

Department of Education
EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED
Fiscal Year 2010 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language	A-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes	A-3
Amounts Available for Obligation	A-5
Obligations by Object Classification	A-6
Summary of Changes	A-7
Authorizing Legislation	A-9
Appropriations History	A-11
Significant Items in FY 2009 Appropriations Reports	A-12
Summary of Request.....	A-14
Activities:	
Grants to local educational agencies	A-18
School improvement grants	A-39
Title I early childhood grants	A-47
Early learning challenge fund	A-50
Early reading first	A-55
Striving readers	A-63
Even Start	A-72
Literacy through school libraries	A-79
State agency programs:	
Migrant	A-85
Neglected and delinquent.....	A-92
Evaluation	A-99
Special programs for migrant students	A-102
High school graduation initiative	A-111
State tables.....	A-117

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

For carrying out title I and subpart 1 of part D of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 ("ESEA") and section 418A of the Higher Education Act of 1965, [\$15,760,086,000] \$16,431,632,000, of which [\$4,739,881,000] \$5,008,427,000 shall become available on July 1, [2009]2010, and shall remain available through September 30, [2010]2011, and of which \$10,841,176,000 shall become available on October 1, [2009]2010, and shall remain available through September 30, [2010]2011, for academic year [2009-2010]2010-2011:

¹ *Provided*, That [\$6,597,946,000] \$5,097,946,000 shall be for basic grants under section 1124 of the ESEA:² *Provided further*, That up to \$4,000,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary of Education on October 1, [2008]2009, to obtain annually updated local educational-agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census:³ *Provided further*, That \$1,365,031,000 shall be for concentration grants under section 1124A of the ESEA:⁴ *Provided further*, That \$3,264,712,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA:⁵ *Provided further*, That \$3,264,712,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A of the ESEA:⁶ *Provided further*, That \$9,167,000 shall be to carry out sections 1501 and 1503 of the ESEA:⁷ *Provided further*, That \$300,000,000 shall be for subpart 1 of part D of title V of the ESEA for the early learning challenge fund:⁸ *Provided further*, That \$1,545,633,000 shall be available for school improvement grants under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, of which up to \$30,000,000 shall be for competitive awards to local educational agencies located in counties in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas that were designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency as counties eligible for Individual Assistance due to damage caused by Hurricanes Katrina, Ike, or Gustav (and such awards shall be used to improve education in areas affected by the hurricanes, including for such activities as replacing instructional materials and equipment; paying teacher incentives; constructing, modernizing, or renovating school buildings; beginning or expanding Advanced Placement or other rigorous courses; supporting the expansion of charter schools; and supporting after-school or extended

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

learning time activities);⁹ and of which the remainder of such funds shall be allocated by the Secretary through the formula described in section 1003(g)(2), and each State educational agency shall ensure that 40 percent of its allocation under such formula is spent on school improvement activities in its middle and high schools, unless the State educational agency determines that all middle and high schools identified for school improvement can be served with a lesser amount.¹⁰ Provided further, That the ESEA title I, part A funds awarded to local educational agencies under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 for fiscal year 2009 shall not be considered for the purpose of calculating hold-harmless amounts under subsections 1122(c) and 1125A(g)(3) in making allocations under title I, part A for fiscal year 2010 and succeeding years.¹¹ (*Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2009.*)

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>¹ ... of which [\$4,739,881,000] <u>\$5,008,427,000</u> shall become available on July 1, [2009]<u>2010</u>, and shall remain available through September 30, [2010]<u>2011</u>, and of which \$10,841,176,000 shall become available on October 1, [2009]<u>2010</u>, and shall remain available through September 30, [2010]<u>2011</u>, for academic year [2009-2010]<u>2010-2011</u>:</p>	<p>This language provides for funds to be appropriated on a forward-funded basis for the Title I Basic Grants, Concentration Grants, Targeted Grants, Education Finance Incentive Grants, School Improvement Grants, Title I Early Childhood Grants, State Agency Migrant and Neglected and Delinquent, and Striving Readers programs. The language also provides that a portion of the funds is available in an advance appropriation that becomes available for obligation on October 1 of the following fiscal year.</p>
<p>² <i>Provided</i>, That [\$6,597,946,000] <u>\$5,097,946,000</u> shall be for basic grants under section 1124 of the ESEA:</p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Basic Grants.</p>
<p>³ <i>Provided further</i>, That up to \$4,000,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary of Education on October 1, [2008]<u>2009</u>, to obtain annually updated local educational-agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census:</p>	<p>This language makes available, on a current-funded basis, \$4 million from Basic Grant funds to support continued work by the Census Bureau to update LEA-level poverty data.</p>
<p>⁴ <i>Provided further</i>, That \$1,365,031,000 shall be for concentration grants under section 1124A:</p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Concentration Grants.</p>
<p>⁵ <i>Provided further</i>, That \$3,264,712,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA:</p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Targeted Grants.</p>
<p>⁶ <i>Provided further</i>, That \$3,264,712,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A of the ESEA:</p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Education Finance Incentive Grants.</p>
<p>⁷ <i>Provided further</i>, That \$9,167,000 shall be to carry out sections 1501 and 1503 of the ESEA:</p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Evaluation.</p>
<p>⁸ <i>Provided further</i>, That <u>\$300,000,000 shall be for subpart 1 of part D of title V of the ESEA for the early learning challenge fund:</u></p>	<p>This language earmarks funds for the new Early Learning Challenge Fund program.</p>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>⁹ <u>Provided further, That \$1,545,633,000 shall be available for school improvement grants under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, of which up to \$30,000,000 shall be for competitive awards to local educational agencies located in counties in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas that were designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency as counties eligible for Individual Assistance due to damage caused by Hurricanes Katrina, Ike, or Gustav (and such awards shall be used to improve education in areas affected by the hurricanes, including for such activities as replacing instructional materials and equipment; paying teacher incentives; constructing, modernizing, or renovating school buildings; beginning or expanding Advanced Placement or other rigorous courses; supporting the expansion of charter schools; and supporting after-school or extended learning time activities);</u></p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for School Improvement Grants and specifies that \$30 million of these funds are to be distributed on a competitive basis to local educational agencies that were affected by Hurricanes Katrina, Ike, or Gustav in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas. The language also specifies the uses of funds for those competitive grants.</p>
<p>¹⁰ <u>...and of which the remainder of such funds shall be allocated by the Secretary through the formula described in section 1003(g)(2), and each State educational agency shall ensure that 40 percent of its allocation under such formula is spent on school improvement activities in its middle and high schools, unless the State educational agency determines that all middle and high schools identified for school improvement can be served with a lesser amount;</u></p>	<p>This language specifies that States receiving School Improvement Grants funds must spend 40 percent of their allocations on school improvement activities in middle and high schools in that State, unless the State educational agency determines that all middle and high schools can be served with a lesser amount.</p>
<p>¹¹ <u>Provided further, That the title I, part A funds awarded to local educational agencies under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 for fiscal year 2009 shall not be considered for the purpose of calculating hold-harmless amounts in making allocations under subsections 1122(c) and 1125A(g)(3) under title I, part A for fiscal year 2010 and succeeding years.</u></p>	<p>This language specifies that the funds that local education agencies were awarded for fiscal year 2009 under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act will not be used when calculating recipients' hold-harmless amounts for fiscal year 2010 or for any other future years.</p>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

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

	2008	2009	2010
Discretionary authority:			
Annual appropriation.....	\$15,755,083	\$15,760,086	\$16,431,132
Across-the-board reduction	<u>-265,607</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, appropriation.....	15,489,476	15,760,086	16,431,132
Recovery Act supplemental (PL 11-5).....	0	13,000,000	0
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	-7,934,756	-10,841,176	-10,841,176
Advance from prior year	<u>7,383,301</u>	<u>7,934,756</u>	<u>10,841,176</u>
Subtotal, budget authority	14,938,021	25,853,666	16,431,132
Unobligated balance, start of year	265,377	153,578	0
Recovery Act, unobligated balance, start of year	0	0	3,000,000
Recovery of prior-year obligations	1,114	0	0
Unobligated balance, expiring.....	-462	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year	-153,578	0	0
Recovery Act unobligated balance, end of year	<u>0</u>	<u>-3,000,000</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, direct obligations	15,050,472	13,007,244	16,431,132
Subtotal, Recovery Act direct obligations	<u>0</u>	<u>10,000,000</u>	<u>3,000,000</u>
Total, direct obligations	15,050,472	23,077,244	19,431,132

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Obligations by Object Classification
(\$000s)

	2008	2009	2010
Travel and transportation of persons	\$3	0	0
Printing and reproduction.....	\$2,504	\$2,750	\$3,000
Other contractual services and supplies:			
Advisory and assistance services	6,116	2,297	1,284
Peer review	1,331	1,876	2,107
Other services.....	38,451	38,124	42,893
Purchases of good and services from other government accounts	0	4,000	4,000
Operation and maintenance of equipment	<u>64</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>85</u>
Subtotal, other contractual services	48,470	46,372	53,369
Grants, subsidies, and contributions	15,001,992	19,458,122	16,377,763
Grants, subsidies, and contributions, Recovery Act.....	0	10,000,000	3,000,000
Interest and dividends.....	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations.....	15,050,471	23,007,244	19,431,222

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Changes
(\$000s)

2009	\$15,760,086
2009 Recovery Act (non-add)	(13,000,000)
2010	<u>16,431,132</u>
Net change.....	+671,046

	<u>2009 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
Increases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
Increase funding for School Improvement Grants to provide additional funding for identifying and implementing effective strategies for turning around low-performing schools and making sure that States and LEAs have the resources needed to meet the ambitious proficiency goals set by the ESEA. Of these funds, States would be required to use 40 percent of the funds they receive for school improvement activities in middle and high schools. In addition, \$30 million would be distributed on a competitive basis to local educational agencies that were affected by Hurricanes Katrina, Ike, or Gustav in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas.	\$545,633	+\$1,000,000
Initial funding for the Title I Early Childhood Grants to provide financial incentives for LEAs to invest Title I funds received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) in early childhood education.	0	+500,000
Initial funding for the Early Learning Challenge Fund to improve the quality of publicly funded early learning programs.	0	+300,000
Increase funding for Early Reading First to expand support for programs that prepare children to learn to read when they enter elementary school.	112,549	+50,000

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Changes (\$000s)

	<u>2009 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
Increase funding for Striving Readers to make additional grants for the development, implementation, and evaluation of reading interventions for middle- and high-school students reading significantly below grade level and to expand the program by making grants to improve the reading comprehension of students in low-income elementary schools.	\$35,371	+335,000
Increase funding for Special Programs for Migrant Students to expand the number of new High School Equivalency (HEP) and College Assistance Migrant (CAMP) projects and increase the number of migrant individuals obtaining a high school equivalency certificate or completing their first year of postsecondary education	\$34,168	+\$2,500
Initial funding for the High School Graduation Initiative to improve high school graduation rates in schools that have a low rate.	0	<u>+50,000</u>
Subtotal, increases		+2,237,500
Decreases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
Decrease funding for Basic Grants to LEAs to make available resources for Title I School Improvement Grants and Early Childhood Grants. Much of the historic increase provided by the 2009 regular appropriation and the ARRA will still be available to LEAs during the 2010-1011 school year.	\$6,597,946	-\$1,500,000
Eliminate funding for Even Start to target funds to other early childhood programs that have a record of effectiveness or show high promise.	66,454	<u>-66,454</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-1,566,454
Net change		+671,046

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

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

Activity	2009 Authorized	2009 Estimate	2010 Authorized	2010 Request
Grants to LEAs (ESEA-1-A):				
LEA grants formulas:	0 ¹		0 ¹	
Basic grants (Section 1124)	(2)	\$6,597,946	(2)	\$5,097,946
Concentration grants (Section 1124A)	(2)	1,365,031	(2)	1,365,031
Targeted grants (Section 1125)	(2)	3,264,712	(2)	3,264,712
Education finance incentive grants (ESEA I-A-1125A)	0 ¹	3,264,712	0 ¹	3,264,712
School improvement grants (ESEA I-1003(g))	0 ¹	545,633	0 ¹	1,545,633
Title I early childhood grants (ESEA I-E-1502)	0 ³	0	0 ³	500,000
Early learning challenge fund (ESEA V-D-1)	0 ⁴	0	0 ⁴	300,000
Early reading first (ESEA I-B-2)	0 ¹	112,549	0 ¹	162,549
Striving readers (ESEA I-E-1502)	0 ¹	35,371	0 ¹	370,371
Even Start (ESEA I-B-3)	0 ⁵	66,454	0 ⁵	0
Literacy through school libraries (ESEA I-B-4)	0 ¹	19,145	0 ¹	19,145
State agency programs:				
Migrant (ESEA I-C)	0 ¹	394,771	0 ¹	394,771
Neglected and delinquent (ESEA I-D)	0 ¹	50,927	0 ¹	50,927
Evaluation (ESEA I-E-1501 and 1503)	0 ¹	9,167	0 ¹	9,167

A-9

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Authorizing Legislation - continued
(\$000s)

Activity	2009 Authorized	2009 Estimate	2010 Authorized	2010 Request
Special programs for migrant students (<i>HEA IV-A-418A</i>)	Indefinite	\$34,168	Indefinite	\$36,668
High school graduation initiative (<i>ESEA 1-H</i>)	<u>0⁶</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0⁶</u>	<u>50,000</u>
Total appropriation		15,760,086		16,401,132
Portion of request subject to reauthorization				16,394,464

¹ The program is authorized in fiscal year 2009 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in fiscal year 2010 through appropriations language.

² Of the total funds appropriated for Grants to LEAs, an amount equal to the fiscal year 2001 appropriation of \$7,397,690 thousand is to be distributed through the Basic Grants formula. An amount equal to the fiscal year 2001 appropriation of \$1,365,031 thousand is to be distributed through the Concentration Grants formula. Amounts appropriated in excess of the fiscal year 2001 appropriation are to be distributed through the Targeted Grants formula.

³ The GEPA extension for the ESEA Title I Demonstration authority, under which this initiative would be funded, expired September 30, 2008. The initiative would be funded in fiscal year 2010 through appropriations language.

⁴ The GEPA extension for ESEA Title V, Part D, Subpart 1, Fund for the Improvement of Education/Programs of National Significance authority, under which this activity would be funded, expired September 30, 2008. The program would be funded in fiscal year 2010 through appropriations language.

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

⁶ The GEPA extension for this program expired September 30, 2008. The program would be funded in fiscal year 2010 through appropriations language.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriations History (\$000s)

	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2001	\$9,149,500	\$8,816,986	\$8,986,800	\$9,532,621
(2001 Advance for 2002)	(6,204,763)	(6,204,763)	(6,223,342)	(6,758,300)
2002	11,032,621	12,571,400	11,926,400	12,346,900
(2002 Advance for 2003)	0	(6,758,300)	(6,953,300)	(7,383,301)
2003	13,388,330	12,936,900	18,178,400	13,774,039
(2003 Advance for 2004)	(7,383,301)	(6,883,301)	(8,627,301)	(9,027,301)
2003 Amended	0	0	0	2,244,000
(2003 Amended Advance for 2004)	0	0	0	(-2,444,000)
2003 Supplemental	0	0	0	4,353
2004	14,184,000	14,507,000	14,107,356	14,446,343
(2004 Advance for 2005)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)
2005	15,205,168	15,515,735	15,500,684	14,843,974
(2005 Advance for 2006)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)
2006	16,431,473	14,728,735	14,532,785	14,481,161
(2006 Advance for 2007)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)
2007	16,469,541	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	14,725,593 ¹
(2007 Advance for 2008)	(7,383,301)			(7,383,301) ¹
2008	16,689,090	15,969,818	15,867,778	15,489,476
(2008 Advance for 2009)	(7,383,301)	(8,136,218)	(8,867,301)	(7,934,756)
2009	16,917,059	15,788,285 ²	15,735,884 ²	15,760,086
(2009 Advance for 2010)	(7,934,756)	(10,841,176)	(8,893,756)	(10,841,176)
Recovery Act Supplemental (PL 111-5)	0	13,000,000	12,400,000	13,000,000
2010	16,431,632			
(2010 Advance for 2011)	(10,841,176)			

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

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Significant Items in FY 2009 Appropriations Reports

Grants to Local Educational Agencies

Senate: States are required to reserve 4 percent of their allocation under this program for school improvement activities, unless such action would require a State to reduce the grant award of a local educational agency to an amount below the preceding year. States must distribute 95 percent of these reserved funds to LEAs for schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. The Committee intends for States to utilize these funds along with those available under the School Improvement Grants program to make competitive awards to school districts that are of sufficient size and scope, and of a multi-year duration, so that schools may undertake sustainable, scientifically based research reform activities that have a positive impact on improving instructional practices in the classroom.

The Committee was disappointed by the findings of a February 2008 Government Accountability Office [GAO] report, which was requested by the Committee, showing that some States did not fulfill No Child Left Behind Act [NCLBA] requirements for allocating or tracking the 4 percent funds, and that the Education Department failed to monitor States' compliance. The Committee requests an update on the Department's plans to improve its monitoring practices in the fiscal year 2010 budget justification.

Response: The authorizing statute gives States considerable flexibility in allocating and using school improvement funds reserved under section 1003(a) of the the ESEA (the 4-percent reservation). However, the Department is using the application process for the section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants program to require States to describe how they will combine funding from the two school improvement authorities to implement specific improvement strategies, such as building capacity to support school improvement at the local level, using research-based interventions to address academic achievement problems, and creating partnerships to deliver technical assistance and provide professional development.

In addition, the Department is requiring States to report annually on the amount of section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funding allocated to each participating LEA and school, the academic achievement of students in schools receiving program funds or technical assistance, whether schools receiving program funds or technical assistance make AYP or exit improvement status, and data on which improvement strategies contribute to improved performance by students and schools. The Department collected baseline data as part of the 2007-2008 Consolidated State Performance Report, the results of which will be available in calendar year 2009.

Finally, for the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 State Title I monitoring cycle, the Department expanded its monitoring of the statewide systems of support and school improvement. This monitoring is conducted with State and school district

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Significant Items in FY 2009 Appropriations Reports

Grants to Local Educational Agencies- continued

staff and, for schools in corrective action and restructuring, with the building principals and school support staff. Areas covered by the expanded monitoring include how States determine which LEAs and schools receive assistance, State efforts to evaluate and support local improvement plans, and the qualifications of school support staff.

School Improvement Grants

Senate: The Committee requests that the Department assist States in encouraging LEAs to use their school improvement funds only on those programs that are proven to be effective in rigorous research.

Response: The application process developed by the Department for the School Improvement Grants program requires States to include research-based interventions in their strategies and plans for using these funds. However, it must be acknowledged that that research base on effective school improvement strategies is limited and, for this reason, the Department also is emphasizing the collection of data (through the annual Consolidated State Performance Report process) on the use of School Improvement Funds and associated outcomes in order to identify effective interventions for broader dissemination to States and LEAs seeking such assistance.

House: The Committee expects that the increased funding be used to support locally determined scientifically based reading instruction for low-income, low-performing students, who are most in need of assistance with reading.

Response: States and LEAs have considerable flexibility in the use of School Improvement Grant funding, and are able to use funds to implement locally determined reading improvement strategies in the context of their overall school improvement plans.

Early Reading First

Conference: The Department is directed to strengthen professional development partnerships for early childhood educators through grants awarded under Early Reading First.

House: The Committee expects the Department to strengthen professional development partnerships for early childhood educators through grants awarded under Early Reading First.

Response: The Department will emphasize professional development in all meetings and conferences with grantees.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2010 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST

(in thousands of dollars)						
Office, Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	2008	2009	2010	Change from	
		Appropriation	Appropriation	President's Budget	2009 Appropriation	Percent
Education for the Disadvantaged						
1. Grants to local educational agencies (ESEA I-A):						
(a) LEA grants formulas:						
(1) Basic grants (section 1124)						
Annual appropriation	D	5,964,119	3,651,225	2,151,225	(1,500,000)	-41.1%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	633,827	2,946,721	2,946,721	0	0.0%
Subtotal		6,597,946	6,597,946	5,097,946	(1,500,000)	-22.7%
(2) Concentration grants (section 1124A)						
Annual appropriation	D	0	0	0	0	---
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	1,365,031	1,365,031	1,365,031	0	0.0%
Subtotal		1,365,031	1,365,031	1,365,031	0	0.0%
(3) Targeted grants (section 1125)						
Annual appropriation	D	0	0	0	0	---
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	2,967,949	3,264,712	3,264,712	0	0.0%
Subtotal		2,967,949	3,264,712	3,264,712	0	0.0%
(4) Education finance incentive grants formula (section 1125A)						
Annual appropriation	D	0	0	0	0	---
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	2,967,949	3,264,712	3,264,712	0	0.0%
Subtotal		2,967,949	3,264,712	3,264,712	0	0.0%
Subtotal, Grants to LEAs						
Annual appropriation	D	13,898,875	14,492,401	12,992,401	(1,500,000)	-10.4%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	5,964,119	3,651,225	2,151,225	(1,500,000)	-41.1%
	D	7,934,756	10,841,176	10,841,176	0	0.0%
2. School improvement grants (ESEA section 1003(g))						
(a) School improvement State grants	D	491,265	545,633	1,515,633	970,000	177.8%
(b) Gulf Coast recovery grants	D	0	0	30,000	30,000	---
Subtotal, School improvement grants		491,265	545,633	1,545,633	1,000,000	183.3%
3. Title I early childhood grants (ESEA I-E, section 1502)						
	D	0	0	500,000	500,000	---
4. Early learning challenge fund (ESEA V-D, subpart 1)						
	D	0	0	300,000	300,000	---
5. Reading :						
(a) Early reading first (ESEA I-B-2)	D	112,549	112,549	162,549	50,000	44.4%
(b) Striving readers (ESEA I-E, section 1502)	D	35,371	35,371	370,371	335,000	947.1%
(c) Reading first State grants (ESEA I-B-1)	D	393,012	0	0	0	---
(d) Even start (ESEA I-B-3)	D	66,454	66,454	0	(66,454)	-100.0%
(e) Literacy through school libraries (ESEA I-B-4)	D	19,145	19,145	19,145	0	0.0%
Subtotal, Reading		626,531	233,519	552,065	318,546	136.4%

NOTES: Category Codes are as follows: D = discretionary program; M = mandatory program.
FY 2008 detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2010 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST

(in thousands of dollars)						
Office, Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	2008 Appropriation	2009 Appropriation	2010 President's Budget	Change from 2009 Appropriation	
					Amount	Percent
Education for the Disadvantaged (continued)						
6. State agency programs:						
(a) Migrant (ESEA I-C)	D	379,771	394,771	394,771	0	0.0%
(b) Neglected and delinquent (ESEA I-D)	D	48,927	50,427	50,427	0	0.0%
Subtotal		428,698	445,198	445,198	0	0.0%
7. Comprehensive school reform (ESEA I-F)	D	1,605	0	0	0	---
8. Evaluation (ESEA sections 1501 and 1503)	D	9,167	9,167	9,167	0	0.0%
9. Special programs for migrant students (HEA IV-A-5):	D	33,334	34,168	36,668	2,500	7.3%
10. High school graduation initiative (ESEA I-H)	D	0	0	50,000	50,000	---
Total, Appropriation	D	15,489,476	15,760,086	16,431,132	671,046	4.3%
Total, Budget authority	D	14,938,021	12,853,666	16,431,132	3,577,466	27.8%
Current		7,554,720 ¹	4,918,910 ²	5,589,956 ²	671,046	13.6%
Prior year's advance		7,383,301	7,934,756	10,841,176	2,906,420	36.6%
Outlays	D	14,872,535	15,430,213	15,670,348	240,135	1.6%
Education for the Disadvantaged, Recovery Account						
1. Grants to local educational agencies (ESEA I-A):						
(a) Targeted grants (section 1125)	D	0	5,000,000	0	(5,000,000)	-100.0%
(b) Education finance incentive grants formula (section 1125A)	D	0	5,000,000	0	(5,000,000)	-100.0%
Subtotal		0	10,000,000	0	(10,000,000)	-100.0%
2. School improvement grants (ESEA, section 1003(g))	D	0	3,000,000	0	(3,000,000)	-100.0%
Total	D	0	13,000,000	0	(13,000,000)	-100.0%
Outlays	D	0	494,000	6,214,000	5,720,000	1157.9%

¹ Excludes an advance appropriation of \$7,934,756 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of the following fiscal year.

² Excludes an advance appropriation of \$10,841,176 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of the following fiscal year.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Request

The programs in the Education for the Disadvantaged account provide the foundation for the school improvement efforts needed to ensure that all children receive a high-quality education authorized under Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Administration is requesting a total of \$16.4 billion in fiscal year 2010 for the programs in this account, an increase of \$671 million, or 4.3 percent, over the 2009 appropriation level.

