

**Department of Education**  
**SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**  
**Fiscal Year 2010 Budget Request**

**CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language.....	G-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	G-2
Amounts Available for Obligation.....	G-4
Obligations by Object Classification.....	G-5
Summary of Changes .....	G-6
Authorizing Legislation.....	G-8
Appropriations History.....	G-10
Significant Items in FY 2009 Appropriations Reports .....	G-11
Summary of Request .....	G-13
Activities:	
Safe and drug-free schools and communities:	
State grants.....	G-16
National programs.....	G-24
Character education.....	G-46
Elementary and secondary school counseling.....	G-51
Physical education program.....	G-56
Civic education.....	G-62
State Table.....	G-68

**SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

**Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants**

State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	4,330,635	0	4,330,635	0	(4,330,635)
Alaska	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
Arizona	4,707,343	0	4,707,343	0	(4,707,343)
Arkansas	2,706,941	0	2,706,941	0	(2,706,941)
California	35,161,795	0	35,161,795	0	(35,161,795)
Colorado	3,210,467	0	3,210,467	0	(3,210,467)
Connecticut	2,902,721	0	2,902,721	0	(2,902,721)
Delaware	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
District of Columbia	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
Florida	13,949,486	0	13,949,486	0	(13,949,486)
Georgia	7,956,698	0	7,956,698	0	(7,956,698)
Hawaii	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
Idaho	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
Illinois	11,684,770	0	11,684,770	0	(11,684,770)
Indiana	4,976,958	0	4,976,958	0	(4,976,958)
Iowa	2,271,498	0	2,271,498	0	(2,271,498)
Kansas	2,351,305	0	2,351,305	0	(2,351,305)
Kentucky	4,111,169	0	4,111,169	0	(4,111,169)
Louisiana	5,591,692	0	5,591,692	0	(5,591,692)
Maine	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
Maryland	4,410,413	0	4,410,413	0	(4,410,413)
Massachusetts	5,402,940	0	5,402,940	0	(5,402,940)
Michigan	10,797,877	0	10,797,877	0	(10,797,877)
Minnesota	3,935,361	0	3,935,361	0	(3,935,361)
Mississippi	3,526,788	0	3,526,788	0	(3,526,788)
Missouri	5,169,062	0	5,169,062	0	(5,169,062)
Montana	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
Nebraska	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
Nevada	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
New Hampshire	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
New Jersey	6,940,699	0	6,940,699	0	(6,940,699)
New Mexico	2,226,011	0	2,226,011	0	(2,226,011)
New York	22,303,963	0	22,303,963	0	(22,303,963)
North Carolina	6,610,231	0	6,610,231	0	(6,610,231)
North Dakota	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
Ohio	10,502,817	0	10,502,817	0	(10,502,817)
Oklahoma	3,497,685	0	3,497,685	0	(3,497,685)
Oregon	2,793,062	0	2,793,062	0	(2,793,062)
Pennsylvania	11,462,580	0	11,462,580	0	(11,462,580)
Rhode Island	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
South Carolina	3,762,360	0	3,762,360	0	(3,762,360)
South Dakota	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
Tennessee	4,856,799	0	4,856,799	0	(4,856,799)
Texas	23,245,264	0	23,245,264	0	(23,245,264)
Utah	1,816,039	0	1,816,039	0	(1,816,039)
Vermont	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
Virginia	5,429,816	0	5,429,816	0	(5,429,816)
Washington	4,733,378	0	4,733,378	0	(4,733,378)
West Virginia	2,079,478	0	2,079,478	0	(2,079,478)
Wisconsin	4,792,453	0	4,792,453	0	(4,792,453)
Wyoming	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
American Samoa	900,459	0	900,459	0	(900,459)
Guam	1,934,732	0	1,934,732	0	(1,934,732)
Northern Mariana Islands	606,862	0	606,862	0	(606,862)
Puerto Rico	7,110,708	0	7,110,708	0	(7,110,708)
Virgin Islands	1,307,947	0	1,307,947	0	(1,307,947)
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	4,750,000	0	4,750,000	0	(4,750,000)
Undistributed (non-State allocations)	589,518	0	589,518	0	(589,518)
<b>Total</b>	<b>294,759,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>294,759,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(294,759,000)</b>

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

For carrying out activities authorized by [subpart 3 of part C of title II,]<sup>1</sup> part A of title IV, and subparts 2[, 3,]<sup>2</sup> and 10 of part D of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, [\$690,370,000, of which \$294,759,000 shall become available on July 1, 2009, and remain available through September 30, 2010]<sup>3</sup> \$413,608,000: *Provided*, That [\$294,759,000 shall be available for subpart 1 of part A of title IV<sup>4</sup> and \$220,240,000] \$283,608,000 shall be available for subpart 2 of part A of title IV<sup>5</sup> , of which \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for the Project School Emergency Response to Violence ("Project SERV") program to provide education-related services to local educational agencies and to institutions of higher education in which the learning environment has been disrupted due to a violent or traumatic crisis:<sup>6</sup> *Provided further*, That [\$141,912,000] \$130,000,000 shall be available to carry out part D of title V<sup>7</sup> [: *Provided further*, That of the funds available to carry out subpart 3 of part C of title II, up to \$13,383,000 may be used to carry out section 2345<sup>8</sup> and \$2,957,000 shall be used by the Center for Civic Education to implement a comprehensive program to improve public knowledge, understanding, and support of the Congress and the State legislatures<sup>9</sup>].  
*(Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2009.)*

### NOTE

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

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<sup>1</sup> For carrying out activities authorized by [subpart 3 of part C of title II,...of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965...	The citation for subpart 3 of part C of title II of the ESEA in this language is deleted because no funds are requested for the Civic Education program.
<sup>2</sup> ...and subparts 2[, 3,] and 10 of part D of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965...	The citation for subpart 3 of part D of title V of the ESEA in this language is deleted because no funds are requested for the Character Education program.
<sup>3</sup> [...of which \$294,759,000 shall become available on July 1, 2009, and remain available through September 30, 2010...]	This language, which provides for funds to be appropriated on a forward-funded basis for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) State Grants, is deleted because the budget request includes no funding for SDFSC State Grants.
<sup>4</sup> [... <i>Provided</i> , That \$294,759,000 shall be available for subpart 1 of part A of title IV...]	This language, which earmarks funds for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) State Grants (subpart 1 of part A of title IV), is deleted because the budget request includes no funding for SDFSC State Grants.
<sup>5</sup> ...and [ <del>\$220,240,000</del> <u>\$283,608,000</u> ] shall be available for subpart 2 of part A of title IV...	This language earmarks funds for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) National Programs (subpart 2 of part A of title IV).
<sup>6</sup> <u>...of which \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for the Project School Emergency Response to Violence ("Project SERV") program to provide education-related services to local educational agencies and to institutions of higher education in which the learning environment has been disrupted due to a violent or traumatic crisis...</u>	This language earmarks funds for Project SERV (under Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs) and makes these funds available for obligation at the Federal level until they are expended.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>7</sup><i>...Provided further, That [\$141,912,000] <del>\$130,000,000</del> shall be available to carry out part D of title V of the ESEA...</i></p>	<p>This language earmarks funds for programs authorized under part D of title V of the ESEA (the Fund for the Improvement of Education). It is included because the budget request includes funding for the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling and Physical Education programs.</p>
<p><sup>8</sup><i>[...Provided further, That of the funds available to carry out subpart 3 of part C of title II, up to \$13,383,000 may be used to carry out section 2345...]</i></p>	<p>This language earmarks funds under the Civic Education program for the Cooperative Education Exchange. It is deleted because the budget request does not include funding for this activity.</p>
<p><sup>9</sup><i>[...and \$2,957,000 shall be used by the Center for Civic Education to implement a comprehensive program to improve public knowledge, understanding, and support of the Congress and the State legislatures].</i></p>	<p>This language earmarks funds under the Civic Education program for a civics education project. It is deleted because the budget request does not include funding for this activity.</p>

**SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

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

	2008	2009	2010
Discretionary authority:			
Annual appropriation.....	\$705,733	\$690,370	\$413,608
Across-the-board reduction .....	<u>-12,329</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, appropriation .....	693,404	690,370	413,608
Unobligated balance, start of year .....	9,901	8,186	0
Unobligated balance, end of year .....	<u>-8,186</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations .....	695,120	698,556	413,608

**SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

**Obligations by Object Classification**  
(\$000s)

	2008	2009	2010
Printing and reproduction .....	\$70	\$71	\$71
Other contractual services:			
Advisory and assistance services .....	2,871	2,907	2,942
Peer review .....	1,718	1,515	2,420
Other services .....	11,739	14,639	13,933
Research and development contracts.....	2,501	0	0
Purchases of goods and services from other government accounts .....	<u>2,876</u>	<u>2,911</u>	<u>2,947</u>
Subtotal .....	21,705	21,972	22,242
Grants, subsidies, and contributions .....	673,342	676,513	391,295
Interest and dividends.....	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, obligations.....	695,120	698,556	413,608

**SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

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

---

2009 .....	\$690,370
2010 .....	<u>413,608</u>
Net change.....	-276,762

---

	<u>2009 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<b>Increases:</b>		
Program:		
Increase for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities to support new approaches to assisting schools in fostering a safe, secure, and drug-free learning environment.	\$140,264 <sup>1</sup>	+\$110,632
Subtotal, increases		+110,632
<b>Decreases:</b>		
Program:		
Eliminate funding for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants because the program has not been shown to be effective, and generally spreads funds too thinly at the local level to support quality interventions.	294,759	-294,759
Eliminate funding for Mentoring because a recent impact evaluation found the program to be ineffective.	47,264 <sup>1</sup>	-47,264
Eliminate funding for Character Education as a distinct program because character education activities would be supported under the request within a new initiative under Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities.	11,912	-11,912

---

<sup>1</sup> Reflects a reprogramming of \$1,280 thousand from Mentoring to National Activities within Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs.



**SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

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

	<u>2009 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<b>Decreases:</b>		
Program (continued):		
Eliminate funding for Civic Education because the request includes funds under the Fund for the Improvement of Education in the Innovation and Improvement account for a grant competition that would support the development or expansion of projects to improve student achievement in history, government, and civics.	\$33,459	<u>-\$33,459</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-387,394
Net change		-276,762

**SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

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

Activity	2009 Authorized	2009 Estimate	2010 Authorized	2010 Request
Safe and drug-free schools and communities (ESEA-IV-A):				
State grants (Subpart 1)	0 <sup>1</sup>	\$294,759	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
National programs (Subpart 2)				
National activities (Sections 4121 and 4122)	0 <sup>2,3</sup>	140,264 <sup>4</sup>	0 <sup>2,5</sup>	\$250,896
Alcohol abuse reduction (Section 4129)	0 <sup>2</sup>	32,712	0 <sup>2</sup>	32,712
Mentoring programs (Section 4130)	0 <sup>1</sup>	47,264 <sup>4</sup>	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
Character education (ESEA V-D, Subpart 3)	0 <sup>1,6</sup>	11,912	0 <sup>1,6</sup>	0
Elementary and secondary school counseling (ESEA-V-D, Subpart 2)	0 <sup>2,6</sup>	52,000	0 <sup>2,6</sup>	52,000
Physical education program (ESEA-V-D, Subpart 10)	0 <sup>2,6</sup>	78,000	0 <sup>2,6</sup>	78,000
Civic education (ESEA II, Part C-3):				
We the People (Section 2344)	0 <sup>1,7</sup>	20,076	0 <sup>1,7</sup>	0
Cooperative education exchange (Section 2345)	0 <sup>1,7</sup>	13,383	0 <sup>1,7</sup>	0
<u>Unfunded authorizations</u>				
Grants directed at preventing and reducing alcohol abuse at institutions of higher education (section 2(e)(2) of P.L. 109-422)	\$5,000	0 <sup>8</sup>	\$5,000	0
Total definite authorization	5,000		5,000	
Total appropriation		690,370		413,608
Portion of the request subject to reauthorization				413,608

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

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Authorizing Legislation—continued

<sup>2</sup> The program is authorized in FY 2009 through appropriations language. The Administration proposes to continue funding this program in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

<sup>3</sup> Funds appropriated for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs in fiscal year 2009 may not be increased above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2008 unless the amount appropriated for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants in fiscal year 2009 is at least 10 percent greater than the amount appropriated in 2008.

<sup>4</sup> Reflects a reprogramming of \$1,280 thousand from Mentoring to National Activities.

<sup>5</sup> Funds appropriated for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs in fiscal year 2010 may not be increased above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2009 unless the amount appropriated for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants in fiscal year 2010 is at least 10 percent greater than the amount appropriated in 2009.

<sup>6</sup> A total of \$675,000 thousand is authorized to carry out all Title V, Part D activities.

