency of all limited English proficient students annually. The annual assessments in reading and mathematics are used to determine whether States, local educational agencies (LEAs), and schools are making adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward the goal of all students attaining proficiency by 2013-2014; the science and language proficiency assessments are not currently required for the determination of adequate yearly progress.

All assessments must be valid and reliable, include measures that assess higher-order thinking skills and understanding of challenging content, and enable achievement results to be disaggregated by major racial and ethnic group, gender, and poverty, disability, English proficiency, and migrant status. The annual assessments also provide a critical diagnostic tool for teachers and parents to improve instruction and meet specific student needs.

The Grants for State Assessments program, authorized by Section 6111, provides formula grants to States to pay the costs of developing standards and assessments required by the ESEA and, once a State has put in place such standards and assessments, to pay for the administration of the assessments. Funds also may be used to develop standards and assessments in subjects other than those required by the ESEA and to improve the reliability and validity of assessment systems. Other allowable uses include expanding the range of testing accommodations for students with disabilities and limited English proficient students, professional development aligned with State standards and assessments, and the development of information and reporting systems.

Under the funding formula, 0.5 of 1 percent of the appropriation is reserved for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and 0.5 of 1 percent goes to the Outlying Areas. From the remaining funds, each

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

State assessments

State first receives \$3 million, and then a share of any remaining funds based on its proportion of students ages 5 through 17.

Section 6112 of the ESEA authorizes the Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments program, a competitive grant program that makes 18-month awards to support efforts by States, or consortia of States, to: (1) improve the quality, validity, and reliability of State academic assessments; (2) measure student academic achievement through the use of multiple measures from multiple sources; (3) chart student progress over time; and (4) use comprehensive instruments such as performance- and technology-based assessments. To date, the Department has made 22 awards under the Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments program.

State Assessments 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.

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$384,484
2004.....	390,000
2005.....	411,860
2006.....	407,563
2007.....	411,630

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2008, the Administration requests \$411.6 million for State assessment grants, the same amount as the fiscal year 2007 level. The State Assessments 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.

Funds for State formula grants would support development of new annual assessments in reading and mathematics for 2 additional high school grades, extending to the high school level the level of assessment that, in grades three through eight, has been at the center of school accountability under the No Child Left Behind Act. One of the new assessments would be a test of college readiness. The new high school testing requirements would be part of the Administration's proposal for the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). The requested level of funding will give States resources to implement the additional high school assessments by the end of school year 2010-2011. The request would provide \$400 million for State formula grants and \$11.6 million for awards under the Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments program.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

State assessments

Fiscal year 2008 State formula grant funds will also support the final year of development and implementation of science assessments in three grade spans. These assessments, which were new under NCLB, must be in place by school year 2007-08.

High School Assessments

State assessments have been a key component of the education reform efforts supported by NCLB. The State Assessments program funded the development and implementation of the statewide annual assessments in reading and mathematics of students in every grade from 3rd grade through 8th grade, and once in high school, that must be in place by school year 2005-06, along with statewide assessments in science in three grade spans that must be in place by school year 2007-08.

Although the specific parameters for the additional high school assessments (including the extent to which they would have to meet the same requirements as apply under current law, or could take alternative forms) will be addressed more completely during the ESEA reauthorization, they will clearly be critical to the Administration's efforts to improve high school education under a reauthorized ESEA. These assessments will produce valuable data that can be used for both accountability and instructional purposes. The assessments would provide a uniform, objective mechanism for measuring student achievement and holding schools accountable for the academic improvement of high school students. They would also offer information about individual student progress and help educators make informed decisions for helping students advance through high school.

The new assessments would also support the call by the National Governors Association and many others to restore value to the high school diploma. They would help ensure that students graduate from high school with diplomas that are meaningful and with the skills needed to succeed in college and in the workforce. According to the American Diploma Project (ADP), all high school students need to learn the same rigorous academic content and skills, whether they expect to enter the workforce immediately after graduation or to pursue postsecondary education. However, an ADP review of assessments in 6 States showed that high school tests were not overly demanding, measuring only a small part of what employers and colleges say high school graduates need to know in order to succeed after high school. The additional high school assessments would be a tool for improving academic rigor by setting high expectations for what high school students should learn and measuring student progress in acquiring the skills they need to succeed in the workplace or postsecondary education.

A few States already assess high school students more than once to support these various purposes. California, Delaware, Florida, and Texas do so to ensure that schools are accountable for improving the academic achievement of all their students and to review student progress towards mastering the rigorous content and skills every high school graduate should know. The 11th-grade student assessment in Texas is also used for demonstrating students' readiness for college. A number of States, including Virginia and North Carolina, have instituted end-of-course tests at the high school level for students pursuing rigorous academic coursework.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

State assessments

However, although some States now assess high school students several times during a student's high school career, most States do not, or they do not test enough students to make these high school assessments a true gauge of the achievement of all their students and the performance of all their schools. They do not collect the information needed to hold schools accountable and address individual student needs at a time when many high school students leave school without the skills they need to succeed in either college or the workplace. A 2005 survey conducted by Achieve, Inc. found that employers, colleges, and students themselves think many students graduate from high school without those skills. The surveyed employers estimated that 41 percent of high school graduates were not sufficiently prepared in mathematics and 38 percent were not sufficiently prepared in writing. Sixty-five percent of college instructors surveyed said that high schools do not adequately prepare students to meet the expectations they face in college. When Achieve asked high school graduates themselves about what would encourage high school students to work harder and be better prepared for life after high school, 81 percent said that requiring exams in mathematics and English to graduate would help.

A requirement for States to develop and implement assessments in two additional high school grades in reading/language arts and mathematics would be a key element of the Administration's strategy for using the upcoming ESEA reauthorization to drive NCLB reforms to the high school level. It complements our proposal to drive more than \$1 billion in additional Title I resources to high schools. Without the additional assessments, high schools would have only a single measure (generally an assessment aligned with only 9th- or 10th-grade standards) for measuring the achievement of students and targeting additional Title I funds where the needs are greatest. LEAs would have only limited information on the performance and needs of high schools identified for improvement. The additional assessments will provide much richer information, enabling a wiser, more strategic use of the Title I funds.

In addition, States can use FY 2008 funds for other activities authorized in the statute, such as refining their existing assessments for using longitudinal assessment data under a growth-based accountability model, or developing ways to increase the validity and reliability of the assessments.

Enhanced Assessment Instruments

The request includes \$11.6 million to fund Enhanced Assessment Instruments grants that will assist States in improving the quality of their assessments for limited English proficient (LEP) students and students with disabilities and add to the knowledge base about properly assessing these students. For the next competition, the Department will announce a competitive preference for applications that propose to address the assessment of students with disabilities and limited English proficient students.

States are still struggling with implementation of high-quality assessment instruments that produce reliable and valid information about all students. A July 2006 report by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) noted that, while the majority of States offer some accommodations to try to increase the validity and reliability of assessment results for limited English proficient (LEP) students, there is limited research on the appropriate use of accommodations with this population. The report also found that many States are facing challenges in establishing the

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

State assessments

validity and reliability of the English language proficiency assessments they are developing. GAO recommended that the Department support additional research on appropriate accommodations for LEP students and disseminate information on research-based accommodations to the States. Partly in response to that report, the Secretary announced on July 27, 2006, that the Department will seek partnerships with approximately 20 States to improve and develop fair and accurate testing for LEP students.

The Department expects to publish new rules in the spring of 2007 allowing States to use modified assessments based on modified achievement standards for students with disabilities who are eligible to be assessed in such a manner. The new guidelines reflect the latest scientific research showing that certain students with disabilities – approximately 2 percent of all students – can make progress toward grade-level standards when they receive high-quality instruction and are assessed with alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards; this is a separate policy from the current regulation that allows up to 1 percent of all students being tested (those with the most significant cognitive disabilities) to take an alternate assessment. The request for Enhanced Assessment Instruments grants will help support States' efforts in developing these alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards.

To date, the Department has supported a wide variety of projects that addressed the needs of LEP students or students with disabilities, including projects that investigated improved assessments of English proficiency, the validity of accommodations or other strategies, and the technical adequacy of assessment strategies for these two populations.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Grants for State Assessments			
Estimated number of awards	52	52	52
Average award	\$7,615	\$7,615	\$7,615
BIA and Outlying Areas	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments			
Amount for new awards	\$7,563	\$11,630	\$11,630
Number of new awards	5	8	8
Range of awards	\$1,000 - 2,000	\$1,000 - 2,000	\$1,000 - 2,000
Peer review of new award applications	\$32	\$32	\$32

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

State assessments

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, those resources requested in FY 2008 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Two of the program's performance measures address States' implementation of annual assessments for students in grades 3 through 8 and once in high school in reading and mathematics. The measures are the number of States (including DC and PR) that have reading/language arts assessments that align with the State's academic content standards for all students in grades three through eight and in high school, and the number of States (including DC and PR) that have mathematics assessments that align with the State's academic content standards for all students in grades three through eight and in high school and.

In 2005, the Department began formal peer reviews of State standards and assessment systems. These reviews determine whether a State has met each of the requirements specified in the authorizing statute. The Department determines whether to approve State assessment systems based on the outcome of those reviews. To date, the Department has conducted reviews of all States and has granted "full approval" to 18 States. Full approval means that the State's standards and assessment system meets all requirements. Two States have been categorized as "approval expected." These are States where the evidence to date suggests that a State is fully compliant with the requirements, but certain elements may not have been complete by July 1, 2006; these States are required to provide the Department with the complete documentation and evidence needed to satisfy the remaining requirements before administering their assessments in 2006-07.

Thirty-two States received "approval pending" status. These States have one or more fundamental components that were missing or did not meet assessment requirements by June 30, 2006. Most States in this category (29) have fewer than three issues to resolve by the end of the 2006-07 school year and, although the Department has placed them in "Mandatory Oversight" status and placed specific conditions on their fiscal year 2006 Title I, Part A grant awards, there will be no withholding of Federal funds at this time. However, the Department has withheld 10 percent of States' Title I, Part A administrative funds for three States that have three or more major issues based on the 2005-06 test administration.

A third measure addresses States' implementation of science assessments in three grade spans.

Goal: To support states in the development of State assessments.

Objective: *By SY 2007-2008, all States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in at least one grade per grade span (three*

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

State assessments

through five, six through eight, and high school) in science, all of which are aligned with their content specific academic content standards.

Measure: The number of States (including DC and PR) that have science assessments that align with the State's academic content standards for all students in each grade span (grades 3 through 5, 6 through 8, and high school).		
Year	Target ¹	Actual
2004	Set a Baseline	0
2005	18	0
2006	15	5
2007	25	
2008	52	
¹ Targets were adjusted to reflect expectations that, between 2005 and 2006 fewer States would have completed science assessments because the deadline for completing those assessments (2007-08) was two years later than the deadline for completing reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (2005-06).		

Source of data: Department of Education, Standards and Assessment External Peer Review Process, Title I review processes, staff recommendations, and decisions by the Secretary. This measure includes only assessments that have full, expected, or pending Department approval as meeting the requirements of No Child Left Behind.

Measure: The number of States (including DC and PR) that have completed field-testing of the required assessments in science.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003		18
2004		19
2005		24
2006	20	26
2007	52	
2008	52	

Source of data: Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Reports; State Web sites; monitoring visits.

Assessment of progress: The indicator for States' completion of field-testing of the required assessments assists in tracking States' progress towards completing development of assessment systems. In 2006, the program surpassed the target of 20 States completing field-testing of the required assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics. In addition, 5 States completed science assessments. The target for 2006 was 15, but the deadline for completion of science assessments is school year 2007-08.