The \$13 billion request for **Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies** (LEAs) will support local programs aimed at helping more than 20 million students, nearly all of them from low-income families, improve their academic achievement and reach the proficient level in reading and mathematics on State academic assessments. The requested amount, combined with Title I funds provided by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) that will remain available in fiscal year 2010, would support efforts to improve standards and assessments, increase teacher effectiveness and encourage our best teachers to teach in our most challenging schools, expand the use of data to raise student achievement and turn around low-performing schools, and focus improvement resources on the chronically low-performing schools undergoing corrective action or restructuring. The proposed \$1.5 billion reduction for Title I Grants to LEAs in fiscal year 2010 reflects the fact that historically high levels of Title I funding, provided through the 2009 regular appropriation and the ARRA, will still be available to LEAs during the 2010-1011 school year. The request will also permit the reallocation of funds to more targeted priorities (School Improvement Grants and Title I Early Childhood Grants) that support key Title I-related reform efforts.

The 2010 request also includes \$1.5 billion for the **School Improvement Grants** program, an increase of \$1 billion (over the 2009 appropriation) that is intended to help build State and local capacity to provide intensive support to the growing number of schools identified for Title I improvement efforts, and, in particular, schools undergoing comprehensive restructuring actions. In addition, the request would require States to use 40 percent of their allocations for school improvement activities in middle and high schools, unless they determine that the needs of all their middle and high schools in improvement status can be met with a lesser amount. The request also includes a \$30 million to provide for competitive awards that would support a broad range of educational improvement activities in LEAs that were affected by Hurricanes Katrina, Ike, or Gustav in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas.

The Administration will pursue the President's commitment to expanding support for quality early childhood education through the existing Early Reading First program and the proposed Title I Early Childhood Grants and Early Learning Challenge Fund. The request seeks \$162.5 million for **Early Reading First**, a \$50 million increase. The proposed \$500 million **Title I Early Childhood Fund** would provide funds to States for matching grants to Title I LEAs that agree to invest Recovery Act Title I funds in early childhood education. LEAs would use their grants to expand existing pre-K programs or to develop and implement new ones serving economically disadvantaged pre-school students. The \$300 million requested for the new **Early Learning Challenge Fund** would provide demonstration grants to States for development of State plans and infrastructure to raise the quality of publicly funded early learning programs. The Administration is proposing to eliminate funding for the Even Start program, which has been shown through repeated evaluations to have little impact on the achievement of program participants.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Request

In addition, the Administration is proposing to expand the Striving Readers program to include elementary school-aged children as well as middle and high school students. The \$370.4 million request for **Striving Readers** represents a \$335 million increase over the 2009 appropriation, of which \$70.4 million would support projects to implement and evaluate reading interventions for middle- or high-school students reading significantly below grade level and \$300 million would support implementation of innovative and effective strategies for improving the reading comprehension of students in low-income elementary schools.

The Administration is also proposing a new \$50 million **High School Graduation Initiative** to provide assistance to LEAs to implement proven strategies for increasing the high school graduation rate in schools that have high dropout rates.

The request also includes a \$2.5 million increase for **Special programs for migrant students** to expand the number of new High School Equivalency (HEP) and College Assistance Migrant (CAMP) projects and increase the number of migrant individuals obtaining a high school equivalency certificate or completing their first year of postsecondary education.

The request would level-fund the other programs in this account, including \$19.1 million for **Literacy Through School Libraries**, \$394.8 million for the **Migrant State Agency Program**, and \$50.4 million for the **Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program**. The request also would maintain support for **Title I Evaluation** at \$9.2 million.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget authority (\$000s):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
LEA Grants Formulas:			
Basic grants	\$6,597,946	\$5,097,946	-\$1,500,000
Concentration grants	1,365,031	1,365,031	0
Targeted grants	3,264,712	3,264,712	0
Education finance incentive grants	<u>3,264,712</u>	<u>3,264,712</u>	<u>0</u>
 Total, Grants to LEAs	 14,492,401	 12,992,401	 -1,500,000
 Annual appropriation	 3,651,225	 2,151,225	 -1,500,000
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	10,841,176	10,841,176	0
 Recovery Act appropriation	 10,000,000	 0	 -10,000,000

¹ The program is authorized in FY 2009 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) provide supplemental education funding, especially in high-poverty areas, for local programs that provide extra academic support to help raise the achievement of students at risk of educational failure or, in the case of schoolwide programs, to help all students in high-poverty schools meet challenging State academic standards. The program serves an estimated 20 million students in nearly all school districts and more than half of all public schools—including two-thirds of the Nation’s elementary schools.

Title I Grants to LEAs were first authorized as part of the original Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), and Congress has invested more than \$240 billion in the program since that time. Annual funding has grown even more rapidly in recent years, more than doubling since 1997.

Title I Grants to LEAs give school districts and schools considerable flexibility in using Federal education dollars to support instructional strategies and methods that best meet local needs. Title I schools help students reach challenging State standards through one of two models: “targeted assistance” that supplements the regular education program for individual children deemed most in need of special assistance, or a “schoolwide” approach that allows schools to

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

use Title I funds—in combination with other Federal, State, and local funds—to improve the overall instructional program for all children in a school. Schools in which poor children account for at least 40 percent of enrollment are eligible to operate schoolwide programs, and an estimated 30,000 schools, or about 55 percent of all Title I schools, currently operate such programs. In the 2004-2005 school year, these schoolwide programs accounted for an estimated 87 percent of participating students and received two-thirds of the Title I Grants to LEAs funding allocated to schools.

The ESEA also encourages the use of Title I funds for effective educational practices. Both schoolwide and targeted assistance programs must employ effective methods and instructional strategies grounded in scientifically based research. Schools are required to give primary consideration to instructional arrangements—such as after-school, weekend, and summer programs—through which participating children receive Title I services in addition to, and not instead of, all the regular classroom instruction that other children receive. Schools also must provide ongoing professional development for staff working with disadvantaged students and carry out activities designed to increase parental involvement.

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

Standards and Assessments

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

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

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Adequate Yearly Progress

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

In December 2003, the Department announced a final regulation permitting States, school districts, and schools to include in AYP calculations the “proficient” scores of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who take assessments based on alternate achievement standards. Without this flexibility, those students would have to be measured against grade-level achievement standards and considered “not proficient” when States determine AYP. The number of those proficient scores included in AYP determinations may not exceed 1 percent of all students in the grades tested (about 9 percent of students with disabilities).

The Department provided additional flexibility permitting States to count for AYP purposes the “proficient” scores of a limited number of students with disabilities who take assessments based on modified achievement standards. The number of such “proficient” scores is capped at 2 percent of all students tested. This decision recognizes that some students with disabilities who are capable of meeting grade-level standards may need more time to do so. A final rule published in the *Federal Register* on April 9, 2007, codified this “2 percent rule” and also allowed States to include in AYP calculations for the students with disabilities subgroup the scores of students previously identified as having disabilities, for up to 2 years, after they no longer receive special education services. These regulations are intended to give schools and teachers credit for raising the achievement of students with disabilities.

In addition, the Department has extended flexibility to States regarding the determination of AYP for limited English proficient (LEP) students. In early 2004, the Department announced that States are not required to count in AYP calculations the assessment results for LEP students in their first year of enrollment in U.S. schools. States also may include in the LEP subgroup for up to 2 years those students who were LEP but who have attained English proficiency. These provisions, as well as related flexibility measures for LEP students, were codified in a final regulation published in the *Federal Register* on September 13, 2006.

Finally, the Department has taken steps to allow States to incorporate individual academic growth into their AYP systems, beginning with a pilot growth model initiative in late 2005. States desiring to implement growth models submitted proposals to the Department for approval, and the Department has requested that these proposals retain key ESEA requirements such as ensuring that all students are proficient in reading and math by 2014, annual goals to close achievement gaps, the inclusion of all students in testing for grades 3-8, and subgroup accountability. Final regulations published on October 29, 2008, permit all States to apply for

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

approval to add growth models to AYP determinations. Fifteen States currently include growth models in their AYP definitions.

Accountability and School Improvement

Title I accountability and school improvement provisions require progressively tougher improvement measures over time for schools that continue to miss AYP targets, while also making available additional financial resources to LEAs with schools identified for improvement. In addition, LEAs must offer immediate benefits to students attending schools identified for improvement, including public school choice and supplemental educational services (SES) options.

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

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

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

For the 2008-2009 school year, States identified an estimated total of 12,700 schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

In addition to helping schools identified for improvement develop and implement improvement plans, LEAs must immediately provide students attending such schools the option of attending another public school, which may include a public charter school, that is not identified for improvement. LEAs must provide or pay for transportation to the new school, though this obligation is limited by the funding available for this purpose, as described below. In school year 2007-08, of more than 6.4 million eligible students, an estimated 150,000 students exercised a public school choice option, for a national participation rate of about 2.3 percent.

If a school does not make AYP following 1 year of improvement (3 years of not making AYP), the LEA must permit low-income students remaining in the school to obtain SES, such as

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

tutoring, from a State-approved public- or private-sector provider selected by students and their parents, with the LEA paying the cost of the services. There currently are more than 3,000 State-approved SES providers nationwide, with nearly 90 percent of them from the private sector. In the 2007-08 school year, an estimated 580,000 students, or 13.7 percent of the more than 4.2 million students who were eligible, obtained SES.

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

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

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

The law requires LEAs to use an amount equal to 20 percent of their Part A allocations to pay for the transportation of students exercising the public school choice option or for SES for eligible students. In reserving such funds, LEAs may not reduce allocations to schools identified for corrective action or restructuring by more than 15 percent. The per-child cost of SES is set at the lesser of the LEA's per-child Part A allocation or the cost of services. For fiscal year 2009 (the 2009-2010 school year), the national average per-child Part A allocation for each participating LEA was \$1,548 based on the regular 2009 appropriation, or \$2,617 if funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act is included.

Corrective Action

If an identified school does not make AYP for 2 additional years (4 years of not making AYP), the LEA must take corrective action. Corrective actions include measures likely to bring about meaningful change, such as replacing school staff responsible for the continued inability to make AYP, comprehensive implementation of a new curriculum (including professional development), and reorganizing the school internally. LEAs must continue to provide choice and SES options to students in schools identified for corrective action. States identified roughly 1,900 schools for corrective action during the 2008-09 school year.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Restructuring

If a school does not respond to corrective action, the LEA must begin planning for restructuring, which involves making a fundamental change such as closing the school and reopening it as a public charter school, replacing all or most of the school's staff, or turning operation of the school over to a private management company with a demonstrated record of effectiveness. The LEA must implement the restructuring plan no later than the beginning of the following school year if the school still does not make AYP (i.e., 6 years of not making AYP), and must continue to provide choice and SES options to students attending such schools. States identified an estimated 5,000 schools for either the planning or implementation phase of restructuring during school year 2008-09.

Delay, Exit, and Reward

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

Qualifications for Teachers and Paraprofessionals

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

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

As the deadline approached for meeting the HQT requirements at the end of the 2005-06 school year, the Department announced a new "reasonable implementation" policy in the expectation that some States and LEAs, despite their best efforts, might not meet those requirements.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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

Allocations

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

Three formulas are based primarily on the number of poor children in each LEA, weighted by State per-pupil expenditures for education. Basic Grants are awarded to school districts with at least 10 poor children who make up more than 2 percent of enrollment and, thus, spread funds thinly across nearly all LEAs.

Concentration Grants provide additional funds to LEAs in which the number of poor children exceeds 6,500 or 15 percent of the total school-age population.

The Targeted Grants formula weights child counts to make higher payments to school districts with high numbers or percentages of poor students. For example, the number of poor children exceeding 38.24 percent of the school-age population in an LEA is assigned a weighting factor of 4.0, generating a higher per-child award than the 1.0 factor applied when the number of poor children represents 15.58 percent or less of an LEA's school-age population. To be eligible for Targeted Grants, an LEA must have at least 10 formula children counted for Basic Grant purposes, and the count of formula children must equal at least 5 percent of the population aged 5-17. The authorizing statute calls for the Targeted Grants formula to be used for allocating all LEA Grant funds in excess of the 2001 combined appropriation for Basic and Concentration Grants.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Targeted Grants and Education Finance Incentive Grants were first authorized in 1994, but have been funded only since fiscal year 2002. In practice, beginning with the 2002 appropriations act, the annual appropriations acts have divided all increases for Title I Grants to LEAs equally between the Targeted and EFIG formulas.

In determining allocations under each of the four formulas, the statute requires the use of annually updated Census Bureau estimates of the number of children from low-income families in each local educational agency. There is roughly a 2-year lag between the income year used for LEA poverty estimates and the fiscal year in which those estimates are used to make Title I allocations. For example, the fiscal year 2009 allocations will be based on LEA poverty estimates for 2007. The Department transfers a small amount of funding from the annual Title I appropriation (\$4.0 million in 2009) to the Census Bureau to finance the preparation of these LEA poverty estimates.

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

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

States must withhold from their Part A allocations amounts generated by annual counts of delinquent children in local institutions in order to operate State-administered projects in LEAs that have the highest dropout rates and are located in areas serving large numbers of children in local correctional facilities. In fiscal year 2008, the 46 States with these counts reserved about \$139 million for this purpose.

In addition, States are permitted to reserve up to 1 percent, or \$400,000, whichever is greater, to cover SEA costs of administering Title I programs, except that such amounts may not exceed the level that is provided if the total appropriation for Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA equals \$14 billion. Finally, and, as noted above, section 1003(a) of the ESEA requires States to reserve 4 percent for State school improvement activities and to distribute 95 percent of this reservation to LEAs with schools identified for improvement.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

available for Federal obligation for 12 months, expiring at the same time as the forward-funded portion.

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) provided an additional \$10 billion for supplemental fiscal year 2009 formula grant awards under the Title I Grants to LEAs program. The Act divided the \$10 billion equally between the Targeted Grants and FIG formulas. The Administration awarded half of the Title I Recovery Act funds (\$2.5 billion for Targeted Grants and \$2.5 billion for FIG) on April 1, 2009, under each State's existing Consolidated State Application. The remaining \$5 billion will be awarded once States have submitted additional information addressing how they will meet the recordkeeping and reporting requirements of the Recovery Act. In the absence of a waiver, LEAs must obligate at least 85 percent of these funds by September 30, 2010, and any remaining funds by September 30, 2011.

While LEAs may use Recovery Act funds for any purpose consistent with Title I statutory and regulatory requirements, the Administration is encouraging LEAs to focus on short-term investments with the potential for long-term benefits. The large increases provided by the Recovery Act are not expected to remain available for obligation beyond September 30, 2011.

The Administration's overall guidance for use of Recovery Act funds includes four key principles: (1) spend funds quickly to save and create jobs; (2) improve student achievement through school improvement and reform; (3) ensure transparency, reporting, and accountability; and (4) invest one-time Recovery Act funds using evidence-based practices wisely and thoughtfully so as to minimize any "funding cliff" when they are no longer available.

Specific examples of activities that are consistent with these principles include the following:

- Establishing a system for identifying and training highly effective teachers to serve as instructional leaders in Title I schoolwide programs and increase collaboration among the instructional staff;
- Establishing intensive, year-long teacher training for all teachers and the principal in a Title I elementary school in corrective action or restructuring status to build staff capacity to address academic achievement problems;
- Strengthen and expand early childhood education by providing resources to align a district-wide Title I pre-K program with state early learning standards and state content standards for grades K–3;
- Providing professional development to teachers in Title I targeted assistance programs on the use of data to inform and improve instruction for Title I-eligible students, and;
- Using longitudinal data systems to drive continuous improvement efforts focused on improving achievement in Title I schools.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

The Department will update its Recovery Act guidance throughout the year to provide additional information on the most effective uses of these funds.

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

	<u>Basic Grants</u> (\$000s)	<u>Concentration Grants</u> (\$000s)	<u>Targeted Grants</u> (\$000s)	<u>Education Finance Incentive Grants</u> (\$000s)
2005	\$6,934,854	\$1,365,031	\$2,219,843	\$2,219,843
2006	6,808,408	1,365,031	2,269,843	2,269,843
2007	6,808,408	1,365,031	2,332,343	2,332,343
2008	6,597,946	1,365,031	2,967,949	2,967,949
2009	6,597,946	1,365,031	3,264,712	3,264,712
Recovery Act.....	0	0	5,000,000	5,000,000

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The 2010 request for Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies is \$13.0 billion, a reduction of \$1.5 billion from the 2009 regular appropriation level. The decrease will be taken from the Basic Grants formula—the least targeted of the four Title I, Part A formulas and one that spreads funds very thinly and to many schools with relatively low poverty rates. Every dollar of the decrease is provided instead for School Improvement Grants and Title I Early Childhood Grants.

Two factors support the 2010 request. First, the Recovery Act provided an unprecedented \$10 billion increase for Title I Grants to LEAs. While half of these funds have been made available already and the remainder will be available before the end of September, fiscal year 2010 begins in less than five months. As a practical matter, much of this \$10 billion will not be obligated in the next 5 months. Thus, when taken together, the 2010 request and the remaining Recovery Act obligations would provide billions of dollars above the regular 2009 funding level.

Second, the request will make available resources for programs within the Title I account that are likelier to support congressionally mandated efforts to improve low-performing schools. These include a \$1 billion increase (from the regular FY 2009 appropriation level) for section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants, a program that is more directed than the regular Title I formulas to LEAs with the greatest need for assistance in improving student achievement and turning around low-performing schools, and \$500 million for the proposed Title I Early Childhood Grants initiative, which would leverage Title I Recovery Act funds to help link Title I to the President's Zero-to-Five initiative for improving early childhood learning.

The reduction proposed for 2010, like the Recovery Act, is a one-time event reflecting the unprecedented levels of funding provided for education as part of the President's effort to cushion the impact of the current economic decline and make the investments needed to ensure that our education system is ready to help lead the recovery and support future prosperity. The President's 2010 budget, announced in February, assumes significant increases in overall discretionary funding for Department of Education programs in fiscal years 2011-2014. Title I

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Grants to LEAs will likely share in those increases, particularly once the program is reauthorized to reflect the Administration's priorities. These priorities, which are helping to drive reforms funded in the Recovery Act, include the following:

- Improving teacher effectiveness and creating incentives that both reward effective teachers and encourage them to teach in the most challenging schools;
- Encouraging the development of college- and career-ready academic standards and improved assessments based on those standards;
- Focusing improvement resources on chronically low-performing schools, including high school "dropout factories" (schools that graduate 60 percent or less of their entering 9th-grade classes) and their feeder schools, as well as other schools identified for corrective action and restructuring, and;
- Improving the collection and use of data to drive school improvement.

These priorities and others will be described in more detail in the Administration's plan for reauthorizing the ESEA, which will be released in fall of 2009 or early in 2010.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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

		<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
<u>LEA Poverty Rate</u>				
0-15%	# of LEAs	6,834	6,720	6,720
	Dollars	\$2,753,475	\$5,177,669	\$2,696,835
	% of Total \$	20.22	21.58	21.21
	\$ Per Formula Child	\$1,205	\$2,181	\$1,108
15<25%	# of LEAs	4,151	4,309	4,309
	Dollars	\$4,272,567	\$7,385,444	\$4,033,989
	% of Total \$	31.38	30.79	31.72
	\$ Per Formula Child	\$1,376	\$2,405	\$1,313
>25%	# of LEAs	2,205	2,088	2,088
	Dollars	\$6,590,680	\$11,426,938	\$5,987,078
	% of Total \$	48.40	47.63	47.07
	\$ Per Formula Child	\$1,624	\$3,121	\$1,635
LEA Allocation Subtotal		\$13,616,722	\$23,990,051	\$12,717,902
BIA/Outlying Areas		138,949	244,884	129,884
Part D, Subpart 2		139,274	253,466	140,615
Census Updates		<u>3,930</u>	<u>4,000</u>	<u>4,000</u>
Grants to LEAs Total		13,898,875	24,492,401	12,992,401
Schools receiving Title I funds		54,600	54,600	54,600
Schoolwide programs		30,300	30,300	30,300
Targeted assistance programs		24,300	24,300	24,300
<u>Students served (in millions)</u>				
In schoolwide programs		17.2	17.2	17.2
In targeted assistance programs		2.5	2.5	2.5
In other programs (non-public, N&D)		<u>0.3</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>0.3</u>
Total		20.0	20.0	20.0

NOTE.- Data for 2009 includes funding provided by both the fiscal year 2009 appropriation and the Recovery Act.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Performance measures and targets for the Title I Grants to LEAs program were developed in compliance with the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act. These measures are based on data submitted annually through the ESEA Consolidated State Performance Reports, which include State and local performance information specified primarily through the annual “report card” requirements described in Section 1111(h) of the ESEA.

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

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

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

Measure: The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		52.6
2006	57.8	55.3
2007	60.9	57.4
2008	66.5	
2009	72.1	
2010	77.7	

Assessment of progress: The initial baseline (2004) and comparison year (2005) data used all students tested within grades 3-8 during the given year to establish the national percentage of students at least proficient for each year. The data showed a small but significant increase in the reading proficiency of economically disadvantaged students from 2004 to 2005. In 2006, which was the first year States were required to assess all students annually in grades 3-8, the data showed a similar increase but fell short of the initial target. The 2006 assessment results included data for each grade in the 3-8 range for 51 out of 52 States, compared to just 23 out of 52 States that submitted data for the full range of grades in 2005. In particular, the inclusion of additional middle-school grades in the 2006 assessment results helped to limit overall proficiency gains because middle-school proficiency rates generally are lower than those seen in the elementary school grades. Targets for 2007-2010 were recalculated against the 2006 baseline to support a more accurate comparison of assessment results across all required

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

grades in future years. The 2007 assessment results shows that progress in improving proficiency levels in reading for the economically disadvantaged students served by Title I is occurring at less than half the rate needed to reach the ESEA's goal of 100-percent proficiency by 2014.

Measure: The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State math assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		50.7
2006	56.2	52.3
2007	58.3	55.9
2008	64.2	
2009	70.2	
2010	76.2	

Assessment of progress: The initial baseline (2004) and comparison year (2005) data used all students tested within grades 3-8 during the given year to establish the national percentage of students at least proficient for each year. The data showed a small but significant increase in the mathematics proficiency of economically disadvantaged students from 2004 to 2005. In 2006, which was the first year States were required to assess all students annually in grades 3-8, the data showed a similar increase but fell short of the initial target. The 2006 assessment results included data for each grade in the 3-8 range for 51 out of 52 States, compared to just 23 out of 52 States that submitted data for the full range of grades in 2005. In particular, the inclusion of additional middle-school grades in the 2006 assessment results helped to limit overall proficiency gains because middle-school proficiency rates generally are lower than those seen in the elementary school grades, especially in mathematics. Targets for 2007-2010 were recalculated against the 2006 baseline to support a more accurate comparison of assessment results across all required grades in future years. The 2007 assessment results shows that progress in improving proficiency levels in mathematics for the economically disadvantaged students served by Title I is occurring at about half the rate needed to reach the ESEA's goal of 100-percent proficiency by 2014.

Measure: The difference between the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading assessments and the percentage of all students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		13.2
2006	11.7	13.0
2007	11.4	12.8
2008	9.8	
2009	8.1	
2010	6.5	

Assessment of progress: The initial baseline (2004) and comparison year (2005) data used all students tested within grades 3-8 during the given year to establish the national percentage of students at least proficient for each year. The data showed a small but significant decrease in the reading achievement gap between economically disadvantaged students and the "all

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

students” group from 2004 to 2005. In 2006, which was the first year States were required to assess all students annually in grades 3-8, the data showed a fractional decrease but fell well short of the initial target. The 2006 assessment results included data for each grade in the 3-8 range for 51 out of 52 States, compared to just 23 out of 52 States that submitted data for the full range of grades in 2005. Targets for 2007-2010 were recalculated against the 2006 baseline to support a more accurate comparison of assessment results across all required grades in future years. The 2007 results show that the reading achievement gap is shrinking too slowly to meet the targets required to reach the ESEA’s goal of 100-percent proficiency in reading (and, thus elimination of the gap) by 2014.

Measure: The difference between the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State math assessments and the percentage of all students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State math assessments		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		12.8
2006	11.4	12.7
2007	11.1	12.2
2008	9.5	
2009	7.9	
2010	6.4	

Assessment of progress: The baseline (2004) and comparison year (2005) data used all students tested within grades 3-8 during the given year to establish the national percentage of students at least proficient for each year. The data showed a small but significant decrease in the mathematics achievement gap between economically disadvantaged students and the “all students” group from 2004 to 2005. In 2006, which was the first year States were required to assess all students annually in grades 3-8, the data showed a fractional decrease but fell well short of the initial target. The 2006 assessment results included data for each grade in the 3 8 range for 51 out of 52 States, compared to just 23 out of 52 States that submitted data for the full range of grades in 2005. Targets for 2007-2010 were recalculated against the 2006 baseline to support a more accurate comparison of assessment results across all required grades in future years. The 2007 results show that the math achievement gap is shrinking too slowly to meet the targets required to reach the ESEA’s goal of 100-percent proficiency in math (and, thus, elimination of the gap) by 2014.