<sup>7</sup> Of the amount appropriated for Subpart 3 (Civic Education), not more than 40 percent of the amount appropriated in any fiscal year may be used to carry out Section 2345 (the Cooperative Education Exchange).

<sup>8</sup> The 2009 appropriation for SDFSC National Programs includes \$2,500 thousand for similar activities.

**SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

**Appropriations History**  
(\$000s)

---

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

---

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

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

---

## **SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

### **Significant Items in FY 2009 Appropriations Reports**

#### **Recognition of Model Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Programs in Higher Education**

Conference: The Department shall use \$850,000 within the amount provide for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs to identify and provide recognition of promising and model alcohol and drug abuse education programs in higher education.

Senate: The Committee directs the Department to use \$850,000 within the amount provided for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs to identify and provide recognition of promising and model alcohol and drug abuse prevention and education programs in higher education.

Response: The Department plans to use \$850,000 in Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs funds to identify and provide recognition of exemplary, effective, and promising alcohol and drug abuse education programs in higher education.

#### **Alcohol Abuse Reduction**

Senate: The Committee directs the Department and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) in the Department of Health and Human Services to work together on this program.

Response: The Department will continue to collaborate with SAMHSA in providing alcohol abuse resources and technical assistance to the grantees under this program.

#### **Physical Education**

House: The Committee directs the Department to work with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to incorporate the CDC's School Health Index assessment tool into the Physical Education program. For fiscal year 2009 awards, the Department shall grant priority to those applications that have completed physical education and nutritional assessments as part of the School Health Index or propose to implement the School Health Index.

Conference: The Department shall incorporate the CDC's School Health Index assessment tool into the Physical Education program and require new grantees to implement the index within their physical education programs, if they have not already done so.

## **SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

### **Significant Items in FY 2009 Appropriations Reports (continued)**

#### **Physical Education (continued)**

Response: In the fiscal year 2009 notice inviting applications for new awards for this program, the Department included an invitational priority for projects that propose to address problems identified by the applicant in a self-assessment, using the Physical Education and Other Physical Activity Programs and Nutrition Services modules of the CDC's School health Index that are appropriate for the schools to be served by the grant.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2010 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST

(in thousands of dollars)					Change from		
Office, Account, Program and Activity		Category Code	2008 Appropriation	2009 Appropriation	2010 President's Budget	2009 Appropriation	
						Amount	Percent
<b>Safe Schools and Citizenship Education</b>							
1. Safe and drug-free schools and communities (ESEA IV-A):							
(a) State grants (Subpart 1)		D	294,759	294,759	0	(294,759)	-100.0%
(b) National programs (Subpart 2):							
(1) National activities (sections 4121 and 4122)		D	137,664	140,264 <sup>1</sup>	250,896	110,632	78.9%
(2) Alcohol abuse reduction (section 4129)		D	32,423	32,712	32,712	0	0.0%
(3) Mentoring program (section 4130)		D	48,544	47,264 <sup>1</sup>	0	(47,264)	-100.0%
Subtotal, National programs			218,632	220,240	283,608	63,368	28.8%
Subtotal			513,391	514,999	283,608	(231,391)	-44.9%
2. Character education (ESEA V-D, subpart 3)		D	23,824	11,912	0	(11,912)	-100.0%
3. Elementary and secondary school counseling (ESEA V-D, subpart 2)		D	48,617	52,000	52,000	0	0.0%
4. Physical education program (ESEA V-D, subpart 10)		D	75,655	78,000	78,000	0	0.0%
5. Civic education (ESEA II, Part C-3):							
(a) We the People (section 2344)		D	20,056	20,076	0	(20,076)	-100.0%
(b) Cooperative education exchange (section 2345)		D	11,861	13,383	0	(13,383)	-100.0%
Subtotal			31,917	33,459	0	(33,459)	-100.0%
<b>Total</b>		<b>D</b>	<b>693,404</b>	<b>690,370</b>	<b>413,608</b>	<b>(276,762)</b>	<b>-40.1%</b>
Outlays		D	823,893	807,558	759,279	(48,279)	-6.0%

<sup>1</sup> Reflects a reprogramming of \$1,280 thousand from the Mentoring Program to National Activities.

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

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Summary of Request

The programs in the Safe Schools and Citizenship Education account help ensure that our Nation's schools offer a safe, secure, and drug-free environment for learning, and promote strong character and citizenship among our Nation's youth.

Teaching and learning to help students achieve rigorous, college-ready academic achievement standards and receive the high-quality education they need to compete in the global economy require that our schools are safe and our students are drug-free and active in promoting their well-being and healthy development. For 2010, the Administration requests \$413.6 million for programs in the account, a \$276.8 million, or 40 percent, decrease from 2009. The request also provides a significant increase for one key program to launch a major new initiative.

The Administration proposes to terminate funding for **Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) State Grants** because of the program's inability to demonstrate effectiveness and the fact that grant funds are spread too thinly to support quality interventions. Instead the budget request includes \$250.9 million (a \$110.6 million increase) for **SDFSC National Activities** to promote positive and safe learning environments by providing direct support, in amounts sufficient to make a real difference, for targeted school safety and drug prevention and education activities that are structured in a manner that permits grantees and independent evaluators to measure progress and add to the national knowledge base on program effectiveness and best practices. Highlights of the SDFSC National Programs request include:

- \$100 million for a major new initiative of grant assistance to LEAs (or to other organizations in partnership with LEAs) to support new approaches to assisting schools in fostering a safe, secure, and drug-free learning environment, particularly by using approaches designed to change school culture and climate and, thereby, improve character and discipline and reduce drug use, crime, and violence;
- \$33 million for school emergency preparedness initiatives that the Department is implementing to coincide with the inclusion of the Nation's elementary and secondary schools in the Department of Homeland Security's National Infrastructure Protection Plan, and \$7 million for a companion initiative in emergency preparedness for institutions of higher education;
- \$77.8 million for grants to LEAs for comprehensive, community-wide "Safe Schools/Healthy Students" drug and violence prevention projects that are coordinated with local law enforcement and also include mental health preventive and treatment services;
- \$7.8 million for the final year of continuation awards for school-based drug testing programs for students;
- \$8 million to continue providing financial and technical assistance to institutions of higher education (IHEs) for drug prevention and campus safety programs, including the IHE National Recognition Awards program;
- \$5 million for Project SERV (School Emergency Response to Violence), to ensure that funds are available for the Department, if called upon, to provide emergency response services to



## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Summary of Request

LEAs and IHEs in which the learning environment has been disrupted by a violent or traumatic crisis; and

- \$12.2 million for other activities that support and improve drug and violence prevention efforts, such as evaluation, data collection and analysis, joint projects with other Federal agencies, a national clearinghouse for educational facilities, development and dissemination of materials and information, and other forms of technical assistance.

The Administration's budget request also includes level funding for the following programs in the account:

- \$32.7 million for **Alcohol Abuse Reduction**, for projects in secondary schools to prevent under-age drinking;
- \$52 million for **Elementary and Secondary School Counseling**, to assist LEAs in developing or expanding elementary and secondary school counseling programs; and
- \$78 million for **Physical Education**, to support efforts by LEAs and community-based organizations to increase child fitness, address the serious issue of childhood obesity, and help children develop more healthy lifestyles.

Finally, no funding is requested for the **Mentoring** program, because a recent impact evaluation found the program to be ineffective; no funds are requested for the **Character Education** program, because character education activities would be supported within the \$100 million new SDFSC National Activities initiative; and no funds are requested for **Civic Education**, because the budget request includes funds under the Fund for the Improvement of Education (Programs of National Significance) in the Innovation and Improvement account for a grant competition that would support the development or expansion of projects to improve student achievement in civics, government, and history.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

---

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

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

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$294,759	0	-\$294,759

---

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

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) State Grants is a State-administered formula grant program intended to help create and maintain drug-free, safe, and orderly environments for learning in and around schools by supporting effective, research-based approaches to drug and violence prevention.

From the total appropriation, 1 percent or \$4.75 million (whichever is greater) is reserved for the Outlying Areas, 1 percent or \$4.75 million (whichever is greater) is reserved for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for programs for Indian youth, and 0.2 percent is reserved for programs for Native Hawaiians. The Department allocates the remaining funds by formula to States, half on the basis of school-aged population and half on the basis of State shares of ESEA Title I Concentration Grants funding for the previous year, provided that no State receives less than the greater of: (1) one-half of 1 percent of the total, or (2) the amount it received under the program in fiscal year 2001. Of each State's allocation, the Governor may elect to administer up to 20 percent of the funds; the remainder is administered by the State educational agency (SEA).

SEAs are authorized to reserve up to 5 percent of their allocations to plan, develop, and implement capacity-building, technical assistance and training, evaluation, program improvement, and coordination activities for local educational agencies (LEAs), community-based organizations, and other public and private entities. These services and activities assist LEAs in developing, implementing, and evaluating comprehensive prevention programs that are consistent with the SDFSC statutory requirements. They may include, but are not limited to, identification, development, evaluation, and dissemination of drug and violence prevention strategies, programs, and activities; training, technical assistance, and demonstration projects to address violence that is associated with prejudice and intolerance; and financial assistance to enhance drug and violence prevention resources available in areas that serve large numbers of low-income children, are sparsely populated, or have other special needs. SEAs may also reserve up to 3 percent for administrative costs but must subgrant at least 93 percent to their

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

---

LEAs. LEA allocations are based 60 percent on Title I Basic and Concentration Grant funding for the preceding year and 40 percent on enrollment.

LEAs participating in the program must use their SDFSC funds to develop, implement, and evaluate comprehensive programs and activities that are coordinated with other school and community-based services and programs and that:

- Are consistent with the SDFSC principles of effectiveness listed below.
- Foster a safe and drug-free learning environment that supports academic achievement.
- Are designed to: (1) prevent or reduce violence; the use, possession, and distribution of illegal drugs; and delinquency; and (2) create a disciplined environment conducive to learning, including through consultation among teachers, principals, and other school personnel, in order to identify early warning signs of drug use and violence and to provide behavioral interventions as part of classroom management efforts.
- Include activities to: (1) promote the involvement of parents in the activity or program; (2) promote coordination with community groups and coalitions, and government agencies; and (3) distribute information to those individuals and organizations about the LEA's needs, goals, and programs funded under the SDFSC Act.

Within these program requirements, LEAs may use their SDFSC funds for a wide variety of activities. However, an LEA may use not more than 20 percent of its SDFSC funds for school security-related activities, other than for hiring and training school security personnel, which may absorb up to 40 percent of the LEA's SDFSC allocation. In addition, not more than 2 percent of an LEA's funding under the program may be used for administrative costs.

Governors may reserve up to 3 percent of their funds for administrative costs, and must use the remainder to award competitive grants and contracts to LEAs, community-based organizations (including community anti-drug coalitions), and other public entities and private organizations. These awards must be used to carry out the State's comprehensive plan submitted to the Department jointly by the chief State school officer and the Governor for the use of funds to provide safe, orderly, and drug-free schools and communities through programs and activities that complement and support the activities of LEAs. Funds may support activities to prevent and reduce violence associated with prejudice and intolerance; dissemination of information about drug and violence prevention; and development and implementation of community-wide drug and violence prevention planning and organizing.

In making grants and contracts, the Governor must give priority to programs and activities for (1) children and youth who are not normally served by SEAs or LEAs, or (2) populations that need special services or additional resources (such as youth in juvenile detention facilities, runaway or homeless children and youth, pregnant and parenting teenagers, and school dropouts). Governors must also give special consideration to grantees that pursue a comprehensive approach to drug and violence prevention that includes incorporating mental health services within their program.

Principles of Effectiveness. SEAs, LEAs, and Governors' award recipients are required to operate their State Grant programs in a manner consistent with statutory Principles of

**SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

**Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants**

---

Effectiveness. These Principles require prevention programs to: (1) be based on an assessment of objective data about the drug and violence problems in the schools and communities to be served; (2) be based on performance measures aimed at ensuring that these schools and communities have a safe, orderly, and drug-free learning environment; (3) be grounded in scientifically based research that provides evidence that the program will reduce violence and illegal drug use; (4) be based on an analysis of the prevalence of “risk factors, protective factors, buffers, assets, or other variables,” identified through scientifically based research, that exist in the schools and communities in the State; (5) include consultation with and input from parents; and (6) be evaluated periodically against locally selected performance measures and modified over time (based on the evaluation) to refine, improve, and strengthen the program.

Uniform Management Information and Reporting System. The statute requires States to establish and maintain a Uniform Management Information and Reporting System (UMIRS) under which they must provide information on a school-by-school basis to the public on truancy rates and on the frequency, seriousness, and incidence of violence and drug-related offenses resulting in suspensions and expulsions. The UMIRS must also include information, reported publicly, on the types of curricula, programs, and services provided by grantees and on the incidence and prevalence, age of onset, perception of health risk, and perception of social disapproval of drug use and violence by youth. The Department has worked collaboratively with the States to develop a uniform data set that includes the UMIRS elements. States and LEAs must also develop and identify performance measures for their SDFSC-funded drug and violence prevention programs and activities, and assess and publicly report on progress toward meeting those measures.