Efficiency Measures

In 2005, the Department adopted an efficiency measure that tracks the average number of days per peer review session it takes the Department to issue the initial standards and assessment

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

State assessments

decision letter to a State. The target for this measure is 90 days or less. During fiscal year 2006, the average time for issuing of the letter was 60.45 business days.

Follow-Up on PART Findings and Recommendations

This program was rated as “Adequate” in the PART review conducted in 2004. The review found that the program has a clear purpose and need, is managed well, provides effective technical assistance to grantees, and collects and uses data to assess whether States are on track to meet the statutory deadlines. The review yielded two recommendations: (1) that the Department develop and implement a strategy for standardizing and analyzing data on State implementation of assessment systems, and make those data publicly accessible; and (2) that the Department develop a framework for assessing whether State data collection systems are adequate for NCLB accountability purposes and for assessing whether States and school districts use those data effectively to improve student achievement.

The Department commenced formal reviews of State assessment systems in 2005 to determine whether each State’s assessment system meets NCLB requirements. Every State went through a formal review in accordance with the procedures and standards specified in the Department’s peer review guidance (published in 2004) as well as the rules conveyed to States through communications to chief State school officers. The reviews examined whether a State’s assessment system met the statutory requirements for academic content standards, academic achievement standards, assessment in the required subjects across the State, technical quality, alignment, inclusion of all students, and reporting. The Department’s website publication of decision letters regarding the review and approval of each State’s assessment system addresses the recommendation that the Department make data on States’ implementation of their assessment systems publicly accessible. The decision letters also detail areas of a State’s assessment system that do not yet comply with NCLB requirements.

The PART review also recommended that the Department develop a framework for assessing whether State data collection systems are adequate for NCLB accountability purposes. In response to this recommendation, the Department developed and published guidelines for States, districts, and schools on improving the quality of the data that are used to make their accountability decisions.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Education for homeless children and youths

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

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$61,878	\$61,878	0

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

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

The Department allocates funds to States through a formula based on each State's share of Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies. Each State receives a minimum annual award that is the greater of \$150,000, 0.25 percent of the total, or the amount of the State's fiscal year 2001 award. Under a Memorandum of Agreement with the Department, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) receives 1 percent of the appropriation to serve homeless children and youth attending schools funded by the Bureau. The Department is also authorized to reserve 0.1 percent of each year's appropriation for grants to the Outlying Areas, and to withhold funds sufficient to conduct technical assistance (if requested by a State educational agency (SEA)), evaluation, and dissemination activities.

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

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

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

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.....	\$54,642
2004.....	59,646
2005.....	62,496
2006.....	61,871
2007.....	61,878

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2008, the Administration requests \$61.9 million for the Education for Homeless Children and Youth program, the same as the 2007 CR level. The funds help maintain services to an especially disadvantaged population that is difficult to identify and serve. Funds support the activities of State coordinators and State subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs). In addition, from the total amount, \$535,000 would support the continuation of technical assistance, evaluation, and dissemination activities. Currently, the National Center for Homeless Education receives these set-aside funds to provide assistance to States and LEAs to help them carry out program activities.

This program is an important component of the national effort to end the cycle of homelessness. It also addresses the goals of the No Child Left Behind Act by giving States needed assistance in providing homeless children and youth with learning opportunities that enable them to make significant academic progress. Toward that end, the program facilitates the enrollment of homeless students in school and gives them access to services available to other children, such as preschool programs, special education, gifted and talented programs, and vocational education. Homeless children face many barriers that impede their educational access and success, such as immunization, transportation, and guardianship requirements. This program helps to reduce and eliminate those barriers.

The Education for Homeless Children and Youth program is authorized by the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act and 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.

The Administration is considering several amendments to the program's authorization, including one concerning the percentage of funds that States educational agencies (SEAs) may reserve for State-level activities. A State that receives an allocation greater than the State minimum (\$150,000) must subgrant competitively to LEAs at least 75 percent of its allocation, but a State that receives the minimum State allocation must subgrant competitively to LEAs only 50 percent of its allocation. When the McKinney-Vento Act was reauthorized in 2001, nine States were minimally funded and were, therefore, authorized to reserve 50 percent of their funds for State activities, which include providing for a State coordinator for the homeless education program,

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Education for homeless children and youths

providing technical assistance to local districts, training local liaisons, holding competitions and issuing subgrants to LEAs, and conducting compliance monitoring. However, all States now receive funding more than the \$150,000 threshold and, therefore, some have reduced funds for State-level activities. Some States went from having \$75,000 for State-level activities to \$38,000, which greatly affects the SEAs' capacity to provide technical assistance throughout the State. States also use these funds to provide direct services to homeless children and youth, establish a State coordinator position, and provide professional development to school personnel to help them respond to problems unique to homeless children and youth. The Administration may recommend establishing a minimum amount for State-level activities that will enable small States to have sufficient funds to carry out the program.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Average State award	\$1,166	\$1,167	\$1,167
Evaluation and dissemination	535	535	535
Amount to Outlying Areas	62	62	62
Amount to BIA	619	619	619

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The program statute requires States to collect, and submit to the Department, data related to the nature and extent of problems homeless children and youths experience in gaining access to a free, appropriate public education. Currently, the Department is working with States to create uniform standards for data collection. In addition, the Department submitted a report to Congress in 2006 describing the implementation of the program at the Federal, State, and local levels.

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.

Until 2002, the performance measures for this program focused on increasing the enrollment and attendance of homeless children and youths. Data provided by SEAs to support those measures show that, in 2001, 87 percent of homeless children and youth were enrolled in school, a significant increase over previous years. In 2003, the Department revised the performance measures to place stronger emphasis on educational outcomes.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Education for homeless children and youths

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

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

Measure: The percentage of homeless children and youth, grades three through eight, included in statewide assessments in reading and mathematics, as reported by LEA subgrantees.				
Year	Target – Reading	Actual – Reading	Target – Math	Actual – Math
2003				
2004				
2005		50		49
2006	53	55	52	54
2007	60		60	
2008	63		63	

Measure: The percentage of homeless students, grades three through eight, who meet or exceed proficiency on State assessments in reading and mathematics.				
Year	Target – Reading	Actual – Reading	Target – Math	Actual – Math
2003				
2004				
2005	34	42		41
2006	43	45	43	42
2007	50		50	
2008	52		52	

Source: U.S. Department of Education, McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act Annual Report

Assessment of progress: In 2006, the targets for three of the four performance measures were met. For the fourth measure, the percentage of homeless students who meet or exceed proficiency on State mathematics assessments, the actual percentage of students was 1 percentage point lower than the target. In the 2005-06 school year, 118,842 students took the math test compared to only 81,699 in the 2004-05 school year. In addition, many of these students were students affected by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita who moved one or more times during the year to unfamiliar States and school programs. Thus, the 2005-06 school year may have been a particularly challenging one for inclusion of homeless students in State assessments.

Efficiency Measure

The Department has established one efficiency measure for the Education for Homeless Children and Youth program: the number of days it takes the Department to send a monitoring report to States after monitoring visits. The baseline and targets for this measure should be available later this year.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Education for homeless children and youths

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

This program went through a PART review in 2006. Although the PART findings indicate that the program is generally well managed and has a good performance data collection system in place, it also identified the lack of an independent evaluation and efficiency data for the program. The program received an "Adequate" rating. The Department should have baseline data for the program's efficiency measure later in 2007 and will establish targets for the measure once baseline data are available.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Education for Native Hawaiians

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

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$33,908	0	-\$33,908

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

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Education for Native Hawaiians program supports the provision of supplemental education services to the Native Hawaiian population. Competitive grants and contracts are awarded to eligible applicants for a variety of authorized activities in such areas as teacher training, family-based education, gifted and talented education, special education, higher education, and community-based education learning centers. Eligible applicants include Native Hawaiian educational organizations and community-based organizations, public and private nonprofit organizations, agencies, and institutions with experience in developing or operating Native Hawaiian programs or programs of instruction in the Native Hawaiian language, and other entities.

The appropriation also supports the activities of the Native Hawaiian Education Council. The Council uses funds directly and is authorized to make grants to facilitate its coordination of the educational and related services and programs available to Native Hawaiians. Council members are appointed by the Secretary based on recommendations from the Native Hawaiian community. The Council receives a minimum award of \$500,000 annually.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$30,798
2004.....	33,302
2005.....	34,224
2006.....	33,908
2007.....	33,908

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Education for Native Hawaiians program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The Administration

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Education for Native Hawaiians

is not recommending reauthorization of this program and, accordingly, the budget provides no funding for it. While the Administration recognizes the importance of ensuring that Native Hawaiian students receive appropriate educational services, the request is consistent with the Administration's policy of increasing resources for high-priority programs by eliminating small categorical programs that have narrow or limited effect.

School districts that wish to implement programs and services tailored to the educational and cultural needs of Native Hawaiian students are able to use funds provided under other Federal programs. For example, significant funds are provided to Native Hawaiian students who receive services through Federal formula grant programs, such as Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies and the Special Education State Grant programs. Under Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, supplemental education funding is provided to LEAs and schools, particularly those in high-poverty areas, to help raise the achievement of all students in meeting challenging State academic standards. Since Native Hawaiian students are more likely to be living in poverty than their non-Hawaiian peers, they will directly benefit from programs supported through Title I, Part A, for which the Administration is requesting a \$1.2 billion increase. Further, Native Hawaiian students are also provided support through Special Education State grants because more than one-third of Native Hawaiian students who attend public school in Hawaii receive special education services.

In addition to the requested \$1.2 billion increase for Title I, Part A, the 2008 Administration recommends significant increases for several K-12 education programs that are designed to help all students meet challenging academic standards. For example, the budget request includes \$250 million to initiate the Math Now program, which will support scientifically based mathematics instruction in elementary and middle schools, particularly those with concentrations of students from low-income families. The budget request would also increase, by \$68 million, funding for the Striving Readers program, making it possible for many more middle school students who read below grade level to receive interventions designed to pull them up to grade. These and other components of the 2008 request make it unnecessary to fund a program targeted only toward Native Hawaiian students.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Amount for new awards	\$11,611	\$3,914	0
Number of new awards	23	4-7	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$19,156	\$29,494	0
Number of continuation awards	38	48-52	0
Earmarks in appropriation	\$2,475	0	0
Native Hawaiian Education Council	\$500	\$500	0

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Education for Native Hawaiians

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) – continued

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Peer review of new award applications	\$166	0 ¹	0

¹ In 2007, new awards will be selected from high-quality applicants that could not be funded in 2006; therefore, no peer review funds are requested.

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 the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Goal: To support innovative projects to provide supplemental services that address the educational needs of Native Hawaiian children and adults.

Objective: *The percentage of participants who will benefit from the Native Hawaiian Education program will increase.*

Measure: The percentage of Native Hawaiian children participating in early education programs who improve on measures of school readiness and literacy.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		63
2006	68	78.7
2007	73	

Measure: The percentage of students participating in the Education for Native Hawaiians program who meet or exceed proficiency standards in mathematics, science, or reading.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		82
2006	83.64	67.4
2007	85.31	

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Education for Native Hawaiians

Measure: The percentage of teachers involved with professional development activities that address the unique education needs of Native Hawaiians.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		89.3
2006	91	90.7
2007	92.82	

Assessment of progress: In 2005, the Department established measures for this program that focus on measuring increased proficiency in mathematics, science, or reading; improved school readiness; and increases in the number and percentage of teachers receiving professional development that addresses the unique educational needs of program participants. Recent data, collected in 2006, show increased performance in two of the three measures. The second measure on proficiency in mathematics, science, or reading decreased significantly due to a grantee collecting data for the first time using a State Assessment test, in which only 10 percent of their students met or exceeded proficiency standards. The percentage, not including data from this grantee, was 81.8. The data are self-reported through grantee performance reports. The Department does not conduct any formal verification of these data. Data for 2006 will be available later this winter.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Alaska Native education equity

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

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$33,908	0	-\$33,908

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

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Alaska Native Education Equity program supports supplemental educational programs and services to Alaska Natives. By statute, the following grants must be awarded annually: \$1 million for cultural education programs operated by the Alaska Native Heritage Center; \$1 million for a cultural exchange program operated by the Alaska Humanities Forum; \$1 million for parenting education activities; \$2 million for an Alaska Initiative for Community Engagement; and \$2 million for the dropout prevention programs operated by the Cook Inlet Tribal Council's Partners for Success program.