Efficiency Measures

The efficiency measure adopted for this program is the average number of business days required to complete State monitoring reports following the completion of a site visit. For the fiscal year 2005 baseline, the average time to complete State-monitoring reports was 46.3 days. The Department reduced this time to 43.3 days in fiscal year 2006 and set targets of 40.3 days for 2007 and 40.0 days for 2008. However, the 2007 completion time rose to 59.9 days due to a more intensive monitoring cycle (visits were conducted from January 2007 to September 2007, instead of the usual 12-month October-to-September schedule) and expanded monitoring of public school choice and SES implementation. In 2008, the Department made significant progress in reducing the number of days required to complete State monitoring reports to 47 days, but fell short of the target of 40 days. The Department continues to work to reduce

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

monitoring completion time, but may have to revisit its efficiency targets due to the increased complexity of monitoring, including a greater emphasis on school improvement and fiscal accountability issues.

Other Performance Information

National Assessment of Title I

The ESEA requires a comprehensive, multi-year national assessment on the implementation and impact of the Title I Grants to LEAs. The Department released the National Assessment of Title I (NATI) Final Report in October 2007. Volume I of the report provided a wide range of descriptive information and data on the implementation, through the end of the 2004-05 school year, of ESEA as reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. This report is available on the Department of Education's web site at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20084012/>. In January 2009, the Department published Title I Implementation—Update on Recent Evaluation Findings, which included new data from the 2006-07 school year as well as other updated data. This report is available at <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oeped/ppss/reports.html#title>. Highlights from these reports include the following:

Program Participants

- Title I funds go to 93 percent of the Nation's school districts and to 56 percent of all public schools. Most Title I funds go to elementary schools, and nearly three-fourths (72 percent) of Title I participants in 2004-05 were in pre-kindergarten through grade 6. Minority students accounted for two-thirds of Title I participants. Private school students account for about 1 percent of Title I participants.
- Fueled by a growing use of Title I schoolwide programs, the number of students counted as Title I participants has tripled over the past decade, rising from 6.7 million in 1994-95 to 20.0 million in 2004-05.

Targeting and Use of Funds

- In 2004-05, about three-fourths (76 percent) of Title I funds went to schools with 50 percent or more students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, while low-poverty schools, which accounted for 14 percent of Title I schools, received 6 percent of Title I funds.
- At the district level, Title I targeting has changed little since 1997-98, despite the allocation of nearly \$3.6 billion in new funding through the Targeted Grants and Education Finance Incentive Grants formulas following the 2001 ESEA reauthorization. The share of funds received by the highest-poverty quartile of districts in 2004-05 (52 percent) was similar to their share in 1997-98 (50 percent).
- The share of Title I funding flowing to the highest-poverty schools also remained virtually unchanged since 1997-98, and those schools continued to receive smaller Title I allocations per low-income student than did low-poverty schools. The average Title I

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

allocation in the highest-poverty Title I schools was \$558 per low-income student in 2004-05, compared with \$563 in 1997-98. Low-poverty schools continued to receive larger Title I allocations per low-income student than did the highest-poverty schools (\$763 vs. \$558).

- Elementary schools received 74 percent of Title I school allocations in 2004-05; the share allocated to middle schools (14 percent) and high schools (10 percent) was less than their share of the Nation's low-income students (20 percent and 22 percent, respectively). Seventy-one percent of elementary schools received Title I funds, compared with 40 percent of middle schools and 27 percent of high schools. The average allocation per low-income student was \$664 in elementary schools, \$502 in middle schools, and \$451 in high schools.
- In the 2004-05 school year, nearly three-fourths (73 percent) of district and school Title I funds were spent on instruction, 16 percent were used for instructional support, and another 11 percent were used for program administration and other support costs such as facilities and transportation. About half (49 percent) of local Title I funds were spent on teacher salaries and benefits, with an additional 11 percent going for teacher aides.

Trends in Student Achievement

- In 30 States that had trend data available from 2004–05 to 2006–07, the percentage of students achieving at or above the State's proficient level rose for most student groups in a majority of the States. For example, State fourth-grade reading assessments show achievement gains for low-income students in 23 out of 27 States (85 percent) that had trend data available for this assessment.
- None of the 30 States would meet the goal of 100 percent proficiency by 2013–14 unless the percentage of students achieving at the proficient level increased at a faster rate.
- State assessments and NAEP both provided some indications that achievement gaps between disadvantaged students and other students may be narrowing. For example, on the NAEP fourth-grade reading assessment the Black-White achievement gap declined from 29.3 scale score points in 2002 to 26.6 points in 2007, a reduction of 2.7 points. Black-white achievement gaps also declined in fourth grade math from 2000 to 2007 (by four points) and in fourth-grade science from 2000 to 2005 (by four points). The Hispanic-White achievement gap for fourth-grade students declined in both math and science (by five points and eight points, respectively) but showed no significant change in reading.

Assessment Systems

- By early 2009, the Department had approved 39 State assessment systems as meeting all ESEA testing requirements for reading and mathematics. For the remaining States, the evidence submitted indicated that one or more fundamental components were

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

missing or did not meet the statutory and regulatory requirements, and reviews of their state assessment systems are continuing.

- The ESEA required science assessments to be in place by the end of the 2007–08 school year. Seven States had science assessments approved prior to May 2008 along with their reading and mathematics assessments; as of December 2008, 11 States had approved science assessments.
- In 2005–06, two-thirds of the States (36) met the requirement to annually assess 95 percent or more of their students, including major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, limited English proficient (LEP) students, and low-income students. The remaining 16 States did not meet the minimum test participation requirement for one or more student subgroups.

AYP and School Improvement

- The number of Title I schools that were identified for improvement rose to 10,781 in 2006–07, an 11 percent increase over the 9,694 identified Title I schools in 2005–06. Twenty percent of all Title I schools were identified in 2006–07, up from 19 percent in 2005–06 and 18 percent in 2004–05.
- The number and percentage of schools identified for improvement varied considerably across States: 9 States had identified 5 percent or fewer of their Title I schools, while 12 States had identified more than one-third of their Title I schools.
- Most schools that have been identified for improvement are concentrated in a relatively small number of districts. Two-thirds (67 percent) of all Title I identified schools were located in just 3 percent of all Title I districts; 47 percent of Title I identified schools were located in 122 districts that had 13 or more identified schools, and 16 percent were located in the 15 school districts that had the largest numbers of identified schools.
- Most schools that were identified for improvement in 2004–05 remained in improvement status 2 years later, in 2006–07. Nearly three-fourths of identified schools in 2004–05 continued to be identified schools in 2006–07, while 28 percent had exited school improvement status.
- Almost half of identified Title I schools were in the more advanced stages of identification status. Forty-six percent of all identified Title I schools in 2006–07 were in either corrective action or restructuring, up from 33 percent in 2005–06 and 23 percent in 2004–05.
- Schools with high concentrations of poor and minority students were much more likely to be identified than other schools, as were schools located in urban areas. Over one-third of high-poverty schools (37 percent) and schools with high percentages of minority students (38 percent) were identified schools in 2006–07, compared with 4 to 5 percent of schools with low concentrations of these students. Schools in urban areas were more

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

likely to be identified (25 percent) than were suburban and rural schools (12 percent and 9 percent, respectively). Middle schools were more likely to be identified (22 percent of middle schools) than were high schools (13 percent) or elementary schools (14 percent).

- Most Title I schools in corrective action status in 2006–07 reported experiencing required interventions for such schools, though the two most common corrective actions were less frequently reported in 2006–07 than in 2004–05: Title I schools in corrective action status were less likely to report being required to implement new curricula or instructional programs (67 percent in 2006–07 vs. 89 percent in 2004–05) or the appointment of an outside advisor (26 percent vs. 59 percent).
- Few Title I schools in restructuring status in 2006–07 reported experiencing any of the specific interventions listed in the law for this stage of improvement status, although they did frequently report other types of interventions. The most frequently reported restructuring intervention was replacement of all or most of the school staff (12 percent). Replacement of the principal, which is not specified in the law as a restructuring strategy, was reported by 40 percent of schools in restructuring.

Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

- Student eligibility for and participation in both Title I choice options continued to rise. The number of students eligible for Title I school choice increased from 3.3 million in 2003–04 to 5.5 million in 2006–07, while the number eligible for supplemental educational services (SES) increased from 1.9 million to 3.6 million. Participation in the school choice option increased to 120,000 in 2006–07, up from 65,000 in 2005–06 and 48,000 in 2004–05, while participation in SES to 530,000 in 2006–07, up from 498,000 in 2005–06 and 446,000 in 2004–05. The percentage of eligible students who participated in 2006–07 was 15 percent for SES and 2 percent for school choice.
- Student participation rates varied widely. In districts required to offer SES in 2005–06, 24 percent reported participation rates of more than 20 percent, while 20 percent reported participation rates between 5 and 20 percent, 25 percent reported at least one student participating but less than 5 percent, and 31 percent reported that no students participated.
- District expenditures on Title I choice options doubled from 2003–04 to 2005–06. Total spending on SES was estimated at \$375 million for 2005–06, up from \$192 million in 2003–04, based on district survey responses. Spending on transportation for Title I school choice participants was estimated at \$56 million for 2005–06, compared with \$24 million in 2003–04. The growth in spending on these two Title I choice options was roughly proportional to the growth in participation over the same period.
- The timeliness of parental notification about the school choice option improved from 2004–05 to 2006–07, but still was often too late to enable parents to choose a new school before the start of the 2006–07 school year. Based on a nationally representative survey of districts, 43 percent of affected districts notified parents about the school choice option before the beginning of the 2006–07 school year, an increase from

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

29 percent in 2004–05. However, 42 percent notified parents after the school year had already started, and in these districts this notification occurred, on average, 5 weeks after the start of the school year.

- Most participating students received SES from a private provider, but school districts and public schools also served a substantial share of participants. Private firms accounted for 86 percent of approved providers in May 2007, while school districts and public schools accounted for only 11 percent. However, districts and public schools accounted for 40 percent of student participants in 2003-04, although they comprised 25 percent of approved providers in that year.
- Based on data from a survey of 125 SES providers in 16 school districts, services were provided both through one-on-one tutoring and through group instruction and were most often provided at the student's school. Services were provided for an average of 57 hours per student per year in those districts, and students attended an average of 78 percent of the sessions.
- Half of all school districts required to offer SES indicated that providers could use district facilities free of charge (based on the nationally representative sample), but only 17 percent of providers in the 16 districts said their contract with the district permitted them to use district facilities free of charge.

Teacher Quality

- States vary considerably in their criteria for teachers to demonstrate content knowledge in the subjects they teach. For example, among the 36 States that used the Praxis II Mathematics Content Knowledge assessment to test new teachers' content knowledge in mathematics, as of November 2007, nine States set their cut scores below the 25th percentile of all scores attained by test takers, while three States set the cut score above the national median.
- The large majority of teachers across the country have been designated as highly qualified under the ESEA. States reported that 92 percent of classes were taught by highly qualified teachers in 2005–06.
- Among teachers who said they were highly qualified, those in high-poverty schools had less experience and were less likely to have a degree in the subject that they teach, compared with their peers in low-poverty schools. In 2006–07, 14 percent of highly qualified teachers in high-poverty schools had fewer than three years of teaching experience, compared with 8 percent of highly qualified teachers in low-poverty schools. Similarly, highly qualified secondary mathematics teachers in high-poverty schools were less likely to have a degree in mathematics (32 percent, compared with 50 percent in low-poverty schools).
- Although most teachers reported that they participated in some professional development that focused on instructional strategies for teaching reading or

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

mathematics, relatively few participated for an extended period of time. For example, 79 percent of elementary teachers participated in at least 1 hour of professional development focused on instructional strategies for teaching mathematics during the 2005–06 school year and summer, but only 44 percent participated for 6 or more hours and only 11 percent participated for more than 24 hours.

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

Program Improvement Efforts

In response to evaluation and other data on the Title I Grants to LEAs program, the Department has taken steps to increase the transparency of performance information available to policy-makers and the public, including the posting of performance indicators compiled to meet the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act, program performance plans, and State monitoring reports. For example, the Department is posting individual State data on student academic performance that are used for national performance measures and plans to make available “after action” reports on the outcomes of its monitoring process, with tables showing specific actions taken by States to correct adverse findings. One area in particular where the Department has made significant progress is in the transition from paper to electronic submission of Title I performance data collected through the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) process. Working closely with the States, the Department has reduced the time needed to certify such data by 80 percent over the past few years. The Department now is using these more up-to-date CSPR performance data to prepare for monitoring visits and to develop follow-up recommendations to States to improve outcomes in the Title I Grants to LEAs program.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

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

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget authority (\$000s):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
School Improvement Grants:			
School improvement State Grants	\$545,633	\$1,515,633	+\$970,000
Gulf Coast recovery grants	0	30,000	+30,000
Recovery Act appropriation	3,000,000	0	-3,000,000

¹The program is authorized in FY 2009 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) authorizes a separate State formula grant program supporting State and local assistance for Title I schools that are identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. Funds support activities required by section 1116(b) of the ESEA, including the development and implementation of school improvement plans, professional development for teachers and staff, corrective actions such as instituting a new curriculum, development and implementation of restructuring plans, and the provision of public school choice and supplemental educational service options for students enrolled in schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

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

After 4 years of not making AYP (and 2 years of implementing its improvement plan), the LEA must take corrective action, such as by replacing school staff responsible for the continued inability to make AYP, implementing a new curriculum, or reorganizing the school internally. If corrective action does not result in the school making AYP, the LEA is required to begin planning for restructuring, which involves making a fundamental change such as closing the school and reopening it as a public charter school, replacing all or most of the school's staff, or

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

turning operation of the school over to a private management company with a demonstrated record of effectiveness. If the school does not make AYP for a 6th year, the LEA must carry out the restructuring plan. The LEA must continue to offer public school choice and SES options to eligible students during corrective action or restructuring.

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

To receive a School Improvement Grant, States must submit an application describing how the funds will be used to assist State and local school improvement efforts. Grants are allocated in proportion to each State's share of funding received under parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA. States must subgrant 95 percent of their allocations to LEAs with schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. The statute requires States to give priority in making awards to LEAs demonstrating the greatest need for school improvement funding and the strongest commitment to providing the resources needed to help their lowest-achieving schools successfully implement their improvement plans. Grants to LEAs must be between \$50,000 and \$500,000 per participating school and are renewable for up to 2 years.

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

This is a forward-funded program. Funds 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.

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) provided an additional \$3 billion for supplemental fiscal year 2009 formula grant awards under the section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants. The Department will award these funds in the overall context of reform and accountability created by the Recovery Act. For example, in addition to helping ensure that States avoid lay-offs and maintain their education funding, the Recovery Act's State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) establishes a key school improvement objective—turning around achievement in low-performing schools by providing intensive support and effective interventions in schools that need them the most—and sets aside \$4.4 billion that the Secretary will use to reward States that meet this and other reform goals as part of the Secretary's Race-to-the-Top (RTTT) Fund (described in more detail in the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund account). States can use School Improvement Grant funds as a valuable resource to help turn around low-performing schools, making the State more competitive in the RTTT award process. In awarding RTTT Funds either to a State or consortia of States, the Secretary will identify best practices in school improvement and other reform objectives and set a high bar for all States to meet.

The Administration will award Recovery Act School Improvement Grants in fall 2009 following an application process that will require States to describe their plans for using their School Improvement Grants to build their capacity to provide comprehensive, coordinated support for local school improvement. The Administration wants to encourage a robust State and local

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

planning process that ensures that the historic investment in school improvement provided by the Recovery Act is used as effectively as possible. School Improvement Grants is a relatively new program, which already had grown from an initial appropriation of \$125 million in fiscal year 2007 to more than \$545 million in fiscal year 2009. Many States are still developing their statewide systems of support for LEA and school improvement and will benefit from additional planning time before receiving Recovery Act School Improvement Grant funding.

States will have nearly 2 full years to spend their grants, which must be obligated by September 30, 2011. As with Title I Grants to LEAs, the Administration is encouraging LEAs to focus on short-term capacity-building investments with the potential for long-term benefits, rather than entering into ongoing commitments that they may be unable to sustain once Recovery Act funds are exhausted.

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

	(\$000s)
2005.....	0
2006.....	0
2007.....	\$125,000
2008.....	491,265
2009.....	545,633
Recovery Act	3,000,000

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$1.5 billion for School Improvement Grants (SIG), an increase of \$1 billion over the regular 2009 appropriation level, of which \$30 million would fund Gulf Coast Recovery Grants as described below. The request reflects the strong priority that the Administration is placing on identifying and implementing effective strategies for turning around low-performing schools and making sure that States and LEAs have the resources needed to meet the ambitious proficiency goals set by the ESEA. The Administration would like to work with Congress to broaden the schools that can be served under the School Improvement Grants program to better address State and local needs and priorities. In addition, the request would require States to ensure that least 40 percent of their SIG allocations are spent on school improvement activities in their middle and high schools. Congress included a similar emphasis on middle and high schools in SIG report language accompanying the Recovery Act, and the Administration believes that a greater focus on low-performing middle and high schools will help States and LEAs begin to address the factors that contribute to the high school dropout crisis in American education.

The latest data from the "Promoting Power" project at the Johns Hopkins University's Center for Social Organization of Schools suggest that there are more than 2,000 high schools that graduate 60 percent or fewer of each entering 9th-grade class. These schools enroll an estimated 2.6 million students and, thus, account for nearly all of the roughly 1 million young people who drop out of high school each year. Nearly 60 percent of these so-called "dropout factories" have poverty rates of 40 percent or higher, and the Department believes that one-third

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

or more are Title I schools that are virtually certain to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

One factor that may contribute to the dropout crisis is the disproportionate targeting of Title I funds by LEAs on elementary schools. While focusing Title I resources on the early grades may make sense in light of such factors as the higher concentrations of poverty in many elementary schools and a longstanding emphasis on early intervention, one result is that high schools enroll an estimated 20 percent of students from low-income families yet receive only 10 percent of Title I dollars. Middle schools receive another 10 percent of Title I dollars, while 80 percent flows to elementary schools. Increasing the share of SIG funds to middle schools makes particular sense because middle schools are almost twice as likely as elementary schools to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring (22 percent vs. 13 percent).

Growing Numbers of Identified Schools Strain State and Local Capacity

The increasing need for effective school improvement efforts is driven by the growing numbers of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring phases of improvement. The trajectories set by many States for reaching the ESEA 100-percent proficiency goal require more rapid progress in the next few years than was achieved in earlier years, and more schools are likely to encounter difficulty in meeting annual proficiency targets.

The likely trend is suggested by preliminary data from the 2007-2008 Consolidated State Performance Reports (CSPR) showing that the number of schools identified for all stages of improvement grew by more than 10 percent, from 11,511 schools in the school year 2007-2008 to 12,737 in school year 2008-2009. The number of schools in restructuring rose nearly 28 percent over the same period, from 3,923 schools to 5,018 schools.

These data mean that States and LEAs will quickly need to build and expand their capacity to support effective school improvement strategies, and, in particular, provide the more intensive and comprehensive interventions that will be required as increasing numbers of schools are subject to ESEA restructuring requirements. The number of schools identified for restructuring has nearly tripled over the past 3 years, from 1,727 schools in school year 2005-2006 to 5,018 in school year 2008-2009. Continuation of this trend could mean that roughly half of all Title I schools identified for improvement by the ESEA will be in restructuring as early as the 2009-2010 school year.

Application Process Addresses Capacity-Building Needs

Building State and local capacity is critical to turning around low-performing schools. Today Federal resources are limited, especially because the section 1003(e) hold-harmless limits States' ability to drive funds to areas of growing needs.

Several reports have noted the need for more resources for school improvement. For example, the *National Assessment of Title I: Final Report* identified resource limitations as "a moderate or serious challenge" to implementing the school improvement provisions of Title I. More specifically, the National Assessment reported that States cited obstacles in the following areas: adequacy of State-level staff size (45 States); adequacy of State-level staff expertise (30 States)

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

adequacy of State funding (40 States); and adequacy of Federal funds allocated for State systems (39 States). In addition, a July 2007 report from the Center on Education Policy (CEP) entitled *Moving Beyond Identification: Assisting Schools in Improvement*, found that more than one-third of districts surveyed reported a lack of capacity to take corrective action and restructuring actions, with the absence of adequate financial resources identified as the primary reason for that lack of capacity. The report noted that half or more of the districts citing capacity constraints stated that a lack of money prevented them from replacing all or most of the school staff or from entering into a contract with a private management company to operate identified schools.

The CEP study also found that less than one-third of States reported being able to monitor and provide technical assistance “to a great extent” to districts with schools in improvement. Four-fifths of the States reported that a lack of Federal funding was a key obstacle to such monitoring and technical assistance.

The more than \$3.5 billion in combined fiscal year 2009 appropriations and Recovery Act funding for School Improvement Grants, along with the increased section 1003(a) reservations from the regular Title I Grants to LEAs program, have largely eliminated these early, resource-based limitations on State and local support for school improvement. Instead, the emphasis now must be on a rigorous application process that helps ensure that States and LEAs use the one-time investment provided by the Recovery Act to build long-term capacity to turn around low-performing schools using evidence-based practices.

For example, Ohio has used the State share of Title I school improvement funds to support diagnostic review teams that gather additional data on behaviors in “high-priority” LEAs with high numbers or percentages of non-proficient students. Audited behaviors include the use of assessment data to guide instruction, the alignment of instruction to State standards, and school leadership. The State uses the results of these reviews to identify the strengths and weaknesses of LEAs and schools and to target assistance from its Statewide System of Support for LEA and school improvement.

Tennessee is using School Improvement Grant funds to implement initiatives targeted to high schools identified for corrective action or restructuring (secondary schools make up only 20 percent of the State’s public schools, but represent 56 percent of the schools identified for corrective action or restructuring). The SIG-funded initiatives include the provision of virtual high school courses and partnerships with community-based organizations to increase parental involvement at participating high schools. In addition, Tennessee is collecting data that allow it to compare improvement strategies used by schools that have made AYP to strategies used by schools that continue to miss AYP targets, with the goal of identifying successful strategies for wider use by identified LEAs and schools.

The Department still is working out the details of the revised School Improvement Grants application process for fiscal year 2009, but expects to include the following elements:

- The development of State planning committees that include Title I staff, curriculum specialists, assessment coordinators, school improvement specialists, special education

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

coordinators, technology experts, and others who will work to develop systemic approaches to school improvement that draw on all State resources;

- An emphasis on capacity-building at the State and local levels;
- The identification of “best practices” based on the State’s previous efforts to turn around low-performing schools, including intensive and sustained professional development and extended-learning-time strategies;
- The targeting of improvement resources on the lowest-performing schools, including high school “dropout factories” and their feeder schools;”
- Partnerships with outside organizations with proven histories of success in turning around low-performing schools;
- The coordination of school improvement assistance funded through section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants with funds made available through the section 1003(a) 4-percent reservation for school improvement; and
- Permitting LEAs that are demonstrating success in their school improvement efforts to continue to pursue their current plans and priorities, and requiring SEAs to develop: (a) streamlined procedures and greater flexibility for those LEAs to draw down and allocate funds, and (b) processes through which SEAs can draw on those LEAs’ best practices to build their own statewide improvement strategies.

In awarding School Improvement Grant funds to LEAs, States will be encouraged to consider whether LEAs demonstrate a willingness to implement aggressive interventions in chronically underperforming schools.

The increase requested for 2010 is intended to help sustain the efforts launched with 2009 regular and Recovery Act funding. For example, the statute requires that awards to LEAs be “renewable for two additional 1-year periods if schools are meeting the goals in their school improvement plans.” While it is not possible to sustain the full level of support provided through the Recovery Act, the increase proposed for 2010 will help minimize the “cliff effect” that otherwise could undermine successful school improvement strategies.

Gulf Coast Hurricane-Related Assistance

The 2010 request for School Improvement Grants also includes \$30 million for competitive awards to local educational agencies located in counties in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas that were designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency as counties eligible for Individual Assistance due to damage caused by Hurricanes Katrina, Ike, or Gustav. Funds would be used to improve education through such activities as replacing instructional materials and equipment; paying teacher incentives; constructing, modernizing, or renovating school buildings; beginning or expanding Advanced Placement or other rigorous instructional curricula; starting or expanding charter schools, and supporting after-school or extended learning time

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

activities. Because of the major challenges still faced by these districts in recovery from the hurricanes and providing a quality education to their students, the Administration believes it is appropriate to target these funds in this manner.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
School Improvement State Grants:			
Number of awards	57	57	57
Range of awards	\$119-61,808	\$872-409,333	\$360-178,950
Average award	8,619	62,204	26,590
BIE and outlying areas	4,603	34,135	14,107
Gulf Coast Recovery Grants:			
Amount for new awards	0	0	\$29,700
Number of new awards	0	0	5-10
Range of awards	0	0	\$1,000-\$5,000
Peer review of new award applications	0	0	300

NOTE.- Data for 2009 includes funding provided by both the fiscal year 2009 appropriation and the Recovery Act.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

In launching the School Improvement Grants program in late 2007, the Department implemented an application process that closely followed the authorizing statute while emphasizing the importance of obtaining comprehensive data on program performance and outcomes. For example, the States were required to draft plans for using program funds that focused on the following measurable outcomes:

- The number and percentage of students who score proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics in LEAs and schools receiving program funds.
- The number of LEAs and schools receiving program funds that make adequate yearly progress and move out of improvement status.
- The number of LEAs and schools receiving program funds that create systems using data to support continuous feedback and improvement.