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$437,381
2006.....	346,500
2007.....	346,500
2008.....	294,759
2009.....	294,759

**FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST**

No funds are requested for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) State Grant program in 2010. The Administration strongly supports efforts to improve school safety and reduce drug use. However the SDFSC State Grant program has never been shown to be effective. The program does not adequately target schools most needing help and generally spreads funding too thinly at the local level to support quality interventions, as a 2001 study from the Rand Drug Policy Research Center found and the statutory SDFSC Advisory

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

---

Committee reaffirmed in 2007. For example, SDFSC State Grants provide more than half of LEAs with allocations of less than \$10,000. It is time for a new approach to the problem.

By comparison, SDFSC National Programs does not have these design flaws and limitations and is better structured to support targeted, high-quality interventions. Accordingly the Administration proposes to redirect \$100 million from the SDFSC State Grant program to SDFSC National Programs in order to fund direct grants to LEAs, or to other organizations in partnership with LEAs, to support new approaches to assisting schools in fostering a safe and drug-free learning environment, particularly by using approaches designed to change school culture and climate and thereby improve character and discipline, and reduce drug use, crime, and violence. More details on this proposal are provided under the budget request for SDFSC National Programs.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Grants to States	\$284,669	\$284,669	0
Amount for SEAs and LEAs	228,305	228,305	0
Amount for Governors	56,364	56,364	0
Average State award	5,473	5,473	0
Range of awards	1,423-	1,423-	0
	35,162	35,162	
Set-aside for Outlying Areas	4,750	4,750	0
Set-aside for BIA schools	4,750	4,750	0
Programs for Native Hawaiians	590	590	0

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

#### Performance Measures

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

The Department's strategy for assessing whether the SDFSC State Grant program is making an investment toward positive outcomes uses (1) data on the extent to which recipients of SDFSC State Grant funds are implementing research-based practices, coupled with (2) national survey data on the prevalence of youth drug use and violence.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

---

**Goal:** Develop safe, disciplined, and drug-free learning environments

**Objective:** To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of programs that reflect scientifically based research.

<b>Measure:</b> Percentage of drug and violence prevention programs and practices supported with SDFSC State Grant funds that are research-based.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		7.8
2009	13.0	

<b>Measure:</b> Percentage of SDFSC-funded research-based drug and violence prevention curriculum programs that are implemented with fidelity.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		44.3
2009	53.1	

**Assessment of progress:** The Department collected baseline data for these two performance measures, for the 2004-05 school year, as part of a Study of the Implementation of Research-Based Programs and Practices in Schools to Prevent Youth Substance Abuse and School Crime (which was funded under SDFSC National Programs). An assessment of progress cannot be made until at least 2010, when data for the 2008-09 school year are expected to become available.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who were offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003		28.7
2005	28	25.4
2007	27	22.3
2009	26	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who used marijuana one or more times during the past 30 days.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003		22.4
2005	21	20.2
2007	19	19.7
2009	18	

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

**Measure:** The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who had five or more drinks of alcohol in a row (that is, within a couple of hours) one or more times during the past 30 days.

Year	Target	Actual
2003		28.3
2005	27	26.5
2007	26	26.0
2009	25	

**Measure:** The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who were in a physical fight on school property one or more times during the past 12 months.

Year	Target	Actual
2003		12.8
2005	12	13.6
2007	12	12.4
2009	11	

**Measure:** The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who carried a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property one or more times during the past 30 days.

Year	Target	Actual
2003		6.1
2005	5	6.5
2007	5	5.9
2009	4	

**Assessment of progress:** The Department is using these five measures on the prevalence of drug use and violence as a component of measuring the performance of the SDFSC State Grant program. Data for these measures are collected from the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System, conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention every 2 years, using a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9-12. The 2007 targets for two of these indicators were met or exceeded. The 2007 targets for the other three were not met, but by less than 1 percentage point each. In each case, the data show improvement between 2005 and 2007.

### Efficiency Measures

To improve the operational efficiency of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants program, the Department developed two measures of efficiency.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

**Measure:** The (average) number of days it takes the Department to send monitoring reports to States after monitoring visits.

Year	Target	Actual
2005		46
2006	45	44
2007	43	43
2008	41	40
2009	39	

**Measure:** The (average) number of days it takes States to respond satisfactorily to findings in the monitoring reports.

Year	Target	Actual
2005		78
2006	77	74
2007	75	84
2008	72	70
2009	69	

**Assessment of progress:** The average number of days it takes the Department to send monitoring reports to States after monitoring visits decreased from 46 days in 2005 to 40 days in 2008, surpassing the target of 41 days. The average number of days it takes States to respond satisfactorily to findings in the monitoring reports first decreased, from 78 days in 2005 to 74 days in 2006; then increased to 84 days; then dropped to 70 days in 2008, exceeding the target of 72 days. No targets are included for 2010 because the Administration is not requesting funding for this program in fiscal year 2010.

### Other Performance Information

The Department also established GPRA measures for the SDFSC program for Native Hawaiians to assess the effectiveness of the projects funded through that program. Beginning with the 2008 cohort, the performance measures for these grants are: (1) the percentage of students annually served through a grant who show a decrease in violent or disruptive behavior, or delinquency; and (2) the percentage of students annually served through a grant who show a decrease in the use of illegal drugs. Later in 2009, the Department will have the first data on these measures for the two SDFSC Native Hawaiian grants awarded in 2008. For the prior (2003) cohort of SDFSC Native Hawaiian grants, the Department required grantees to establish their own performance measures related to changes in student behaviors or risk or protective factors related to youth drug use or youth violence. Data from the final performance reports of those two grantees will also be available later in 2009.



## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

---

#### Program Improvement Efforts

The Department is undertaking the following improvement efforts for SDFSC State Grants:

- *Collecting and reporting data on the extent to which program funds are being used to support high-quality, research-based strategies at the local level.* The Department has collected data concerning the extent to which program funds are being used to support high-quality, research-based programs. Data for the 2004-05 school year on the extent to which SDFSC State Grant program funds were used to support research-based strategies, and among those strategies, the extent to which curriculum-based programs were implemented with fidelity to the research, are now available and comprise the baseline data for two of the Government Performance and Results Act measures for the program. The Department is implementing a follow-up data collection for the 2008-09 school year.
- *Strengthening SEA and Governor's grantees implementation of the Principles of Effectiveness, including the use of science-based programs and data collection.* As part of routine monitoring, the Department examines how a grantee implements and complies with program and policy requirements. Recent recommendations from the Safe and Drug-free Schools and Communities Advisory Committee cited the need for increased monitoring and mentoring from the Department to grantees on data collection requirements and implementation of evidenced-based programming. In addition, data from the study referred to in the preceding bullet indicate that a low prevalence of LEAs implement evidence-based programming. Accordingly, the Department has expanded its monitoring, technical assistance and information dissemination in these areas.
- *Supporting technical assistance to help States improve the collection, analysis, and use of data to improve the quality, and report the outcomes, of their SDFSC programs.* Since 2005, the Department has been implementing a project with States to develop a uniform data set that they can use as a model in meeting the requirements of the Uniform Management Information and Reporting System. The Department completed a roll-out of the uniform data set in 2008 and since then the Department has been (1) completing a document describing the data set, and (2) working to align data collections and required file specifications with the uniform data set. The Department awarded a new contract at the end of fiscal year 2008 to support the next phase of this work. The contract includes support for assessing State's training and technical assistance needs related to collecting and reporting data, and for delivering technical assistance services that respond to identified needs. Increasingly, States will use the data elements and definitions contained in the uniform data set in providing their SDFSC data to the Department as part of the ESEA Consolidated State Performance Report.
- *Posting State-level performance data on progress toward meeting performance targets on the program website.* The Department has completed the collection of information from States about their progress toward meeting their performance targets for the 2005-06 and 2006-07 school years and posted this information on the Department's web site. Comparable information from States for the 2007-08 school year has been received by the Department and should also be posted on the Department's website later in 2009.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

---

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

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

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
National activities	\$140,264 <sup>2</sup>	\$250,896	+\$110,632
Alcohol abuse reduction	32,712	32,712	0
Mentoring program	<u>47,264</u> <sup>2</sup>	<u>0</u>	<u>-47,264</u>
Total	220,240	283,608	+63,368

---

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

<sup>2</sup> Reflects a reprogramming of \$1,280 thousand from Mentoring to National Activities.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) National Programs statute authorizes funding for several competitive and discretionary programs and activities to help promote safe and drug-free learning environments for students and address the needs of at-risk youth. These include alcohol abuse reduction, mentoring programs, and other national programs (Federal activities and impact evaluation).

#### **Alcohol Abuse Reduction (Section 4129)**

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

#### **Mentoring program (Section 4130)**

Under this program, the Department awards grants to LEAs, non-profit community-based organizations, and partnerships of the two to establish and support mentoring programs and activities for children who are at risk of educational failure, dropping out of school, or involvement in criminal or delinquent activities, or who lack strong, positive role models. The

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### **Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs**

---

programs must be designed to link these children (particularly those living in rural areas, high-crime areas, or troubled home environments, or children experiencing educational failure or attending schools with violence problems) with mentors who have received training and support in mentoring and are interested in working with such children. Mentors provide general guidance and emotional support; promote personal and social responsibility; offer academic assistance and encouragement to excel in school and plan for the future; discourage illegal use of drugs and alcohol, violence, and other harmful activity; and encourage participation in community service and community activities. Grant funds must be used for activities that include, but are not limited to, hiring and training mentoring coordinators and support staff; recruiting, screening, and training mentors; and disseminating outreach materials. However, the mentors may not be compensated directly with grant funds. In awarding grants, the Department is required to give priority to projects that propose school-based mentoring programs. The Department may also use funds under this program to provide technical assistance to grantees in implementing their projects effectively.

### **Federal Activities (Section 4121)**

The Department is authorized to carry out a wide variety of discretionary activities designed to prevent the illegal use of drugs and violence among, and promote safety and discipline for, students. These activities may be carried out through grants to or contracts with public and private organizations and individuals, or through agreements with other Federal agencies, and may include, but are not limited to:

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

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

The statute (in section 4124) also requires the establishment of a Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Advisory Committee composed of representatives of Federal agencies, State and local governments (including school districts), and researchers and expert practitioners to advise the Secretary of Education and to help coordinate Federal school- and community-based substance abuse and violence prevention programs.

#### **Impact evaluation (Section 4122)**

The statute authorizes the Department to reserve up to \$2 million in SDFSC National Programs funds to conduct a required biennial evaluation of the impact of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program “and of other recent and new initiatives to combat violence and illegal drug use in schools.” The evaluation is to report on whether community and local educational agency programs funded under SDFSC State Grants: (1) comply with the SDFSC principles of effectiveness set forth in the statute; (2) have appreciably reduced the level of illegal drug, alcohol, and tobacco use, school violence, and the illegal presence of weapons at schools; and (3) have conducted effective parent involvement and training programs.

Section 4122 also requires the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to collect data to determine the incidence and prevalence of illegal drug use and violence in elementary and secondary schools in the States, and for the Secretary, every 2 years, to submit to the President and Congress a report on the findings of the biennial impact evaluation and the NCES data collection, along with data available from other sources on drug use and violence in elementary and secondary schools in the States.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$234,580
2006.....	222,335
2007.....	230,929
2008.....	218,632
2009.....	220,240

#### FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2010 the Administration requests \$283.6 million for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs, an increase of \$63.4 million over 2009. Of this amount (after adjusting for the reprogramming of \$1.3 million from Mentoring to National Activities), \$250.9 million (a \$110.6 million increase) is requested for National Activities; level funding of \$32.7 million is requested for the Alcohol Abuse Reduction program; and no funding (a decrease of \$47.3 million) is proposed for the Mentoring program.

#### National Activities

Students cannot be expected to excel in schools where they are threatened by drugs, violence, crime, bullying, harassment, or intimidation, all of which continue to be serious problems

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

affecting school-aged youth. The public also continues to be extremely concerned about school safety, overall, in part because of the tragic school shootings in public schools across the Nation in recent years and also as a result of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States. The shootings at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and Northern Illinois University have sparked similar concerns about safety on our Nation's college campuses.

Major elements of the budget request for SDFSC National Programs follow. Most funds are requested for activities that would provide direct support to LEAs, in sufficient amounts to make a real difference, for targeted projects that address key national concerns and are structured in a manner that permits grantees and independent evaluators to measure progress, hold projects accountable, and determine which interventions are most effective.