With the remaining funds, the program awards competitive grants and contracts to eligible applicants for a variety of authorized activities, such as teacher training and student enrichment programs. Eligible applicants include Alaska Native organizations, educational entities with experience in developing or operating Alaska Native programs or programs of instruction conducted in Alaska Native languages, cultural and community-based organizations, and other entities.

All grantees may use no more than 5 percent of the funding for administrative costs.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$30,798
2004.....	33,302
2005.....	34,224
2006.....	33,908
2007.....	33,908

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Alaska Native education equity

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Alaska Native Education Equity 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 and, accordingly, the budget provides no funding for it. While the Administration recognizes the importance of ensuring that Alaska Native students receive appropriate educational services to enable these students to achieve academically, the request is consistent with the Administration's policy of increasing resources for high-priority programs by eliminating small categorical programs that have limited effect. In addition, the services provided to Alaska Native students through this program are redundant with many of those provided through the Department's Indian Education programs.

School districts that wish to implement programs and services tailored to the educational and cultural needs of Alaska Native students are able to use funds provided under other Federal programs. The FY 2008 President's Budget request includes approximately \$1 billion in direct support for the education of Indians and Alaska Natives, in addition to significant funds that are provided to Indian and Alaska Native students who receive services through broader Federal formula grant programs, such as Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies and Special Education State Grants.

Alaska Native students will also benefit from the Department's Indian Education programs, which provide more than \$118 million in formula grants to school districts and competitive grants for demonstration and professional development programs. These programs serve as the Department's principal vehicle for addressing the unique educational and culturally related needs of Indian and Alaska Native students. Specifically, the grant awards supplement the regular school program, helping Indian and Alaska Native students improve their academic skills, raise their self-confidence, and participate in enrichment programs and activities that would otherwise be unavailable. Because Alaska Native students are currently served under both programs, each of which addresses their educational and culturally related needs as Alaska Natives, the two programs are redundant.

Finally, a significant portion of the funding for this program is earmarked for specific entities. The Administration does not favor earmarking because it relieves grantees of having to develop a competitive application and high-quality program and it reduces accountability for results.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Amount for new awards	\$16,637	\$2,318	0
Number of new awards	32-35	5-8	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$10,127	\$24,490	0
Number of continuation awards	22	49	0
Mandated awards	\$7,000	\$7,000	0

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Alaska Native education equity

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) – continued

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Peer review of new award applications	\$144	\$100	0

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, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Goal: To help meet the unique educational needs of Alaska Natives and to support the development of supplemental educational programs to benefit Alaska Natives.

Objective: Support supplemental educational programs to benefit Alaska Natives.

Measure: The percentage of students participating in the Alaska Native Education Equity program who meet or exceed proficiency standards in mathematics, science, or reading.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		44
2006	49	43.5
2007	54	

Measure: The percentage of Alaska Native children participating in early learning and preschool programs who improve on measures of school readiness.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		76.4
2006	80	84.2
2007	85	

Assessment of Progress: In 2005, the Department developed new measures for this program that focus on measuring increased proficiency in mathematics, science or reading and on improved school readiness. Baseline and performance targets for later years were also established in 2005. The data are self-reported through grantee performance reports. The Department does not conduct any formal verification of these data. Data for 2007 will be available this fall.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Training and advisory services

(Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IV)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$7,113	\$7,113	0

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Training and Advisory Services supports efforts to achieve the intent of Title IV of the Civil Rights Act by aiding educators in preparing, adopting, and implementing plans for desegregation of public schools and in solving equity problems related to race, gender, and national origin. The Department awards 3-year grants to regional Equity Assistance Centers (EACs) in each of the 10 Department of Education regions.

The EACs provide services to school districts upon request. Typical activities include disseminating information on successful educational practices and on legal requirements related to nondiscrimination on the basis of race, sex, and national origin in educational programs. Other activities include training designed to develop educators' skills in such areas as the identification of race and sex bias in instructional materials, and technical assistance in the identification and selection of appropriate educational programs to meet the needs of a diverse student body.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$7,286
2004.....	7,243
2005.....	7,185
2006.....	7,113
2007.....	7,113

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2008, the Administration requests \$7.1 million, the same as the 2007 level, for the Training and Advisory Services program. Funds will support a new competition for 3-year grants to 10 regional Equity Assistance Centers that provide equity assistance to school districts on issues related to discrimination based on race, gender, and national origin.

Ensuring equitable access to quality education and the opportunity for all students to develop strong academic skills in reading, mathematics, and other core subjects is among the Administration's priorities. Yet, many of the schools in the U.S. continue to be segregated

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

economically and racially. Additionally, many of the schools facing sanctions under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act are heavily minority schools, and the Nation's high dropout problem is squarely concentrated in the heavily minority high schools in big cities. These and other findings highlight the continuing need for EAC services that help school districts address educational inequality and racial and socioeconomic segregation.

To achieve the goal of equal access for all students, the requested funds would provide support to the EACs for such activities as: instructing school officials on how to prevent sexual harassment and combat biases that can lead to hate crimes and bullying; providing training to help educators identify race and sex bias in instructional materials and to help them select appropriate educational programs to meet the needs of limited English proficient students; increasing participation by minorities and females in mathematics and science courses; and working with local educational agencies to ensure that systemic reform and educational restructuring plans consider the needs of all students. The Centers' activities help to ensure that all children have equal access to quality education and the opportunity to develop strong academic skills in reading, math, and other core subject areas.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Amount for continuation awards	\$7,096	\$7,096	0
Number of continuation awards	10	10	0
Amount for new awards	0	0	\$7,025
Peer review of new award applications	0	0	\$71
Number of new awards	0	0	10
Data collection	\$17	\$17	\$17

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.

The Department established four performance measures for this program that determine the percentage of customers of Equity Assistance Centers who (1) develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices in eliminating, reducing, or preventing harassment, conflict, and school violence, (2) develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices ensuring that students of different race, sex, and national origin have equitable opportunity for high-quality instruction, (3) report that the products and services they received are of high quality, and

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Training and advisory services

(4) report that the products and services they received are of high usefulness to their policies and practices. Baselines were set in 2006.

The Department is gathering data to inform the program's performance measures through customer surveys conducted by the Library of Congress. The measures are consistent with the Department's measures for all technical assistance programs, looking at the quality, relevance, and usefulness of products and services.

About 48 percent of the targeted customer group responded to the 2006 survey conducted by the Library of Congress. Results show that:

- About 85 percent of respondents reported that the products and services they receive from the EACs are of high usefulness to their policies and practices;
- About 71 percent of respondents reported that the assistance they receive from the EACs helped them develop, implement, or improve policies and practices to ensure that students of different race, sex, and national origin have equitable opportunity for high-quality instruction;
- About 66 percent of respondents reported that the assistance they receive from the EACs helped them develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices in eliminating, reducing, or preventing harassment, conflict, and school violence.

The Department intends to work with the Library of Congress to make minor adjustments to the survey so that it aligns more closely with the program's measures and to conduct it again in April 2007. The Department anticipates having baseline data for the remaining performance measure, the percentage of customers who report that the products and services they received from the EACs are of high quality, in July 2007.

Efficiency Measures

The Department is implementing a common measure of administrative efficiency to assess the Training and Advisory Services program and other technical assistance programs. The measure is the percentage of grant funds that each EAC carries over for each year of operations. For FY 2006, Training and Advisory Services program grantees carried over less than 1 percent of grant funds.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

In 2004, the Training and Advisory Services program received a PART rating of "Results Not Demonstrated." The PART acknowledged that the program addresses a specific problem and reaches intended beneficiaries, and that some survey data show that beneficiaries were satisfied with the services they received. At the same time, however, the PART identified weaknesses, including a lack of long-term goals and limited evidence of program effectiveness.

The PART review recommended that the Department develop long-term performance goals to assess the program's effectiveness and conduct a survey to obtain information on the quality,

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Training and advisory services

relevance, and usefulness of program services. In response to these recommendations, the Department developed two new indicators for this program, adapted from a set of common measures developed by the Department. The added indicators allow the comparison of this program to other technical assistance programs and assess, among other things, the quality and usefulness of the services provided by the EACs. The Department also implemented a customer survey, administered by the Library of Congress. The results from the survey are discussed in the Program Performance Information section.

The PART review also called for the Department to implement the program's efficiency measure and continue work to establish and implement at least one additional efficiency measure. The Department has not yet developed the additional efficiency measure.

This program will likely be among the small programs that will receive help from the Department's new Data Quality Initiative that, beginning in early 2007, will provide technical assistance to promote and improve the capacity of Department staff and grantees to obtain better outcomes under selected grant programs. 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.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

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

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite ^{1,2}

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$168,851	\$168,851	0

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

² The amount appropriated to carry out Title VI, Part B is to be distributed equally between Subparts 1 and 2.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Part B of Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) authorizes two programs to assist rural school districts in carrying out activities to help improve the quality of teaching and learning in their schools. The programs differ in the types of local educational agencies (LEAs) targeted for assistance. The Small, Rural School Achievement program provides funds to rural LEAs that serve small numbers of students; the Rural and Low-Income School program provides funds to rural LEAs that serve concentrations of poor students, regardless of the LEA's size. Funds appropriated for the Rural Education program are divided equally between the Small, Rural School Achievement and Rural and Low-Income School programs.

The two programs have similar accountability requirements. Participating LEAs are required to administer an assessment that is consistent with the Title I assessment requirements. An LEA has 3 years to meet the State's definition of adequate yearly progress (AYP). If, after 3 years, an LEA is making AYP, it may continue to participate in the program. If it does not meet the State's definition of AYP, an LEA may continue to participate only if it agrees to use all of its applicable funding to carry out Title I school improvement activities.

Rural Education 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.

SMALL, RURAL SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (Subpart 1)

To be eligible to receive funds under the Small, Rural School Achievement program, an LEA must: (1) (a) have a total average daily attendance (ADA) of less than 600 students; or (b) serve only schools that are located in counties that have a population density of fewer than 10 persons per square mile; and (2) serve only schools that (a) have a National Center for Education

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Statistics (NCES) locale code of 7 (rural) or 8 (rural near an urban area); or (b) are located in an area of the State defined as rural by a governmental agency of the State.

Funds are allocated by formula to eligible LEAs based on the number of students in ADA in the schools served by the LEA and the amount the LEA received under certain Federal programs in the previous fiscal year. For each eligible LEA, the Department calculates an initial allocation that is equal to \$20,000 plus \$100 for each child in ADA above 50, with a maximum initial allocation of \$60,000. An LEA's final allocation is equal to the initial allocation minus the amount received in "applicable funding" (funds allocated under the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, Educational Technology State Grants, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants, and State Grants for Innovative Programs) in the previous fiscal year. The Department makes awards directly to eligible LEAs.