The Department is currently developing performance measures for the School Improvement Grants program that will be based on these outcome measures, as well as metrics related to the Recovery Act's State Fiscal Stabilization Fund.

The Department is requiring States to report annually the amount of program funds allocated to each participating LEA and school, the academic achievement of students in schools receiving program funds or technical assistance, whether schools receiving program funds or technical

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

assistance make AYP or exit improvement status, and data on which improvement strategies contribute to improved performance by students and schools. The Department will collect these data through the Consolidated State Performance Report process, with initial, baseline data expected to be available late this year.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Title I Early Childhood Grants

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

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0 ¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
0	\$500,000	+\$500,000

¹ The GEPA extension for the ESEA Title I Demonstration authority, under which this initiative would be funded, expired September 30, 2008. The initiative would be funded in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Administration proposes a new program of Title I Early Childhood Grants to encourage local educational agencies (LEAs) participating in the Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program to invest Title I funds received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (the Recovery Act) in early childhood education. Report language accompanying the Recovery Act expressed Congress's intent to provide significant funding for early childhood education through the unprecedented increase in funding for Title I Grants to LEAs. Title I preschool programs are authorized by section 1112(b)(1)(K) of the ESEA, but historically LEAs have used only about 2 percent of their Title I, Part A allocations for preschool activities. The Title I Early Childhood Grants program is designed to leverage a portion of that increase by supporting the planning and implementation of local early childhood education initiatives that would be supported later by the Early Learning Challenge Fund. The Administration would seek to ensure, as part of its Zero-to-Five initiative, that Recovery Act funds spent on early learning now would be sustained in future years.

Through the Title I demonstration authority in section 1502 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), the Department would make formula grants to States based on the proportional share of Title I, Part A funds received by their LEAs in fiscal year 2009, including Recovery Act funds. States would then provide matching grants to LEAs, with the match supplied by LEAs through the allocation of Recovery Act Title I funds to eligible early childhood programs. In order to receive a matching grant, an LEA would submit an application describing its plan for investing Recovery Act funds in pre-K education. This plan would include data on existing Title I pre-K expenditure and participation, if any, the amount of Recovery Act funds that would be dedicated to pre-K programs, and the number of Title I-eligible children that would be served with the additional funding. States would be permitted to establish their own additional requirements for LEAs seeking matching grants, including more extensive plans for using the grants or priorities for the use of funds, such as a priority for LEAs creating new pre-K programs. States also would determine the size of the match to be provided by grant recipients.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Title I Early Childhood Grants

LEAs would use funds to create new pre-K education programs, to expand existing programs, or improve the quality of existing programs, including improvements in access for children with disabilities and limited English proficiency. LEAs would be required to report, through their SEAs, pre-K expenditures and participation data to the Department, which would use these data to inform the expansion of the Early Learning Challenge Fund. The 2010 request for the Early Learning Challenge Fund is intended primarily for State-level development and implementation of Quality Rating Systems aimed at improving the quality of early childhood programs. In subsequent years, the Fund would help States and LEAs expand high-quality early childhood programs. The Title I Early Childhood Grants program would effectively serve as a “funding bridge” to support—as part of the Zero-to-Five initiative—expanded early childhood programs until this later phase of the Early Learning Challenge Fund.

Title I Early Childhood Grants would be a forward-funded program. Funds would become available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available through September 30 of the following year.

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The 2010 request includes \$500 million for the Title I Early Childhood Grants program to help jump-start expanded investment of ESEA Title I, Part A funds in early childhood education prior to full implementation of the Early Learning Challenge Fund. However, just 2 percent of Title I funds have been spent on pre-K education, despite the decades of research demonstrating the positive impact of high-quality early childhood education on later academic performance and other economic and social outcomes. The unprecedented increase in Title I funding provided by the Recovery Act creates a unique opportunity for LEAs to make the investments needed to establish or expand high-quality pre-K programs that are fully coordinated with their existing Title I programs. Indeed, the Senate version of the Recovery Act would have required LEAs to allocate at least 15 percent of their Title I Recovery funds to early childhood education, and the joint House-Senate conference report accompanying the final bill encouraged the use of Recovery Act funds for early childhood programs. This emphasis on the need for more investment in early childhood education is one reason, in the context of the historic increase provided for the regular Title I program by the Recovery Act, that the Administration is seeking to fund Title I Early Childhood Grants through a modest reduction in funding for Title I Grants to LEAs.

The proposed program would make available \$500 million for State matching grant funds that would serve as a powerful incentive for States and LEAs to implement or expand high-quality local early childhood education programs. In particular, the new program would provide an opportunity for LEAs that previously have not had the resources to establish pre-K programs to undertake the planning and early implementation that will be needed to take full advantage of the Early Learning Challenge Fund in fiscal year 2011. Program requirements would be deliberately few and flexible, so that States and LEAs have the discretion to use funds in innovative and creative ways to meet their specific needs. In addition, the program would be able to accommodate strategies and priorities that Congress may include in the authorization of the Early Learning Challenge Fund.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Title I Early Childhood Grants

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>
Number of State awards	52
Range of State awards	\$1,212-\$55,922

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Department would measure the performance of Title I Early Childhood Grants by collecting data on such program outcomes as the following:

- The amount of Title I funds leveraged by Title I Early Childhood Grants to support early childhood education.
- The number of LEAs starting or expanding pre-school programs.
- The number of students participating in pre-school programs supported through Title I Early Childhood Grants.
- The number of newly created pre-school programs that achieve high scores on their State's Quality Rating System.

The Department expects to collect these and similar data as part of its annual Consolidated State Performance Report system.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early learning challenge fund

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

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
0	\$300,000	+\$300,000

¹The GEPA extension for ESEA Title V, Part D, Subpart 1, Fund for the Improvement of Education/Programs of National Significance authority, under which this activity would be funded, expired September 30, 2008. The program would be funded in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Administration proposes funding, in the fiscal year 2010 budget, for the Early Learning Challenge Fund. This initiative would provide grants to State educational agencies, or the agency in a State that administers early childhood programs, for development of a statewide infrastructure of integrated early learning supports and services for children, from birth through age 5. This infrastructure would provide a pathway to a high standard of quality across all publicly funded early learning programs in the State. Early learning programs that would benefit from this initiative include center-based and family child care, pre-kindergarten programs, Head Start, Early Head Start, early intervention, and other programs that support healthy development and education of children birth to five.

States receiving an award under this program would establish and implement rigorous systems that promote healthy child development, positive child outcomes, and the readiness of children for success upon school entry. Such systems would include: (1) methods for measuring, monitoring, and supporting improvements in program quality; (2) early learning guidelines that are developmentally appropriate and aligned with K-3 standards; (3) plans for increasing the engagement and involvement of parents in their child's early learning and development; and (4) criteria for the preparation, development, and compensation of the early education workforce. This initial investment in fiscal year 2010 would lay the foundation for larger Federal investments in future years that extend support for high-quality early childhood education services for children who are not served by programs funded by existing local, State, or Federal programs.

The Early Learning Challenge Fund would make competitive awards to States to develop new or improve upon existing standards and protocols for monitoring the effectiveness of early learning programs in the State, and to foster quality and continuous improvement across such programs. States receiving an Early Learning Challenge Fund award would be required to develop and establish a system of research-based metrics and measures for addressing essential aspects of program quality, such as child health and safety, the effectiveness of the early learning environment, the qualifications of early education staff, research-based curricula,

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early learning challenge fund

and program effectiveness, including child outcomes. Through the implementation of their grants, States would establish a pathway to high quality, beginning with a basic level of standards for licensing, and support the enhancement of programs as they progress to higher levels of quality over time.

States receiving an Early Learning Challenge Fund award would also develop and implement a plan to assess the quality of early care and education programs in the State. The plan would provide a system of supervision and program monitoring, which could include visits to early childhood programs across the State – regardless of the setting or funding source of the program – to observe early childhood activities, evaluate program quality, and rate each program's effectiveness against the State's standards and metrics. As a result, States would be able to compare the quality of services for children from birth through age 5, which would inform State decision-making regarding investments in early learning. States would also be required to publicly post the system's standards and metrics, along with individual programs' ratings. Parents would, therefore, have access to crucial information about program quality as they seek to select the care that best serves their children.

The Department would require applicants to describe, at a minimum: (1) the standards and system for evaluating program quality that they would implement using funds from the grant; (2) how they would develop and implement a data collection system to track program types, the participation of and demographic information on children in the State's programs, and the qualifications and characteristics of the workforce in the State's programs; (3) the early childhood education quality improvement plan that the State would create or enhance, including the State's strategies for providing technical assistance to early learning programs across the range of providers in the State and for improving the credentials and compensation of the workforce; (4) the incentives and resources that the State would provide to achieve higher standards of quality across early education programs, including the efforts it would make to move a higher proportion of low-income children to higher-quality early learning settings; and (5) the consequences that the State would impose for programs that do not reach a high standard of quality after receiving technical assistance. In addition, States would be required to describe the steps they would take to address the quality of education for children in grades K-3, using other resources allocated to elementary and secondary education, including improvements in curriculum, teacher preparation and development, and parent engagement.

Grantees would also be required to implement data system enhancements needed to track children enrolled in early learning programs through at least the early elementary grades (at minimum to grade 3); develop a rigorous monitoring and technical assistance plan; align early learning guidelines with K-3 standards; use (and, as necessary, develop) developmentally appropriate assessment tools linked to child outcomes in order to improve practice and inform program planning; collect baseline data on early learning programs across the State; and develop and use program evaluation strategies to establish the effectiveness of programs. .

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act provided funds to the Head Start program for Governors to carry out activities of the State Advisory Councils on Early Childhood Education and Care. The State Advisory Councils will play a key role in planning better-coordinated systems, facilitating coordination among partners, and moving towards seamless delivery of services to our young children and families. As the overall responsibility of the State Advisory

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early learning challenge fund

Councils is “to lead the development or enhancement of a high-quality, comprehensive system of early childhood development and care,” the State Advisory Councils would be central in overseeing and implementing a State’s Early Learning Challenge Fund grant. Councils are now asked to undertake a number of activities, including developing recommendations on data collection systems, professional development systems, early learning standards, and career ladders, that should inform and direct Challenge Fund activities. Requirements and charges under each should be viewed as complementary and not separate requirements.

The Department of Education would administer the Early Learning Challenge Fund program in consultation with the Department of Health and Human Services. The Department would award grants through a rigorous peer review process through which reviewers would assess States’ proposed infrastructure and plans. In selecting reviewers, the Department would consult with the National Academy of Sciences, the National Institute for Child Health and Development (NICHD), and the Administration for Children and Families (ACF). Grantees would be required to report data for the performance measures the Department would establish under the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA).

The Department would reserve 2.5 percent of the appropriation for national activities, including for technical assistance and a rigorous national evaluation. The Department would publish the evaluation results in a manner that would inform Federal, State, and local investments in early childhood education.

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2010, the Administration requests \$300 million for the Early Learning Challenge Fund initiative under the Title I Demonstrations authority. This request would support awards that would enable States to raise their standards, build systems that promote quality and ensure the effectiveness of their early learning programs, and monitor all publicly funded early childhood programs’ performance against the States’ standards. This request would be the first of several years of investment. The Administration will propose new authorizing language for this program and, assuming that States demonstrate promising results in ensuring the quality of their early childhood programs, will request additional funds for it in future years so that States can extend early childhood education to more children than are currently served by existing local, State, and Federal programs. This program, a central component of the President’s early education agenda, compliments existing and proposed Federal investments in Head Start and Early Head Start, home visitation, the Child Care Development Fund, Title I preschool, and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Research shows that children, particularly those from low-income families, have many challenges to overcome during the course of their education and development. For example, the size of the working vocabulary of 4-year old children from low-income families is approximately one-third that of children from middle-income families (Hart & Risley, 1995). We also know that these early differences in children’s skills persist over time. The NCES Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, which follows the academic progress of children from kindergarten through 5th grade, has found, for example, that differences in children’s reading skills and knowledge that are usually seen in later grades appear to be present as children

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early learning challenge fund

begin school and continue to persist after 1 or 2 years of school. In addition, research shows that students who fail to read well by fourth grade have a greater likelihood of dropping out of high school and of a lifetime of diminished success. Further, the National Research Council report, *Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children* (1998), concluded that the majority of reading problems faced by adolescents and adults could have been avoided or resolved in the early years of childhood. Taken together, these findings demonstrate the importance of building early language and literacy skills in early childhood education programs, before gaps in skills develop and widen, and preventing the need for more costly and difficult interventions, including referrals to special education, later on.

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

Available evidence suggests that many States do have some mechanism in place to address early childhood issues across programs at the State level. According to a study by the National Governors Association (NGA) Center for Best Practices, 31 of 36 States that responded to a survey had Early Childhood Advisory Councils in place in fall 2007. According to an HHS report, as of November 2006, 14 States had a quality rating system in place, 9 were piloting a system, either Statewide or in one or more communities, and 31 were exploring or designing one. It is important to note, however, that the same report indicated that States vary in the level of monitoring their early learning programs. States are grappling with how to do this work well, and report having a need for guidance and support; over half of all of the respondents in the NGA study (56 percent) reported that they needed technical assistance on quality improvement efforts, and an even greater share (61 percent) reported needing guidance on early childhood assessments. The peer review process in making awards and the national activities supported by the Early Learning Challenge Grants initiative would address these needs.

In addition, other Federal programs, such as Head Start and the Child Care Development Fund provide funds for quality improvement. The Early Learning Challenge Fund program would encourage States to leverage existing State and Federal investments in quality to establish cross-sector standards that would be applied to all publicly funded early learning programs in the State.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early learning challenge fund

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>
New grants	\$290,500
Peer review of new award applications	\$2,000
National activities	\$7,500
Technical assistance	\$5,000
Evaluation	\$2,500

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early reading first

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

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$112,549	\$162,549	+\$50,000

¹ The program is authorized in FY 2009 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Early Reading First program supports local efforts to enhance the early language, literacy, and pre-reading development of preschool-aged children, particularly those from low-income families, through instruction, materials, and professional development based on scientific reading research. Grants are awarded to existing local preschool programs, including centers that receive funds from Title I and Head Start, to add new or improve literacy-related services. Programs support professional development for preschool staff to improve their ability implement high-quality language, literacy, and pre-reading activities based on scientific reading research.

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

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

The program's authorizing statute required the Department to conduct an independent evaluation of this program to determine its effectiveness. The evaluation, for which the Department spent \$3 million over a 4-year period, examined how grantees improved the prereading skills of preschool children, the effectiveness of the professional development

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early reading first

provided to teachers, how early childhood teachers received training based on scientifically based reading research on early reading development, which activities and instructional practices were most effective, and how grantees were integrating instructional materials and activities into preschools. The Department released the evaluation in 2007.

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

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$104,160
2006.....	103,118
2007.....	117,666
2008.....	112,549
2009.....	112,549

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2010, the Administration requests \$162.5 million for the Early Reading First (ERF) program, an increase of \$50 million over the 2009 appropriation. The fiscal year 2010 request would fund a new round of competitive grants to LEAs in local communities with high numbers of low-income families and would help strengthen professional development for early childhood educators. Early Reading First is an important investment in strengthening early childhood programs, helping them to deliver the content that young children need to develop their vocabulary, acquire the ability to hear the sounds that make up words, and learn about how print and books work. This program, along with the Early Learning Challenge Fund (a component of the “Zero-to-Five” initiative) and existing programs like Head Start, will be of great importance as the Administration pursues its commitment to expanding support for quality early childhood education. Funds for ERF in 2010 will support up to 52 new projects.

Research demonstrates the strong relationship between high-quality educational experiences for children before kindergarten and their later success in school. The National Research Council report, *Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children* (1998), concluded that the majority of reading problems faced by today's adolescents and adults could have been avoided or resolved in the early years of childhood. The National Center for Early Development and Learning report, *Cost, Quality and Child Outcomes* (1999), concluded that children's cognitive and social competence in the second grade can be predicted by the experiences that they had 4 years previously in child care, even after taking into account kindergarten and first-grade classroom experiences. The report also found that the populations of children that have traditionally been at risk for not doing well in school are more affected by the quality of childcare experiences than are other children. More recently, the National Institute for Literacy report, *Developing Early Literacy, Report of the National Early Literacy Panel* (2008), underscored the importance of reading and writing skills in the early childhood context. The report stated that “conventional reading and writing skills that are developed in the years from birth to age 5 have a clear and consistently strong relationship with later conventional literacy skills.” For example, the report found that six specific skills strongly predict later literacy development: alphabet knowledge; phonological awareness; “rapid automatic naming” of letters or numbers; “rapid automatic naming” of colors or objects; writing, including individual letters or one’s name; and

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early reading first

phonological memory, which means the ability to “remember spoken information for a short period of time.” Early Reading First is intended to build these skills among preschool-aged children.

Additional support for this program is provided by the Department’s Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, which follows the academic progress of a nationally representative sample of children from kindergarten through 5th grade and provides information about children’s reading achievement in early elementary school. Findings released in October 2007 demonstrate that children’s language and literacy knowledge and skills vary significantly based on their families’ socioeconomic status. For example, the average overall literacy score for children in the lowest 20 percent of the socioeconomic distribution is more than one standard deviation below that of the children in the highest 20 percent. Earlier study findings include that students’ reading achievement scores in kindergarten are positively associated with their reading achievement scores in fifth grade. Taken together, these findings suggest that the differences in early literacy skills between children from different socioeconomic groups are significant, and such differences that exist when children begin school may persist throughout the early years of schooling.

Early Reading First grants help to meet the challenges of preparing young children for success in school by funding projects that provide high-quality, research-based experiences in language and early literacy for preschool-aged children. These grants improve the instruction and environment provided by programs primarily serving young children living in poverty, including preschool programs supported by the Title I program, Head Start, and publicly funded or subsidized child care. Moreover, the statutorily required evaluation of the Early Reading First program found numerous positive effects, including improvements in children’s print and letter knowledge, which justify an increased investment in the program.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
New grants	\$111,272	\$108,892	\$160,924
Number of new grants	31 ¹	30-35 ¹	43-52 ¹
Average new award	\$3,589	\$3,095- \$3,714	\$3,095- \$3,714
Continuation awards	0	\$2,532	0
Number of children served	32,652 ²	33,278 ²	37,713 ²
Number of educators served	3,338 ²	3,402 ²	3,856 ²

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early reading first

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) - continued

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Peer review of new award applications	\$1,125	\$1,125	\$1,625
Reimbursement for an ECEPD award	\$151 ³	0	0

¹The Department funded multi-year projects under this program in fiscal year 2008 entirely from the fiscal year 2008 appropriation; estimates for 2009 and 2010 assume continuation of this policy.

²The number of children and educators served in a given year is the total that grantees that were active in that year proposed to serve in their initial applications. For example, the estimated number of children and teachers served in fiscal year 2008 is the total number included in the applications for grantees from fiscal years 2005 to 2008.

³Funds were used to reimburse an Early Childhood Educator Professional Development (ECEPD) grantee for expenses charged to a closed award.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

Measure: The percentage of preschool-aged children participating in Early Reading First (ERF) programs who demonstrate age-appropriate oral language skills after each year of implementation.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	57	67.9
2006	59	66.9
2007	59	72.5
2008	60	77.8
2009	61	
2010	61	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early reading first

Assessment of progress: In 2008, 77.8 percent of preschool-aged children participating in Early Reading First (ERF) programs attained age-appropriate oral language skills, which exceeded the target. Grantees who received awards between 2004 and 2008 were required to use the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III to report on this measure. From the 2009 cohort onward, grantees will be permitted to use any valid, reliable assessment to report data for this measure. The Department will issue guidance on this subject in spring 2009.

Measure: The average number of letters Early Reading First preschool-aged children are able to identify after each year of implementation.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	16	16
2006	17	18
2007	18	18
2008	19	19
2009	19	
2010	19	

Assessment of progress: In 2008, children in ERF programs across all cohorts identified an average of 19 letters, which met the target. Grantees who received awards between 2004 and 2008 were required to use the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask to report on this measure. From the 2009 cohort onward, grantees will be permitted to use any valid, reliable assessment to report data for this measure. The Department will issue guidance on this subject in spring 2009.

Measure: The percentage of preschool-aged children participating in Early Reading First programs who achieve significant gains in oral language skills after each year of implementation.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		62.2
2007	63	62.5
2008	64	63.7
2009	65	
2010	66	

Measure: The percentage of preschool-aged children participating in Early Reading First programs who achieve significant gains in oral language skills after each year of implementation.					
Year	Target	Actual			
		2003 cohort	2004 cohort	2005 cohort	2006 cohort
2006		61.1	64.4	50.0	
2007	63	57.8	66.6	63.6	60.0
2008	64		67.8	64.8	60.4
2009	65				
2010	66				

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early reading first

Assessment of progress: In 2008, 63.7 percent of 4-year-old children in ERF programs across all cohorts achieved significant learning gains, which was an increase from 2007 but slightly below the target. The Department used 2006 performance to set targets for subsequent years. Grantees who received awards between 2005 and 2008 were required to use the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III to report on this measure. From the 2009 cohort onward, grantees will be permitted to use any valid, reliable assessment to report data for this measure. The Department will issue guidance on this subject in spring 2009.

Efficiency Measure

Measure: The cost per preschool-aged child participating in Early Reading First programs who achieves a significant gain in oral language skills after each year of implementation		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		\$5,234
2007	\$5,234	\$8,823
2008	\$5,234	\$10,598
2009	\$5,234	
2010	\$5,234	

Measure: The cost per preschool-aged child participating in Early Reading First programs who achieves a significant gain in oral language skills after each year of implementation					
Year	Target	Actual			
		2003 cohort	2004 cohort	2005 cohort	2006 cohort
2006		\$4,088	\$7,438		
2007	\$5,234	\$6,692	\$11,601	\$9,399	
2008	\$5,234		\$7,201	\$7,208	\$14,291
2009	\$5,234				
2010	\$5,234				

Assessment of progress: In 2008, the cost per participant achieving a significant gain increased to \$10,598 from \$8,823 in 2007. Grantees who received awards between 2005 and 2008 were required to use the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III to report on this measure. From the 2009 cohort onward, grantees will be permitted to use any valid, reliable assessment to report the data. The Department will issue guidance on this subject in spring 2009. In an effort to understand this large increase, the Department analyzed these data by grantee cohort; the cost per significant gain for the 2004 and 2005 grantees in 2008 was approximately \$7,200, whereas the figure for the 2006 grantees was \$14,291. In 2008, the cost per child served across all grantee cohorts was \$3,874, with a low of \$3,408 for fiscal year 2007 grantees, and a high of \$4,312 among fiscal year 2005 grantees. The Department will continue to assess these data in order to reach a better understanding of the variation in the efficiency measure across cohorts.

To attempt to determine whether the ERF program has a lasting impact on participants' early reading skills, the Department made supplemental awards to three grantees who applied for and received a second consecutive grant award. These grantees were required to collect data

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early reading first

on five measures from former participants who entered kindergarten, and they reported data to the Department in 2008. According to these data, over 90 percent of former ERF participants achieved a standard score above the “at risk” range on the Woodcock-Johnson III, Letter-Word Identification (Test 1) subtest, and almost 70 percent scored above the 50th percentile. Further, over 84 percent achieved a standard score above the “at risk” range on the Woodcock-Johnson III, Story Recall (Test 3) subtest, and over 64 percent scored above the 50th percentile. Finally, over 80 percent demonstrated age-appropriate oral language skills as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III, Receptive.

Other Performance Information

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

The evaluation found that the Early Reading First program had numerous positive impacts on preschool classrooms. Specifically, the ERF program improved elements of the classroom environment, such as materials available, book-reading practices, and the variety of phonological-awareness activities and children’s engagement in them. In addition, the program increased the number of hours of professional development provided to teachers, and increased the use of mentoring. The program also demonstrated impacts on children’s print and letter knowledge, but did not affect phonological awareness or oral language skills. In addition, the program had no impact on children’s social-emotional development.