- \$100 million for grants for a major new initiative to support new approaches to assisting schools in fostering a safe, secure, and drug-free learning environment, particularly by using approaches designed to change school culture and climate and thereby improve character and discipline, and reduce drug use, crime, and violence. School officials face significant challenges in terms of (1) fitting a classroom- or curriculum-based drug and violence prevention program into a school day that is already crowded with core academic subjects; and (2) even absent those time constraints, having staff available who have the training and skills to implement those types of programs. Increasingly, therefore, they seek alternative and comprehensive solutions for addressing the continuum of behavioral issues that affect teaching and learning, including bullying, cyber-bullying, teasing, harassment, truancy, gang activity, fighting and other assaults, theft, firearms and other weapons possession, and drug and alcohol use, possession, and sales.

Accordingly, under this new initiative the Department would hold a grant competition with two separate funding priorities, each generally addressing opposite ends of this destructive continuum. The first priority would support projects to reduce the number of suspensions and expulsions related to disruptive behavior and non-violent offenses and to reduce the amount of time teachers spend on disciplining students for engaging in disruptive behavior and on other minor non-violent offenses. The second priority would support projects to reduce the amount of serious violent crime in schools (including on school grounds, as well as crimes affecting students on the way to and from school), and to reduce the amount of serious violent crime among school-aged youth in the community.

Eligible applicants for the first priority would be (1) LEAs, or (2) institutions of higher education, community-based organizations, or other private non-profit entities, in partnership with LEAs. Applicants for this priority could propose a range of activities, including new and innovative ways for dealing with truants or with other problem behaviors, including alcohol and other drug use; training teachers to deal more effectively with disruptive behavior at the classroom level; and forging partnerships between schools, law enforcement, juvenile justice, community colleges, and community-based groups (including faith-based organizations) to provide a comprehensive, cross-system approach to addressing these problems.

Eligible applicants for the second priority would be LEAs. Applicants for this priority could also propose a range of activities, including developing and participating in community-wide partnerships or task forces with law enforcement, juvenile justice, or other agencies that

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

focus on preventing serious violent crime (including gang activity and drug-related crime); and implementing prevention and early intervention programs that target serious violent crime, including the sale and distribution of illicit substances.

- \$33 million to support a variety of school emergency preparedness initiatives that the Department is developing and implementing to coincide with the inclusion of the Nation's elementary and secondary schools in the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS's) National Infrastructure Protection Plan (NIPP).

As part of the Administration's efforts to enhance our national readiness to respond to terrorist threats and other crises, the NIPP involves the identification of vulnerabilities in key "sectors" of the U.S. infrastructure. DHS has incorporated elementary and secondary schools into the government facilities sub-sector of the NIPP. Education and DHS have also identified a number of challenges that continue to face elementary and secondary schools as they prepare to prevent, mitigate, respond to, and recover from crisis events. Those challenges include (1) the lack of expertise in the school community related to terrorism and crisis response; (2) limited available technical assistance capacity for crisis response that is specific to elementary and secondary schools (such as strategies for ensuring the safety of the more than 24 million students who travel to school via school bus each day); (3) lack of resources to develop that expertise and to support appropriate planning and practice simulations; (4) failure of States and communities to include elementary and secondary schools in their planning activities; (5) use of communications equipment by schools that is incompatible with communications devices for first responders; and, (6) lack of procedures or capacity to share credible information about imminent threats and actual crisis incidents. Other challenges specific to preparing schools to deal effectively with crisis situations are related to school governance and organization, including the strong tradition of local control of education, lack of contiguous boundaries between municipal entities and school districts, and lack of needed regional coordination among school districts located in metropolitan areas that include multiple municipalities and school districts.

Funds for this initiative will be used to support a combination of direct grants and technical assistance that respond to the challenges related to elementary and secondary schools identified in the NIPP vulnerability assessment. The initiative encompasses planning and preparation for the entire constellation of threats (not only terrorist attacks but also natural disasters, shootings, and gang-related activity) that face elementary and secondary schools. Grants provide resources that permit local school districts, in coordination with public health and safety agencies, to help shape their individual crisis planning and response activities to conform with DHS' National Incident Management System (NIMS), helping to ensure that, during crises, schools can communicate and coordinate activities with first responders who have responsibility for assisting them. Grants are supplemented by technical assistance, training activities, and a communications system designed to (1) expand the number of State and local educational agency personnel who are qualified to help schools plan and respond to threats and crises, and (2) support the efficient sharing of accurate information about threats and incidents, especially sharing with the most vulnerable schools and school districts.

- \$7 million for similar initiatives in emergency preparedness for institutions of higher education (IHEs), including the dissemination of information about emergency management

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

planning tailored to the needs of higher education, as well as training, technical assistance, and grant funding to IHEs to support the emergency management process on their campuses.

- \$77.8 million to make continuation grants under the Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative, which helps communities create safe, disciplined, and drug-free learning environments, promote healthy childhood development, and provide needed mental health services in the communities served. This initiative, which the Department of Education funds jointly with the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and administers in collaboration with both HHS and the Department of Justice, supports LEAs and communities in developing and implementing a comprehensive set of programs and services designed to prevent youth drug use and violence, support early childhood development activities, and provide needed student mental health services.

To be eligible for Safe Schools/Healthy Students funding, an LEA must demonstrate agreement in the form of a partnership among the major community systems serving students – schools, the local public mental health authority, law enforcement, and juvenile justice – to work collaboratively in assessing needs and providing programs and services in the following five areas: (1) safe school environments and violence prevention; (2) alcohol, tobacco, and other drug prevention; (3) student behavioral, social, and emotional supports; (4) mental health services; and (5) early childhood social and emotional learning programs.

- \$7.8 million for the final year of grant continuation awards and technical assistance to LEAs and public and private entities to support the development, implementation, or expansion of school-based drug testing programs for students. The drug testing funded by these grants, which received 3-year awards in 2008, must be part of a comprehensive drug prevention program in the schools served and must provide for the referral to treatment or counseling of students identified as drug users. The projects must also be consistent with recent Supreme Court decisions regarding student drug testing and must ensure the confidentiality of testing results.
- \$8.0 million to continue to provide financial and technical assistance to institutions of higher education (IHEs) for drug prevention and campus safety programs for students attending such institutions. SDFSC National Programs is the only Department of Education program that provides funding for campus-based drug and violence prevention program at IHEs. The request includes funds for the IHE National Recognition Awards program that recognizes models of exemplary, effective, and promising drug and alcohol prevention programs on college campuses.
- \$5 million for Project SERV (School Emergency Response to Violence), which provides education-related services, including increased safety and security, to LEAs and IHEs in which the learning environment has been disrupted by a violent or traumatic crisis. The \$5 million request should ensure that funds are available to provide crisis response services in the event that the Department is called upon to do so.

Consistent with previous appropriations, funds for Project SERV are requested on a no-year basis, to remain available for obligation at the Federal level until expended. In the hoped-for event that there are no school- or college-related crises, the unobligated funds would be

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

carried over into the next fiscal year. Examples of services provided include mental health assessments, referrals, and services for victims and witnesses of violence; enhanced school security; technical assistance on developing a short-term and long-term response to the crisis; and training for teachers, faculty, administrators, and staff in implementing the response.

- \$12.2 million for other activities that support and improve drug and violence prevention efforts, such as evaluation, data collection and analysis, joint projects with other Federal agencies, a national clearinghouse on educational facilities, development and dissemination of materials and information, and other forms of technical assistance.

No funds are requested for Sober Truth on Preventing Underage Drinking (STOP) grants, which received their first appropriation under SDFSC National Programs in 2009. Consistent with the program framework authorized in the STOP Act, Public Law 109-422, the Department will hold a competition in 2009 for grant awards to States, IHEs, and non-profit organizations to support Statewide coalitions and other activities designed to prevent and reduce the rate of underage alcohol consumption, including binge drinking, among students at IHEs. Continued funding for this activity in 2010 is not proposed because the SDFSC National Programs budget request includes more than \$8 million for campus-based drug and violence prevention programs serving students at IHEs, including grants to reduce high-risk drinking among that population. That program provides a more flexible vehicle for supporting efforts to reduce underage drinking among students at IHEs because it permits the development and implementation of a broader range of strategies and approaches. Statewide coalitions (the primary activity under the provisions of the STOP Act dealing with IHEs) may also be implemented under the broader postsecondary prevention grants.

Finally, no funds are requested for the longitudinal Impact Evaluation of a School-Based Violence Prevention Program. This 5-year study, which began in 2004, will determine whether: (1) aggressive and violent behaviors decrease for students in schools that participate in a selected violence prevention program compared to students in schools that do participate in the selected program; (2) the program improves other in-school outcomes, such as truancy, school attendance, and on-time promotion, or results in a reduction in other disruptive and delinquent behaviors, such as vandalism; and (3) the effects of the program vary by students' risk profiles (that is, whether program impacts differ based on whether students are at a high risk or low risk for different outcomes). The evaluation contract received its fifth and final year of funding in 2008. An interim evaluation report will be issued later in 2009, and the final report is expected in December 2010.

#### Alcohol Abuse Reduction

The 2010 budget request for SDFSC National Programs includes level funding of \$32.7 million for the Alcohol Abuse Reduction program. This request would support new and continuation grant awards, along with technical assistance from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), to assist approximately 95 LEAs in developing and implementing innovative and effective programs to reduce alcohol abuse in secondary schools.

As acknowledged in *The Surgeon General's Call to Action to Prevent and Reduce Underage Drinking*,



## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

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

Indeed, under-age drinking has serious social costs and often tragic personal consequences. Each grantees under this program will, at a minimum, implement a strategy for reducing under-age alcohol abuse that SAMHSA has determined is effective.

#### Mentoring

No funds are requested in 2010 for the Mentoring program. A recent impact evaluation of the program conducted by the Institute of Education Sciences found the program to be ineffective. The evaluation compared outcomes of students in the fourth through eighth grades who were randomly assigned either to receive or not to receive school-based mentoring from one of the Department 's mentoring grantees. Students were compared on seventeen measures across four domains: school engagement, academic achievement, delinquent behavior, and "prosocial" behavior. The evaluation found that, for the full sample of students, the program did not lead to statistically significant impacts on any of the measures.

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
<b>National Activities</b>			
<u>Improving School Culture and Climate</u>			
Grant award funds (new)	0	0	\$99,000
Peer review of new award applications	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,000</u>
Total budget authority	0	0	100,000
Number of new awards	0	0	400
Average award	0	0	\$248

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

(Continued)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
<u>School Emergency Preparedness Initiative</u>			
LEA grant award funds (new)	\$24,641	\$26,000	\$29,000
IHE grant awards (new)	5,862	5,991	7,000
Other school safety initiatives	2,780	3,700	3,700
Peer review of new award applications	<u>250</u>	<u>300</u>	<u>300</u>
Total budget authority	33,533	35,991	40,000
Number of new awards	112	121	136
Average award	\$272	\$264	\$265
<u>Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative</u>			
Grant award funding (new)	\$37,636	\$16,672	0
Grant award funding (continuations)	39,520	60,694	\$77,816
Peer review of new award applications	<u>400</u>	<u>450</u>	<u>0</u>
Total budget authority	77,556	77,816	77,816
Number of new awards	60	28	0
Number of continuation awards	46	87	115
Average award	\$728	\$673	\$677
<u>Student Drug Testing</u>			
Grant award funding (new)	\$5,783	0	0
Grant award funding (continuations)	2,685	\$6,708 <sup>1</sup>	\$7,339 <sup>2</sup>
Evaluation and data collection	1,068	679	0
Student Drug Testing Institute	1,000	500	500
Peer review of new award applications	<u>50</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total budget authority	10,586	7,887	7,839
Number of new awards	49	0	0
Number of continuation awards	22	71	49
Average award	\$119	\$95	\$150

<sup>1</sup> Reflects a reprogramming of \$1,280 thousand from the Mentoring program to more fully fund fiscal year 2009 student drug testing continuation costs.