LEAs may use program funds to carry out activities authorized under: (1) Part A of Title I (Grants to Local Educational Agencies); (2) Part A of Title II (Improving Teacher Quality State Grants); (3) Part D of Title II (Educational Technology State Grants); (4) Title III (Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students); (5) Part A of Title IV (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants); (6) Part B of Title IV (21st Century Community Learning Centers); and (7) Part A of Title V (State Grants for Innovative Programs).

Under the program, eligible LEAs also have the flexibility to consolidate funds they receive from these sources to carry out effective activities under any of the authorized programs.

RURAL AND LOW-INCOME SCHOOL PROGRAM (Subpart 2)

To be eligible for funds under the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) program, a local educational agency (LEA) must: (1) have a Census child-poverty rate of at least 20 percent and (2) serve only schools that have an NCES locale code of 6 (small town), 7 (rural), or 8 (rural near an urban area). Funds are allocated by formula to States based on each State's proportionate share of children in average daily attendance (ADA) in all eligible LEAs. States have the option of allocating funds to eligible LEAs competitively or through a formula based on the number of children in ADA in eligible LEAs within the State. A State may also use an alternative formula to allocate funds if it can demonstrate that an alternative would better target funds to eligible LEAs that serve the highest concentrations of poor students. Currently, however, all States make RLIS awards through the statutory formula. Lastly, the Department reserves one-half of 1 percent of the amount appropriated for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and an equal amount for the Outlying Areas.

An LEA located within a State that chooses not to participate in the program may apply directly to the Department for assistance, and the Department may award funds to eligible LEAs within non-participating States on a competitive basis or by formula. However, all States with eligible LEAs have agreed, as a part of consolidated State plans submitted to the Department in 2002, to participate in the program.

LEAs use program funds for: (1) teacher recruitment and retention; (2) professional development; (3) educational technology; (4) parental involvement activities; (5) activities authorized under Part A of Title IV (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities); (6) activities

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

authorized under Part A of Title I (Grants to LEAs); and (7) activities authorized under Title III (Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students).

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$167,653
2004.....	167,831
2005.....	170,624
2006.....	168,918
2007.....	168,851

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is requesting \$168.9 million for the Rural Education program. The request recognizes that rural LEAs receiving program funds face significant challenges in implementing some of the provisions and meeting the objectives of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). The program provides rural districts with resources for meeting those challenges.

According to the National Center for Education Statistics, during the 2003-04 school year, over 39 percent of the Nation's public schools were located in small towns or rural areas, and over 27 percent of all students attended those schools. The small size of many rural schools and districts presents a different set of problems from those of urban schools and districts. For example, rural schools and districts cannot derive the benefits of economies of scale and, thus, face greater per-pupil costs in providing staff or transportation services.

In addition, because of size and location, many small, rural districts face difficulty in meeting the NCLB requirement that students receive instruction in the core academic subjects from teachers who are fully certified by the State and have demonstrated competency in the subjects they teach. Rural teachers are frequently called upon to teach multiple subjects, presenting a challenge for teachers to obtain multiple certifications, which, in turn, makes it difficult for many rural teachers to meet the statutory definition of "highly qualified." (A 2003 national survey conducted by the Appalachia Educational Laboratory found that 57 percent of secondary school teachers in rural schools with 250 or fewer students teach multiple subjects.) Rural Education funds can be used to help rural local educational agencies (LEAs) meet the challenge of recruiting and retaining a staff of highly qualified teachers.

Rural districts frequently receive allocations under State formula grant programs that are too small to allow the LEA to effectively carry out the purposes for which the funds are appropriated. For example, in fiscal year 2006, the median total allocation received by districts eligible for the SRSA program under four current Federal formula grant programs (Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, Educational Technology State Grants, State Grants for Innovative Programs, and Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants) was \$18,315.

Recognizing that rural districts frequently receive small allocations from Federal formula grants, the Rural Education statute provides flexibility to LEAs eligible to receive funds under the SRSA

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

program through the alternative uses of funds authority. This flexibility, commonly referred to as "REAP-Flex," is important to these districts because it allows them to make more effective use of their small Federal formula allocations. An eligible LEA can use its formula allocations under the covered programs to carry out authorized activities or for activities authorized under Part A of Title I, Title III (Language Instruction), or Part B of Title IV (21st Century Community Learning Centers). Fifty-six percent of eligible districts took advantage of this authority in fiscal year 2005. Yet even when the eligible LEAs consolidate their allocations under these programs, they typically do not have enough money to provide effective educator professional development, strengthen school safety, or address the other statutory objectives in a meaningful manner. Rural Education program funds help to make up the difference and assist rural LEAs in financing and implementing approaches to meeting NCLB requirements and addressing the other challenges they face.

The Administration included in the request \$100,000 to evaluate the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) program. The evaluation would examine: (1) the educational goals or objectives that LEAs target with RLIS funds, (2) the types of activities that RLIS funds support, and (3) the academic progress of students enrolled in districts that receive RLIS funds. In addition, the evaluation would analyze the types of improvement activities supported by program funds in LEAs that fail to meet their State's definition of adequate yearly progress.

The Rural 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. In reauthorization, the Administration will propose to change the SRSA program to a State-administered grant program. The Department currently makes over 4,000 grants to small, rural school districts that have little experience in receiving funds directly from the Department and are more likely to turn to their State educational agency for assistance. In 2002, the first year of the program, approximately 75 percent of districts receiving SRSA grants had never before received funds directly from the Department. State administration of the SRSA program will result in improved efficiency in making awards and administering the program.

In reauthorization, the Administration will also propose to modify the formula used to calculate allocations to LEAs under the SRSA program. The current formula used to determine SRSA awards often yields allocations that are disproportionate to the size and needs of many LEAs. For example, in fiscal year 2006, an LEA with one student received an allocation of \$20,000, while an LEA with 862 students received \$47. The proposed formula will result in a more equitable distribution of funds among participating districts.

Finally, the Administration will propose to provide additional flexibility to LEAs eligible to receive funds under the RLIS program by allowing them to consolidate funds using the REAP-Flex authority. This authority will allow larger districts that are, nonetheless, rural and poor to use other Federal formula funds they receive for any purpose authorized under Title I, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants, Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students, and 21st Century Community Learning Centers. These larger rural districts often face many of the same

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

challenges that smaller rural districts encounter, and expanding this authority will allow these districts to use limited Federal resources to more effectively target their areas of greatest need.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Small, rural school achievement			
Total funding	\$84,459	\$84,426	\$84,426
Average LEA grant	\$21	\$21	\$21
Estimated number of LEAs receiving grants	4,067	4,060	4,060
Rural and low-income schools			
Total funding	\$84,459	\$84,425	\$84,425
Range of awards to States	0 - \$7,402	0 - \$7,402	0 - \$7,399
Average LEA grant	\$71	\$71	\$71
Estimated number of LEAs receiving grants	1,195	1,195	1,195
Amount for BIA	\$422	\$422	\$422
Amount for outlying areas	\$422	\$422	\$422
Evaluation	0	0	\$100

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

The Department has established the following goal, three objectives, and corresponding performance measures to assess the impact of the Rural Education program:

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

Goal: Raise educational achievement of students in small, rural school districts.

Objective: Local educational agencies (LEAs) participating in Rural Education programs will make adequate yearly progress (AYP) after the third year.

Measure: The percentage of RLIS program participating LEAs that make adequate yearly progress after 3 years.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		58
2006	64	
2007	70	
2008	76	

Measure: The percentage of SRSA program participating LEAs that make adequate yearly progress after 3 years.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		96
2006	95	
2007	96	
2008	96	

Assessment of Progress: The initial annual AYP target for LEAs participating in both RLIS and SRSA programs was 1 percent over the established baseline. When LEAs reported baseline data in 2005, the Department found that 58 percent of LEAs participating in RLIS and 95 percent of LEAs participating in SRSA made AYP. With the baseline data now in place, the Department has adjusted the performance targets to reflect a yearly increase of 6 percentage points over the baseline in the number of RLIS LEAs that make AYP, in order to reach 100 percent by the year 2014. Similarly, the Department has also adjusted the performance targets for the SRSA program to reflect an increase of 1 percentage point over the baseline in the number LEAs that make AYP every 2 years.

Objective: Students enrolled in LEAs participating in Rural Education programs will score proficient or better on States' assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics in each year through the 2013-2014 academic year.

Assessment of Progress: The Department is currently processing student achievement data from the 2004-05 school year to establish baseline data and determine actual performance. Once baseline data are available in early 2007, performance targets for this measure will reflect the Department's goal that 100 percent of students enrolled in districts participating in both the SRSA and RLIS programs are proficient by 2014. Student achievement data for fiscal year 2007 will be available in June 2008 once data have been collected from participating States and districts.

Objective: Eligible rural school districts will use the Rural Education program flexibility authority.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Measure: The percentage of eligible school districts utilizing the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility authority.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003		61
2004	71	59
2005	65	56
2006	65	
2007	65	
2008	65	

Assessment of Progress: In fiscal year 2005, 56 percent of eligible districts reported using the flexibility authority, below the Department's target of 65 percent.

Program Efficiency Measures

The Department developed the following efficiency measure for the Rural Education Achievement Program: obligate 80 percent of SRSA funds to participating LEAs by August 30 of each fiscal year. In 2006, the Department obligated 80 percent of SRSA funds by August 23.

Other Performance Information

A 2006 evaluation conducted by the Urban Institute examined the use of REAP-Flex authority in rural school districts. The study found that 80 percent of Rural Education districts that exercised REAP-Flex authority used the flexibility to maintain a stable level of effort for ongoing activities that had been affected by Federal and State budget cuts. Similarly, over 80 percent of REAP-Flex participants reported using the authority to target achievement outcomes, including 73 percent that have targeted math and 77 percent that have targeted reading.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The Rural Education program was reviewed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) during the 2006 rating cycle. The program received a rating of "Results Not Demonstrated." The PART review acknowledged the program's strengths in strategic planning and program management and noted that the program is the single Federal mechanism that addresses the disparity between what rural LEAs receive in State and Federal funding and what they need to support quality instruction.

The program received low scores for program results and accountability due to lack of student achievement data for the program's annual and long-term performance measures at the time of the initial review. The Department is currently processing student achievement data from the 2004-05 school year to establish a baseline, and these data will be available in January 2007. In addition, the preliminary review noted the need to evaluate the effectiveness of the RLIS program. In the fiscal year 2008 budget request, the Administration set aside \$100,000 for an evaluation, which would draw data from a nationally representative sample of eligible LEAs to provide information about how RLIS funds are targeted, the impact that these funds have on

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

student achievement in districts that receive them, and the types of improvement activities supported by RLIS funds in districts that fail to meet their State's definition of adequate yearly progress.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Supplemental education grants

(Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003, Section 105(f)(1)(B)(iii))

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): \$19,190¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$18,001	\$18,001	0

¹ The Act authorizes \$12,230 thousand for the Federated States of Micronesia and \$6,100 thousand for the Republic of the Marshall Islands for fiscal year 2005 and an equivalent amount, as adjusted for inflation (calculated as two thirds of the percentage change in the U.S. Gross Domestic Product Implicit Price Deflator, or 5 percent, whichever is less in any 1 year) for each of the succeeding fiscal years through 2023. The 2008 authorization is calculated based on inflation estimates as of February 6, 2006.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003 (P.L. 108-188) authorizes supplemental education grants to the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) and the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI). The Act eliminated the participation of the FSM and the RMI in most domestic formula grant programs funded by the Departments of Education, Health and Human Services (HHS), and Labor (DOL). As a replacement, beginning in fiscal year 2005, the Act authorizes supplemental education grants, appropriated to the Department of Education in an amount that is roughly equivalent to the total formula funds that these entities received in fiscal year 2004 under the Federal formula programs for which they are no longer eligible. These Supplemental Education grants augment the funds that the FSM and the RMI receive for general education assistance under their Compacts of Free Association with the U.S. Government.