Program Improvement Efforts

The Department is undertaking the following improvement efforts for this program:

- *Conduct targeted technical assistance to improve the quality of phonological awareness and oral language instruction.* The National Evaluation of Early Reading First found no program impacts on phonological awareness and oral language skills, which prompted the development of this effort. During the ERF National Conference in spring 2008, grantees participated in a variety of breakout and plenary sessions concerning phonological awareness and oral language. In addition, during the ERF Summer Institute held in August 2008, grantees in their second year of implementation participated in a variety of workshops aimed at improving the instructional practices of teachers and the quality of professional development activities in the areas of phonological awareness and oral language.
- *Improve the quality of kindergarten transition activities.* The Department included an invitational priority for a “Kindergarten Transition Plan” in the current (fiscal year 2009) grant competition, encouraging applicants to describe, among other things, the key

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early reading first

issues involved in transitioning preschool-aged children to kindergarten, how the project would effectively support ongoing communication and cooperation between the program and the LEA, and a timeline that describes benchmarks for transition activities.

- *Develop measures of kindergarten readiness and report data for those measures.* The Department awarded three supplemental grants in 2007 to grantees receiving a second 3-year award to collect achievement data for former Early Reading First participants currently in kindergarten. The Department has collected the first year of these data; the data are included in the performance section above.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

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

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$35,371	\$370,371	+\$335,000

¹ The program is authorized in FY 2009 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Striving Readers program supports competitive grants to implement and evaluate reading interventions for middle- or high-school students reading significantly below grade level. Projects have focused on the implementation and evaluation of strategies to improve the reading achievement of students reading 2 or more years below grade level, including professional development in reading instruction for secondary-school teachers in the core academic subjects and the implementation of reading curricula that are appropriate for teenage students.

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

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

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

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

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$24,800
2006.....	29,700
2007.....	31,870
2008.....	35,371
2009.....	35,371

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$370.4 million for Striving Readers, a \$335 million increase over the 2009 appropriation. Of this amount, \$70.371 million would support up to 87 projects to implement and evaluate reading interventions for middle- or high-school students reading significantly below grade level, and \$300 million would support up to 70 awards that would enable schools to implement innovative and effective strategies for improving the reading comprehension of students in low-income elementary schools.

Research and assessment data provide strong justification for a continued Federal investment in a large-scale reading program based on scientific reading research. For example, according to the 2007 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results, an alarming number of our Nation's children are not reading at grade level. The results show an achievement gap between students in low-poverty schools and those in high-poverty schools; more than half (56 percent) of fourth-grade students in high-poverty schools scored below the basic reading level, compared with only 18 percent in low-poverty schools. (For the purpose of this analysis, low-poverty schools are defined as those where 25 percent or less of the students were eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch, and high-poverty schools are defined as those where more than 75 percent of the students were eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch.) About half of eighth-grade students in high-poverty schools scored below the basic reading level, compared with only 14 percent in low-poverty schools.

Research also shows that students who fail to read well by fourth grade have a greater likelihood of dropping out and of a lifetime of diminished success. These differences in children's reading skills and knowledge are dramatic. The size of the working vocabulary of 4-year old children from low-income families is approximately one-third that of children from middle-income families (Hart & Risley, 1995). Perhaps even more alarming, these early differences in children's skills persist over time. The NCES *Early Childhood Longitudinal Study*, which follows the academic progress of children from kindergarten through 5th grade, has found, for example, that differences in children's reading skills and knowledge that are usually seen in later grades appear to be present as children begin school and persist after 1 or 2 years of school. Further, the National Research Council report, *Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children* (1998), concluded that the majority of reading problems faced by adolescents and

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

adults could have been avoided or resolved in the early years of childhood. Taken together, these findings demonstrate the importance of providing consistent, research-based reading instruction in the early grades, before gaps in skills develop and widen, and preventing the need for more costly and difficult interventions, including referrals to special education, later on. In addition, because NAEP and other data clearly show that many students are reaching the later grades without having learned to read at the level necessary for understanding higher-level content, the Administration believes that efforts to address the adolescent literacy problem should continue and expand.

Early Literacy Grants

The proposed Striving Readers Early Literacy Grants program would enable LEAs to test a variety of strategies designed to improve children's reading comprehension, with particular emphasis on instruction in vocabulary development, oral language fluency, and writing skills. These efforts would be based on the five components of reading instruction identified in 2000 by the National Reading Panel: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. The program also draws lessons from and addresses the deficiencies of Reading First and other literacy efforts.

According to the *Reading First Impact Study: Final Report* from the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), the Reading First program had a statistically significant impact on students' decoding, phonics, and fluency skills — three of the five basic components of reading. At the implementation level, the program also resulted in the implementation of instructional practices that are supported by reading research, including ongoing support from reading coaches with expertise in reading instruction and coaching, increased time for reading instruction, and provision of extra classroom support for struggling readers. However, the Impact Study found that Reading First did not have a significant impact on the most important measure of a reading program's success — increasing students' reading comprehension. The Early Literacy Grants program would build on the assets of previous efforts while addressing this central deficiency by emphasizing reading comprehension, vocabulary, oral language, and writing skills.

In particular, the new program would focus on the fact that reading comprehension requires more than just decoding and fluency skills. Educators and policymakers cannot expect comprehension to occur naturally after students have attained fluency in reading. Research indicates that large percentages of students from low-income families can learn the skills of reading, such as decoding, phonemic awareness, and reading sight words, yet still struggle to comprehend text in fourth grade and beyond. In addition to decoding and understanding the meaning of single words, children need to understand how the order of words affects meaning and how one sentence affects the meaning of the next. Comprehension also requires drawing on real-world knowledge to understand context and meaning. Further, comprehension requires understanding non-literal meanings such as metaphors and inferences, and the ability to remember and think about what has been read. It is, therefore, critical that comprehension be taught in the earliest grades (*Children's Comprehension Problems in Oral and Written Language*, Kate Cain & Jane Oakhill, eds. 2007).

In addition, these funds would help schools improve students' comprehension ability by providing interventions designed to improve students' vocabulary, oral language skills, and

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

contextual knowledge. Teaching vocabulary effectively must entail more than having students learn lists of words and memorize their meanings. The National Reading Panel (2000) found that students acquire vocabulary best when it is used in meaningful, authentic contexts. Furthermore, the more a student encounters a word in context, the greater the likelihood that the student will acquire and retain that word's meaning (Pearson, P. D., Hiebert, E. H. & Kamil, M. L. (2007). "Vocabulary Assessment: What We Know and What We Need to Learn." *Reading Research Quarterly*, Vol. 42, No. 2). This research suggests that children should read a wide variety of books, and as many books as possible, to foster the development of their vocabulary, language, and ultimately, comprehension.

Helping young children learn to read also means ensuring that students engage in rich, meaningful conversation with adults and other students. Modeling the effective use of language in classroom discussion can help students learn complex sentence structures, the proper usage of prepositions and phrases, and how to convey meaning through language. Unfortunately, many reading classes in the early elementary grades, particularly those in schools serving a high percentage of children from low-income families, focus almost exclusively on decoding and fluency skills. As a result, students may not be expected to read more than individual words or scripted paragraphs. These students are not expected to use oral language to enrich their language by storytelling, make logical arguments, converse with adults, or give directions, even though such verbal activities will be required of them later in school. The Early Literacy Grants program would emphasize vocabulary and language development through instructional strategies that enhance students' understanding of complex sentence structure, analytical thought, real-world content knowledge, and speaking and writing skills.

To be eligible for grants, LEAs would be required to apply to the Department on behalf of schools: (1) eligible to implement a Title I schoolwide program, and (2) where a significant number of students read, or are at risk of reading, below grade-level. The Department would give competitive preference to LEAs that propose to serve large numbers of students with disabilities, limited English proficiency, or multiple risk factors. Eligible LEAs would be able to apply alone, in partnership with institutions of higher education or public or private, nonprofit or for-profit organizations, or through a State educational agency. Grants would be awarded through a rigorous and transparent peer review process. In selecting reviewers, the Department would consult with the National Academy of Sciences, the National Institute for Child Health and Development, and the Administration for Children and Families (ACF). Awards would be made for up to 5 years.

Applicants would be required, at a minimum, to serve students in grades kindergarten to third grade and would be encouraged to extend services to children in pre-kindergarten and in the fourth or fifth grades. In addition, applicants would be required to demonstrate how they would coordinate their reading programs from pre-kindergarten through grade 5, including with activities supported with funds from other Federal, State, or local sources. The Department would require participating schools to incorporate proven practices into their programs, including by providing a significant amount of time focused exclusively on reading instruction as well as integrating reading instruction into other content areas across the curriculum.

Grantees would be required to use funds to: implement an evidence-based reading curriculum that supports differentiated instruction; use formative, diagnostic, and outcome assessments in

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

(1) determining where students need help in learning to read, and (2) tracking student progress; provide high-quality professional development in reading for teachers, coaches, and administrators; adopt innovative approaches to reading comprehension; and support reading interventions, including extended learning time, for students who require additional assistance. In addition, grantees would be encouraged to provide professional development and technical assistance to non-participating schools within the eligible LEA in order to increase the impact of the project.

Finally, grantees would conduct formative program evaluations to guide program improvement and to report data for the performance measures the Department would establish under the Government Performance and Results Act.

The Department would reserve 2.5 percent of the appropriation designated for Striving Readers Early Literacy Grants for national activities, including for technical assistance and a rigorous national evaluation. The Department would publish the evaluation results in a manner that would inform State and local investments in reading instruction that works across the Nation.

Adolescent Literacy Grants

Too many of the Nation's high school students are unable to read at a level that would enable them to meet challenging State academic content and student performance standards. For example, a 2002 study done by researchers at the Johns Hopkins Center for Social Organization of Schools estimates that up to one-third of entering ninth-grade students need additional help in reading. The problem is even worse in high-poverty high schools. The same report found that about half of freshmen students attending regular high school in Philadelphia begin their freshman year 3 or more years behind grade level in reading achievement. Further, in 8 of the 22 high schools studied in Philadelphia, less than 30 percent of the freshmen were within 2 years of the expected grade level in reading. Many of these low-achieving secondary school students are at risk of dropping out of school, in part because of frustration about their poor reading skills. A 1999 study by Andrew Sum, *Literacy in the Labor Force: Results from the Adult Literacy Survey*, underscores the concern about the future of students who drop out of school because they are poor readers. The study found that prose literacy is highly correlated with future earnings and with the probability of earning a high school diploma and earning a higher education degree.

A 2005 report by ACT, *Reading Between the Lines: What the ACT Reveals about College Readiness in Reading*, demonstrates that the problem is national in scope. According to the report, student performance on the "ACT College Readiness Benchmark for Reading" was at its lowest level in 12 years; only 51 percent of ACT-takers were ready for college-level courses that require high levels of reading, such as psychology and U.S. history. In addition to this troubling finding, the data reveal dramatic differences in reading skills between students in different demographic groups. For example, the data show that 70 percent of test-takers whose families have an annual income of \$100,000 or more were college-ready in reading, while only 33 percent of students with family incomes under \$30,000 were adequately prepared. Further, 59 percent of White students were college-ready in reading, while only 21 percent of African-American students had the required reading skills to be successful in college.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

Despite these struggling readers' need for instructional support, most secondary school students are generally not able to benefit from high-quality literacy instruction. Although the knowledge base on what works at the secondary level is thin compared to what we know about beginning reading, schools must make more of an effort to improve the quality of reading instruction at the secondary level and to provide targeted interventions to secondary school students who struggle in reading. Efforts in this area ought to be rigorously evaluated in order to broaden the research base in adolescent literacy, informing strategic investments in adolescent literacy instruction for struggling readers.

Some evidence on promising practices in adolescent literacy instruction is beginning to emerge. The Center on Instruction released a report in 2007: *Academic Literacy Instruction for Adolescents: A Guidance Document from the Center of Instruction*, that includes numerous recommendations for the improvement of adolescent literacy instruction. For example, several experts recommended that teachers work to improve literacy skills by embedding reading instruction, especially reading comprehension strategies, across content areas such as math and social studies. In addition, several experts have suggested that students who are reading significantly below grade level be enrolled in a course that focuses on the development of skills such as fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary usage that students need to develop to meet grade-level requirements. In addition, the Department's Institute of Education Sciences (IES) released *Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices* in August 2008. The report included five recommendations for educators working to improve adolescent literacy, including implementing intensive and individualized interventions for struggling readers provided by trained specialists.

The current Striving Readers program provides such targeted interventions and will also add to the research base through the Department's evaluation of the implementation and impact of specific adolescent literacy interventions in the middle and high school settings. Initial implementation results were released in 2008, and initial impact results will be released in 2009.

Approximately 46,000 middle and high school students are annually receiving new literacy instruction through funded projects, and independent evaluators are collecting data about the work teachers, literacy coaches, administrators, and professional development providers are doing in Striving Readers schools. For example, in Danville, Kentucky, where 23 middle and high schools in 7 rural districts are implementing an adolescent literacy program, the Kentucky Board of Education is using the implementation study on the program in planning for adolescent literacy across the State. The Chicago Public Schools (CPS), which instituted an aligned approach to literacy instruction for grades 6, 7, and 8, is using its implementation study to analyze what components of the Striving Readers project can be incorporated into the CPS district literacy model.

In addition to funding grants, the Department would continue to reserve a portion of funds for Striving Readers Adolescent Literacy Grants to work with local evaluators in order to ensure that the evaluations are rigorous and are conducted consistent with the evaluation plan proposed in the application.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
<u>Early Literacy Grants</u>			
New grants			\$289,500
Number of new grants	0	0	35-70
Range of awards	0	0	\$4,000-\$8,000
Average new award	0	0	\$6,000
Number of schools served	0	0	1,500
Number of children served	0	0	600,000
Peer review of new award applications	0	0	\$3,000
National activities	0	0	\$7,500
Technical assistance	0	0	\$5,000
Evaluation	0	0	\$2,500
<u>Adolescent Literacy Grants</u>			
Amount for local awards	\$34,767	\$34,544	\$68,771
Continuation	\$27,522	\$32,336	\$9,453
New	\$7,245	\$2,208	\$59,318
Total number of grants			
Continuation	8	13-17	7-12
New	5-9	2-3	40-75
Number of students served			
Whole-school intervention	73,556 ¹	84,872 ¹	265,932 ¹
Targeted intervention	11,924 ¹	13,759 ¹	43,111 ¹
Peer review of new award applications	\$354	\$354	\$700
Evaluation	\$250	\$473	\$900

¹The estimated students served are based on the actual number of students served by the first cohort of grantees during the 2007-08 school year, which are the most recent data available.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

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 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department would develop program performance measures to assess the effectiveness of the Striving Readers Early Literacy Grants program. These measures would likely include the percentage of students who learn to read proficiently by the end of third grade as measured by State reading assessments.

Objective: *To raise the reading achievement levels of middle and high school-aged students in Title I eligible schools with significant numbers of students reading below grade level.*

Measure: The percentage of adolescent students reading significantly below grade level who demonstrate a gain in their reading achievement at a minimum of one grade level or its equivalent after participating in an intensive literacy intervention over an academic year.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		34.14
2008	36.14	42.59
2009	44.14	
2010	46.14	

Assessment of progress: At the end of the spring 2008 school year, 42.6 percent of adolescent students participating in the targeted literacy intervention component of the program demonstrated a gain of at least one grade level in reading achievement, which was an increase from 34.1 percent in spring 2007. These data were aggregated from reports from seven of the eight grantees, which is the most complete information presently available. The Department established targets for 2009 and 2010 based on 2008 data.

Measure: The percentage of students in schools participating in the Striving Readers program who score at or above proficient on the State's assessment in reading/language arts		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		58.45
2007	60.45	59.32
2008	61.32	62.40
2009	64.40	
2010	66.40	

Assessment of progress: The percentage of students in Striving Readers schools who scored at or above proficient on State reading assessments increased to 62.4 percent in spring 2008. The Department established targets for 2009 and 2010 based on 2008 data.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

Other Performance Information

All grantees are conducting rigorous experimental or quasi-experimental evaluations of their targeted interventions to determine their effectiveness. The Department released year-1 reports on the implementation of the targeted and whole-school interventions in 2008. In summer 2009, the Department will release year-1 impact studies from the eight sites and will provide preliminary results from 2 years of implementation. The key research questions that the impact studies address are: (1) do the specific supplemental literacy and classroom-based strategies employed by the grantee significantly improve reading proficiency among students?; and (2) do the school-level classroom-based literacy improvement strategies significantly improve student performance on state assessments in reading/language arts?

In addition, the Institute of Education Sciences plans to release two cross-site synthesis reports, one in spring 2010 and another in spring 2011. The reports will assess the empirical evidence from the eight local evaluations and provide, where appropriate, summary conclusions about the impact of the interventions.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even Start

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

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$66,454	0	-\$66,454

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is authorized in FY 2009 through appropriations language. The Administration is not proposing appropriations language for FY 2010, nor seeking reauthorizing legislation.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

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

Six percent of the annual appropriation is set aside at the national level for programs serving migrant children, the Outlying Areas, and Indian tribes and tribal organizations if the appropriation for the program exceeds \$200 million. When the appropriation is \$200 million or less, the set-aside is 5 percent. The Department is also required to fund a grant for an Even

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even Start

Start project in a women's prison. Up to 3 percent is reserved at the Federal level for evaluation and technical assistance. In addition, in years in which the appropriation exceeds the amount appropriated for the preceding fiscal year, the Department is required to reserve \$2 million, or 50 percent of the excess, whichever is less, for the National Institute for Literacy (NIFL) to carry out scientifically based research on family literacy. When the appropriation is the same as or less than the preceding year's appropriation, the Department may reserve only sufficient funds for NIFL to continue multi-year research projects. The statute also authorizes \$1 million for competitive grants to States for Even Start statewide family literacy initiatives in years when the appropriation increases over the previous year.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$225,095
2006.....	99,000
2007.....	82,283
2008.....	66,454
2009.....	66,454

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funds for the Even Start program in fiscal year 2010, because of the poor results demonstrated by the program in national evaluations. The Administration believes that the resources currently used for Even Start would be better directed to more promising or effective early childhood programs, including the proposed Early Learning Challenge Fund (a component of the "Zero-to-Five" initiative), the new Title I Early Childhood Grants initiative, and existing programs like Early Reading First, Head Start, and Early Head Start that have demonstrated real benefits for children. The Administration will pursue the President's commitment to expanding support for quality early childhood education through these programs.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even Start

The key premise underlying the Even Start program is that the integration of the four core instructional components of adult education, parenting education, parent-child activities, and early childhood education adds value to the individual components. While these parent-centered approaches may yield positive outcomes in some settings, such impacts have not been found in the Even Start program setting.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Funding:			
Amount distributed to States	\$61,138	\$61,138	0
Average State award	\$1,176	\$1,176	0
Range of State awards	\$306 - \$7,270	\$306 - \$6,746	0
Evaluation and technical assistance	\$1,994	\$1,994	0
Set-aside for migrant children, the			
Outlying Areas, and Indian tribes	\$3,314	\$3,323	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$9	0	0
Projects:			
Number of State-awarded projects	462	462	0
Indian tribes projects:			
Continuation	0	3-5	0
New	3-5	0	0
Migrant projects:			
Continuation	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>
Total projects	471-473	471-473	0
Number of children served	23 570 ¹	23 570 ¹	0
Number of adults served	17,060 ¹	17,060 ¹	0

¹ The 2008 and 2009 estimates are based on the number of children and students during 2006-07, which are the most recent data available.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even Start

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

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

Objective: *The literacy of participating families will improve.*

Measure: The percentage of Even Start adults who achieve significant learning gains on measures of reading/English language acquisition, as measured by the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS) and the Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE).		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	71.4	63.8
2006	72.1	66.3
2007	70.9	68.4
2008	71.2	
2009	73.0	

Assessment of progress: In 2007, 68.4 percent of Even Start adults achieved significant learning gains on measures of reading/English language acquisition. The program made progress from the previous year, but did not meet the target of 70.9 percent. No targets are shown for 2010 because the Administration is not requesting funding for this program.

Measure: The percentage of Even Start adults with a high school completion goal who earn a high school diploma.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	60.2	47.2
2006	60.8	77.6
2007	60.8	68.5
2008	60.8	
2009	70.0	

Assessment of progress: In 2007, 68.0 percent of Even Start adults with a high school completion goal earned a high school diploma, a decrease from the 2006 level but exceeding the target of 60.8 percent. It is important to note that most participants whose performance is

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even Start

reported under this measure are school-aged parents. In years prior to 2006, States included in the data for this measure parents who were working toward a high school diploma but may not have been eligible to receive a diploma in the reporting year, such as freshmen in high school. The Department clarified the grantee reporting instructions for this measure in 2006, which is likely at least a partial cause of the dramatic increase in the reported rate of adult participant diploma attainment. In 2007, 68.5 percent of Even Start adults with a high school completion goal earned a high school diploma, which exceeded the target. No targets are shown for 2010 because the Administration is not requesting funding for this program.

Measure: The percentage of Even Start adults with General Equivalency Diploma (GED) attainment goal who earn a GED.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	44.9	57.9
2006	45.3	47.3
2007	45.3	48.9
2008	48.0	
2009	45.0	

Assessment of progress: In 2007, 48.9 percent of Even Start adults with a high school completion goal earned a GED, exceeding the target of 45.3 percent. No targets are shown for 2010 because the Administration is not requesting funding for this program.

Measure: The percentage of Even Start children who are entering kindergarten achieving significant gains on receptive language, as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT – III).		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	83.7	79.8
2006	84.6	75.3
2007	84.6	75.0
2008	85.0	
2009	80.0	

Assessment of progress: In 2005, the Department defined significant gains as a gain of 4 points or more on the PPVT-III. In 2007, 75.0 percent of Even Start children entering kindergarten achieved significant gains on receptive language, falling short of the target of 84.6 percent. No targets are shown for 2010 because the Administration is not requesting funding for this program.

Measure: The number of letters preschool-aged Even Start children can identify, as measured by the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		15
2007	16	16
2008	17	
2009	17	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even Start

Assessment of progress: On average, Even Start children could identify 16 letters in 2007, meeting the target. No targets are shown for 2010 because the Administration is not requesting funding for this program.

In addition, in 2007, the Department added a new measure: "The percentage of preschool-aged children participating in Even Start programs who demonstrate age-appropriate oral language skills as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III, Receptive (PPVT-III, Receptive)." The purpose of this measure is to determine the percentage of preschool-aged Even Start participants who enter kindergarten with sufficient language skills. In 2007, 66 percent of preschool-aged children demonstrated age-appropriate oral language skills. The Department set targets of 67 percent for 2008 and 68 percent for 2009. No targets are shown for 2010 because the Administration is not requesting funding for this program.

Other Performance Information

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

In addition, the statute requires the Department to conduct independent evaluations to determine the performance and effectiveness of Even Start programs. Two of these evaluations employed a rigorous experimental design model in which families who wished to enroll in Even Start were randomly assigned either to participate in the program or to become part of the control group. Both experimental evaluations showed that, although Even Start adult and child participants made gains in literacy assessments and on other measures, these gains were not larger than those achieved by members of the control group. The third national Even Start evaluation found that, while the early childhood classroom experiences provided by Even Start projects in the study were of overall good quality, they did not include sufficient emphasis on language acquisition and reasoning to produce measurable impacts on literacy assessments.

In order to learn more about the effectiveness of Even Start instructional services, the Institute of Education Sciences conducted the *Even Start Classroom Literacy Interventions and Outcomes (CLIO)* study. The study tested whether two research-based, literacy-focused preschool and parenting education curricula were more effective than existing Even Start instructional services, and the extent to which research-based parenting education curricula focused on child literacy add value to the CLIO preschool curricula. The final report, released in September 2008, found that the CLIO combined curricula had statistically significant positive impacts on support for print knowledge and literacy resources in the classroom, the amount of parenting education time spent on child literacy, parent interactive reading skill and parent responsiveness to their child, and child social competence. The combined curricula did not,

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even Start

however, demonstrate statistically significant impacts in numerous other areas, including parent English reading skills, and several child outcome measures including expressive language, receptive vocabulary, phonological awareness, print knowledge, and grammar.

Program Improvement Efforts

The Department is undertaking the following improvement efforts for this program:

- Supporting grantees in the delivery of high-quality services through monitoring and technical assistance.
- Measuring outcomes, such as early literacy skills for children and high school completion for adults, and establish ambitious annual and long-term performance targets. The Department is also considering adjusting the performance targets to better reflect current performance.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Literacy through school libraries

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

FY 2010 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$19,145	\$19,145	0

¹ The program is authorized in FY 2009 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

An LEA receiving assistance under the program is required to report annually on: (1) how it used program funds; and (2) the extent to which the LEA has increased the availability of, and access to, up-to-date school library media resources in its schools. In addition, the Department is required to conduct biennial evaluations of the program. Finally, the Department requires grantees to report data for the performance measures established under the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA).

