

**Department of Education**  
**CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**  
**Fiscal Year 2010 Budget Request**

**CONTENTS**

	<u><b>Page</b></u>
Appropriations Language.....	N-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	N-3
Amounts Available for Obligation.....	N-6
Obligations by Object Classification.....	N-7
Summary of Changes.....	N-8
Authorizing Legislation.....	N-9
Appropriations History.....	N-11
Significant Items in FY 2009 Appropriations Reports.....	N-12
Summary of Request.....	N-13
Career and technical education: State grants.....	N-16
Career and Technical Education: National programs.....	N-25
Career and technical education: Tech prep education State grants.....	N-27
Adult education:	
Adult basic and literacy education State grants.....	N-34
National leadership activities.....	N-42
National Institute for Literacy.....	N-45
Smaller learning communities.....	N-51
Grants to States for workplace and community transition training for incarcerated individuals.....	N-58
State Tables.....	N-62

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (“AEFLA”), subpart 4 of part D of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 (“ESEA”) and title VIII-D of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, [\$1,944,348,000] \$2,018,447,000, of which \$4,400,000 shall become available on October 1, [2008] 2009 and remain available until September 30, [2010] 2011<sup>1</sup>, of which [\$1,148,948,000] \$1,223,047,000 shall become available on July 1, [2009] 2010, and shall remain available through September 30, [2010] 2011<sup>2</sup>, and of which \$791,000,000 shall become available on October 1, [2009] 2010, and shall remain available through September 30, [2010] 2011:<sup>3</sup> *Provided*, That the Secretary of Education shall first distribute up to \$66,995,000 to States that, due to administrative error, were underpaid for fiscal years 2003 through 2008 in the amounts such States were underpaid: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall not reduce the allocations for those years to the States that were overpaid through such error, or take other corrective action with respect to those overpayments: *Provided further*, That the additional funds provided to States to correct the administrative error shall not be considered in determining the “hold-harmless” amounts under section 211(f) of the AEFLA for fiscal year 2011 or subsequent fiscal years:<sup>4</sup> *Provided further*, That of the amount provided for Adult Education State Grants, [\$67,896,000] \$75,000,000 shall be made available for integrated English literacy and civics education services to immigrants and other limited English proficient populations<sup>5</sup>: *Provided further*, That of the amount reserved for integrated English literacy and civics education, notwithstanding section 211 of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, 65 percent shall be allocated to States based on a State’s absolute need as determined by calculating each State’s share of a 10-year average of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services data for immigrants admitted for legal permanent residence for the 10 most recent years, and 35 percent allocated to States that experienced

growth as measured by the average of the 3 most recent years for which United States Citizenship and Immigration Services data for immigrants admitted for legal permanent residence are available, except that no State shall be allocated an amount less than \$60,000<sup>6</sup>: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available for the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, [\$6,878,000] \$13,346,000 shall be for national leadership activities under section 243<sup>7</sup> [and \$6,468,000 shall be for the National Institute for Literacy under section 242.]<sup>8</sup>: *Provided further*, That \$88,000,000 shall be available to support the activities authorized under subpart 4 of part D of title V of the ESEA<sup>9</sup>, of which up to 5 percent shall become available October 1, [2008] 2009, and shall remain available through September 30, [2010] 2011, for evaluation, technical assistance, school networks, peer review of applications, and program outreach activities, and of which not less than 95 percent shall become available on July 1, [2009] 2010, and remain available through September 30, [2010] 2011, for grants to local educational agencies<sup>10</sup>: *Provided further*, That funds made available to local educational agencies under this subpart shall be used only for activities related to establishing smaller learning communities within large high schools or small high schools that provide alternatives for students enrolled in large high schools<sup>11</sup> [.]: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Education may use amounts available under this heading for the necessary costs of any close-out of the National Institute for Literacy.<sup>12</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 Provisions and Changes document, which follows the appropriation language.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>1</sup> ...of which \$4,400,000 shall become available on October 1, [2008] <u>2009</u> and remain available until September 30, [2010] <u>2011</u>...</p>	<p>This language provides for national activities funds for the Smaller Learning Communities program to be appropriated on a 2-year basis.</p>
<p><sup>2</sup> ...of which [\$1,148,948,000] <u>\$1,223,047,000</u> shall become available on July 1, [2009] <u>2010</u>, and shall remain available through September 30, [2010] <u>2011</u>...</p>	<p>This language provides for funds to be appropriated on a forward-funded basis for Career and Technical Education programs, Adult Education programs, the Smaller Learning Communities program, and the Incarcerated Individuals program.</p>
<p><sup>3</sup> ...and of which \$791,000,000 shall become available on October 1, [2009] <u>2010</u>, and shall remain available through September 30, [2010] <u>2011</u>:</p>	<p>This language provides that a portion of the funds appropriated for Career and Technical Education State grants become available for obligation on an advance-funded basis.</p>
<p><sup>4</sup> <u>Provided, That the Secretary of Education shall first distribute up to \$66,995,000 to States that, due to administrative error, were underpaid for fiscal years 2003 through 2008 in the amounts such States were underpaid: Provided further, That the Secretary shall not reduce the allocations for those years to the States that were overpaid through such error, or take other corrective action with respect to those overpayments: Provided further, That the additional funds provided to States to correct the administrative error shall not be considered in determining the "hold-harmless" amounts under section 211(f) of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act ("AEFLA") for fiscal year 2011 or subsequent fiscal years:...</u></p>	<p>This language earmarks a specific amount of Adult Education State grants for distribution to States that did not receive their full allocations in fiscal years 2003 through 2008 due to an administrative error. It also authorizes the Secretary to hold the States harmless that were overpaid during this time period.</p>
<p><sup>5</sup> <u>Provided further, That of the amount provided for Adult Education State Grants, [\$67,896,000] \$75,000,000 shall be made available for integrated English literacy and civics education services to immigrants and other limited English proficient populations:...</u></p>	<p>This language earmarks funds from the Adult Education State Grants appropriation for English Literacy and Civics Education State Grants.</p>