The Act eliminated the participation of the FSM and the RMI in the following Department of Education programs: Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies; Career and Technical Education Grants under Title I of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006; Adult Basic and Literacy Education State Grants; Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunities Grants; and Federal Work-Study. However, they remain eligible for participation in other Department programs, including the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act State Grants and the Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants and Work Study programs under Part A, Subpart I of Title IV of the Higher Education Act and in ED, HHS, and DOL competitive programs. Also, the Act eliminated FSM and RMI participation under the Adult, Dislocated, and Youth Workforce Investment Act programs (DOL) and Head Start (HHS).

The Department of Education is required to transfer funds appropriated for Supplemental Education Grants to the Department of the Interior for disbursement to the RMI and the FSM not later than 60 days after the appropriation becomes available. Appropriations are to be used and monitored in accordance with an interagency agreement between the four cabinet agencies, and

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Supplemental education grants

in accordance with the “Fiscal Procedure Agreements” entered into by the FSM and the RMI with the U.S. Government. These procedures call for the funds to be used at the local school level for direct educational services focused on school readiness, early childhood education, elementary and secondary education, vocational training, adult and family literacy, and the transition from high school to postsecondary education and careers. They may not be used for construction or remodeling, the general operating costs of school systems, or teacher salaries (except the salaries of teachers who carry out programs supported by the grants).

The FSM and RMI may request technical assistance from ED, HHS, or DOL, on a reimbursement basis. The fiscal year 2006 appropriations act permits the FSM and the RMI to reserve up to 5 percent of their grants for administration and such technical assistance, and the 2007 continuing resolution continues this policy.

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	(1)
2004.....	(1)
2005.....	\$18,183
2006.....	18,001
2007.....	18,001

¹ This program was not authorized prior to fiscal year 2005.

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$18 million, the same as the fiscal year 2007 level, to maintain funding for Supplemental Education Grants to the RMI and FSM. The request would ensure the continuation of supplementary education services for residents of the RMI and the FSM.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Grant to Federated States of Micronesia	\$12,010	\$12,010	\$12,010
Grant to Republic of the Marshall Islands	5,991	5,991	5,991

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Supplemental Education Grants program was funded for the first time in fiscal year 2005. The Department has not established performance measures for this program because it is operated by the Department of the Interior.

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) recently completed a review of Federal assistance to the RMI and FSM under their Compacts of Free Association. The report documents both the

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Supplemental education grants

continuing need for improvement in the public education systems of the Freely Associated States and the difficulties in obtaining and reporting performance data for this program. The RMI, according to the report, is not able to measure progress towards its educational goals because the data the Republic collects are inadequate, inconsistent, and incomplete. Tests to measure achievement have not been administered in each year, and some of the tests are not aligned with the curriculum used in the RMI and, thus, are not adequate measures of student achievement. The FSM also lack consistent performance outcomes and measures; measures and outcomes have been established but constantly change, making it difficult to track progress. Both entities face continuing challenges in improving the quality of education due to a lack of qualified teachers, poor facilities, and a high absentee rate among students and teachers.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Comprehensive centers

(Education Technical Assistance Act of 2002, Title II, Section 203)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$56,256	\$56,256	0

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Education Technical Assistance Act authorizes support for not less than 20 comprehensive centers to provide training, technical assistance, and professional development in reading, mathematics, and technology, particularly to local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). By statute, the Department is required to establish at least one center in each of the 10 geographic regions served by the regional educational laboratories. Allocations for regional centers are to be determined on the basis of the number of school-aged children, the proportion of disadvantaged students in the various regions, the increased cost burdens of service delivery in sparsely populated areas, and the number of schools identified for improvement under Section 1116(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The Department provided initial grants for 20 new Comprehensive Centers from fiscal year 2005 funds, and a grant for 1 additional center from fiscal year 2006 funds to complete the system of 21 centers. The system includes 16 **regional centers** that work with the State educational agencies (SEAs) within their geographic regions to help them implement No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) school improvement measures and objectives. The regional centers provide technical assistance to SEAs to increase their capacity to assist districts and schools in meeting the key goals of NCLB. These goals call for, among other things, all students to be proficient in reading and math by the 2013-2014 school year; a highly qualified teacher in every classroom; teaching and instruction based on knowledge of what works; and greater parental choice in education.

In addition, instead of requiring each regional center to have in-depth knowledge of all aspects of school improvement – from instruction to teacher quality to assessment design – the Department funded five **content centers**, with one center specializing in each of the following key foci of NCLB: assessment and accountability; instruction; teacher quality; innovation and improvement; and high schools. Each content center is pulling together resources and expertise to provide analyses, information, and materials in its focus area for use by the network of regional centers, SEAs, and other clients.

Each center has developed a 5-year plan for carrying out authorized activities. The plan of each regional center addresses the needs of the SEAs in its region to implement NCLB or to meet the student achievement goals of NCLB. The content centers' plans address the priorities established by the Department and the States. Each center has an advisory board that advises

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Comprehensive centers

the center on: (1) allocation of resources; (2) strategies for monitoring and addressing the educational needs of the region, (or the needs of the regional centers in the case of the content centers); (3) maintaining a high standard of quality in the performance of its activities; and (4) carrying out the center's activities in a manner that promotes progress toward improving student academic achievement.

The statute requires that the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, a component under the Department's Institute of Education Sciences, provide for an ongoing independent evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers to determine the extent to which each center meets its objectives.

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	0
2004.....	0
2005.....	\$56,825 ¹
2006.....	56,256
2007.....	56,256

¹ The appropriation supported initial grants to 20 new Comprehensive Centers and costs associated with the close-out of the antecedent Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers.

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2008, the Administration requests \$56.3 million, the same as the 2007 level, to support the fourth year of the Comprehensive Centers program. The Administration's fiscal year 2008 request would continue the policy of supporting funding for a single program dedicated to providing comprehensive technical assistance to grantees under the ESEA.

The centers began providing technical assistance to SEAs in 2005-2006, after almost 4 years of State and local NCLB implementation. By then, SEAs had begun to focus more intensively on activities to enable school districts and schools to improve student achievement and meet annual State targets for adequate yearly progress. For example, SEAs are focusing more attention and resources on approaches for helping districts and schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring, and on providing academic supports for subgroups of students that need special help to meet achievement goals. SEAs are also facing increasing demands for technical assistance in many other areas, such as supporting improvements at the high-school level; improving or expanding teacher training, both as part of school improvement plans and to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified; and furthering local adoption of instructional methods that have been proven effective through scientifically based research.

The centers' activities are shaped by SEA and Department priorities. Early in the first operating year, all centers developed and populated web pages with resources and, in many cases, searchable databases and interactive data tools. They focused on the most pressing issues for

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Comprehensive centers

States, including assistance to prepare many States for two major ESEA hurdles – peer review of State standards and assessment systems required under ESEA Title I and submission of revised State plans for highly qualified teachers required under ESEA Title II. Other assistance provided by the centers in the first year included help with State decision-making on whether to pursue the “growth model” approach in assessing student achievement, briefing materials on assessments for students with limited English proficiency, tools and planning help in the areas of adolescent literacy and special education assessment, strategies for ensuring the presence of highly qualified teachers in high-poverty schools, and status reports on State support systems for local school improvement.

The 16 regional centers focus entirely on providing assistance to SEAs on the implementation of ESEA requirements and helping increase State capacity to assist districts and schools in meeting their student achievement goals. In addition to the work mentioned above, in the first year, almost all of the regional centers responded to SEA requests for help in creating or improving State capacity to effectively utilize multiple technical assistance resources and for assistance with professional development plans and strategies.

The five content centers provide, in their content area, in-depth knowledge, expertise, and analyses to the regional centers and the States served by those centers. In fiscal year 2005, each of the content centers began work to identify, organize, and translate existing key research knowledge pertaining to its focus.

For fiscal year 2008, the centers will focus a larger proportion of technical assistance on:

- Providing intensive assistance on school restructuring and systems of support, such as supplemental educational services (SES), and school and district improvement strategies and processes, including best practices in restructuring and working with schools in corrective action, and lessons learned from high- and low-performing schools and districts.
- Responding to the increasing demands for assistance in areas involving the assessment of special populations, including students with disabilities and limited English proficiency; in areas related to teacher quality, including recruitment and retention practices and policies, and helping States develop collaborative projects with institutions of higher education; and in areas related to high school reform, including reviewing key practices of high-performing high schools and providing information on strategies for easing middle-school students' transition to high school and on high-school curriculum and course requirements.

As part of the fiscal year 2008 request, \$2 million would be reserved to support the 4-year evaluation. The Department obligated approximately \$3 million from fiscal year 2006 funds to initiate the evaluation contract, and plans to provide another \$3 million increment from fiscal year 2007 funds.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Comprehensive centers

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Comprehensive centers			
Number of centers	21	21	21
Center awards	\$53,262	\$53,256	\$54,256
Average award	\$2,536	\$2,536	\$2,584
Evaluation	\$2,995	\$3,000	\$2,000

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

In response to deficiencies of the antecedent program identified by the PART in 2004, the Department placed strong emphasis on structuring the new centers around a performance-based framework that includes, among other things, annual performance measures that are designed to assess the effectiveness of the new centers in providing technical assistance to SEAs, LEAs, schools, and education service agencies.

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data. The performance measures, adapted from a set of common measures developed by the Department to help bring consistency to the assessment of program performance across technical assistance programs, are: (1) the percentage of products and services that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products and services, (2) the percentage of products and services that are deemed to be of high relevance to educational policy or practice by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners, and (3) the percentage of all products and services that are deemed to be of high usefulness to educational policy or practice by target audiences. The national evaluation will provide baseline data for these measures in February 2008.

Efficiency Measures

The Department is implementing a common measure of administrative efficiency to assess the Comprehensive Centers program and other technical assistance programs. The measure is the percentage of grant funds that the centers carry over for each year of operations. The antecedent program reported large percentages of carryover funds each year. As a result, the Department has made consistent financial monitoring a priority for this program. Excessive draw-downs or the lack of regular draw-downs may signal problems with project management and the efficient use of Federal funds, making it important that program staff closely monitor project expenditures. Monitoring project activities, including expenditures, and resolving problems with project management early will likely result in a smaller percentage of carryover funds each year.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Comprehensive centers

Data for the measure will be available each year in May, after Department staff have reviewed data for the previous 12-month budget cycle. For 2006, year 1 of the grant cycle for grantees under the new program, grantees carried over 40 percent of their grant funds. However, external factors contributed to the projects' high carryover amounts. Grantees had only 9 months for the 1st year of their grant cycle. Also, project starts were delayed by the negotiation of cooperative agreements with the Department. The Department intends to monitor grantee spending carefully in year 2 of the projects in order to help grantees reduce their carryover amounts and help the program meet its target for this efficiency measure.