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Literacy through school libraries

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

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$19,683
2006.....	19,486
2007.....	19,485
2008.....	19,145
2009.....	19,145

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2010, the Administration requests \$19.1 million, the same amount as the 2009 level, for the Literacy Through School Libraries program. The requested level recognizes the strategic role that school libraries can play in making information available to all students, training students and teachers about how to obtain and make use of information, and increasing access for low-income students to technology and information.

Compelling evidence indicates that far too many young people are struggling through school without having mastered reading, the most essential and basic skill. On the 2007 National Assessment of Educational Progress, 50 percent of all fourth graders in high-poverty schools scored below the "basic" reading level. Research shows that students who fail to read well by fourth grade have a greater likelihood of dropping out and of a lifetime of diminished success. For these reasons, providing consistent support for reading success from the earliest age has critically important benefits.

The Literacy Through School Libraries program addresses specifically the problem of access to printed materials and high-quality school libraries for schools that serve concentrations of poor students. Children who attend these schools have less access to the types of services and materials that seem to raise student achievement. The 2004 National Center for Education Statistics report, *School Library Media Centers: Selected Results From the Education Longitudinal Study of 2002*, found that high-poverty schools (defined as those in which more than 50 percent of the students are eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch) are more likely than wealthy schools (those with less than 20 percent of students so eligible) to have libraries with fewer than 8,000 books and to have expended no funds for computer hardware for the school library in the 2000-01 school year.

In 2008, the American Association of School Librarians released its second annual survey of school libraries, *School Libraries Count!* Although respondents to the survey are self-selected, and the sample is, therefore, not nationally representative, the survey indicated differences between high- and low-poverty schools. For example, school libraries that serve fewer poor students average 31.7 hours per week of State-certified school library media specialist time, compared to 28.1 hours in schools with more poor students. In addition, high-poverty schools average fewer total books in the school library than do lower-poverty schools (less than 12,000 versus about 13,400), although poor schools do average slightly more books per student than low-poverty schools (23 versus 22). High-poverty schools average fewer computers in the school library than do low-poverty schools – 20 versus 28 computers, respectively. Although

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Literacy through school libraries

there is no significant difference between high- and low-poverty schools on groups visits (entire classes, small groups) to the school library per week, there is a difference between high- and low-poverty schools in individual visits to the school library; high-poverty schools average 237 visits per week, while low-poverty schools average 357. Finally, on average, high-poverty schools spend less on their libraries than low-poverty schools, both in total (\$12,254 in low-poverty schools versus \$8,604 in high-poverty schools) and per student (\$16.64 versus \$14.59).

Several studies have found correlations between significant library investment and improved student achievement in general and with improved literacy in particular. Analyses of national and State assessment data have also found correlations between student performance on those assessments and the use and quality of school library media centers. For example, an analysis of 1994 National Assessment of Educational Progress data found that States with reading scores above the national average were more likely to have schools where students had greater access to library media specialists and that those students used library resources more frequently. State-level studies have shown comparable findings. A 2003 analysis of achievement data in North Carolina found that scores on standardized reading and English tests tended to increase when, among other things, libraries in schools: (1) were open more hours during the week; (2) had newer books; and (3) subscribed to online periodical services and CD ROM services. A 2000 study by Keith Curry Lance found that Colorado achievement test scores averaged 10 to 15 percent higher in elementary schools and 18 percent higher in middle schools with well-developed library media programs.

The following are examples of the projects funded Literacy Through School Libraries program in fiscal year 2006, the most recent year for which the Department has received final grantee reports. With a grant of approximately \$300,000, the Chicago Public Schools improved school library media centers in 10 elementary schools. Grant funds added from 750 to 1,400 new book titles to each school library for a total of 11,730 new books. In addition, each school received two computers as well as projectors, listening centers, and other equipment. To maximize the use of the library, nine of the schools provided extended hours on Saturdays, after school, and during the summer.

Glidden School District in Wisconsin received a grant of about \$150,000 and used the funds to purchase over 1,200 books and 26 computers (including laptops), and to employ a part-time library aide, which allowed the school library media specialist more time to work with teachers on collaboration efforts in teaching language arts.

Espanola Public Schools in New Mexico used its grant of nearly \$290,000 to purchase over 16,000 books, as well as 15 computers, for four schools. Further, the district opened the existing media centers during the summer in three of the schools for 4 hours per day for 4 weeks.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Literacy through school libraries

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Amount for local awards	\$18,571	\$18,571	\$18,571
Number of new awards	60	55-65	55-65
Number of schools served	590	590	590
Amount for peer review of applications	\$191	\$191	\$191
Amount for evaluation	\$191	\$191	\$191
Amount for the DOI Bureau of Indian Education	\$96	\$96	\$96
Amount for the Outlying Areas	\$96	\$96	\$96

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measure

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2010 and future years and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department recently revised the program's performance measures as: (1) the percentage of students in schools served by the Literacy Through School Libraries program who are proficient in reading; (2) the number of books and media resources purchased per student, pre- and post-grant, compared to the national average; and (3) the difference in the number of purchases of school library materials (books and media resources) between schools participating in the Literacy Through School Libraries program and the national average. The Department expects to have baseline data for the new measures in fall 2009.

Other Performance Information

In 2009, the Department completed an evaluation of the program to determine: (1) how districts allocate grant funds and target them to schools with the greatest need for improved library resources; (2) how funds are used (e.g., to buy books, improve technology, increase library hours, or provide professional development for library and reading staff); (3) the effects of the program on staff collaboration and coordination; and (4) how reading achievement scores vary in schools that received grants compared to schools that did not. The study addressed these questions by examining data from grantee performance reports, a school library survey of

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Literacy through school libraries

grantees and matched comparison schools, and annual school-level student test score data. The study is posted at: <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oepd/ppss/reports.html#libraries>.

Key findings of the study include:

- School districts reported selecting participating schools based on various kinds of disadvantages at those schools. For example, 36 percent chose schools based on a lack of library resources, 22 percent based on poverty level, and 20 percent based on those identified for school improvement under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. However, 53 percent of districts distributed grant funds to all of the schools in the district. (Districts could use more than one method to select schools for participation.)
- Compared to nongrantees, grantees were more likely to identify needs with regard to having up-to-date materials (95 percent of grantees versus 85 percent of nongrantees), having the library open for more hours (75 percent versus 41 percent), and having more time for planning with teachers (64 percent versus 40 percent).
- Before the grant, significantly fewer grantees considered their materials to be adequate or excellent compared with nongrantees for all types of materials, especially the reading/English literature collection, print materials, video/audiovisual materials, and computer software. In contrast, during the grant year, significantly more of the grantees considered their reading/English literature collection, print materials, and computer software to be adequate or excellent compared with nongrantees.
- School libraries tended to allocate the greatest amount of their funds to materials such as books and subscriptions and the next most to computer hardware. Districts that received grants spent 57 percent of the grant money on school library sources, including books and subscriptions, in the 2005-06 school year. Districts spent 20 percent of funds on the acquisition of advanced technology and 8 percent on operating the library during nonschool hours. After receiving the grants, grantees roughly tripled the amounts they spent on books and subscriptions and on computer hardware. By contrast, nongrantees showed little change in these categories. Among the grantees, some of the greatest changes were among small schools, rural schools, and schools with \$12 or less in pre-grant library expenditures per student.
- Grantees showed significant increases in the number of days that the library was open in the summer and in the number of visits to the library per week.
- Before receiving the grants, grantees provided significantly fewer non-school hours of access than nongrantees, but they eliminated this difference after receiving the grants.
- Grantees acquired substantially more books in the 2005-06 grant year than did nongrantees (with means of 1,611 and 784 books, respectively), although nongrantees still had more books in their library collections at the end of the year than did grantees (11,892 for nongrantees and 9,451 for grantees).

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Literacy through school libraries

- About twice as many classroom teachers, paraprofessionals, and reading specialists in grantee schools received professional development related to school libraries compared with nongrantee staff members (for example, a mean of 9.5 to 4.7 classroom teachers, respectively) in 2005-06. However, the mean number of both grantee and nongrantee staff members receiving professional development decreased in 2005-06 compared to 2003-04, especially for classroom teachers (from 14.1 to 9.5 for grantees and from 11.1 to 4.7 for nongrantees).
- Grantees were more likely than nongrantees to have library media staff members: (1) assist teachers in designing, implementing, and evaluating research projects for students (42 percent versus 24 percent, respectively); (2) work with the principal and/or teachers on curriculum issues (40 percent versus 23 percent); (3) participate in team meetings (36 percent versus 23 percent); and (4) coordinate training programs on integrating educational technology into the curriculum for teachers and other staff members (42 percent versus 22 percent).
- No definitive statement can be made as to whether the Literacy Through School Libraries program was associated with changes in student test scores. The program feature that most clearly was related to improved test results was an increase in the number of books per student that were purchased by the library. Some differences appeared by instructional level, with grantee status showing a stronger relationship to student test scores at the elementary-school level and an increase in the number of books per student showing a stronger relationship at the secondary-school level. However, because of the lack of a true experimental design, the findings cannot support causal inferences that attribute observed differences in student reading achievement between grantee and non-grantee schools to the program.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

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

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$394,771	\$394,771	0

¹ The program is authorized in FY 2009 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

Beginning with fiscal year 2003, every State receives at least 100 percent of the amount that it received through the program in fiscal year 2002. All funds in excess of \$396 million (the fiscal year 2002 appropriation) are allocated through a statutory formula based on each State's per-pupil expenditure for education, its count of eligible migratory students aged 3 through 21 residing within the State in the previous year, and its count of students who received services in summer or intersession programs provided by the State.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

the Department may reserve up to \$3 million a year from coordination funds for incentive grants of not more than \$250,000 to such consortia.

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

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

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

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$390,428
2006.....	386,524
2007.....	386,524
2008.....	379,771
2009.....	394,771

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2010, the Administration requests \$394.8 million for the Title I Migrant Education program, the same amount as the 2009 level. Funds would support activities to identify highly mobile migratory children and youth, provide them comprehensive services that address their specific needs, and promote coordination of the Federal resources available to serve this population.

Migrant students represent an especially disadvantaged, hard-to-serve group due to a multitude of risk factors present in the migrant population in general. These students tend to be highly mobile, live in poverty, and have limited English proficiency. In addition, migrant children and youth sometimes help their families perform agricultural work, and a growing number of migrant "emancipated youth" travel without a parent or guardian to obtain migratory work in the fields and in processing plants. These characteristics create a need for educational services that go well beyond services traditionally supported with State and local education budgets. Migrant children, by definition, move across school district and State boundaries, and this movement, connected to the production of food distributed in interstate commerce, provides a classic rationale for Federal intervention. Furthermore, no single school district or State is responsible for the education of these students due to their high rate of mobility across district and State lines.

Data for 2006-07 indicate that the program provided services to 537,056 migrant students during the regular school year and 192,794 during the summer or intersessions. Program funds supported 3,155 projects that operated during the school day, 939 projects that included an

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

extended school day, 1,632 summer projects, and 4,007 year-round projects. Services include supplemental instruction in reading, math, and other academic areas, as well as support services such as counseling, health services, and (especially in the summer) transportation.

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

In 2008, the Department published regulations that require States to establish quality control procedures to ensure the accuracy of the counts of eligible migratory children. The regulations were instituted to address the problems of erroneous migrant student counts reported by the Department's Office of Inspector General in 2004 and 2005 and to establish procedures for adjusting prior-year allocations due to discrepancies in 2002 student counts, which were the basis of allocations for fiscal years 2002 through 2008. The Department is providing technical assistance to States on the new regulations and on improving their migrant student identification activities.

From the 2010 request, \$384.8 million would support the basic State Grants program. In addition, the Department plans to reserve \$10 million for migrant coordination activities, including \$3 million for consortium incentive grants and the remainder for activities related to inter- and intra-State coordination, primarily the maintenance and operation of the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX), including technical assistance to States as they implement their own data systems to collect and exchange data on migrant students.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Number of students generating funds	536,376	536,376	536,376
SEA program:			
Amount for State grants	\$369,771	\$384,771	\$384,771
Range of awards	\$67 - \$124,730	\$70 - \$136,003	\$70 - \$136,003
Coordination activities:			
Consortium incentive grants	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) - continued

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Migrant student information exchange and related coordination activities	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

Objective: *Ensure that secondary and postsecondary CTE concentrators, including special populations, meet rigorous academic standards, attain technical skills, and make successful transitions to further education and employment.*

Measure: The number of States meeting an annually set performance target in reading at the elementary school level for migrant students.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	16	23
2006	18	27
2007	20	30
2008	22	
2009	31	
2010	33	

Measure: The number of States meeting an annually set performance target in reading at the middle school level for migrant students.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	17	14
2006	19	19
2007	21	24
2008	23	
2009	25	
2010	27	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

Measure: The number of States meeting an annually set performance target in mathematics at the elementary school level for migrant students.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	20	26
2006	22	31
2007	24	31
2008	26	
2009	31	
2010	33	

Measure: The number of States meeting an annually set performance target in mathematics for middle school migrant students.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	14	14
2006	16	15
2007	18	23
2008	20	
2009	23	
2010	25	

Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Assessment of progress: The measures call for States to reach annually-set performance targets; the current target is that 50 percent of migrant students perform at the proficient or above level on State reading and mathematics assessments. As more States reach the initial target level, the Department will raise the target accordingly. The number of States reporting at least 50 percent of migrant students performing at the proficient or above level on State reading assessments in the elementary and middle school grades and in the mathematics assessments in the middle school grades increased between fiscal year 2006 and fiscal year 2007. It remained the same for mathematics assessments in the elementary school grades. In fiscal year 2007, 30 States met or exceeded the 50 percent target in reading in the elementary grades; 24 did so for reading in the middle school grades; 31 did so for mathematics in the elementary grades; and 23 did so for mathematics in the middle grades. The target goal was met in every case.

Based on State data, 43.5 percent of migrant 4th-grade students were proficient in reading and 50.8 percent in math in 2007, a decrease from 51.8 percent in reading and 54 percent in math in 2006. For 8th-grade migrant students, 37.6 percent were proficient in reading in 2007 and 35.4 percent in math, a decrease from 43 percent in reading and 38.7 percent in math in 2006. However, the numbers are not comparable across the 2 years. The 2006 data were estimated based on an average of the percentage of migrant students that States reported as proficient in reading and mathematics. The 2007 data are based on actual counts of numbers of migrant students that States reported as proficient in reading and mathematics, which is a better indicators of the performance of the students. The change in methodology used to calculate these percentages is due to changes in reporting requirements for States to provide data on

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

migrant students that the Department instituted to improve data quality and reduce errors in the data.

Measure: The number of states meeting an annually set performance target for dropout rate for migrant students.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	16	23
2006	17	27
2007	18	
2008	19	
2009	27	
2010	29	

Measure: The number of states meeting an annually set performance target for high school graduation of migrant students.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	14	15
2006	15	18
2007	16	
2008	17	
2009	18	
2010	19	

Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Assessment of progress: The measures call for States to reach annually-set performance targets; the current targets are 50 percent or fewer migrant students drop out of school and that 50 percent or more migrant students graduate from high school. As more States reach the initial target level, the Department will change the targets accordingly.

The baseline for the number of States with 50 percent or fewer migrant students dropping out of school was 23 in 2005, and the number increased to 27 States in 2006, surpassing the target of 17 States. The baseline for the number of States with 50 percent or more migrant students graduating from high school was 15 in 2005, and the number increased to 18 in 2006, surpassing the target of 15 States for that year. Data for 2007 will be available in late 2009. Note that variation in the calculation of dropout rates limits the validity of comparisons across the States. This measure will have greater validity and reliability over time as State procedures for calculating and reporting dropout and graduation rates stabilize, and as they include all migrant students appropriately in the calculations and properly disaggregate and report results.

Efficiency Measures

The Department established an efficiency measure associated with the transfer of migrant student records. The efficiency measure will assess annual changes in the percentage of actively migrating students for which the MSIX system has consolidated records that reflect a

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

complete history of school and health information. The MSIX integrates procedures designed to achieve efficiencies and cost reductions by linking separate State and local efforts to transfer health and education records into a single system that can be used within and across all States.

The system began collecting data from a number of States in December 2007, but not every State had access to the system at that time. The Department is now working with States to ensure they put in place data systems that meet the appropriate technical standards to connect to MSIX. The targets for the percentage of migrant student records that are consolidated when school enrollment has occurred in more than one State are 50 percent in 2009, 75 percent in 2010, and 100 percent in 2011.

Program Improvement Efforts

The Department is undertaking the following improvement efforts for this program:

- *Completing negotiation with States regarding corrections of State-reported estimates of the ineligible children included in previous statewide counts of migratory children.* On July 28, 2008, the Department issued regulations requiring States to submit defect rates to the Secretary that will be used to re-estimate their counts of eligible children and adjust their allocations. The Department expects to complete these negotiations in 2009.
- *Supporting State implementation of actions, policies, and procedures to eliminate migrant child eligibility problems.* The July 2008 regulations also included requirements regarding quality control procedures States must implement to ensure accurate determinations of student eligibility and clear definitions of several terms that had previously been defined in non-regulatory guidance and applied inconsistently. In 2010, the Department will continue to provide technical assistance to States on making accurate eligibility determinations and improving quality control procedures.
- *Supporting State participation in the Migrant Student Information Exchange records system (MSIX).* The Department is developing regulations to require States to implement data systems to support collection of migrant student data and transmit those data to the MSIX so that they are available to other States when a migrant student moves. The Department expects to publish the regulations late in 2009.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and Delinquent

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

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$50,427	\$50,427	0

¹ The program is authorized in FY 2009 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

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

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$48,600
2006.....	49,797
2007.....	49,797
2008.....	48,927
2009.....	50,427

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2010, the Administration requests \$50.427 million, the same as the 2009 funding level, to help an estimated 132,000 Neglected and Delinquent (N and D) students return to and complete school and obtain employment after they are released from State institutions.

In terms of academic achievement, the youth served by this program are, on average, 3 years behind in grade level and generally lack job skills. A 1996 study conducted by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) found that, while most of the inmates in America's prisons would eventually be paroled, two-thirds did not have the literacy skills needed to function in society. The findings of the ETS report show the importance of educating and preparing neglected and delinquent youth for further education or to enter the workforce.

Moreover, the Department has some evidence that the program is producing positive outcomes. Although only early data on the academic proficiency gains of participating students are available, the initial results are promising. An evaluation of the program (2000) showed that over 80 percent of participating institutions provided reading and math instruction, and data reported by States in ESEA Consolidated State Performance Reports for the 2005-06 and 2006-07 school years indicate that approximately 70 percent of students enrolled in an N and D program or facility for 90 or more consecutive calendar days showed improved performance on assessments in reading and math. In addition, the percentage of participating students earning high school course credits while in an N and D program appears to be increasing. The Department is continuing to provide technical assistance to States to help ensure they are providing effective transition services to help students continue their schooling or seek employment. The Department is also continuing to develop better means of tracking data on achievement once students leave institutions, including data on high school graduation rates for program participants.

The population served by this program is extremely disadvantaged and isolated. Most have encountered challenges in school before entering the program and need skills that will help them reenter school or obtain a job after release. An earlier evaluation of the program (1991) showed that: (1) about half of program participants enrolled in school when they left the institution, but many subsequently dropped out; and (2) most participants found jobs after being released, but they were typically low-paying, and about two-thirds of the employed youth had more than one job. According to a 2006 report by the Department of Justice's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the number of delinquency cases processed by juvenile

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

courts increased 6 percent between 1993 and 2002. There were nearly 92,000 delinquents in juvenile facilities in 2003.

From the 2010 request, the Department would reserve approximately \$1.26 million to continue to provide technical assistance and other activities through the National Evaluation and Technical Assistance Center for Children who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk, which the Department established with N and D national activities funds. Some of the center's activities include: (1) developing a national model for evaluating the effectiveness of N and D programs; (2) collecting and disseminating information on tools and effective practices that can be used to support N and D youth; and (3) providing technical assistance, using experts and practitioners, to State agencies.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Number of participating institutions	905	905	905
Estimated number of students served	132,229	132,229	132,229
Average Federal contribution Per child (whole dollars)	\$370	\$381	\$381
National activities	\$1,223	\$1,260	\$1,260

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 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

Measure: The percentage of neglected or delinquent students obtaining a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent while in the N and D program.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	8.8	10.5
2006	11.0	11.2
2007	11.6	10.3
2008	12.2	
2009	12.8	
2010	13.4	

Assessment of progress: Student counts for this measure are based on the number of long-term N and D students (those enrolled in a participating program or facility for 90 or more consecutive calendar days). The Department collected 2005 data through the ESEA Consolidated State Performance Reports from 45 States; in that year the program exceeded the performance target. Data collected in 2005 provided the first data collection from all 52 grantees and established a working baseline for subsequent performance targets. In 2006, 11.2 percent of long-term N and D students received a secondary school diploma or equivalent while participating in the program, exceeding the target. In 2007, 10.3 percent of N and D students, less than the target, received a secondary school diploma or equivalent while participating in the program. Data for 2008 will be available in June 2009.

Measure: The percentage of neglected or delinquent students earning high school course credits.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		56.0
2006	58.8	47.7
2007	61.7	50.0
2008	64.8	
2009	55.2	
2010	58.0	

Assessment of progress: The Department collected data in 2005 as the baseline for this indicator; however, grantees reported inconsistent data, including information for adults. In 2006, with improved data collection and reporting, program staff re-assessed information reported in 2005, using counts of the population of students between the ages of 11 and 21 in neglected, juvenile detention, and juvenile correctional institutions. Using these new criteria, the Department determined that approximately 56 percent of N and D students earned high school course credits in 2005 and established targets for subsequent years based on a 5-percent increase from the 2005 baseline. The 2006 target was not met. In 2007, 50.0 percent of N and D students earned high school course credits, again less than the target. The 2007 level omits data received from three States, representing about 9 percent of all N and D students, that may have submitted inaccurate information for this performance measure. Data for 2008 will be available in June 2009.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

Measure: The percentage of long-term neglected or delinquent students who improve reading skills as measured through State-approved assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		72.5
2006	76.2	70.1
2007	80.0	70.3
2008	84.0	
2009	88.2	
2010	92.6	

Measure: The percentage of long-term neglected or delinquent students who improve mathematics skills as measured through State-approved assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		69.2
2007	72.7	72.9
2008	76.4	
2009	80.2	
2010	84.2	

Assessment of progress: In 2007, the Department developed two new measures to track improvements in the reading and mathematics skills of N and D participants. Student counts are based on the number of long-term students (those enrolled in a participating program or facility for 90 or more consecutive calendar days) who are in N and D institutions and complete pre- and post-testing in reading and mathematics. These are not the same as the State assessments required under ESEA Title I and do not necessarily reflect State proficiency levels. Data collected in 2005 and 2006 provided performance baselines for reading and mathematics targets, respectively. In 2006, 70.1 percent of long-term N and D students showed improvement in reading skills as measured through State-approved assessments, and 69.2 percent of long-term N and D students showed improvement in mathematics skills. In 2007, 70.3 percent of N and D students demonstrated improved reading skills and 72.9 percent showed improved mathematics skills. However, three States, representing about 11 percent of all the students in the program, did not report on these two performance measures in 2007. Data for 2008 will be available in June 2009.

Efficiency Measure

Measure: The cost per high school diploma or equivalent.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		\$5,059
2006	\$4,789	4,421
2007	4,502	4,974
2008	4,232	
2009	3,978	
2010	3,739	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

Assessment of progress: The Department developed an efficiency measure for the N and D program: the cost per high school diploma or equivalent. This measure attempts to determine program cost efficiencies by tracking the ratio of the number of participating students achieving a high school diploma or its equivalent to the cost of the program. In 2005, the first year in which this measure was used, the cost per high school diploma or equivalent was \$5,095. In 2006, this measure decreased to \$4,421. In 2007, the cost per high school diploma or equivalent increased to \$4,974, and again exceeded the target for that year. The 2007 result excludes data from one State, representing less than 2 percent of the total number of N and D students, that may have submitted inaccurate data for this measure. Data for 2008 will be available in June 2009.

Other Performance Information

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

Program Improvement Efforts

The Department is undertaking the following improvement efforts for the N and D program:

- *Pursuing legislative, regulatory, or administrative changes that would enable the Department to collect data on achievement once students leave institutions, including data on high school completion.* The Department will develop and implement at least one additional outcome measure in order to determine the effectiveness of transition services and the graduation rate of students who have been in N or D institutions.
- *Enhancing technical assistance to States to help ensure that they are providing the required services to help students transition successfully to further schooling or employment.* The Department's annual national meeting in 2007 highlighted newly available State data on transition outcomes and provided States with tools to make the data useful for program improvement purposes. The Department's technical assistance center also began running bi-monthly "ND Community" calls for State Part D coordinators, with two recent calls focusing on transition. The technical assistance center will continue updating the Transition Library and the At-Risk pages of its website.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

- *Using performance data to target services and monitor areas of greatest need.* The Department is working with its technical assistance center to improve the collection and quality of data on service delivery and program performance.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Evaluation

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

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$9,167	\$9,167	0

¹ The program is authorized in FY 2009 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

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

In accordance with the authorizing statute, the Department submitted National Assessment reports to the Congress in April 2006 and October 2007. Key findings from the October 2007 report may be found under the request in this account for Title I Grants to Local Educational

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Evaluation

Agencies, and the full report is available at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20084012/>. In early 2009, the Department published an update of the October 2007 report that includes data collected in the 2006-2007 school year, as well as separate studies on targeting and the uses of Federal education funds, teacher quality, and public school choice and supplemental educational services. These studies are available at <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oepd/ppss/reports.html#title>.