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$1,703 thousand to fully fund fiscal year 2009 continuation costs.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

(Continued)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
<u>Postsecondary Education Drug and Violence Prevention Programs</u>			
Grant award funds (new)	\$374	\$2,579	\$2,538
Number of awards	2	18	16
Grant award funds (continuations)	\$2,545	\$355	\$2,579
Number of awards	18	2	18
Training and technical assistance center	\$2,437	\$2,183	\$2,000
National recognition awards program	\$781	\$850	\$830
Number of new awards	5	2	5
Peer review of new award applications	<u>\$20</u>	<u>\$50</u>	<u>\$70</u>
Total budget authority	\$6,157	\$6,017	\$8,017
<u>Project SERV</u>	\$1,474	0	\$5,000
<u>Other Activities</u>	\$7,326	\$10,053	\$12,224
<u>Sober Truth on Preventing Underage Drinking (STOP Act)</u>			
Grant award funding (new)	0	\$2,475	0
Peer review of new award applications	<u>0</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>0</u>
Total budget authority	0	2,500	0
Number of new awards	0	9	0
Average award	0	\$275	0
<u>Impact Evaluation (section 4122)</u>	\$1,032	0	0
<b>Alcohol Abuse Reduction</b>			
Grant award funding (new)	\$24,590	\$2,405	\$3,657
Grant award funding (continuations)	6,038	30,307	27,230
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)	1,670	0	1,700
Peer review of new award applications	<u>125</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>125</u>
Total budget authority	32,423	32,712	32,712
Number of new awards	76	8	11
Number of continuation awards	18	94	84
Average award	\$326	\$321	\$325

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) (Continued)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
<b>Mentoring Program</b>			
Grant award funding (new)	\$16,324	0	0
Grant award funding (continuations)	30,511	\$47,264	0
Technical assistance center	1,109	0	0
Evaluation	600	0	0
Peer review of new award applications	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total budget authority	48,544	47,264 <sup>3</sup>	0
Number of new awards	96	0	0
Number of continuation awards	168	264	0
Average award	\$177	\$179	0

---

<sup>3</sup> Reflects a reprogramming of \$1,280 thousand to National Activities to fund student drug testing continuation costs.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### **Performance Measures**

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

##### Safe Schools/Healthy Students

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

Beginning with the 2007 cohort of grants, the Department has established as performance measures for Safe Schools/Healthy Students projects: (1) Percentage of grantees that experience a decrease in the percentage of their students who did not go to school on one or more days during the past 30 days because they felt unsafe at school, or on their way to and from school; (2) Percentage of grantees that experience a decrease in the percentage of their students who have been in a physical fight on school property in the 12 months prior to the survey; (3) Percentage of grantees that report a decrease in the percentage of their students

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

who report current (30-day) marijuana use; (4) Percentage of grantees that report a decrease in the percentage of their students who report current (30-day) alcohol use; (5) Percentage of grantees that report an increase in the number of students receiving school-based mental health services; and (6) Percentage of grantees that report an increase in the percentage of mental health referrals for students that result in mental health services being provided in the community. Targets for the above measures will not be established until later in 2009, when the first baseline data become available for the 2007 cohort.

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

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

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

Year	Targets			Actual		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
<b>2006</b>				70		
<b>2007</b>	90			55	54.3	
<b>2008</b>		80.5				82.3
<b>2009</b>			86.4			

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

Year	Targets			Actual		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
<b>2006</b>				75		
<b>2007</b>	90			66.7	43.75	
<b>2008</b>		86.25				66.67
<b>2009</b>			76.67			

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

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

Year	Targets			Actual		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
<b>2006</b>				33.3		
<b>2007</b>	90			64.7	40.5	
<b>2008</b>		38				80.0
<b>2009</b>			84			

**Assessment of progress:** None of the 2007 targets was met for the several measures above for which 2007 data are available. In some cases the targets were missed significantly; however, the targets were set prior to the receipt of baseline data, and turned out to be too ambitious. In general the data show an improvement on the measures for the 2006 cohort compared to the prior cohorts.

#### Student Drug Testing

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

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

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

Year	Targets					Actual				
	2003 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2003 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort
<b>2006</b>						33				
<b>2007</b>	50	33				25				
<b>2008</b>		50	50	33				67		
<b>2009</b>			70	50	33					
<b>2010</b>			75	60	50					

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Student Drug Testing grantees that experience a 5 percent annual reduction in the incidence of past-year drug use by students in the target population.										
<b>Year</b>	<b>Targets</b>					<b>Actual</b>				
	2003	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2005	2006	2007	2008
	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort
<b>2006</b>						25				
<b>2007</b>	50	25				0				
<b>2008</b>		50	50	33				56		
<b>2009</b>			60	50	33					
<b>2010</b>			70	60	50					

**Assessment of progress:** The 2006 cohort of grantees exceeded the 2008 target for each of these measures. Unfortunately, an assessment of progress for the 2005 cohort of grantees cannot be made because the data reported by grantees were not sufficiently comparable across sites to be aggregated meaningfully for the cohort. A 2008 assessment of progress for the 2007 cohort of grantees will be available later in 2009.

#### Readiness and Emergency Management for Schools

The Department will have baseline data later in 2009 on the following performance measures for the fiscal year 2006 cohort of Emergency Response and Crisis Management (since renamed Readiness and Emergency Management for Schools) grants: (1) demonstration by grantees of the number of hazards addressed by the improved school emergency response plan as compared to the baseline plan; (2) demonstration of improved response time and quality of response in practice drills and simulated crises; and (3) a plan for and commitment to the sustainability and continuous improvement of the school emergency response plan beyond the period of Federal financial assistance signed by all community partners.

Beginning with the 2009 cohort of grants, the Department has discontinued these measures and replaced them with the following new measure, for which baseline data will be available in 2011: the average number of National Incident Management System (NIMS) course completions by key personnel at the start of the grant compared to the average number of NIMS course completions by key personnel at the end of the grant.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

#### Postsecondary Prevention

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

Year	Targets		Actual	
	2005 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2007 Cohort
2007			81	
2008				
2009		85		
2010				

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

Year	Targets		Actual	
	2005 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2007 Cohort
2007			67	
2008				
2009		70.4		
2010				

**Assessment of progress:** An assessment of progress cannot be made until 2010, after the Department receives 2009 data from the 2007 cohort of grantees.



## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

#### Alcohol Abuse Reduction

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

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

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Alcohol Abuse Reduction grantees whose target students show a measurable decrease in binge drinking.								
Year	Targets				Actual			
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort
<b>2005</b>								
<b>2006</b>					50			
<b>2007</b>	70					65		
<b>2008</b>		75					61.5	
<b>2009</b>			76.9	61.5				
<b>2010</b>			80.0	76.9				

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Alcohol Abuse Reduction program grantees that show a measurable increase in the percentage of target students who believe that binge drinking is harmful to their health.								
Year	Targets				Actual			
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort
<b>2005</b>								
<b>2006</b>					56			
<b>2007</b>	76					70		
<b>2008</b>		80					69.2	
<b>2009</b>			86.5	69.2				
<b>2010</b>			86.5	86.5				

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Alcohol Abuse Reduction program grantees that show a measurable increase in the percentage of target students who disapprove of alcohol abuse.								
Year	Targets				Actual			
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort
2005								
2006					67			
2007	87					71		
2008		87					69.2	
2009			86.5	69.2				
2010			86.5	86.5				

**Assessment of progress:** None of the 2007 or 2008 targets were met.

#### Mentoring Program

**Goal: To support mentoring programs and activities for children who are at risk of educational failure, dropping out of school, or involvement in criminal or delinquent activities, or who lack strong positive role models.**

The following performance information begins with the 2004 and 2005 cohorts of Mentoring grants. Beginning with the 2007 cohort the Department revised two of these measures slightly, as (1) the percentage of student-mentor matches that are sustained by the grantees for a period of 9 months (rather than 12 months), and (2) the average number of unexcused absences from school per mentored student (as a replacement for the percentage of mentored students who have unexcused absences from school). Performance information for the 2007 and 2008 cohorts aligned with these new measures is provided further below, immediately after the 2004 and 2005 cohorts.

**Objective:** Provide grants to community-based organizations and local school districts to support mentoring programs for high-risk youth.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of student-mentor matches that are sustained by the grantees for a period of 12 months.				
Year	Targets		Actual	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005				
2006			44.9	
2007	56.1	44.9		36.8
2008		56.1		

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of mentored students who demonstrate improvement in core academic subjects as measured by grade point average after 12 months.				
Year	Targets		Actual	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005				
2006			49.6	
2007	52.1	49.6		22.0
2008		52.1		

**Assessment of progress:** The 2007 targets for the above measures were not met for the 2005 cohort of grantees. An assessment of progress for the 2004 cohort cannot be made until later in 2009. (Most grantees from the 2004 cohort received no-cost extensions through the end of fiscal year 2008 to complete their projects and, as a result, the Department is only now in the process of compiling their final performance data.)

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of mentored students who have unexcused absences from school.				
Year	Targets		Actual	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005			39.4	
2006	35.5		47.8	44.0
2007	27.6	39.6		28.9
2008		30.8		

**Assessment of progress:** The 2006 target (for the 2004 cohort of grants) was not met but the 2007 target was exceeded for the 2005 cohort.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of student-mentor matches that are sustained by the grantees for a period of 9 months.				
Year	Targets		Actual	
	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort
2008				
2009	44.9			

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of mentored students who demonstrate improvement in core academic subjects as measured by grade point average after 12 months.				
Year	Targets		Actual	
	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort
2008				
2009	49.6			

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

**Assessment of progress:** An assessment or progress for the above two measures cannot be made until 2010, after the Department receives 2009 data from the 2007 cohort of grantees. The 2009 target for the third measure for the 2007 and 2008 cohorts (the average number of unexcused absences from school per mentored student) will be established in 2009, after the 2008 baseline is determined for this measure. No targets are included for 2010 because the Administration is not requesting funding for this program in fiscal year 2010.

#### Efficiency Measures

The Department has established, and is collecting data, on the following efficiency measure for the Mentoring program:

<b>Measure:</b> The cost per student mentored for each student-mentor match that is sustained for a period of 12 months.								
Year	Targets				Actual			
	2004	2005	2007	2008	2004	2005	2007	2008
	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort	Cohort
<b>2005</b>								
<b>2006</b>					\$1,948			
<b>2007</b>	\$1,851	\$1,948				\$3,116		
<b>2008</b>		\$2,960						
<b>2009</b>			\$3,116					

**Assessment of progress:** Although the 2007 cost per student, \$3,116, was much higher than the target of \$1,948, the target was mistakenly based on 2006 data (for the 2004 cohort) on the cost per student match for all matches, rather than the cost per student match sustained for 12 months. The Department has reset the targets to reflect the new, more accurate data. No targets are included for 2010 because the Administration is not requesting funding for this program.

#### Other Performance Information

In addition to collecting data on the above performance measures directly from grantees, the Department is conducting several evaluations to assess the impact of programs and interventions supported with SDFSC National Programs funds. Each of the following evaluations is being funded by SDFSC National Programs funds, except for the Safe Schools/Healthy Students evaluation, which is being funded by the Department of Health and Human Services.

#### Drug Testing Evaluation

In 2006, the Department launched an impact evaluation, using grants supported with SDFSC National Programs funds, to assess the effectiveness of random mandatory student drug testing. The evaluation is designed to address the following research questions: (1) Do high school students who are subject to mandatory-random drug testing (e.g., athletes, participants in competitive extra-curricular activities) report less use of tobacco, alcohol, and illicit

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

substances compared to students in high schools without drug testing policies? (2) Do students in high schools with mandatory-random drug testing policies, but who are not subject to drug testing, report less use of tobacco, alcohol, and illicit substances compared to students in high schools without drug testing policies? and (3) What are the characteristics of the drug testing policies implemented by participating treatment schools, and what types of other strategies are treatment or control schools using to reduce substance use among students?

This 4-year evaluation involves 36 schools from 7 grantees that received awards under the Department's student drug testing grant competition in 2006. About half of the schools were randomly assigned to begin implementing drug testing immediately (treatment schools), and the other half were assigned to implement drug testing only at the conclusion of the 1-year experimental period (control schools). Data collection will include student surveys of reported drug use, interviews with staff at grantee schools, and school records. Results of the evaluation should be available before the end of 2009.

#### Safe Schools/Healthy Students Evaluation

Two national evaluations of the Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative will be completed later this year. The first evaluation was conducted under a cooperative agreement with the Department of Justice, and the second under contract with the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration in the Department of Health and Human Services. Both evaluations are being jointly managed by the Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, and Justice. The evaluations seek to document the effectiveness of collaborative community efforts to promote safe schools and provide opportunities for healthy childhood development.

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

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

- Student self-report data for high school students reflected decreases in 30-day alcohol and tobacco use, cigarette sales on school property, and perceived disapproval of peer substance use. Current alcohol use was down 10 percent, and current tobacco use declined 13 percent. Middle and high school students also reported feeling unsafe at school (a 7 percent reduction for middle school students and a 6 percent reduction for high school students).

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

- Teachers in elementary schools reported a 5 percent reduction in classroom bullying, a 21 percent reduction in feeling threatened by a student, and an 11 percent reduction in being verbally abused by a student. Finally, although not statistically significant, elementary school principals reported a 33 percent reduction in current-year tobacco infractions and a 36 percent reduction in total alcohol infractions, and elementary school teachers reported an 8 percent reduction in classroom fighting.

The second evaluation, examining activities being implemented by 86 sites in the fiscal year 2005, 2006, and 2007 cohorts, is expected to provide data later in 2009.