Other Performance Information

As part of the Department's national evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers, initiated in 2006, the contractor will gather information to inform the measures through panel reviews conducted in 2007, 2008, and 2009. In addition to panel ratings of the quality, relevance, and usefulness of Center products and services, the evaluation will assess: (1) the extent to which the centers meet the objectives of their respective technical assistance plans and the educational needs of SEAs, and (2) whether the centers' assistance expands SEAs' capacity to provide technical assistance to help LEAs and schools meet ESEA requirements. The evaluation will examine the centers' responses to changing SEA technical assistance needs, SEAs' reliance on the centers compared to other technical assistance sources, the overall costs for SEAs in providing ESEA-related technical assistance, and the estimated dollar value of the centers' products and services to SEAs. The evaluation will include reviews of center documents, meetings and site visits with each center, and surveying center staff and SEA officials twice over the course of the study. Evaluation findings will be available in an interim report (2009) and a final report (2010), and the contractor may be asked to prepare several case studies to examine certain aspects of center-based technical assistance.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The antecedent Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers program received a PART rating of "Results Not Demonstrated." The PART assessment, conducted in the summer of 2004, acknowledged that the antecedent Centers succeeded in establishing a good customer base and offering services to school districts with high rates of poverty, but noted the lack of any national evaluation findings demonstrating that the program was providing effective technical assistance to those entities. Also, the PART noted that evaluation and customer service surveys were not of sufficient scope and quality to support specific program improvements.

The Department has completed its response to the initial PART recommendations, which called for the embedding of new common measures for technical assistance programs into the new program. Additional PART recommendations focus on implementation of the measures, including:

- Establishing long-term performance goals, targets, and time frames for the new measures. The Department plans to establish targets and time frames in 2008, after baseline data for the measures are available.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Comprehensive centers

- Collecting data on whether the centers provide technical assistance that is of high quality, relevant, and useful. The Department plans to collect data to assess the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the centers' services and products as part of the national evaluation. Panels will convene to review and rate about 40 products or services per center in each of 3 years (2007-2009), and data will be aggregated for the performance measures and also used for other evaluation purposes. Baseline data for the measures from the first panel rating will be available in February 2008.
- Implementing the new efficiency measure (described above) and continuing work to establish and implement at least one additional efficiency measure. The Department has not yet developed a second efficiency measure.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Improving Teacher Quality State Grants

State or Other Area	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate	Change from 2007 Estimate
Alabama	46,150,063	45,829,970	44,217,037	(1,612,933)
Alaska	13,751,559	13,751,801	13,259,275	(492,526)
Arizona	48,146,530	48,290,687	46,097,174	(2,193,513)
Arkansas	28,202,977	27,648,900	26,681,080	(967,820)
California	335,450,834	332,049,016	319,155,675	(12,893,341)
Colorado	32,311,959	32,178,301	31,000,374	(1,177,927)
Connecticut	26,178,855	26,611,255	25,775,323	(835,932)
Delaware	13,751,559	13,751,801	13,259,275	(492,526)
District of Columbia	13,751,559	13,751,801	13,259,275	(492,526)
Florida	134,652,749	131,244,351	126,300,576	(4,943,775)
Georgia	77,237,250	77,467,966	74,364,409	(3,103,557)
Hawaii	13,751,559	13,751,801	13,259,275	(492,526)
Idaho	13,751,559	13,751,801	13,259,275	(492,526)
Illinois	116,333,721	118,140,876	114,115,566	(4,025,310)
Indiana	47,998,159	49,337,332	47,527,602	(1,809,730)
Iowa	21,617,232	21,765,421	21,088,097	(677,324)
Kansas	22,208,802	22,366,342	21,651,391	(714,951)
Kentucky	44,227,881	44,029,566	42,645,880	(1,383,686)
Louisiana	64,349,542	63,910,379	61,989,874	(1,920,505)
Maine	13,751,559	13,751,801	13,259,275	(492,526)
Maryland	41,276,966	41,570,965	40,192,869	(1,378,096)
Massachusetts	50,504,870	50,896,516	49,395,595	(1,500,921)
Michigan	108,503,695	109,727,579	106,638,553	(3,089,026)
Minnesota	37,544,870	37,767,970	36,638,638	(1,129,332)
Mississippi	41,918,414	42,004,924	40,681,015	(1,323,909)
Missouri	49,119,202	49,685,180	47,956,648	(1,728,532)
Montana	13,751,559	13,751,801	13,259,275	(492,526)
Nebraska	14,028,502	14,028,744	13,536,218	(492,526)
Nevada	15,207,563	15,335,005	14,633,859	(701,146)
New Hampshire	13,751,559	13,751,801	13,259,275	(492,526)
New Jersey	64,456,697	64,085,609	62,074,654	(2,010,955)
New Mexico	23,006,672	22,446,582	21,699,816	(746,766)
New York	228,754,756	228,410,295	221,917,292	(6,493,003)
North Carolina	64,910,283	65,133,383	62,422,728	(2,710,655)
North Dakota	13,751,559	13,751,801	13,259,275	(492,526)
Ohio	103,564,208	104,966,457	101,701,176	(3,265,281)
Oklahoma	33,349,904	32,557,707	31,458,765	(1,098,942)
Oregon	28,259,227	28,000,448	26,994,814	(1,005,634)
Pennsylvania	112,879,535	113,509,594	110,195,979	(3,313,615)
Rhode Island	13,751,559	13,751,801	13,259,275	(492,526)
South Carolina	36,834,010	37,060,098	35,598,911	(1,461,187)
South Dakota	13,751,559	13,751,801	13,259,275	(492,526)
Tennessee	49,235,445	49,106,085	47,294,812	(1,811,273)
Texas	239,613,046	239,915,505	230,810,810	(9,104,695)
Utah	18,476,020	18,636,546	17,956,692	(679,854)
Vermont	13,751,559	13,751,801	13,259,275	(492,526)
Virginia	51,710,156	51,383,817	49,573,139	(1,810,678)
Washington	47,044,832	47,304,088	45,623,114	(1,680,974)
West Virginia	23,520,468	23,065,647	22,504,791	(560,856)
Wisconsin	44,988,136	46,506,015	45,032,437	(1,473,578)
Wyoming	13,751,559	13,751,801	13,259,275	(492,526)
American Samoa	3,416,101	3,416,167	3,280,526	(135,641)
Guam	5,057,259	5,057,340	4,894,894	(162,446)
Northern Mariana Islands	1,610,598	1,610,627	1,551,101	(59,526)
Puerto Rico	91,727,440	91,571,680	88,301,096	(3,270,584)
Virgin Islands	4,281,051	4,281,120	4,141,232	(139,888)
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	14,365,009	14,365,254	13,867,753	(497,501)
Other (non-State allocations)	14,437,194	14,437,441	13,937,440	(500,001)
Total	2,887,438,950	2,887,488,162	2,787,488,000	(100,000,163)

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Mathematics and Science Partnerships

State or Other Area	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate	Change from 2007 Estimate
Alabama	3,201,958	3,099,644	3,099,642	(2)
Alaska	906,246	906,067	906,067	0
Arizona	4,148,195	4,144,027	4,144,024	(3)
Arkansas	2,032,567	1,838,982	1,838,981	(1)
California	25,055,987	23,630,179	23,630,166	(13)
Colorado	1,867,339	1,819,761	1,819,760	(1)
Connecticut	1,084,703	1,244,662	1,244,661	(1)
Delaware	906,246	906,067	906,067	0
District of Columbia	906,246	906,067	906,067	0
Florida	9,896,545	8,620,560	8,620,555	(5)
Georgia	5,646,027	5,719,884	5,719,880	(4)
Hawaii	906,246	906,067	906,067	0
Idaho	906,246	906,067	906,067	0
Illinois	6,457,558	7,118,268	7,118,264	(4)
Indiana	2,509,881	2,997,837	2,997,835	(2)
Iowa	965,907	1,034,898	1,034,898	0
Kansas	1,074,102	1,144,956	1,144,955	(1)
Kentucky	2,671,971	2,608,056	2,608,055	(1)
Louisiana	4,025,349	3,893,317	3,893,315	(2)
Maine	906,246	906,067	906,067	0
Maryland	1,956,872	2,064,129	2,064,128	(1)
Massachusetts	2,187,932	2,335,119	2,335,118	(1)
Michigan	4,863,333	5,333,033	5,333,030	(3)
Minnesota	1,492,910	1,594,807	1,594,806	(1)
Mississippi	2,699,257	2,738,606	2,738,605	(1)
Missouri	2,836,676	3,062,823	3,062,821	(2)
Montana	906,246	906,067	906,067	0
Nebraska	906,246	906,067	906,067	0
Nevada	1,150,844	1,173,295	1,173,294	(1)
New Hampshire	906,246	906,067	906,067	0
New Jersey	3,001,498	2,859,845	2,859,844	(1)
New Mexico	1,654,301	1,455,736	1,455,735	(1)
New York	12,383,694	12,301,511	12,301,504	(7)
North Carolina	4,803,954	4,865,948	4,865,945	(3)
North Dakota	906,246	906,067	906,067	0
Ohio	5,008,969	5,558,392	5,558,389	(3)
Oklahoma	2,265,042	1,994,728	1,994,727	(1)
Oregon	1,804,918	1,711,843	1,711,843	0
Pennsylvania	5,319,659	5,582,239	5,582,236	(3)
Rhode Island	906,246	906,067	906,067	0
South Carolina	2,677,920	2,761,547	2,761,546	(1)
South Dakota	906,246	906,067	906,067	0
Tennessee	3,322,207	3,289,859	3,289,858	(1)
Texas	17,485,219	17,535,070	17,535,060	(10)
Utah	959,144	1,012,343	1,012,342	(1)
Vermont	906,246	906,067	906,067	0
Virginia	2,887,237	2,763,995	2,763,994	(1)
Washington	2,681,815	2,782,387	2,782,385	(2)
West Virginia	1,231,366	1,069,733	1,069,733	0
Wisconsin	1,868,056	2,438,622	2,438,621	(1)
Wyoming	906,246	906,067	906,067	0
American Samoa	906,246	906,067	906,067	0
Guam	906,246	906,067	906,067	0
Northern Mariana Islands	906,246	906,067	906,067	0
Puerto Rico	7,755,860	7,703,623	7,703,619	(4)
Virgin Islands	906,246	906,067	906,067	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0
Other (non-State allocations)	910,800	910,620	910,620	0
Total	182,160,000	182,124,090	182,124,000	(90)

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Educational Technology State Grants