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

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$9,424
2006.....	9,330
2007.....	9,330
2008.....	9,167
2009.....	9,167

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The Department requests \$9.2 million for Title I evaluation in fiscal year 2010, the same as the 2009 level. Most funds would be used to support the next National Assessment of Title I, consistent with the requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In addition, the 2010 request would continue to fund quick-turnaround support and other analyses related to the implementation and effectiveness of Title I.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
<u>National Assessment of Title I</u>	0	\$7,367	\$8,167
<u>Impact Studies</u>			
Technical Support for the Independent Review Panel	\$50	160	160
Impact Evaluation of Reading Comprehension Interventions	1,765	0	0
Impact Evaluation of Math Curricula	4,775	800	0
Impact Study of Supplemental Service Providers	1,480	0	0

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Evaluation

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) - continued

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
<u>Implementation Studies</u>			
Evaluation of Growth Model Pilot	\$400	\$400	0
National Longitudinal Study of NCLB	240	0	0
Smaller studies	417	400	\$800
Printing	<u>40</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>40</u>
<u>Total</u>	9,167	9,167	9,167

NOTE: Reflects preliminary estimates for fiscal years 2009-2010 pending final approval of Evaluation spending plans.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

(Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part A, Subpart 5, Section 418A)

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$34,168	\$36,668	+\$2,500

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Special Programs for Migrant Students provide 5-year grants to institutions of higher education (IHEs) and to private nonprofit organizations to support educational programs designed for students who are engaged in, or whose families are engaged in, migrant and other seasonal farmwork. In making awards under both programs, the Department is required to consider applicants' prior experience in operating High School Equivalency Program (HEP) and College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) projects. These programs were reauthorized in 2008 under the Higher Education Opportunities Act.

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

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

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

The Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 added a new provision allowing the Department to reserve up to one half of 1 percent of the funds appropriated between the two programs for outreach, technical assistance, and professional development activities. In addition, under the reauthorization, if the total amount appropriated is below \$40 million, the remaining funds are to be distributed between the two programs in the same proportion as the amounts available for each program the previous year. If the appropriation is over \$40 million, 45 percent of the funds must be used for HEP and 45 percent for CAMP, and the remainder may be used for either program, based on the number, quality, and promise of applications received.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

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

	<u>HEP</u> (\$000s)	<u>CAMP</u> (\$000s)
2005.....	\$18,737	\$15,532
2006.....	18,550	15,377
2007.....	18,550	15,377
2008.....	18,226	15,108
2009	(1)	(1)

¹ The funding level for Special Programs for Migrant Students for 2009 was \$34,168 thousand.

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2010, the Administration requests a total of \$36.7 million for the Special Programs for Migrant Students, an increase of \$2.5 million over the 2009 level. The increase would expand the number of new High School Equivalency (HEP) and College Assistance Migrant (CAMP) projects that provide academic and support services for students who are engaged in, or whose families are engaged in, migrant and seasonal, thus improving HEP participants' prospects for obtaining a high school equivalency certificate and entering postsecondary education, CAMP participants' prospects for continuing their postsecondary education, and, for both HEP and CAMP participants, their likelihood of obtaining better employment. In addition, recent actions to improve the quality and consistency of grantee outcome data, a change that will enable the Department and grantees to improve and better target the services grantees provide, will help ensure that this modest increase is used effectively.

Migrant youth face a number of challenges in completing high school and entering and remaining in higher education. Many experience poor educational outcomes that affect their ability to pursue postsecondary education or obtain skilled work that pays higher wages. The 2002-03 National Agricultural Workers Survey (NAWS) found that 87 percent of school-aged migrant workers had dropped out of school in either the U.S. or their country of origin. Of the remaining 13 percent, 10 percent were behind in school and only 3 percent were in school and performing at grade level.

Besides being subject to the risk factors usually present in the migrant community, such as poverty, mobility, limited English proficiency, and lack of health care, many migrant youth are sometimes migrant workers themselves as well as dependents of workers. Furthermore, a substantial number of migrant youth are living on their own. According to the NAWS, migrant youth working in farmwork on their own constitute 11 percent of the total farm labor force. The Public Policy Institute of California reported in 2007 that, in that State, which, according to the NAWS employs an estimated 36 percent of the Nation's farmworkers, more than half of youth aged 13 to 15 working in agriculture live away from their parents.

HEP and CAMP focus on finding and assisting migrant youth who have potential but who have not been able—due to lack of positive role models, lack of outreach on the part of local school

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

authorities, interrupted schooling, or other obstacles—to complete high school or go on to postsecondary education. HEP and CAMP emphasize services to out-of-school-youth by conducting extensive outreach in locations where these youth live and work (e.g., farms, production facilities, and labor camps) and providing services at locations and times that meet the needs of an out-of-school, working population.

The Department would reserve funds under the new provision that allows up to one half of 1 percent of the funds appropriated between the two programs to be used for outreach, technical assistance, and professional development activities.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Outreach, technical assistance, and professional development	0	\$171	\$183
HEP:			
Number of students served (projected)	6,989	6,800	7,298
Number of awards:			
First year	0	16	13
Second year	4	0	16
Third year	11	4	0
Fourth year	10	11	4
Fifth year	<u>18</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>
Total	43	41	44
Funding:			
New awards	0	\$7,233	\$5,936
Peer review of new award applications	0	185	199
Continuation awards	\$18,226	11,170	13,814
Average grant award	424	453	453
Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars)	\$2,608	\$2,734	\$2,734
CAMP:			
Number of students served (projected)	1,633	1,633	1,765
Number of awards:			
First year	0	13	10
Second year	9	0	13
Third year	8	9	0
Fourth year	7	8	9
Fifth year	<u>14</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>
Total	38	37	40

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) - continued

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Funding:			
New awards	0	\$5,713	\$4,443
Peer review of new award applications	0	154	165
Continuation awards	\$15,108	9,542	11,928
Average grant award	398	417	417
 Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars)	 \$9,252	 \$9,436	 \$9,436

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

Objective: *An increasing percentage of HEP participants will receive their General Educational Development (GED) credential.*

Measure: The percentage of High School Equivalency Program (HEP) participants receiving a General Educational Development (GED) credential.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	65	66
2006	66	63
2007	67	54
2008	68	87
2009	69	
2010	69	

Source: Grantee Performance Reports

Assessment of progress: The 2008 data seem to show a large increase in the percentage of HEP students who received a GED between 2007 and 2008, but preliminary analyses indicate that there was wide variation in the data grantees reported. Grantees used the new annual reporting format and requirements for reporting 2008 data; the purpose of the new reporting

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

system was to improve the quality of the data. However, the variation in the data grantees reported for this measure indicates there may be problems in how GED attainment rates were calculated. The Department is reviewing the methods used for calculating the outcomes. For that reason, the Department is keeping the target for fiscal year 2010 at 69 percent. The Department plans to re-set program targets after it has received 2 years' worth of actual performance data from grantees using the new reporting format. That strategy will provide grantees with time and experience in reporting data in a new way and will allow the Department to provide further technical assistance to improve the consistency of the data. Data collected for fiscal year 2009 will be available in spring of 2010.

Objective: *An increasing percentage of HEP recipients of the GED will enter postsecondary education programs, upgraded employment, or the military.*

Measure: The percentage of HEP GED credential recipients who enter postsecondary educational programs, upgraded employment, or the military.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	77	81
2006	78	89
2007	79	84
2008	80	67
2009	81	
2010	68	

Source: Grantee Performance Reports.

Assessment of progress: The percentage of HEP participants who received a GED and then entered postsecondary education programs, upgraded employment, or the military decreased between 2007 and 2008, and failed to meet the target of 80 percent. Note that prior to 2008, data for this measure were based on projections rather than actual placement after receipt of a GED credential. The Department is providing technical assistance to grantees on collecting data on program participants once the participants are no longer receiving program services, and the new reporting format should improve the consistency and accuracy of the data. The performance data for 2007 (for which only a small group of grantees used the new reporting format) and 2008 (when all grantees started using it) seem to indicate that there was a significant decrease in the percentage of HEP participants who received a GED and then entered postsecondary education programs, upgraded employment, or the military. Based on the data reported for 2008 and 2009 the Department may reset the baseline for fiscal year 2010.

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

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

Measure: The percentage of College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) participants completing the first year of their postsecondary program.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	85	91
2006	86	86
2007	86	75
2008	86	
2009	86	
2010	86	

Source: Grantee Performance Reports.

Assessment of progress: The percentage of CAMP participants who successfully completed the first year of their postsecondary program decreased between 2006 and 2007 and did not meet the target of 86 percent. Note that, because projects are funded in the fall, after the school year may have already started, data for projects completing their first year of implementation are not included in any given year. Thus, the measure reflects the percentage of participants completing the first year of their postsecondary program between the second and fifth year of the project. Data for 2008 will be available in spring 2009. The Department will examine whether program targets need to be re-set once 2008 data are analyzed. CAMP grantees used the new performance data reporting format on a voluntary basis for 2008. All recipients will be required to use the new format for reporting 2009 data, which will be available in spring of 2010.

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

Measure: The percentage of College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) participants who, after completing the first academic year of college, continue their postsecondary education.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	80	93
2006	81	93
2007	82	91
2008	83	
2009	84	
2010	85	

Source: Grantee Performance Reports.

Assessment of progress: The percentage of CAMP participants who continued their postsecondary education after completing their first year of college decreased slightly between 2006 and 2007 but surpassed the target of 82 percent. Note that prior to 2008, data for this measure were based on projections rather than actual placement after completion of the first year of college. The Department is providing technical assistance to grantees on collecting data on program participants once the participants are no longer receiving program services, and the new reporting format should improve the consistency and accuracy of the data. Data for 2008 will be available in spring of 2009. The Department will examine whether program targets need

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

to be re-set once 2008 data are analyzed. CAMP grantees used the new performance data reporting format on a voluntary basis for 2008. All recipients will be required to use the new format for reporting 2009 data, which will be available in spring of 2010.

Efficiency Measures

The Department established a cost-per-participant outcome measure to assess program efficiency for HEP and CAMP. For HEP, the measure is the cost per participant earning a GED credential and, for CAMP, it is the cost per participant who completes his or her first year of postsecondary education and then continues that postsecondary education. The Department plans to establish targets for the efficiency measures upon completion of analyses of differences in costs between commuter and residential HEP and CAMP programs.

Year	HEP Cost per participant earning a GED	CAMP Cost per participant completing first year of postsecondary education and continuing postsecondary education
2005	\$7,223	\$7,804
2006	\$8,814	\$9,506
2007	\$4,830	\$11,195
2008	\$4,821	\$9,305

Program Improvement Efforts

The Department is undertaking the following improvement efforts for this program:

HEP Program:

- *Develop a strategy for addressing impediments that discourage new applicants.* The Department has established a competitive preference for applications from novice grantees or from faith-based organizations.
- *Develop targets for its newly adopted efficiency measure, and use the measure to analyze costs relative to the costs of other GED attainment or drop-out prevention programs.* This winter the Department received the first full set of grantee performance data collected pursuant to the new performance data reporting requirements. During 2009 the Department will conduct analyses to identify differences in costs between commuter and residential HEP projects. The Department will also consider strategies for comparing the overall performance of HEP projects relative to the performance of other GED attainment or dropout prevention programs.
- *Set and gather data on long-term goals that address outcomes achieved once participants complete the program, specifically, the extent to which they go to college or obtain better employment. These goals should be indexed against the performance of other disadvantaged populations or non-participating migrants, and not just provide “before and*

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

after” snapshots. The Department is providing technical assistance to grantees on strategies for tracking students once they attain their GED credential. Although grantees have recently submitted the first full set of performance data under the new reporting requirements, the reliability of the data for this indicator is suspect. The Department will also consider strategies for comparing the overall performance of HEP projects relative to the performance of other GED attainment or dropout prevention programs.

- *Develop a more effective method of using outcome data to hold grantees accountable.* The Department is using existing monitoring strategies, including designating grantees as “low-performing” and “high-risk” recipients, to improve program performance and accountability. Further, this year the Department plans to produce individual grantee project profiles containing grantee performance data and to disseminate those profiles among all program grantees. The Department is also exploring the feasibility of collecting performance data electronically, which would allow more efficient use of those data for accountability purposes. In addition, the Department places special conditions on low-performing grantees as a requirement for continued funding.
- *Develop a reporting and auditing system to verify locally reported data and to ensure that performance data are being collected consistently across grantees according to established criteria.* The Department has built-in checks in the new format grantees use for reporting performance data. The Department is also exploring the feasibility of collecting performance data electronically, which would facilitate data checks and audits.

CAMP Program:

- *Develop a more effective method of using outcome data to hold grantees accountable.* The Department is using existing monitoring strategies, including designating grantees as “low-performing” and “high-risk” recipients, to improve program performance and accountability. The Department developed a protocol for reviewing grantee reports for substantial progress towards performance goals and appropriate use of funds and for determining whether the Department should identify grantees for further action. In addition, the Department places special conditions on low-performing grantees as a requirement for continued funding.
- *Use the newly adopted efficiency measure, analyze CAMP program costs relative to the costs of other programs that help disadvantaged students go to college.* This winter the Department received a partial set of grantee performance data collected through the new performance data reporting requirements on a voluntary basis. All CAMP grantees will be required to submit performance data under the new reporting requirements for 2010. During 2009 the Department will conduct analyses to identify differences in costs between commuter and residential CAMP projects. The Department will also consider strategies for comparing the overall cost of CAMP projects relative to the costs of other programs that help disadvantaged students go to college.
- *Develop a reporting and auditing system to verify locally reported data and to ensure that performance data are being collected consistently across grantees according to established criteria.* The Department has built-in checks in the new format grantees use for reporting performance data. The Department is also exploring the feasibility of collecting performance data electronically, which would facilitate data checks and audits.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

- *Develop data collection strategies for the program's long-term college completion goal.* The Department is providing technical assistance to grantees on strategies for tracking students once they complete their first year of college. Although many grantees recently submitted performance data using the new reporting format, CAMP grantees are not required to submit performance data meeting the new reporting requirements until 2010.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

High school graduation initiative

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

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
0	\$50,000	+\$50,000

¹ The GEPA extension for this program expired September 30, 2008. The program would be funded in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The High School Graduation Initiative (formerly the School Dropout Prevention program) authorizes assistance to help schools implement comprehensive efforts to increase high school graduation rates. Each local educational agency (LEA) or State educational agency (SEA) that receives funds under the program must implement proven strategies for increasing the number of students who graduate and for assisting youth who leave high school before graduating to reenter and complete their schooling. LEAs and SEAs are eligible for competitive grants to develop, implement, expand, and evaluate prevention and reentry strategies that increase high school graduation rates. These strategies may include activities: (1) for early and continued identification of students at risk of not graduating; (2) to provide at-risk students with services designed to keep them in school; (3) to identify and encourage youth who have left school without graduating to reenter and graduate; (4) to implement other comprehensive approaches, such as dividing large schools into smaller learning communities; and (5) to implement transition programs that help students successfully transition from middle school to high school. Specific authorized activities include: professional development; reduction in pupil-teacher ratios; counseling and mentoring for students at risk of not graduating; and implementing comprehensive school reform models. In addition, an LEA is required to use part of its funds to provide technical assistance to any secondary school that, after receiving program funds for 2 years, does not reduce its dropout rate.

At appropriation levels of \$75 million or less, the Department makes competitive awards for up to 5 years to SEAs or LEAs to implement effective high school graduation and reentry strategies in schools and districts that serve students in grades 6 through 12 and have annual school dropout rates that are above their State's average. At appropriation levels greater than \$75 million but less than \$250 million, the Department would make competitive awards to SEAs, with the SEAs, in turn, using at least 95 percent of their awards to make competitive subgrants to eligible LEAs. At appropriation levels equal to, or greater than, \$250 million, the Department would allocate funds to States by formula, with each State receiving a share that is proportionate to its share of funds provided under Part A of Title I in the previous fiscal year. States would use at least 95 percent of their funds to make competitive awards to eligible LEAs.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

High school graduation initiative

Actual funding levels in previous years were well under \$75 million, therefore each year the Department made direct competitive grants for the support of State and local projects.

The Department may reserve 10 percent of the amount appropriated for national activities. The statute authorizes, among other things: establishing a national clearinghouse of information on effective school dropout prevention and reentry programs and providing technical assistance to SEAs, LEAs, and schools to assist them in implementing effective school dropout prevention programs. The Department is required to: (1) establish a national recognition program to identify schools that have been effective in reducing dropout rates; and (2) evaluate the effectiveness of activities funded under the program.

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

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$4,930
2006.....	4,851
2007.....	0
2008.....	0
2009.....	0

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$50 million for the High School Graduation Initiative (HSGI) to support innovative efforts to drive better high school graduation rates through prevention and reentry systems for students at risk of not graduating. This tenfold increase over earlier funding levels for the program is consistent with the Administration's goal of increasing the number of students who graduate from high school prepared for the challenges of work and postsecondary education in the 21st century.

Current graduation rates remain unacceptable in an industrialized Nation that is faced with an increasingly challenging economic climate. According to a 2006 report from the Organization for Economic Co-operations and Development (OECD), the United States is 19th among industrialized democracies in graduating students from high school in 4 years, even though dropout rates in the U.S. have shown a downward trend in the last 30 years (National Center for Education Statistics, *The Condition of Education 2008*). National data indicate that the graduation rate for specific subgroups lags far behind others. When the national event dropout rate (the percentage of high school students who leave high school between the beginning of one school year and the beginning of the next without earning a high school diploma or its equivalent) is disaggregated by family income, the data show that students from low-income families drop out approximately six times more frequently than their peers from high-income families (8.9 percent compared to 1.5 percent). The rate for Black and Hispanic students during the same period was 7.3 percent and 5.0 percent, respectively, while the rate for their White peers was 2.8 percent (National Center of Education Statistics, *Dropout Rates in the United States: 2005*).

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

High school graduation initiative

There is little argument over the positive correlation between educational attainment, employability, and earning power. In 2008, the unemployment rate for a person with a bachelor's degree was 2.8 percent while the rate for a person with less than a high school diploma was 9.0 percent. An employed person with less than a high school diploma earned an average of \$426 per week while a person with a bachelor's degree earned more than twice that amount (Bureau of Labor Statistics, Current Population Survey, 2008). In 1970, when 35 percent of the workforce had earned less than a high school diploma (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1970), the need to complete high school prepared for higher education or future training was not as critical. Today, 90 percent of the jobs in the fastest-growing sectors of the economy require postsecondary education or training (Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 2007). The modern economy demands that all students leave high school with a diploma and an education that has prepared them to succeed in postsecondary education and the workforce.

In the past, with very limited funding available, the Department made grants exclusively to SEAs. Under the current request, however, the Department would award 5-year grants directly to LEAs that propose comprehensive approaches that focus on at least a cluster of 3 to 5 schools and address the obstacles that impede students' ability to graduate. LEAs would implement plans that reflect community-based needs assessments and include a plan for ensuring program sustainability. Grantee plans would also identify how many students will likely need additional support to graduate, how many dropouts leave school a few versus many credits shy of graduation, and how many students graduate un-prepared for success in college or the workforce.

Activities carried out with grant funds might include monitoring early warning indicators that a student is at risk of dropping out. Such early warning systems might: (1) focus on the needs of students transitioning from middle school to high school; (2) use identifiers such as low attendance rates, entering ninth grade with achievement scores more than three years behind in a core subject area, failing of one or more core courses during middle school or ninth grade, repeating ninth grade, or being over-age and under-credited during ninth or tenth grade; and (3) begin before middle school. Early warning systems would seek to identify effectively those students at risk of not graduating on time and would provide schools and LEAs with the information necessary to target interventions of the type and level necessary to support students' on-time graduation. Comprehensive prevention and reentry plans might include, among other things: (1) a focus on the needs of students transitioning from middle to high school, (2) alternative scheduling options, (3) alternative programs that address both stable (e.g., family income, neighborhood) and alterable (e.g., attendance, motivation, grade level) characteristics, (4) partnerships with community organizations to provide support services, and (5) small learning communities. Comprehensive plans for over-age, under-credited, or reentry students might also, among other things, eliminate seat requirements, provide competency or proficiency-based credits mapped against State graduation requirements, and allow for accelerated learning opportunities. All plans would include a plan for evaluating the strategies used. This approach, which requires a comprehensive and coordinated community strategy, also allows considerable local flexibility and reflects the complexity of the dropout problem, for which there is no "silver-bullet" solution.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

High school graduation initiative

As an example of how a targeted but flexible strategy can work, New Hampshire (a former grantee) instituted a “multi-tiered” approach to dropout prevention. The approach begins with a detailed needs assessment and includes an accessible data system that enables school personnel to review data regularly before intervening with students who display risk factors for dropping out and also can determine which interventions are working. New Hampshire’s approach acknowledges that different needs require different approaches. One study found that when the State targeted a high school with especially high dropout rates, the annual dropout rate declined from 16.8 percent to 2.6 percent between 2001 and 2005 (University of New Hampshire, 2006). Georgia created “Performance Learning Centers” (PLCs) to reach students who had been unsuccessful in regular school programs and were, therefore, not prone to graduate. Georgia’s 29 established PLCs are modeled after small high schools and provide personal supports to students in an environment that includes job shadowing, internships, dual enrollment programs, and project-based learning opportunities, all of which can make students’ learning more relevant. Resulting graduation rates in PLC districts were six percentage points higher after two years than in matching non-PLC districts (ICF International, 2009). In fiscal year 2010, the Department would support efforts to implement these types of strategies directly at the local level.

Districts with low-performing high schools that do not currently receive Title I funding would receive priority over other applicants. Over the past decade, the share of Title I funds that reach the high school level (grades 9-12) has ranged from just 8 to 10 percent, even though high schools enroll about one-quarter of all elementary and secondary school students and about one-fifth of low-income K-12 students.

In addition to supporting a range of local activities, the fiscal year 2010 request would give the Department the opportunity to test innovative efforts for driving higher high school graduation rates (through prevention and reentry systems for students at risk of not graduating) in order to determine which are most effective and to identify and disseminate information on best practices. Each grant would include a strong evaluation component that uses, where practicable, random assignment or other strong evaluation methodology, and the Department would structure the program to ensure that the activities and interventions’ performance yield data that are comparable across grants. The Department would use National Activities funds for this purpose, and also to provide technical assistance to grantees and inform educators more broadly about promising and effective practices.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

High school graduation initiative

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>
Amount for awards	\$45,000
Number of awards	25-30
Peer review of new award applications	\$200
National activities, including technical assistance and dissemination	\$4,800

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made towards 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 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

In fiscal year 2005, the Department held a competition for the School Dropout Prevention program and made 3-year awards to two State educational agencies; in fiscal year 2006, the Department made two more awards from the same slate. There are currently two performance measures for this program. The Department will revise these measures to better reflect the goals of the refocused program and to align them with the graduation rate that the Department defined in the October 2008 ESEA regulations described below.

Goal: To support effective, sustainable, and coordinated statewide school dropout prevention and reentry programs.

Objective: *Support statewide school dropout prevention programs, collaborations with other agencies, and individual performance plans for at-risk middle and high school students.*

Measure: The State event dropout rate in the States receiving grants.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		4.00
2007	3.27	3.89
2008	3.24	4.58
2009	3.20	
2010	3.00	

Assessment of Progress: The State event dropout rate is defined as the percentage of private and public high school students who left high school between the beginning of one school year and the beginning of the next without earning a high school diploma or its

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

High school graduation initiative

equivalent. The data above reflect the average State event dropout rate for the four SEAs from states that received funds in fiscal years 2005 and 2006.

Objective: *Support effective programs that identify youth who have dropped out or are at risk of dropping out of school and encourage them to reenter school and complete their secondary education.*

Measure: The percentage of students reentering schools who complete their secondary education.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	5	20
2007	5	20
2008	25	
2009	27	
2010	29	

Assessment of Progress: Only one grantee proposed a project that targeted students for reentry; thus, the data presented above reflect data from one SEA.

Other Performance Information

Studies released by the Department's Institute of Education Sciences (IES) and published on the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) web site provide extensive examples of the successes and failures of previous dropout prevention programs. WWC reviewed 11 programs that have the goal of students completing school. Of those 11, 4 were determined to have potentially positive effects while the remaining 7 were determined to have no discernible effects. Of the dropout prevention programs aimed at assisting students to progress in school, IES found 5 of the 11 reviewed to have potentially positive effects and 1 to have positive effects, or strong evidence of a positive effect with no overriding contrary evidence. IES determined that the remaining five programs had no discernible effects.