### Violence Prevention Program Evaluation

The Department is also conducting a longitudinal impact evaluation of a school-based violence prevention program. Specifically, the evaluation is assessing the overall impact of combining “Responding in Peaceful and Positive Ways,” a curriculum-based (instructional) program, with “Best Behavior,” a whole-school program that aims to increase the clarity, fairness, and consistency of school enforcement policies and to improve teachers' classroom management skills. Approximately 40 middle schools are taking part in this evaluation, half of which have been randomly assigned to receive the hybrid program, which is being implemented over three consecutive school years. Within each middle school, students are being sampled and their violent and aggressive behaviors measured. Student and teacher surveys, observation of intervention activities, interviews with school administrators, and school records will be used to assess student outcomes in both treatment and control schools as well as to assess the quality of program implementation. A final report on the evaluation is expected in early 2010.

### **Program Improvement Efforts**

The Department is undertaking the following improvement efforts for SDFSC National Programs:

- *Providing technical assistance to grantees in implementing their projects.* National Programs funds (or in the case of Safe Schools/Healthy Students, Department of Health and Human Services funds) support the provision (or at least availability) of technical assistance to virtually all SDFSC National Programs grantees in carrying out their projects. To a significant extent this assistance is also available to non-grantees, to support the improvement of drug and violence prevention programming generally in the field.
- *Providing improved guidance to grantees in collecting and reporting their performance measurement data.* Under the Department's Data Quality Initiative (DQI), which provides contractual support to program offices and grantees on performance measurement issues, the Department has developed detailed guidance and other tools designed to help grantees collect and report meaningful data for their assigned GPRA measures. The DQI has also supported delivery of additional training to grantees at meetings or via “webinars,” and as well as supporting Department staff in their efforts to work with grantees on issues that affect data quality and comparability.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

- *Posting individual grantee-level GPRA data on [www.ed.gov](http://www.ed.gov) for most of the National Programs activities*, making the data transparent and serving as a motivator for individual grantees to improve their performance.
- *Collecting nationally representative data on school crime and safety and on crime victimization at school*, to track trends in these areas and provide data that schools and school districts can use as a benchmark to compare and assess their progress in these areas.
- *Disseminating nationwide the results of the Mentoring program evaluation*. In March 2009, the Department completed a multi-year evaluation of the Mentoring program. In addition to assessing the impact of the mentoring program on outcomes related to school engagement, academic achievement, delinquent behavior, and prosocial behavior (major findings for which are summarized above in the budget request section), the evaluation also collected and reported data on various characteristics of the program, including training and support for mentors, characteristics of mentors, matching of students with mentors, and mentor/student relationship duration and activities. The Department is disseminating its findings in a variety of ways, including posting the final evaluation report and a summary of its key findings on the Internet (<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20094047/>); distributing those findings to Mentoring grantees; presenting the findings at the next Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools national conference; using the Mentoring training and assistance contractor to help local projects implement the findings that are applicable to improving their projects; and sharing the findings with national mentoring organizations which can disseminate them through their web sites, newsletters, and other available means.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

---

### Character education

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 3)

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$11,912	0	-\$11,912

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 Character Education program provides support for the design and implementation of character education programs in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. Programs must be: (1) capable of being integrated into classroom instruction, (2) consistent with State academic content standards, and (3) carried out in conjunction with other educational reform efforts. Grantees may select the elements of character that will be taught, and must consider the views of parents and students to be served by the program. The elements of character from which grantees may choose include, but are not limited to caring, civic virtue and citizenship, justice and fairness, respect, responsibility, trustworthiness, and giving. Grants may be awarded for up to 5 years, of which up to 1 year may be for planning and program design. The Department may require matching funds.

State educational agencies (SEAs) and local educational agencies (LEAs) are eligible to receive grants. SEAs must form partnerships with one or more LEAs or nonprofit entities, including institutions of higher education (IHEs). LEAs may apply alone or in consortia with other LEAs or nonprofit organizations, including IHEs. The minimum SEA award is \$500,000, and SEAs may not use more than 3 percent of their funds for administrative costs.

Applicants must demonstrate that proposed programs have clear objectives that are grounded in scientifically based research. In addition, they must describe:

- Partnerships and collaborative efforts,
- Program activities, including how parents, students (including those with disabilities), and community members will be involved in the program; the curriculum and instructional practices that will be used or developed; and methods of teacher training and parent education, and
- How the program will be linked to other efforts to improve academic achievement, including broader education reform efforts and State academic content standards.



## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Character education

---

- SEAs must also describe in their applications how they will provide technical and professional assistance to LEA partners in developing and implementing character education programs, as well as how they will assist other interested LEAs that are not part of the original partnership.

All applicants must describe how they will evaluate the success of their programs and agree to cooperate with any national evaluations. Grantee evaluations must be designed to assess the impact of the project(s) on students, students with disabilities (including those with mental or physical disabilities), teachers, administrators, parents, and others. Applicants must also agree to provide the Department with information that is necessary to determine program effectiveness.

The Department may reserve up to 5 percent of funds for national research, dissemination, and evaluation activities. Allowable activities include:

- Conducting research and development,
- Providing technical assistance to State and local programs, particularly on matters of program evaluation,
- Conducting evaluations of State and local programs receiving program funding, and
- Compiling and disseminating information on model character education programs, high quality character education materials and curricula, research findings, and other information of use to program participants.

The Department is committed to supporting the development and implementation of high-quality character education programs, and testing their effectiveness through rigorous evaluations. Because grantee evaluations play such an important role in measuring the effectiveness of any single character-based intervention strategy, the Department supports a variety of technical assistance activities for all current grantees on evaluation design and implementation. For example, starting in fiscal year 2004, a portion of the annual national activities set-aside is being used to support a National Service Center for Character and Civic Engagement (approximately \$850,000 each year over the course of 1 base year and 4 option years (through fiscal year 2008). The service center's role, in large part, is to provide ongoing technical assistance to grantees implementing the program's rigorous evaluation requirements.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$24,493
2006.....	24,248
2007.....	24,248
2008.....	23,824
2009.....	11,912

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Character education

---

#### FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funding for this program in 2010. The budget request for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) includes \$100 million for grants to LEAs, or to other organizations in partnership with LEAs, for a major new initiative to assist schools in fostering a safe, secure, and drug-free learning environment, particularly by using approaches designed to change school culture and climate and thereby improve character and discipline, and reduce drug use, crime, and violence. More details on this proposal are provided under the budget request for SDFSC National Programs.

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Number of new awards:			
LEA partnerships	2	0	0
SEA partnerships	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Sub-total	3		0
Number of continuation awards:			
LEA partnerships	41	33	0
SEA partnerships	<u>7</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>
Sub-total	48	36	0
Total number of awards	51	36	0
Funding for new awards:			
LEA partnerships	\$745	0	0
SEA partnerships	<u>630</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total new awards	1,375	0	0
Funding for continuation awards:			
LEA partnerships	18,262	\$10,559	0
SEA partnerships	<u>2,996</u>	<u>1,345</u>	<u>0</u>
Total continuation awards	21,258	11,904	0
Peer review of new award applications	25	0	0
Total award funding	22,658	11,904	0
National activities:			
National Center for Character Education and Civic Engagement	886	0	0
Reports (development, printing, translating)	<u>279</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>
Total national activities	1,166	8	0

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Character education

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

The Department recently developed two new measures for the Character Education program. These measures will provide data on the percent of Character Education program grantees that conduct evaluations using an experimental or quasi-experimental design, and the percentage of such evaluations that are conducted successfully, and that yield scientifically valid results. Of 39 grantees from the 2002 cohort, 18 are using experimental or quasi-experimental evaluation designs to evaluate the impact of their program. Data for these measures will be collected through a peer review process that will be designed and implemented by the Department. Independent experts will be asked to review grantee interim and final evaluation reports, and relevant accompanying materials, using a rubric and scoring sheet to be developed by the Department. The Department is still developing the data collection timeline, along with an appropriate data collection methodology, with technical input from the Data Quality Initiative.

##### Other Performance Information

The Character Education program contains rigorous evaluation requirements for all grantees. Grantees must reserve a portion of their awards to evaluate the effectiveness of their activities and to disseminate information about their programs. Up to 5 percent of the program's funding may be reserved by the Department to conduct research on the effectiveness of character-related programs and materials, provide technical assistance to grantees on program evaluation, and conduct evaluations of State and local character education programs.

Since fiscal year 2002, a subset of grantees has been using experimental or quasi-experimental evaluation designs to measure the effectiveness of their programs. Preliminary reports from these evaluations were submitted in fiscal year 2004. These reports indicate that several of grantees are starting to demonstrate satisfactory student effects through valid, rigorous evaluations. Many of these grantees are working with independent evaluation experts, and it is likely that some of the evaluations will ultimately yield important insights into the effectiveness of the various character education strategies being supported through this program. However, because most of these grantees exercise the option to use the first full year of their grant as a planning period, preliminary findings from the 2002 cohort of grantees (submitted in 2004) typically include either no data, or baseline data only. Final evaluation reports from this cohort of grantees were submitted by grantees in fall 2007, and are currently being analyzed by a Department contractor.

Examples of preliminary evaluation results provided by grantees include the following:

The Jefferson County Public School District, located in Kentucky, implemented the Child Development Project (CDP) curriculum for its character education program. CDP is designed to promote academic, social, and ethical growth in all students, and the program's emphasis is on enhancing pro-social characteristics in children, as reflected in attitudes and behaviors. Jefferson County reports that in year 3 of a 4-year intervention there was a significant impact on student attitudes and small, but significant, program effects on student reading test scores. In this quasi-experimental study, data were collected from eight treatment and eight carefully

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Character education

---

matched control schools (matching was based on demographic, cognitive, and non-cognitive characteristics). The student attitudes questionnaire consisted of five scales: a) student autonomy and influence in the classroom; b) classroom supportiveness; c) liking for school; d) trust and respect for teachers; and e) concern for others.

The State of Missouri is implementing a 4-year study of the impact of the *Characterplus* program in 64 public K-12 schools. The 64 schools were stratified and randomly selected for participation in the project, and the study utilized a pre-test/post-test control group design with a pre-test administered prior to the intervention in all participating schools. After 3 years, the grantee reports significant positive results for students at the secondary level. More specifically, the evaluation preliminary report demonstrates increases in student feelings of belonging, sense of autonomy and influence, and self-reported altruism in treatment schools compared to control schools in 8<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> grades. Student feelings of competence increased significantly for the treatment schools at the 8<sup>th</sup> grade level, and student perceptions of parent involvement increased at the 11<sup>th</sup> grade level. There were no significant changes in student achievement for any of the curricular areas tested.

In fiscal years 2003 and 2004, the Department used a portion of the national activities set-aside to support a review by the What Works Clearinghouse in the Institute of Education Sciences of character education intervention strategies designed for use in elementary, middle, or high schools with attention to student outcomes related to positive character development, pro-social behavior, and academic performance. The topic report published in June 2007 (see: [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/reports/character\\_education/topic/](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/reports/character_education/topic/)) includes reviews of 93 studies of 41 character education programs or approaches, including 18 studies that either met the What Works Clearinghouse evidence standards or met these standards with reservations.

**SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

---

**Elementary and secondary school counseling**

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

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$52,000	\$52,000	0

---

<sup>1</sup> 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**

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$34,720
2006.....	34,650
2007.....	34,650
2008.....	48,617
2009.....	52,000

**FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$52 million for the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling program for fiscal year 2010, the same as the 2009 level. This request would support approximately 150 new and continuation awards to assist LEAs in developing or expanding elementary and secondary school counseling programs.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Elementary and secondary school counseling

---

Recent estimates show that more than 20 percent of American children and adolescents, between the ages of 9 and 17 years experience mental health problems or addictive disorders severe enough to impair their daily functioning and that only 25 percent of these children receive appropriate treatment. The presence of counselors in schools provides benefits for both students and teachers by helping to create a safe school environment, improve teacher effectiveness and classroom management, increase academic achievement, and promote student well-being and healthy development. In a recent review of school counseling research, Whinston and Quinby (2009) found that students who participated in school counseling interventions tended to score about one-third of a standard deviation point above those students who did not receive interventions, which provides some evidence of the effectiveness of school counseling interventions. These interventions were also shown to produce large effects in reducing student disciplinary problems, enhancing problem solving skills, and increasing career knowledge. In terms of achievement, counseling interventions were found to have a small but significant impact on improving students' academic achievement.

The Administration believes that school-based counseling programs offer great promise for improving prevention, diagnosis, and access to treatment for children and adolescents with mental health problems. The request would support the hiring and training of qualified school counselors, school psychologists, child and adolescent psychiatrists, and school social workers to provide students with beneficial counseling services. The 2010 request would also support the development of innovative strategies for providing school counseling services that show potential for replication and dissemination.