State or Other Area	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate	Change from 2007 Estimate
Alabama	4,055,169	3,934,381	0	(3,934,381)
Alaska	1,317,349	1,321,279	0	(1,321,279)
Arizona	5,291,697	5,319,547	0	(5,319,547)
Arkansas	2,533,599	2,440,950	0	(2,440,950)
California	34,985,639	32,726,555	0	(32,726,555)
Colorado	2,615,388	2,485,837	0	(2,485,837)
Connecticut	1,931,777	2,251,742	0	(2,251,742)
Delaware	1,317,349	1,321,279	0	(1,321,279)
District of Columbia	1,317,349	1,321,279	0	(1,321,279)
Florida	13,388,493	11,789,225	0	(11,789,225)
Georgia	8,435,867	8,327,770	0	(8,327,770)
Hawaii	1,317,349	1,321,279	0	(1,321,279)
Idaho	1,317,349	1,321,279	0	(1,321,279)
Illinois	11,005,654	12,097,912	0	(12,097,912)
Indiana	3,764,831	4,687,829	0	(4,687,829)
Iowa	1,317,349	1,400,999	0	(1,400,999)
Kansas	1,640,101	1,725,667	0	(1,725,667)
Kentucky	3,741,758	3,703,981	0	(3,703,981)
Louisiana	5,738,189	5,570,575	0	(5,570,575)
Maine	1,317,349	1,321,279	0	(1,321,279)
Maryland	3,533,855	3,834,293	0	(3,834,293)
Massachusetts	3,947,378	4,256,738	0	(4,256,738)
Michigan	8,627,196	9,399,922	0	(9,399,922)
Minnesota	2,178,980	2,341,992	0	(2,341,992)
Mississippi	3,357,013	3,444,976	0	(3,444,976)
Missouri	3,777,856	4,124,901	0	(4,124,901)
Montana	1,317,349	1,321,279	0	(1,321,279)
Nebraska	1,317,349	1,321,279	0	(1,321,279)
Nevada	1,584,627	1,628,711	0	(1,628,711)
New Hampshire	1,317,349	1,321,279	0	(1,321,279)
New Jersey	5,269,264	4,999,953	0	(4,999,953)
New Mexico	2,296,764	1,999,290	0	(1,999,290)
New York	24,647,576	24,623,647	0	(24,623,647)
North Carolina	6,015,860	6,125,569	0	(6,125,569)
North Dakota	1,317,349	1,321,279	0	(1,321,279)
Ohio	8,399,849	9,175,673	0	(9,175,673)
Oklahoma	2,843,878	2,486,757	0	(2,486,757)
Oregon	2,672,152	2,445,088	0	(2,445,088)
Pennsylvania	9,884,288	10,571,077	0	(10,571,077)
Rhode Island	1,317,349	1,321,279	0	(1,321,279)
South Carolina	3,657,837	3,835,941	0	(3,835,941)
South Dakota	1,317,349	1,321,279	0	(1,321,279)
Tennessee	4,231,529	4,191,917	0	(4,191,917)
Texas	24,093,239	23,465,765	0	(23,465,765)
Utah	1,317,349	1,321,279	0	(1,321,279)
Vermont	1,317,349	1,321,279	0	(1,321,279)
Virginia	4,217,200	4,152,068	0	(4,152,068)
Washington	3,563,941	3,710,920	0	(3,710,920)
West Virginia	2,011,602	1,693,914	0	(1,693,914)
Wisconsin	3,100,465	4,127,477	0	(4,127,477)
Wyoming	1,317,349	1,321,279	0	(1,321,279)
American Samoa	340,444	370,333	0	(370,333)
Guam	412,448	330,241	0	(330,241)
Northern Mariana Islands	123,663	139,797	0	(139,797)
Puerto Rico	9,351,843	9,337,248	0	(9,337,248)
Virgin Islands	457,470	497,634	0	(497,634)
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	2,001,037	2,007,007	0	(2,007,007)
Other (non-State allocations)	5,445,000	5,461,244	0	(5,461,244)
Total	272,250,000	273,062,248	0	(273,062,248)

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

21st Century Community Learning Centers

State or Other Area	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate	Change from 2007 Estimate
Alabama	14,514,785	14,800,098	14,151,901	(648,197)
Alaska	4,807,715	4,807,782	4,807,782	0
Arizona	18,550,816	19,313,046	19,312,148	(898)
Arkansas	9,179,078	9,246,835	8,701,831	(545,004)
California	131,320,892	127,687,050	119,526,574	(8,160,476)
Colorado	9,051,108	9,545,307	8,958,708	(586,599)
Connecticut	7,655,794	7,050,368	8,064,749	1,014,381
Delaware	4,807,715	4,807,782	4,807,782	0
District of Columbia	4,807,715	4,807,782	4,807,782	0
Florida	45,717,592	48,863,923	43,355,680	(5,508,243)
Georgia	30,357,708	30,788,287	30,091,237	(697,050)
Hawaii	4,807,715	4,807,782	4,807,782	0
Idaho	4,807,715	4,807,782	4,807,782	0
Illinois	39,818,549	40,167,253	44,314,881	4,147,628
Indiana	12,780,055	13,740,342	16,770,390	3,030,048
Iowa	4,807,715	4,807,782	4,969,860	162,078
Kansas	5,789,094	5,985,822	6,155,088	169,266
Kentucky	14,013,589	13,656,262	13,288,260	(368,002)
Louisiana	20,853,669	20,942,651	20,190,162	(752,489)
Maine	4,807,715	4,807,782	4,807,782	0
Maryland	12,837,925	12,897,479	14,027,366	1,129,887
Massachusetts	16,586,960	14,406,712	15,255,054	848,342
Michigan	31,846,372	31,486,527	33,983,280	2,496,753
Minnesota	7,813,285	7,952,535	8,370,870	418,335
Mississippi	12,265,497	12,252,061	12,415,516	163,455
Missouri	14,555,690	13,789,891	14,784,181	994,290
Montana	4,807,715	4,807,782	4,807,782	0
Nebraska	4,807,715	4,807,782	4,807,782	0
Nevada	5,232,632	5,783,401	6,015,313	231,912
New Hampshire	4,807,715	4,807,782	4,807,782	0
New Jersey	19,629,057	19,231,104	17,804,542	(1,426,562)
New Mexico	8,071,240	8,382,484	7,206,905	(1,175,579)
New York	90,478,377	89,956,358	90,877,054	920,696
North Carolina	21,611,974	21,954,147	22,080,887	126,740
North Dakota	4,807,715	4,807,782	4,807,782	0
Ohio	28,369,683	30,631,412	32,978,696	2,347,284
Oklahoma	10,231,818	10,379,256	8,901,222	(1,478,034)
Oregon	9,101,736	9,752,468	8,721,063	(1,031,405)
Pennsylvania	35,462,939	36,074,489	38,185,715	2,111,226
Rhode Island	4,807,715	4,807,782	4,807,782	0
South Carolina	13,299,821	13,349,958	13,775,264	425,306
South Dakota	4,807,715	4,807,782	4,807,782	0
Tennessee	15,214,646	15,443,762	15,121,677	(322,085)
Texas	88,131,658	87,932,979	85,400,159	(2,532,820)
Utah	4,807,715	4,807,782	4,807,782	0
Vermont	4,807,715	4,807,782	4,807,782	0
Virginia	16,181,378	15,391,452	14,913,607	(477,845)
Washington	13,104,646	13,007,214	13,286,178	278,964
West Virginia	7,717,763	7,341,730	6,032,640	(1,309,090)
Wisconsin	11,884,168	11,315,685	14,889,615	3,573,930
Wyoming	4,807,715	4,807,782	4,807,782	0
American Samoa	678,569	684,747	688,408	3,661
Guam	605,108	829,573	613,882	(215,691)
Northern Mariana Islands	293,454	248,728	259,866	11,138
Puerto Rico	35,387,472	34,131,446	36,561,397	2,429,951
Virgin Islands	911,825	920,127	925,046	4,919
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	7,322,706	7,128,624	7,324,598	195,974
Other (non-State allocations)	9,811,662	9,811,799	9,811,800	1
Total	981,166,230	981,179,904	981,180,000	96

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

State Grants for Innovative Programs

State or Other Area	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate	Change from 2007 Estimate
Alabama	1,413,039	1,406,880	0	(1,406,880)
Alaska	491,535	492,446	0	(492,446)
Arizona	1,942,063	1,987,756	0	(1,987,756)
Arkansas	868,946	866,017	0	(866,017)
California	12,321,975	12,443,948	0	(12,443,948)
Colorado	1,486,267	1,490,785	0	(1,490,785)
Connecticut	1,107,413	1,106,757	0	(1,106,757)
Delaware	491,535	492,446	0	(492,446)
District of Columbia	491,535	492,446	0	(492,446)
Florida	5,153,553	5,230,827	0	(5,230,827)
Georgia	2,926,312	2,962,129	0	(2,962,129)
Hawaii	491,535	492,446	0	(492,446)
Idaho	491,535	492,446	0	(492,446)
Illinois	4,154,710	4,155,437	0	(4,155,437)
Indiana	2,070,162	2,079,540	0	(2,079,540)
Iowa	884,171	869,211	0	(869,211)
Kansas	875,519	862,631	0	(862,631)
Kentucky	1,262,857	1,260,187	0	(1,260,187)
Louisiana	1,488,319	1,463,698	0	(1,463,698)
Maine	491,535	492,446	0	(492,446)
Maryland	1,805,568	1,811,823	0	(1,811,823)
Massachusetts	1,891,042	1,882,478	0	(1,882,478)
Michigan	3,333,525	3,324,082	0	(3,324,082)
Minnesota	1,607,400	1,585,720	0	(1,585,720)
Mississippi	957,823	951,882	0	(951,882)
Missouri	1,792,901	1,778,018	0	(1,778,018)
Montana	491,535	492,446	0	(492,446)
Nebraska	553,082	546,706	0	(546,706)
Nevada	769,101	793,324	0	(793,324)
New Hampshire	491,535	492,446	0	(492,446)
New Jersey	2,786,658	2,802,711	0	(2,802,711)
New Mexico	635,206	629,819	0	(629,819)
New York	5,886,802	5,847,617	0	(5,847,617)
North Carolina	2,687,174	2,722,627	0	(2,722,627)
North Dakota	491,535	492,446	0	(492,446)
Ohio	3,626,562	3,596,140	0	(3,596,140)
Oklahoma	1,093,060	1,080,834	0	(1,080,834)
Oregon	1,108,383	1,107,550	0	(1,107,550)
Pennsylvania	3,748,157	3,710,357	0	(3,710,357)
Rhode Island	491,535	492,446	0	(492,446)
South Carolina	1,317,463	1,323,034	0	(1,323,034)
South Dakota	491,535	492,446	0	(492,446)
Tennessee	1,781,419	1,779,183	0	(1,779,183)
Texas	7,829,390	7,901,721	0	(7,901,721)
Utah	897,839	900,037	0	(900,037)
Vermont	491,535	492,446	0	(492,446)
Virginia	2,312,223	2,326,341	0	(2,326,341)
Washington	1,944,294	1,933,847	0	(1,933,847)
West Virginia	501,785	497,651	0	(497,651)
Wisconsin	1,716,099	1,695,752	0	(1,695,752)
Wyoming	491,535	492,446	0	(492,446)
American Samoa	131,372	131,616	0	(131,616)
Guam	282,267	282,790	0	(282,790)
Northern Mariana Islands	88,538	88,702	0	(88,702)
Puerto Rico	1,378,783	1,372,308	0	(1,372,308)
Virgin Islands	190,823	191,176	0	(191,176)
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0
Other (non-State allocations)	0	0	0	0
Total	99,000,000	99,183,447	0	(99,183,447)