In October 2008, the Department issued a final regulation that established a uniform measure for calculating high school graduation rates that will be used by all States in calculating adequate yearly progress under Title I. This "4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate" is defined as the number of students who graduate in 4 years with a regular high school diploma divided by the total number of students in the entering 9th grade cohort, adjusted for students who enter or leave the cohort when they change schools. Regulations require reporting the 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in the aggregate and disaggregated by subgroups at the high school, district, and State levels on report cards providing results of assessments administered in the 2010-2011 school year. States were given the option of applying for an extension of this deadline and four States have applied. Having access to data on graduation rates that have been calculated in a uniform manner will allow researchers to make comparisons across States and districts.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

ESEA Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies

State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	215,191,927	162,969,217	238,612,226	215,425,966	(23,186,260)
Alaska	38,846,309	29,449,710	38,317,982	34,084,685	(4,233,297)
Arizona	274,776,685	195,087,321	290,317,874	260,543,745	(29,774,129)
Arkansas	144,267,804	111,092,138	164,236,474	148,453,585	(15,782,889)
California	1,698,808,133	1,124,920,473	1,636,280,566	1,457,618,134	(178,662,432)
Colorado	135,391,517	111,135,922	160,163,605	142,307,903	(17,855,702)
Connecticut	115,561,983	70,714,174	113,293,311	99,142,139	(14,151,172)
Delaware	38,379,960	32,433,643	41,089,536	36,442,192	(4,647,344)
District of Columbia	47,294,927	37,602,323	49,004,428	44,784,696	(4,219,732)
Florida	656,255,294	490,575,352	674,859,608	604,252,324	(70,607,284)
Georgia	446,271,008	351,008,292	496,708,418	447,974,061	(48,734,357)
Hawaii	44,336,607	33,171,874	43,351,871	38,746,182	(4,605,689)
Idaho	46,662,554	34,955,709	50,209,503	44,380,972	(5,828,531)
Illinois	593,980,302	420,263,561	635,225,623	561,055,983	(74,169,640)
Indiana	247,109,265	168,676,901	261,326,558	230,528,592	(30,797,966)
Iowa	72,717,331	51,497,022	78,453,424	68,742,255	(9,711,169)
Kansas	95,359,153	70,868,075	104,363,407	92,850,990	(11,512,417)
Kentucky	208,550,854	155,347,894	225,938,309	204,204,141	(21,734,168)
Louisiana	294,842,964	177,156,777	310,020,025	278,096,068	(31,923,957)
Maine	51,524,961	37,184,258	53,326,133	47,384,457	(5,941,676)
Maryland	192,239,408	135,958,438	191,365,476	170,075,968	(21,289,508)
Massachusetts	233,353,571	163,680,278	244,635,755	217,096,779	(27,538,976)
Michigan	527,254,785	389,902,873	556,952,044	501,442,025	(55,510,019)
Minnesota	126,936,366	94,711,036	140,937,068	123,699,591	(17,237,477)
Mississippi	187,345,926	132,888,489	198,686,000	179,893,381	(18,792,619)
Missouri	225,205,374	147,728,408	234,907,997	207,405,822	(27,502,175)
Montana	43,554,773	34,650,000	45,749,999	41,301,913	(4,448,086)
Nebraska	60,245,901	47,808,954	67,827,011	60,074,632	(7,752,379)
Nevada	80,754,699	70,126,139	92,841,561	83,049,861	(9,791,700)
New Hampshire	38,198,000	30,947,654	39,864,275	35,153,960	(4,710,315)
New Jersey	286,765,181	182,971,299	286,864,038	252,000,084	(34,863,954)
New Mexico	113,156,234	80,803,396	118,124,839	106,926,869	(11,197,970)
New York	1,226,786,099	907,152,149	1,244,298,041	1,133,339,094	(110,958,947)
North Carolina	358,570,325	257,444,956	371,789,774	334,043,497	(37,746,277)
North Dakota	33,741,932	27,437,105	35,597,005	31,737,359	(3,859,646)
Ohio	511,796,517	372,673,474	548,382,669	490,832,748	(57,549,921)
Oklahoma	148,405,592	109,442,502	162,267,128	145,923,222	(16,343,906)
Oregon	139,986,895	93,735,666	139,139,827	123,494,264	(15,645,563)
Pennsylvania	565,517,553	400,603,678	578,914,676	519,729,251	(59,185,425)
Rhode Island	52,978,454	35,834,427	52,310,532	46,751,633	(5,558,899)
South Carolina	205,597,026	142,838,916	210,582,093	188,736,558	(21,845,535)
South Dakota	41,538,597	34,650,000	43,747,031	39,680,739	(4,066,292)
Tennessee	239,071,783	194,074,879	276,321,639	250,289,292	(26,032,347)
Texas	1,299,356,262	948,737,780	1,368,502,445	1,232,115,269	(136,387,176)
Utah	60,019,100	49,536,283	69,128,808	60,736,508	(8,392,300)
Vermont	32,862,110	25,765,406	33,594,004	29,984,004	(3,610,000)
Virginia	226,095,663	165,352,019	248,292,598	219,872,879	(28,419,719)
Washington	191,852,916	135,123,099	199,654,991	176,299,569	(23,355,422)
West Virginia	99,607,055	60,981,290	93,868,956	83,788,647	(10,080,309)
Wisconsin	199,030,296	147,729,443	215,051,417	190,572,741	(24,478,676)
Wyoming	31,515,777	26,191,647	33,828,445	30,073,193	(3,755,252)
American Samoa	9,524,978	7,026,782	9,836,784	8,815,530	(1,021,254)
Guam	11,477,640	8,664,915	12,129,794	10,298,528	(1,831,266)
Northern Mariana Islands	3,459,861	2,552,414	3,573,121	3,202,160	(370,961)
Puerto Rico	510,525,233	386,407,681	534,389,967	495,376,568	(39,013,399)
Virgin Islands	12,799,164	9,442,219	13,218,151	11,845,844	(1,372,307)
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside (BIA)	96,687,801	72,313,670	101,126,160	90,721,948	(10,404,212)
Undistributed (non-State allocations)	8,930,120	0	9,000,000	9,000,000	0
Total	13,898,874,505	10,000,000,000	14,492,401,000	12,992,401,000	(1,500,000,000)

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School Improvement Grants

State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	7,620,634	49,254,237	8,954,348	24,954,860	16,000,512
Alaska	1,578,096	9,065,783	1,645,505	4,975,049	3,329,544
Arizona	9,261,745	59,123,914	10,747,029	29,911,909	19,164,880
Arkansas	5,287,815	34,138,162	6,210,251	17,509,932	11,299,681
California	61,808,215	346,347,890	62,985,358	178,949,620	115,964,262
Colorado	4,994,143	33,845,209	6,153,869	17,222,454	11,068,585
Connecticut	3,803,038	21,983,797	3,996,960	11,209,868	7,212,908
Delaware	1,346,638	8,972,182	1,632,100	4,621,745	2,989,645
District of Columbia	1,653,767	10,609,966	1,929,094	5,417,821	3,488,727
Florida	24,114,568	144,129,360	26,219,255	72,277,471	46,058,216
Georgia	15,808,110	104,197,189	18,961,065	52,313,761	33,352,696
Hawaii	1,606,277	9,340,914	1,699,137	4,919,365	3,220,228
Idaho	1,771,868	10,806,539	1,964,798	5,552,696	3,587,898
Illinois	19,201,628	124,200,955	22,602,705	61,832,627	39,229,922
Indiana	8,629,835	51,835,890	9,429,422	26,267,587	16,838,165
Iowa	2,568,155	15,981,432	2,907,189	8,137,604	5,230,415
Kansas	3,748,211	22,754,998	4,135,563	12,031,932	7,896,369
Kentucky	7,578,018	47,291,615	8,602,970	24,110,031	15,507,061
Louisiana	10,477,049	57,241,315	10,416,211	29,411,999	18,995,788
Maine	1,856,061	11,175,834	2,031,182	5,609,853	3,578,671
Maryland	6,615,396	39,885,781	7,251,509	19,815,499	12,563,990
Massachusetts	8,118,865	49,841,631	9,052,814	25,179,800	16,126,986
Michigan	18,699,655	115,633,621	21,040,679	57,747,385	36,706,706
Minnesota	4,457,449	28,969,270	5,271,337	14,592,095	9,320,758
Mississippi	6,496,822	39,940,080	7,261,597	20,078,650	12,817,053
Missouri	7,958,332	45,954,726	8,363,149	23,396,592	15,033,443
Montana	1,530,992	9,789,360	1,780,518	5,097,151	3,316,633
Nebraska	2,307,390	14,753,171	2,684,135	7,587,869	4,903,734
Nevada	2,884,829	19,918,044	3,621,147	9,756,245	6,135,098
New Hampshire	1,332,132	8,597,915	1,564,010	4,400,678	2,836,668
New Jersey	9,950,346	56,821,890	10,329,667	28,913,263	18,583,596
New Mexico	3,979,924	24,160,268	4,396,001	12,141,545	7,745,544
New York	41,336,141	260,963,705	47,439,936	128,610,535	81,170,599
North Carolina	12,928,504	77,298,515	14,062,732	39,018,414	24,955,682
North Dakota	1,169,896	7,626,971	1,387,304	3,887,043	2,499,739
Ohio	17,946,161	112,040,417	20,386,439	56,212,449	35,826,010
Oklahoma	5,259,252	33,171,952	6,030,576	16,761,576	10,731,000
Oregon	5,284,979	29,500,744	5,368,004	15,346,451	9,978,447
Pennsylvania	19,981,916	120,052,444	21,841,283	60,291,494	38,450,211
Rhode Island	1,794,239	10,595,696	1,926,543	5,269,706	3,343,163
South Carolina	7,307,214	43,026,030	7,829,527	21,695,207	13,865,680
South Dakota	1,462,826	9,562,990	1,739,345	5,058,167	3,318,822
Tennessee	8,533,441	57,510,315	10,455,122	28,786,182	18,331,060
Texas	46,768,248	286,243,550	52,059,159	145,319,995	93,260,836
Utah	2,154,955	14,752,201	2,681,110	7,364,070	4,682,960
Vermont	1,166,815	7,276,591	1,323,400	3,772,936	2,449,536
Virginia	8,059,192	50,756,218	9,235,875	25,734,065	16,498,190
Washington	7,158,614	42,649,667	7,759,450	22,168,065	14,408,615
West Virginia	3,490,504	18,597,773	3,384,525	9,408,565	6,024,040
Wisconsin	6,526,979	43,041,121	7,832,124	21,161,106	13,328,982
Wyoming	1,110,155	7,332,614	1,333,706	3,771,972	2,438,266
American Samoa	327,291	2,030,341	369,600	991,268	621,668
Guam	394,409	2,503,643	455,727	1,222,359	766,632
Northern Mariana Islands	118,885	737,503	134,254	360,069	225,815
Puerto Rico	18,176,296	112,555,972	20,462,355	55,943,051	35,480,696
Virgin Islands	439,796	2,728,265	496,649	1,332,013	835,364
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	3,322,289	20,881,824	3,797,681	10,201,286	6,403,605
Undistributed (non-State allocations)	0	0	0	0	0
Total	491,265,000	3,000,000,000	545,633,000	1,515,633,000	970,000,000

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Title I Early Childhood Grants

State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	0	0	0	8,295,306	8,295,306
Alaska	0	0	0	1,383,952	1,383,952
Arizona	0	0	0	9,860,078	9,860,078
Arkansas	0	0	0	5,669,620	5,669,620
California	0	0	0	55,921,772	55,921,772
Colorado	0	0	0	5,579,232	5,579,232
Connecticut	0	0	0	3,681,430	3,681,430
Delaware	0	0	0	1,501,490	1,501,490
District of Columbia	0	0	0	1,792,710	1,792,710
Florida	0	0	0	23,921,885	23,921,885
Georgia	0	0	0	17,480,151	17,480,151
Hawaii	0	0	0	1,561,354	1,561,354
Idaho	0	0	0	1,747,834	1,747,834
Illinois	0	0	0	21,005,831	21,005,831
Indiana	0	0	0	8,656,947	8,656,947
Iowa	0	0	0	2,665,106	2,665,106
Kansas	0	0	0	3,605,425	3,605,425
Kentucky	0	0	0	7,843,924	7,843,924
Louisiana	0	0	0	9,623,375	9,623,375
Maine	0	0	0	1,867,098	1,867,098
Maryland	0	0	0	6,730,759	6,730,759
Massachusetts	0	0	0	8,376,056	8,376,056
Michigan	0	0	0	19,423,164	19,423,164
Minnesota	0	0	0	4,873,111	4,873,111
Mississippi	0	0	0	6,746,833	6,746,833
Missouri	0	0	0	7,734,337	7,734,337
Montana	0	0	0	1,636,837	1,636,837
Nebraska	0	0	0	2,384,198	2,384,198
Nevada	0	0	0	3,366,921	3,366,921
New Hampshire	0	0	0	1,446,121	1,446,121
New Jersey	0	0	0	9,539,177	9,539,177
New Mexico	0	0	0	4,073,269	4,073,269
New York	0	0	0	43,993,717	43,993,717
North Carolina	0	0	0	12,970,071	12,970,071
North Dakota	0	0	0	1,287,283	1,287,283
Ohio	0	0	0	18,903,024	18,903,024
Oklahoma	0	0	0	5,598,626	5,598,626
Oregon	0	0	0	4,782,741	4,782,741
Pennsylvania	0	0	0	20,143,382	20,143,382
Rhode Island	0	0	0	1,780,952	1,780,952
South Carolina	0	0	0	7,249,697	7,249,697
South Dakota	0	0	0	1,601,024	1,601,024
Tennessee	0	0	0	9,733,286	9,733,286
Texas	0	0	0	47,246,314	47,246,314
Utah	0	0	0	2,446,945	2,446,945
Vermont	0	0	0	1,212,238	1,212,238
Virginia	0	0	0	8,557,241	8,557,241
Washington	0	0	0	6,890,391	6,890,391
West Virginia	0	0	0	3,138,106	3,138,106
Wisconsin	0	0	0	7,264,093	7,264,093
Wyoming	0	0	0	1,225,730	1,225,730
American Samoa	0	0	0	344,236	344,236
Guam	0	0	0	424,486	424,486
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	0	125,040	125,040
Puerto Rico	0	0	0	19,080,926	19,080,926
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	462,566	462,566
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	-	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	3,542,582	3,542,582
Undistributed (non-State allocations)	0	0	0	-	0
Total	0	0	0	500,000,000	500,000,000

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even Start

State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	953,293	0	998,469	0	(998,469)
Alaska	305,690	0	305,688	0	(305,688)
Arizona	1,139,110	0	1,183,730	0	(1,183,730)
Arkansas	645,415	0	682,596	0	(682,596)
California	7,270,152	0	6,746,761	0	(6,746,761)
Colorado	599,136	0	669,849	0	(669,849)
Connecticut	472,241	0	442,825	0	(442,825)
Delaware	305,690	0	305,688	0	(305,688)
District of Columbia	305,690	0	305,688	0	(305,688)
Florida	2,950,036	0	2,888,279	0	(2,888,279)
Georgia	1,962,930	0	2,106,218	0	(2,106,218)
Hawaii	305,690	0	305,688	0	(305,688)
Idaho	305,690	0	305,688	0	(305,688)
Illinois	2,420,012	0	2,526,665	0	(2,526,665)
Indiana	1,066,406	0	1,040,434	0	(1,040,434)
Iowa	316,327	0	321,748	0	(321,748)
Kansas	0	0	431,648	0	(431,648)
Kentucky	924,857	0	944,669	0	(944,669)
Louisiana	1,310,836	0	1,158,901	0	(1,158,901)
Maine	305,690	0	305,688	0	(305,688)
Maryland	831,666	0	811,715	0	(811,715)
Massachusetts	1,013,121	0	1,004,058	0	(1,004,058)
Michigan	2,327,324	0	2,337,574	0	(2,337,574)
Minnesota	556,550	0	587,483	0	(587,483)
Mississippi	817,404	0	811,436	0	(811,436)
Missouri	995,656	0	929,889	0	(929,889)
Montana	305,690	0	305,688	0	(305,688)
Nebraska	305,690	0	305,688	0	(305,688)
Nevada	363,032	0	407,271	0	(407,271)
New Hampshire	305,690	0	305,688	0	(305,688)
New Jersey	1,240,337	0	1,146,650	0	(1,146,650)
New Mexico	499,258	0	489,800	0	(489,800)
New York	5,182,739	0	5,281,858	0	(5,281,858)
North Carolina	1,608,244	0	1,558,388	0	(1,558,388)
North Dakota	305,690	0	305,688	0	(305,688)
Ohio	2,251,798	0	2,277,413	0	(2,277,413)
Oklahoma	660,757	0	672,916	0	(672,916)
Oregon	623,269	0	575,797	0	(575,797)
Pennsylvania	2,487,370	0	2,412,082	0	(2,412,082)
Rhode Island	305,690	0	305,688	0	(305,688)
South Carolina	916,834	0	872,417	0	(872,417)
South Dakota	305,690	0	305,688	0	(305,688)
Tennessee	1,076,562	0	1,170,058	0	(1,170,058)
Texas	5,662,646	0	5,658,139	0	(5,658,139)
Utah	305,690	0	305,688	0	(305,688)
Vermont	305,690	0	305,688	0	(305,688)
Virginia	1,011,321	0	1,029,173	0	(1,029,173)
Washington	838,132	0	830,245	0	(830,245)
West Virginia	439,305	0	377,923	0	(377,923)
Wisconsin	818,933	0	873,780	0	(873,780)
Wyoming	305,690	0	305,688	0	(305,688)
American Samoa	81,294	0	84,330	0	(84,330)
Guam	97,960	0	103,990	0	(103,990)
Northern Mariana Islands	29,529	0	30,632	0	(30,632)
Puerto Rico	2,299,688	0	2,293,503	0	(2,293,503)
Virgin Islands	109,239	0	113,318	0	(113,318)
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	954,067	0	996,810	0	(996,810)
Undistributed (non-State allocations)	4,044,263	0	3,987,240	0	(3,987,240)
Total	66,454,399	0	66,454,000	0	(66,454,000)

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

State Agency Programs--Migrant

State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2,009 Estimate	2,010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	2,032,615	0	2,154,809	2,154,809	0
Alaska	6,704,087	0	7,288,248	7,288,248	0
Arizona	6,319,251	0	6,877,159	6,877,159	0
Arkansas	5,068,934	0	5,515,869	5,515,869	0
California	124,729,661	0	136,002,691	136,002,691	0
Colorado	7,073,453	0	7,362,601	7,362,601	0
Connecticut	986,188	0	1,040,176	1,040,176	0
Delaware	292,211	0	304,156	304,156	0
District of Columbia	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	22,419,180	0	23,778,697	23,778,697	0
Georgia	7,925,670	0	8,254,487	8,254,487	0
Hawaii	728,585	0	839,784	839,784	0
Idaho	3,584,592	0	3,733,357	3,733,357	0
Illinois	1,885,064	0	1,994,630	1,994,630	0
Indiana	5,093,121	0	5,747,289	5,747,289	0
Iowa	1,645,253	0	1,801,447	1,801,447	0
Kansas	11,384,228	0	12,064,076	12,064,076	0
Kentucky	7,058,604	0	7,727,355	7,727,355	0
Louisiana	2,373,364	0	2,582,392	2,582,392	0
Maine	1,041,154	0	1,200,058	1,200,058	0
Maryland	516,813	0	569,698	569,698	0
Massachusetts	1,594,566	0	1,681,859	1,681,859	0
Michigan	8,424,645	0	8,942,349	8,942,349	0
Minnesota	1,652,800	0	1,743,280	1,743,280	0
Mississippi	585,484	0	617,536	617,536	0
Missouri	1,498,537	0	1,584,737	1,584,737	0
Montana	939,274	0	1,051,288	1,051,288	0
Nebraska	5,042,937	0	5,319,005	5,319,005	0
Nevada	221,056	0	247,079	247,079	0
New Hampshire	140,468	0	152,707	152,707	0
New Jersey	2,004,690	0	2,218,193	2,218,193	0
New Mexico	852,913	0	961,890	961,890	0
New York	9,319,211	0	10,321,374	10,321,374	0
North Carolina	5,653,656	0	5,884,764	5,884,764	0
North Dakota	217,762	0	244,163	244,163	0
Ohio	2,430,821	0	2,770,773	2,770,773	0
Oklahoma	1,015,766	0	1,071,373	1,071,373	0
Oregon	9,419,871	0	9,809,721	9,809,721	0
Pennsylvania	8,954,390	0	9,457,243	9,457,243	0
Rhode Island	66,870	0	69,652	69,652	0
South Carolina	528,161	0	585,986	585,986	0
South Dakota	803,680	0	873,730	873,730	0
Tennessee	523,123	0	600,399	600,399	0
Texas	56,566,224	0	61,541,967	61,541,967	0
Utah	1,711,013	0	1,926,669	1,926,669	0
Vermont	599,547	0	661,929	661,929	0
Virginia	781,751	0	828,917	828,917	0
Washington	15,015,291	0	15,772,922	15,772,922	0
West Virginia	80,734	0	84,035	84,035	0
Wisconsin	605,105	0	663,161	663,161	0
Wyoming	214,100	0	243,320	243,320	0
American Samoa	0	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0	0
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	0	0	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0	0
Undistributed (non-State allocations)	23,444,952	0	10,000,000	10,000,000	0
Total	379,771,426	0	394,771,000	394,771,000	0

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

State Agency Programs--Neglected and Delinquent

State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	729,926	0	745,397	745,397	0
Alaska	268,656	0	242,458	242,458	0
Arizona	1,464,602	0	1,376,531	1,376,531	0
Arkansas	489,067	0	405,016	405,016	0
California	2,560,201	0	2,376,154	2,376,154	0
Colorado	486,239	0	551,092	551,092	0
Connecticut	1,200,974	0	1,284,525	1,284,525	0
Delaware	517,757	0	693,628	693,628	0
District of Columbia	235,920	0	340,742	340,742	0
Florida	1,528,660	0	1,949,794	1,949,794	0
Georgia	1,144,594	0	1,237,291	1,237,291	0
Hawaii	253,276	0	289,304	289,304	0
Idaho	270,226	0	437,539	437,539	0
Illinois	969,973	0	1,002,728	1,002,728	0
Indiana	959,010	0	887,197	887,197	0
Iowa	384,804	0	435,060	435,060	0
Kansas	404,124	0	387,784	387,784	0
Kentucky	923,421	0	974,521	974,521	0
Louisiana	1,358,775	0	1,625,442	1,625,442	0
Maine	205,836	0	198,140	198,140	0
Maryland	936,554	0	1,129,038	1,129,038	0
Massachusetts	1,924,194	0	2,143,066	2,143,066	0
Michigan	1,057,419	0	394,779	394,779	0
Minnesota	203,284	0	248,418	248,418	0
Mississippi	697,029	0	745,107	745,107	0
Missouri	1,360,289	0	1,379,328	1,379,328	0
Montana	115,086	0	106,311	106,311	0
Nebraska	300,492	0	471,019	471,019	0
Nevada	328,810	0	320,469	320,469	0
New Hampshire	428,275	0	447,748	447,748	0
New Jersey	2,613,618	0	2,628,915	2,628,915	0
New Mexico	256,374	0	253,013	253,013	0
New York	2,881,703	0	2,953,982	2,953,982	0
North Carolina	1,096,358	0	1,036,746	1,036,746	0
North Dakota	83,568	0	69,671	69,671	0
Ohio	2,462,898	0	2,191,605	2,191,605	0
Oklahoma	235,392	0	300,738	300,738	0
Oregon	1,166,488	0	1,021,422	1,021,422	0
Pennsylvania	1,096,887	0	1,314,892	1,314,892	0
Rhode Island	613,549	0	728,349	728,349	0
South Carolina	1,487,072	0	1,784,262	1,784,262	0
South Dakota	221,807	0	157,324	157,324	0
Tennessee	474,980	0	459,693	459,693	0
Texas	3,013,656	0	2,432,943	2,432,943	0
Utah	672,397	0	782,807	782,807	0
Vermont	487,008	0	416,415	416,415	0
Virginia	1,410,522	0	1,720,298	1,720,298	0
Washington	717,408	0	1,065,391	1,065,391	0
West Virginia	572,911	0	721,925	721,925	0
Wisconsin	1,203,898	0	1,127,480	1,127,480	0
Wyoming	590,591	0	639,661	639,661	0
American Samoa	0	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0	0
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	637,312	0	533,167	533,167	0
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0	0
Undistributed (non-State allocations)	1,223,176	0	1,260,675	1,260,675	0
Total	48,927,046	0	50,427,000	50,427,000	0