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Grant award funding (new)	\$18,143	\$21,397	\$15,317
Grant award funding (continuations)	30,293	30,603	36,433
Peer review of new award applications	180	0	250
Number of new awards	50	62	36
Number of continuation awards	87	89	115
Average award	\$349	\$349	\$349

#### 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.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Elementary and secondary school counseling

---

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

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

#### 2004 Cohort

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of grantees closing the gap between their student/mental health professional ratios and the student/mental health professional ratios recommended by the American School Health Association. (2004 cohort)		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		75
2006		60
2007	100	

<b>Measure:</b> The average number of referrals per grant site for disciplinary reasons in schools participating in the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling program. (2004 cohort)		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		607
2006		342
2007	257	

<b>Measure:</b> The average number of suspensions per grant site for disciplinary reasons in schools participating in the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling program. (2004 cohort)		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		179
2006		153
2007	138	

**Assessment of progress:** Performance data are collected through annual grantee reports. Between 2005 and 2006 grantees showed improvement on the student/mental health professional ratio, the average number of referrals, and the average number of suspensions per grant site for disciplinary reasons. The Department expects to have 2007 performance data available this spring.

#### 2005 Cohort

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of grantees closing the gap between their student/mental health professional ratios and the student/mental health professional ratios recommended by the statute. (2005 cohort)		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		100
2007	100	100
2008	100	

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Elementary and secondary school counseling

---

<b>Measure:</b> The average number of referrals per grant site for disciplinary reasons in schools participating in the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling program. (2005 cohort)		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2006</b>		485
<b>2007</b>	461	325
<b>2008</b>	437	

**Assessment of progress:** Performance data are collected through annual grantee reports. The Department expects to have 2008 performance data available this fall.

#### 2006 Cohort

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of grantees closing the gap between their student/mental health professional ratios and the student/mental health professional ratios recommended by the statute. (2006 cohort)		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2007</b>		100
<b>2008</b>	100	
<b>2009</b>	100	

<b>Measure:</b> The average number of referrals per grant site for disciplinary reasons in schools participating in the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling program. (2006 cohort)		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2007</b>		1355
<b>2008</b>	1,287	918
<b>2009</b>	872	

**Assessment of progress:** Performance data are collected through annual grantee reports. The Department expects to have 2008 performance data available this fall.

#### 2007 Cohort

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of grantees closing the gap between their student/mental health professional ratios and the student/mental health professional ratios recommended by the statute. (2007 cohort)		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2008</b>		100
<b>2009</b>	100	
<b>2010</b>	100	



## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Elementary and secondary school counseling

---

<b>Measure:</b> The average number of referrals per grant site for disciplinary reasons in schools participating in the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling program. (2007 cohort)		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2008</b>	1,132	1,192
<b>2009</b>	781	822
<b>2010</b>	740	

**Assessment of progress:** Beginning with the 2007 cohort, grantees have provided data on the average number of referrals per site at the start of the grant in order to establish a more accurate baseline. This will lead to three targets, corresponding to the subsequent data collections at the end of grant years 1, 2, and 3. Performance data are collected through annual grantee reports. The Department expects to have performance data for the 2008 cohort available this fall.

Additionally, the Department posted grantee-level data for the 2005, 2006, and 2007 cohorts on its website at [www.ed.gov/programs/elseccounseling/performance.html](http://www.ed.gov/programs/elseccounseling/performance.html).

**SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

---

**Physical education program**

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

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$78,000	\$78,000	0

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 Physical Education program (PEP) provides grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) and community-based organizations to pay the Federal share of the costs of initiating, expanding, and improving physical education (PE) programs (including after-school programs) for students in kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade, in order to make progress toward meeting State standards for physical education. Funds may be used to provide equipment and support to enable students to participate actively in physical education activities and for training and education for teachers and staff. Awards are competitive, typically for 3 years, and the Federal share may not exceed 90 percent of the total program cost for the first year of the project and 75 percent for each subsequent year. Funds must be used to supplement, and may not supplant, other Federal, State, and local funding for physical education activities.

Funding levels for the past 5 years were:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$73,408
2006.....	72,674
2007.....	72,674
2008.....	75,655
2009.....	78,000

**FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST**

For fiscal year 2010, the Administration requests \$78 million, the same as the 2009 level. As part of a multi-agency effort involving the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Agriculture, in addition to the Department of Education, the Administration will focus this program on testing community-wide strategies for improving child fitness and health outcomes. The Administration will encourage grantees to bring together stakeholders from a variety of governmental and non-profit agencies, including education and nutrition administrators, parks and recreation departments, after-school providers, housing authorities,

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Physical education program

---

health officials, community-based organizations, and local business organizations in developing and implementing programs that increase opportunities for structured physical activity for children during and outside the normal school day and that are part of a broader community plan to improve healthy eating and lifestyles. Grantees will be expected to establish measurable goals related to child health and fitness and track their progress against those goals over a multi-year period. Successful models will be studied and disseminated.

In the past 30 years, the prevalence of unhealthy weights among children has increased dramatically. Data from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) show that, between the 1976-1980 and 2003-2006 collection periods, the percentage of children who were overweight increased from 5 percent to 12 percent for children ages 2 to 5, from 7 percent to 17 percent for ages 6 to 11, and from 5 percent to 18 percent for ages 12 to 19.

A September 1997 study published in the *New England Journal of Medicine* concluded that a strong correlation exists between childhood and adult obesity. While many factors are involved and changes in weight are natural for children, being significantly overweight for a child age 10 or older is a strong predictor of adult obesity. Obesity has been linked to a number of health complications related to cardiovascular disease, including high blood pressure, high cholesterol, and Type 2 diabetes. In a study published in the January 2007 issue of *The Journal of Pediatrics*, 70 percent of obese children ages 5 to 17 had high cholesterol, high blood pressure, or abnormal glucose tolerance. The CDC predicts that one in three individuals born in the U.S. in the year 2000 will develop Type 2 diabetes.

Essentially, obesity is the result of a caloric surplus, where more calories are consumed than burned through physical activity. But, according to the 2007 national Young Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS) conducted by the CDC, only 30 percent of high school students attended physical education class daily and only 54 percent attended during an average week. Furthermore, the 2006 School Health Policies and Programs Study (SHPPS) found that, while 95 percent of U.S. high schools reported requiring students to take physical education, only 2 percent required it daily for students in all grades for the entire school year.

Instilling healthy habits in children today is essential to improving the future health of Americans at large. But the benefits of even moderate activity are not merely physical. Social and emotional development also occur in the arena of physical education. Studies have found that physical activity may lead to gains in mental acuity and intellectual ability. In the January 2009 issue of *The Journal of School Health*, researchers from Harvard University found that middle school students scoring better on tests of physical fitness also scored better on tests of academic material, and suggested potential physiological and psychological mechanisms. The April 2008 issue of the *American Journal of Public Health* included an article by CDC researchers who examined the Department's Early Childhood Longitudinal Study and found that higher amounts of physical education had a small but significant benefit for girls in reading and mathematics. According to the American Heart Association, physical activity also leads to greater levels of energy and confidence.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Physical education program

---

The program has helped grantees improve their curriculum and programs. The following are examples of projects that have been funded under the program:

- The LEA of Wallingford, Connecticut, a fiscal year 2007 grantee, used its grant to supplement other initiatives in the community and to plan and implement a new PE curriculum, which included planning time and training for staff. The district assessed its needs using CDC’s School Health Index. Needs included updating an outdated, sports-based PE curriculum that was not aligned with State standards. The district also used the CDC’s Physical Education Curriculum Assessment Tool to identify PE elements to include in its new curriculum. The LEA assessed equipment needs, as well, and purchased equipment to supplement the curriculum.
- The LEA of Wichita, Kansas, a grantee in fiscal years 2004 and 2006, sought to make changes to its PE curriculum and physical activity environment for elementary and middle schools. The grant funded training for teachers in the district, which included a variety of new skills, such as involving youth in activity from the minute that class begins through the end. Teachers not only spent time considering the PE curriculum, but also how best to share resources and equipment between them, including making arrangements to have a single storage facility and developing the ability to move equipment between schools.
- The YMCA of Metro Tucson, a fiscal year 2008 grantee, received a grant to support after-school and summer activities for youth in the community as part of a broader community health initiative. This grantee used program funds to make better use of resources the community had procured in 2007 through the YMCA’s “Activate America: Pioneering Healthier Communities” program, which focuses on a broad community approach toward improving the physical activity environment for entire neighborhoods, such as by building walking trails and improving food choices and options.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Grant award funding (new)	\$33,766	\$27,295	\$39,008
Grant award funding (continuations)	40,843	49,640	37,927
Peer review of new award applications	668	675	675
Evaluation	378	390	390
Number of new grant awards	103	97	80-130
Number of continuation grant awards	199	250	192
Average grant award	\$247	\$222	\$239-\$283

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Physical education program

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of 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. As part of the Administration's multi-agency effort to improve the effectiveness of programs supporting child health and fitness, the Department will be reviewing the performance measures to be used for this program in 2010.

Beginning with the 2006 cohort of grants, the Department established the following new measure for the program: the percentage of students served by the grant who engage in (1) 150 minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity per week (for elementary school students) or (2) 225 minutes per week (for middle and high school students). These are the amounts of weekly physical activity endorsed by the CDC. This measure is more clear and specific than the previous measures, which were based on State standards.

The Department will also require grantees to use additional indicators that measure childhood health and fitness. These measures would need to be statistically valid and would be developed in consultation with other Federal agencies and grantee stakeholders.

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

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

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of elementary students served by the grant who engage in 150 minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity per week.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>		<b>Actual</b>	
	<b>2006 Cohort</b>	<b>2007 Cohort</b>	<b>2006 Cohort</b>	<b>2007 Cohort</b>
<b>2007</b>			55	
<b>2008</b>	55		69	43
<b>2009</b>	60	45		
<b>2010</b>		48		

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Physical education program

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of secondary students served by the grant who engage in 225 minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity per week.				
Year	Target		Actual	
	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort
2007			57	
2008	55		59	55
2009	60	58		
2010		61		

**Assessment of progress:** Data are currently available for the 2006 and 2007 cohorts, although only baseline data are available for the 2007 cohort. Grantees from the 2006 cohort reported an increase in student physical activity at both the elementary and secondary levels.

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

### Efficiency Measure

The Department developed and is implementing the following efficiency measure: the cost per student who achieves 150 minutes (for elementary school students) or 225 minutes (for middle and high school students) of moderate to vigorous physical activity per week. This measure includes the mandatory non-federal expenditures.

<b>Measure:</b> The cost per student who achieves the level of physical activity required to meet the physical activity measures for the program (150 minutes of moderate to vigorous activity for elementary students and 225 minutes of moderate to vigorous activity for middle and high school students).				
Year	Target		Actual	
	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort
2007			\$287	
2008	\$272		190	\$191
2009	258	\$181		
2010		172		

**Assessment of progress:** The program established a baseline for the 2006 cohort of \$287 per student success and a baseline for the 2007 cohort of \$191 per student success. The 2006 cohort showed an improvement with its second data collection, decreasing the cost per successful outcome to \$190.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Physical education program

---

#### Program Improvement Efforts

The Department has taken the following actions to improve the performance of this program:

- *Revise existing performance measures and data collection efforts so that grantees report data that are comparable across sites and provide a better assessment of the program's overall effectiveness.* Although Physical Education program projects often implement a comprehensive range of strategies designed to help students meet State standards, the Department determined that the significant majority of projects focus, at least in part, on increasing the amount and intensity of physical activity for project participants. As a result, the Department identified a single new GPRA outcome measure for the program that identifies the proportion of students meeting developmentally appropriate targets for moderate to vigorous activity. The Department is using this common measure to aggregate data across projects more meaningfully than was the case with the previous indicators.
- *Refine and implement an efficiency measure for the program.* The Department established the following efficiency measure for this program: the cost, per child, of implementing a physical education program that results in children engaging in the CDC-endorsed amount of weekly physical activity.
- *Develop options for a national evaluation to identify needed improvements to, and assess the effectiveness of, the program.* The Department examined options for a national evaluation, developed and issued a request for proposals, and awarded a contract in fall 2008. The program evaluation design is currently being adapted to the projected size of the 2009 cohort of grantees, which will serve as the focus of the study.
- *Provide technical assistance to fiscal year 2007 new and continuation grantees to promote the reporting of consistent data for program performance measures.* The Department gave written guidance to fiscal year 2007 grantees on collecting and reporting data for GPRA measures. The Department has been working with the Data Quality Initiative contractor to develop further guidance for the use of sampling techniques for data collection. Technical assistance efforts are ongoing.
- *Post meaningful grantee-level performance data on the program web site.* The Department posted grantee-level performance data for the first time in early 2008 for the 2006 cohort. Since then, the Department posted baseline data for the 2007 cohort as well. Data for additional years will be posted as available.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

---

### Civic education

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title II, Part C, Subpart 3)

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1,2</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
We the People	\$20,076	0	-\$20,076
Cooperative Education Exchange	<u>13,383</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-13,383</u>
Total	33,459	0	-33,459

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> ESEA section 2343(b)(1) requires that of the total appropriated for Civic education, not more than 40 percent may be used for the Cooperative Education Exchange portion of the program.