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

State Assessments

State or Other Area	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate	Change from 2007 Estimate
Alabama	6,549,524	6,529,143	6,529,143	0
Alaska	3,615,588	3,612,161	3,612,161	0
Arizona	7,878,420	7,986,266	7,986,266	0
Arkansas	5,182,774	5,172,394	5,172,394	0
California	33,952,540	34,215,508	34,215,508	0
Colorado	6,733,470	6,739,617	6,739,617	0
Connecticut	5,781,798	5,776,288	5,776,288	0
Delaware	3,621,163	3,625,224	3,625,224	0
District of Columbia	3,331,278	3,331,555	3,331,555	0
Florida	15,945,616	16,121,473	16,121,473	0
Georgia	10,350,834	10,430,468	10,430,468	0
Hawaii	3,933,285	3,932,130	3,932,130	0
Idaho	4,195,554	4,193,074	4,193,074	0
Illinois	13,436,543	13,423,869	13,423,869	0
Indiana	8,200,202	8,216,504	8,216,504	0
Iowa	5,221,019	5,180,407	5,180,407	0
Kansas	5,199,285	5,163,900	5,163,900	0
Kentucky	6,172,269	6,161,165	6,161,165	0
Louisiana	6,738,627	6,671,670	6,671,670	0
Maine	3,953,588	3,932,931	3,932,931	0
Maryland	7,535,548	7,544,939	7,544,939	0
Massachusetts	7,750,257	7,722,176	7,722,176	0
Michigan	11,373,743	11,338,425	11,338,425	0
Minnesota	7,037,755	6,977,762	6,977,762	0
Mississippi	5,406,032	5,387,785	5,387,785	0
Missouri	7,503,730	7,460,138	7,460,138	0
Montana	3,691,662	3,673,794	3,673,794	0
Nebraska	4,389,330	4,371,405	4,371,405	0
Nevada	4,931,966	4,990,044	4,990,044	0
New Hampshire	4,032,787	4,024,918	4,024,918	0
New Jersey	10,000,027	10,030,570	10,030,570	0
New Mexico	4,595,624	4,579,895	4,579,895	0
New York	17,787,522	17,668,683	17,668,683	0
North Carolina	9,750,125	9,829,680	9,829,680	0
North Dakota	3,458,792	3,443,742	3,443,742	0
Ohio	12,109,848	12,020,877	12,020,877	0
Oklahoma	5,745,744	5,711,260	5,711,260	0
Oregon	5,784,234	5,778,277	5,778,277	0
Pennsylvania	12,415,292	12,307,391	12,307,391	0
Rhode Island	3,810,324	3,805,469	3,805,469	0
South Carolina	6,309,439	6,318,816	6,318,816	0
South Dakota	3,618,625	3,605,349	3,605,349	0
Tennessee	7,474,887	7,463,061	7,463,061	0
Texas	22,667,263	22,821,382	22,821,382	0
Utah	5,255,353	5,257,733	5,257,733	0
Vermont	3,461,068	3,449,059	3,449,059	0
Virginia	8,808,255	8,835,601	8,835,601	0
Washington	7,884,026	7,851,035	7,851,035	0
West Virginia	4,260,474	4,248,353	4,248,353	0
Wisconsin	7,310,804	7,253,775	7,253,775	0
Wyoming	3,382,612	3,370,439	3,370,439	0
American Samoa	379,140	379,140	379,140	0
Guam	814,624	814,624	814,624	0
Northern Mariana Islands	255,521	255,521	255,521	0
Puerto Rico	6,463,475	6,442,420	6,442,420	0
Virgin Islands	550,715	550,715	550,715	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	0
Other (non-State allocations)	7,563,200	11,629,778	11,630,000	222
Total	407,563,200	411,629,778	411,630,000	222

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Education for Homeless Children and Youth

State or Other Area	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate	Change from 2007 Estimate
Alabama	960,708	930,195	919,334	(10,861)
Alaska	159,595	161,523	163,705	2,182
Arizona	1,253,653	1,257,686	1,254,554	(3,132)
Arkansas	600,233	577,107	565,287	(11,820)
California	8,288,438	7,737,453	7,764,672	27,219
Colorado	619,609	587,720	581,975	(5,745)
Connecticut	457,656	532,373	523,901	(8,472)
Delaware	162,973	162,478	164,720	2,242
District of Columbia	238,947	218,135	220,800	2,665
Florida	3,171,863	2,787,296	2,816,467	29,171
Georgia	1,998,536	1,968,913	1,954,784	(14,129)
Hawaii	224,638	176,813	179,895	3,082
Idaho	204,685	197,136	198,205	1,069
Illinois	2,607,343	2,860,277	2,878,778	18,501
Indiana	891,921	1,108,331	1,089,436	(18,895)
Iowa	308,527	331,235	322,851	(8,384)
Kansas	388,554	407,995	399,846	(8,149)
Kentucky	886,458	875,722	863,230	(12,492)
Louisiana	1,359,433	1,317,036	1,311,591	(5,445)
Maine	214,161	206,387	206,503	116
Maryland	837,204	906,532	911,244	4,712
Massachusetts	935,172	1,006,409	990,997	(15,412)
Michigan	2,043,862	2,222,399	2,207,618	(14,781)
Minnesota	516,219	553,711	543,788	(9,923)
Mississippi	795,308	814,486	806,535	(7,951)
Missouri	895,065	975,240	960,408	(14,832)
Montana	191,161	177,497	180,597	3,100
Nebraska	240,853	242,425	239,256	(3,169)
Nevada	375,413	385,072	390,766	5,694
New Hampshire	154,678	165,267	167,261	1,994
New Jersey	1,248,337	1,182,126	1,156,617	(25,509)
New Mexico	544,126	472,687	468,174	(4,513)
New York	5,839,254	5,821,704	5,903,545	81,841
North Carolina	1,425,160	1,448,252	1,434,416	(13,836)
North Dakota	154,678	154,696	154,695	(1)
Ohio	1,989,267	2,169,380	2,142,358	(27,022)
Oklahoma	673,742	587,937	578,240	(9,697)
Oregon	633,056	578,086	566,537	(11,549)
Pennsylvania	2,341,678	2,499,292	2,480,616	(18,676)
Rhode Island	229,962	242,830	240,560	(2,270)
South Carolina	866,576	906,921	894,867	(12,054)
South Dakota	175,286	177,122	180,225	3,103
Tennessee	1,002,489	991,084	982,333	(8,751)
Texas	5,707,920	5,547,949	5,547,756	(193)
Utah	261,644	279,379	276,851	(2,528)
Vermont	154,678	154,696	154,695	(1)
Virginia	999,094	981,663	968,816	(12,847)
Washington	844,330	877,363	863,095	(14,268)
West Virginia	476,567	400,488	391,892	(8,596)
Wisconsin	734,528	975,849	967,258	(8,591)
Wyoming	154,678	154,696	154,695	(1)
American Samoa	15,790	17,127	17,127	0
Guam	19,129	15,272	15,272	0
Northern Mariana Islands	5,735	6,465	6,465	0
Puerto Rico	2,215,543	2,207,581	2,375,097	167,516
Virgin Islands	21,217	23,014	23,014	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	618,710	618,783	618,780	(3)
Other (non-State allocations)	535,000	535,000	535,000	0
Total	61,871,040	61,878,291	61,878,000	(291)

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural and Low-Income Schools Program

State or Other Area	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate	Change from 2007 Estimate
Alabama	5,347,434	5,347,434	5,345,289	(2,145)
Alaska	0	0	0	0
Arizona	1,132,503	1,132,503	1,132,049	(454)
Arkansas	3,775,731	3,775,731	3,774,216	(1,515)
California	1,177,127	1,177,127	1,176,655	(472)
Colorado	350,040	350,040	349,900	(140)
Connecticut	0	0	0	0
Delaware	100,853	100,853	100,813	(40)
District of Columbia	0	0	0	0
Florida	3,688,853	3,688,853	3,687,373	(1,480)
Georgia	7,401,652	7,401,652	7,398,682	(2,970)
Hawaii	0	0	0	0
Idaho	299,745	299,745	299,625	(120)
Illinois	631,134	631,134	630,881	(253)
Indiana	89,898	89,898	89,862	(36)
Iowa	0	0	0	0
Kansas	114,037	114,037	113,991	(46)
Kentucky	5,763,913	5,763,913	5,761,601	(2,312)
Louisiana	5,043,111	5,043,111	5,041,088	(2,023)
Maine	2,062,052	2,062,052	2,061,225	(827)
Maryland	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	63,786	63,786	63,760	(26)
Michigan	711,575	711,575	711,290	(285)
Minnesota	67,775	67,775	67,748	(27)
Mississippi	6,662,404	6,662,404	6,659,731	(2,673)
Missouri	2,222,057	2,222,057	2,221,166	(891)
Montana	392,216	392,216	392,059	(157)
Nebraska	83,753	83,753	83,719	(34)
Nevada	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	783,628	783,628	783,314	(314)
New Jersey	21,013	21,013	21,005	(8)
New Mexico	1,818,450	1,818,450	1,817,721	(729)
New York	1,569,394	1,569,394	1,568,764	(630)
North Carolina	4,696,809	4,696,809	4,694,925	(1,884)
North Dakota	46,548	46,548	46,529	(19)
Ohio	1,195,563	1,195,563	1,195,083	(480)
Oklahoma	4,462,124	4,462,124	4,460,334	(1,790)
Oregon	958,720	958,720	958,335	(385)
Pennsylvania	435,291	435,291	435,116	(175)
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	3,289,065	3,289,065	3,287,746	(1,319)
South Dakota	45,883	45,883	45,865	(18)
Tennessee	3,540,779	3,540,779	3,539,359	(1,420)
Texas	7,286,809	7,286,809	7,283,885	(2,924)
Utah	0	0	0	0
Vermont	0	0	0	0
Virginia	1,506,250	1,506,250	1,505,646	(604)
Washington	749,477	749,477	749,176	(301)
West Virginia	4,001,038	4,001,038	3,999,433	(1,605)
Wisconsin	25,802	25,802	25,792	(10)
Wyoming	0	0	0	0
American Samoa	80,054	80,054	80,022	(32)
Guam	172,006	172,006	171,937	(69)
Northern Mariana Islands	53,952	53,952	53,930	(22)
Puerto Rico	0	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	116,282	116,282	116,235	(47)
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	422,294	422,294	422,125	(169)
Other (non-State allocations)	0	0	0	0
Total	84,458,880	84,458,880	84,425,000	(33,880)

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Small, Rural School Achievement Program

State or Other Area	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate	Change from 2007 Estimate
Alabama	0	0	0	0
Alaska	153,581	153,460	153,521	61
Arizona	2,106,894	2,105,230	2,106,074	844
Arkansas	1,160,498	1,159,581	1,160,046	465
California	5,552,549	5,548,164	5,550,387	2,223
Colorado	1,985,434	1,983,866	1,984,661	795
Connecticut	1,106,166	1,105,292	1,105,735	443
Delaware	0	0	0	0
District of Columbia	0	0	0	0
Florida	0	0	0	0
Georgia	24,625	24,606	24,615	9
Hawaii	0	0	0	0
Idaho	898,290	897,581	897,940	359
Illinois	5,891,958	5,887,305	5,889,664	2,359
Indiana	235,603	235,417	235,511	94
Iowa	4,527,579	4,524,003	4,525,816	1,813
Kansas	3,822,084	3,819,065	3,820,596	1,531
Kentucky	172,026	171,890	171,959	69
Louisiana	57,804	57,758	57,781	23
Maine	1,694,264	1,692,926	1,693,604	678
Maryland	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	1,606,715	1,605,446	1,606,090	644
Michigan	2,792,190	2,789,985	2,791,103	1,118
Minnesota	3,020,931	3,018,545	3,019,755	1,210
Mississippi	18,524	18,509	18,517	8
Missouri	5,056,422	5,052,428	5,054,454	2,026
Montana	4,986,635	4,982,697	4,984,694	1,997
Nebraska	4,012,252	4,009,083	4,010,690	1,607
Nevada	53,197	53,155	53,176	21
New Hampshire	1,112,059	1,111,181	1,111,626	445
New Jersey	2,082,453	2,080,808	2,081,642	834
New Mexico	408,317	407,995	408,158	163
New York	1,877,782	1,876,299	1,877,051	752
North Carolina	792,216	791,590	791,908	318
North Dakota	625,949	625,455	625,705	250
Ohio	2,320,680	2,318,847	2,319,777	930
Oklahoma	7,005,910	7,000,377	7,003,183	2,806
Oregon	1,438,422	1,437,286	1,437,862	576
Pennsylvania	296,464	296,230	296,349	119
Rhode Island	66,290	66,238	66,264	26
South Carolina	0	0	0	0
South Dakota	905,584	904,869	905,231	362
Tennessee	143,661	143,548	143,605	57
Texas	8,471,009	8,464,319	8,467,711	3,392
Utah	234,622	234,437	234,531	94
Vermont	0	0	0	0
Virginia	44,752	44,717	44,735	18
Washington	2,049,295	2,047,676	2,048,497	821
West Virginia	0	0	0	0
Wisconsin	3,199,176	3,196,649	3,197,931	1,282
Wyoming	10,109	10,101	10,105	4
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)	437,909	437,561	437,740	179
Total	84,458,880	84,392,175	84,426,000	33,825