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Civic Education program supports grants to improve the quality of civics and government education, foster civic competence and responsibility, and improve the quality of civic and economic education through exchange programs with emerging democracies. The program consists of two parts, *We the People* and the *Cooperative Education Exchange*. By statute, not more than 40 percent of the funds appropriated may be used for the *Cooperative Education Exchange* component of the program.

### **We the People**

The statute authorizes a noncompetitive grant to the nonprofit Center for Civic Education in Calabasas, California to support the *We the People* program. *We the People* has two key program components: the *Citizen and the Constitution* and *Project Citizen*.

The *Citizen and the Constitution* project provides teacher training and curricular materials for upper elementary, middle, and high school students. The program curriculum, titled *We the People . . . The Citizen and the Constitution*, seeks to promote civic competence and responsibility among students, including support for the constitutional rights and civil liberties of dissenting individuals and groups (<http://www.civiced.org/programs.html>). For upper elementary and secondary school students, the program also provides simulated congressional hearings that give students the opportunity to show their understanding of the basic principles of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. For secondary students, these hearings culminate in a national competition in Washington, D.C., where the winning class from each State and their teachers visit members of Congress. The competition serves as a model for assessing higher levels of student learning. Working in teams, students prepare oral responses to questions that



## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Civic education

---

test their understanding of facts and concepts, along with their ability to conduct research, think critically, and remain poised under pressure. Public officials and community members serve as judges in the competition.

*Project Citizen*, a program for middle school students, focuses on the role of State and local governments in the American Federal system. *Project Citizen* requires participating students to choose a social problem, evaluate alternative policies to address the problem, and then develop an action plan to encourage implementation of their policy. Students create a portfolio and binder displaying their work, which they present to school and community leaders in simulated legislative hearings.

In fiscal year 2007, the Department was authorized through appropriations language to conduct a competition under the We the People program for projects to improve public knowledge, understanding, and support of the United States Congress and State legislatures. The Department received 48 applications and awarded a total of \$3 million to Hillsborough County Public Schools (Tampa, FL), Yonkers Public Schools (Yonkers, NY), and the Chiesman Foundation for Democracy, Inc. (Rapid City, SD). The project period for these awards was 18 months.

### Cooperative Education Exchange

The statute also authorizes noncompetitive grants to the nonprofit Center for Civic Education and the National Council on Economic Education to support program activities. Of the funds appropriated for this program, the authorizing statute requires 37.5 percent to be awarded to the Center for Civic Education, and 37.5 percent to the National Council on Economic Education. The remaining 25 percent must be used for competitive awards to organizations experienced in civics, government, and economic education.

Competitive grants under the *Cooperative Education Exchange* program support education exchange activities in civics and economics between the United States and eligible countries in Central and Eastern Europe, the Commonwealth of Independent States, any country that was formerly a republic of the Soviet Union, the Republic of Ireland, the province of Northern Ireland in the United Kingdom, and any developing country that has a democratic form of government.

Grantees facilitate exchange programs for students, educators and leaders that include seminars on the basic principles of U.S. constitutional democracy, visits to school systems and institutions of higher education, and related activities on the culture, governance, and history of eligible countries.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Civic education

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	<u>We The People</u>	<u>Cooperative Education Exchange</u>
	(\$000s)	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$17,211	\$12,194
2006.....	17,039	12,072
2007.....	17,039	12,072
2008.....	20,056	11,861
2009.....	20,076	13,383

### FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration does not request funding for the Civic Education program in 2010. Instead of requesting funding for several small programs that support activities related to Civics, American history, and government through statutory provisions that earmark funding for specific organizations, the Administration will hold a competition in 2010 for *History, Civics, and Government* grants under the Fund for the Improvement of Education. More details on this initiative are provided under the budget request for the Innovation and Improvement Account.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
<b>We the People:</b>			
Statutory earmark to Center for Civic Education	\$20,056	\$20,076	0
<b>Cooperative Education Exchange Program:</b>			
Statutory earmarks to:			
Center for Civic Education	\$4,448	\$5,019	0
National Council on Economic Education	<u>4,448</u>	<u>5,019</u>	<u>0</u>
Earmark total	8,896	10,037	0
Number of competitive awards:			
New awards	0	1	0
Continuation awards	3	2	0
Competitive award funding:			
New awards	0	\$1,337	0
Continuation awards	<u>\$2,965</u>	<u>1,999</u>	<u>0<sup>1</sup></u>
Competitive total	2,965	3,336	0

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Civic education

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) (Continued)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
<b>Cooperative Education Exchange Program</b> (continued):			
Peer review of new award applications	0	10	0
Total funds, Cooperative Education Exchange	\$11,861	\$13,383	0

<sup>1</sup> Funding for continuation awards for competitive grants awarded under this authority is requested under the Fund for the Improvement of Education in the Innovation and Improvement account.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, 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, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Goal: To educate students about the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights.**

**Objective:** *Provide high quality civic education curricula to elementary and secondary school students through the "We the People: Citizen and the Constitution" program.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of teachers participating in training or professional development activities provided as part of the "We the People" program that have demonstrated improved quality of instruction through an evaluation.		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2005</b>		92.7
<b>2006</b>		96.0
<b>2007</b>	94	97.0
<b>2008</b>	97	96.7
<b>2009</b>	98	

**Assessment of progress:** The target was narrowly missed for 2008, but these data are self-reported by the grantee and the Department has ongoing concerns about data reliability that make them difficult to interpret. Working with consultants, the Center for Civic Education

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Civic education

---

created a 12-question survey to collect data on the extent to which participating teachers report that professional development improved the quality of classroom instruction. The survey is administered after participating teachers return to their respective classrooms and the resulting response rates in previous years have been below the level considered by the National Center for Education Statistics to be necessary to ensure that possible nonresponse bias is minimized. The Administration is not requesting funds for the Civic Education program in fiscal year 2010, so no target is shown for that year.

### Other Performance Information

#### We the People

The Department has not conducted any evaluations of this program. The Center for Civic Education has conducted a number of its own studies of *We the People*. While these studies yield some information on the performance of participants in this program, none of the studies or evaluations conducted to date are sufficiently rigorous to yield reliable information on the overall effectiveness or impact of *We the People*. For example, a recent survey analysis (published in April 2005) conducted to gauge the knowledge and attitudes of *We the People* program national competition finalists concludes that “*We the People* finalists are better informed in every aspect of political knowledge measured than national samples of high school seniors, college freshman, and adults.” However, the students included in this survey represent a highly select, non-representative sample of high-achieving students. In another study, conducted in 2001, the Center for Civic Education compared the scores of *We the People* competition finalists to the national sample of students who participated in the 1998 NAEP Civics assessment component. The study finds that *We the People* national finalists outperformed a national sample of students participating in the NAEP Civics component by approximately 24 percent. Since *We the People* national finalists represent only a very select sample of program participants, however, neither study provides reliable information on the impact of the program generally.

In 2003, the Center for Civic Education hired MPR Associates to evaluate certain aspects of the *We the People* program. The findings of this evaluation are not yet available, except for the results of a pilot study conducted on one curriculum, *We the People: the Citizen and the Constitution*. The key purpose of this pilot study was to measure the effectiveness of the instruments to be used in the upcoming evaluation, such as surveys or assessments, and to gauge the relative impacts on treatment and comparison groups. A brief report of the results of a pilot test suggests that the curriculum is well established in the States, and that students participating in *We the People* may demonstrate improvements in specific learning outcomes compared to students who did not participate. This preliminary report suggests that the factors most likely to make a difference in student performance include (ranked in order of effects) AP course enrollment, overall achievement, participation in *We the People*, parent educational level, and ethnicity. However, due to limitations in the sample size and comparison methodology of the pilot study, the extent to which participation in *We the People* may actually affect student performance cannot yet be reliably demonstrated. No timeline has yet been established for completion and publication of this evaluation. MPR planned to conduct data collection for this evaluation during the 2005-2006 academic year. Results were originally expected by fall 2007, but are not yet available.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Civic education

---

#### Cooperative Education Exchange

While a number of interesting studies and research papers have been written on various aspects of the Center for Civic Education's Cooperative Education Exchange program, no recent evaluations reliably demonstrate the efficacy of these interventions. A 2005 evaluation of the *Civitas Latin America* conducted by WestEd identifies some key barriers to effective program implementation, but unfortunately tells us very little about the overall effectiveness of the programs being supported with respect to such key variables as student outcomes and teacher classroom practice.

Program activities implemented by the National Council on Economic Education (NCEE) focus on providing additional training to: a) educators who train economics teachers, or b) classroom economics teachers. Such training is designed to reinforce content knowledge and provide exposure to additional instructional methods. In recent years, NCEE has conducted multiple evaluations of these activities. Unfortunately, most are not of sufficient scope or rigor to provide reliable information on key program outcomes, such as the extent to which teacher classroom practice actually changes as a result of participating in NCEE-supported interventions, or the extent to which students of teachers who participate in NCEE-supported interventions demonstrate improved academic outcomes. One recent evaluation of NCEE-supported teacher training programs in Russia suggests that teachers who participated in NCEE training programs demonstrated a better understanding of the functions and operations of a market economy and a greater ability to teach these concepts than teachers who didn't receive such training. However, the Department is still reviewing the evaluation results, including design, selection methodology, and sample sizes, to determine the extent to which the evaluation results accurately characterize the effects of such training programs.

**SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

**Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants**

State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	4,330,635	0	4,330,635	0	(4,330,635)
Alaska	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
Arizona	4,707,343	0	4,707,343	0	(4,707,343)
Arkansas	2,706,941	0	2,706,941	0	(2,706,941)
California	35,161,795	0	35,161,795	0	(35,161,795)
Colorado	3,210,467	0	3,210,467	0	(3,210,467)
Connecticut	2,902,721	0	2,902,721	0	(2,902,721)
Delaware	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
District of Columbia	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
Florida	13,949,486	0	13,949,486	0	(13,949,486)
Georgia	7,956,698	0	7,956,698	0	(7,956,698)
Hawaii	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
Idaho	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
Illinois	11,684,770	0	11,684,770	0	(11,684,770)
Indiana	4,976,958	0	4,976,958	0	(4,976,958)
Iowa	2,271,498	0	2,271,498	0	(2,271,498)
Kansas	2,351,305	0	2,351,305	0	(2,351,305)
Kentucky	4,111,169	0	4,111,169	0	(4,111,169)
Louisiana	5,591,692	0	5,591,692	0	(5,591,692)
Maine	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
Maryland	4,410,413	0	4,410,413	0	(4,410,413)
Massachusetts	5,402,940	0	5,402,940	0	(5,402,940)
Michigan	10,797,877	0	10,797,877	0	(10,797,877)
Minnesota	3,935,361	0	3,935,361	0	(3,935,361)
Mississippi	3,526,788	0	3,526,788	0	(3,526,788)
Missouri	5,169,062	0	5,169,062	0	(5,169,062)
Montana	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
Nebraska	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
Nevada	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
New Hampshire	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
New Jersey	6,940,699	0	6,940,699	0	(6,940,699)
New Mexico	2,226,011	0	2,226,011	0	(2,226,011)
New York	22,303,963	0	22,303,963	0	(22,303,963)
North Carolina	6,610,231	0	6,610,231	0	(6,610,231)
North Dakota	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
Ohio	10,502,817	0	10,502,817	0	(10,502,817)
Oklahoma	3,497,685	0	3,497,685	0	(3,497,685)
Oregon	2,793,062	0	2,793,062	0	(2,793,062)
Pennsylvania	11,462,580	0	11,462,580	0	(11,462,580)
Rhode Island	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
South Carolina	3,762,360	0	3,762,360	0	(3,762,360)
South Dakota	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
Tennessee	4,856,799	0	4,856,799	0	(4,856,799)
Texas	23,245,264	0	23,245,264	0	(23,245,264)
Utah	1,816,039	0	1,816,039	0	(1,816,039)
Vermont	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
Virginia	5,429,816	0	5,429,816	0	(5,429,816)
Washington	4,733,378	0	4,733,378	0	(4,733,378)
West Virginia	2,079,478	0	2,079,478	0	(2,079,478)
Wisconsin	4,792,453	0	4,792,453	0	(4,792,453)
Wyoming	1,423,348	0	1,423,348	0	(1,423,348)
American Samoa	900,459	0	900,459	0	(900,459)
Guam	1,934,732	0	1,934,732	0	(1,934,732)
Northern Mariana Islands	606,862	0	606,862	0	(606,862)
Puerto Rico	7,110,708	0	7,110,708	0	(7,110,708)
Virgin Islands	1,307,947	0	1,307,947	0	(1,307,947)
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	4,750,000	0	4,750,000	0	(4,750,000)
Undistributed (non-State allocations)	589,518	0	589,518	0	(589,518)
<b>Total</b>	<b>294,759,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>294,759,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(294,759,000)</b>