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>6</sup> <i>Provided further</i>, That of the amount reserved for integrated English literacy and civics education, notwithstanding section 211 of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, 65 percent shall be allocated to States based on a State's absolute need as determined by calculating each State's share of a 10-year average of the Immigration and Naturalization Service data for immigrants admitted for legal permanent residence for the 10 most recent years, and 35 percent allocated to States that experienced growth as measured by the average of the 3 most recent years for which Immigration and Naturalization Service data for immigrants admitted for legal permanent residence are available, except that no State shall be allocated an amount less than \$60,000:...</p>	<p>This language specifies an allocation formula for awarding State grants for English literacy and civics education, which are not otherwise authorized under the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act.</p>
<p><sup>7</sup> <i>Provided further</i>, That of the amounts made available for the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, [\$6,878,000] <u>\$13,346,000</u> shall be for national leadership activities under section 243...</p>	<p>This language provides a specific amount for National Leadership activities authorized under section 243 of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, overriding the statutory set-aside of 1.5 percent of the Adult Education appropriation (not to exceed \$8 million).</p>
<p><sup>8</sup> ...[and \$6,468,000 shall be for the National Institute for Literacy under section 242.]</p>	<p>This language provides a specific amount for the National Institute for Literacy, authorized under section 242 of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, overriding the statutory set-aside of 1.5 percent of the Adult Education appropriation (not to exceed \$8 million). It is deleted because the Administration is not requesting funds for this program.</p>
<p><sup>9</sup> <i>Provided further</i>, That \$88,000,000 shall be available to support the activities authorized under subpart 4 of part D of title V of the ESEA...</p>	<p>This language earmarks part of the Fund for Improvement of Education appropriation for funds for the Smaller Learning Communities program.</p>

**CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

**Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes**

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>10</sup> ...of which up to 5 percent shall become available October 1, [2008] <u>2009</u>, and shall remain available through September 30, [2010] <u>2011</u>, for evaluation, technical assistance, school networks, peer review of applications, and program outreach activities, and of which not less than 95 percent shall become available on July 1, [2009] <u>2010</u>, and remain available through September 30, [2010] <u>2011</u>, for grants to local educational agencies...</p>	<p>This provision authorizes the Secretary to reserve up to 5 percent of the Smaller Learning Communities funds for peer review and national activities and makes these funds available for a 2-year period while the remaining funds for Smaller Learning Communities program grants are forward-funded.</p>
<p><sup>11</sup> <i>...Provided further</i>, That funds made available to local educational agencies under this subpart shall be used only for activities related to establishing smaller learning communities within large high schools or small high schools that provide alternatives for students enrolled in large high schools.</p>	<p>This language specifies that Smaller Learning Communities funds be used only for creating smaller learning communities in large high schools or in small high schools that provide students in large high schools with an alternative for their high school education.</p>
<p><sup>12</sup> <u>Provided further</u>, That the Secretary of Education may use amounts available under this heading for the necessary costs of any close-out of the National Institute for Literacy.</p>	<p>This language ensures that the Secretary of Education will have access to funds under this heading for any costs related to the elimination of the National Institute for Literacy.</p>

**CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

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

---

	2008	2009	2010
<hr/>			
Discretionary appropriation:			
Appropriation	\$1,976,166	\$1,944,348	\$2,018,447
Across-the-board reduction	<u>-34,524</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, appropriation	1,941,642	1,944,348	2,018,447
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	-791,000	-791,000	-791,000
Advance from prior year	<u>791,000</u>	<u>791,000</u>	<u>791,000</u>
Subtotal, comparable budget authority	1,941,642	1,944,348	2,018,447
Unobligated balance, start of year	131,732	86,088	0
Recovery of prior-year obligations	810	0	0
Unobligated balance expiring	-87	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year	<u>-86,088</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations	1,988,009	2,030,436	2,018,447

---

**CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

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

	2008	2009	2010
Personnel compensation and benefits .....	\$1,436	\$1,730	0
Travel and transportation of things .....	89	115	0
Rental payments to GSA and others .....	362	497	0
Communications, utilities, and miscellaneous charges .....	38	46	0
Printing and reproduction .....	109	56	0
Other contractual services:			
Advisory and assistance services .....	2,842	12,800	\$17,857
Other services .....	4,785	9,300	11,700
Peer Review.....	0	100	180
Purchases of goods and services .....	20	15	400
Research and development contracts .....	9,722	16,222	4,500
Operation and maintenance of equipment .....	<u>322</u>	<u>828</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal .....	17,691	39,265	34,637
Supplies and materials .....	17	20	0
Equipment.....	7	6	0
Grants, subsidies, and contributions .....	1,968,257	1,988,699	1,983,810
Interest and dividends .....	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations.....	1,988,009	2,030,436	2,018,447

**CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

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

---

2009 .....	\$1,944,348
2010 .....	<u>2,018,447</u>
Net change.....	+74,099

---

	<u>2009 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<b>Increases:</b>		
<u>Program:</u>		
Increase funding for Adult Education State Grants in order to fund States that were underpaid while holding harmless States that were overpaid due to an administrative error.	\$554,122	+\$66,995
Increase funding for the integrated English literacy and civics education set-aside from the Adult Education State Grants appropriation to serve more	67,896	+7,104
Increase funding for Adult Education National Leadership Activities to support high-priority projects designed to help adult English language learners and adults preparing to enter the workforce and higher education.	6,878	<u>+6,468</u>
Subtotal, increases		+80,567
<b>Decreases:</b>		
<u>Program:</u>		
Eliminate funding for the National Institute for Literacy and, instead, provide additional funds to the Adult Education National Leadership Activities.	6,468	<u>-6,468</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-6,468
Net change		+74,099

---

**CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

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

Activity	2009 Authorized	2009 Estimate	2010 Authorized	2010 Request
Career and technical education: <i>(Carl D. Perkins CTEA)</i>				
State grants <i>(CTEA Title I)</i>	Indefinite	\$1,160,911	Indefinite	\$1,160,911
National programs <i>(CTEA section 114)</i>	Indefinite	7,860	Indefinite	7,860
Tech prep education State grants <i>(CTEA Title II)</i>	Indefinite	102,923	Indefinite	102,923
Adult education: <i>(Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA))</i>				
Adult basic and literacy education State grants <i>(AEFLA and WIA section 503)</i>	0 <sup>1,2</sup>	554,122	0 <sup>1,2</sup>	628,221
National leadership activities <i>(AEFLA section 243)</i>	0 <sup>1,2</sup>	6,878	0 <sup>1,2</sup>	13,346
National Institute for Literacy <i>(AEFLA section 242)</i>	0 <sup>1,3</sup>	6,468	0 <sup>1,3</sup>	0
Smaller learning communities <i>(ESEA V-D, subpart 4)</i>	0 <sup>2</sup>	88,000	0 <sup>2</sup>	88,000
Grants to states for workplace and community transition training for incarcerated individuals <i>(HEA Amendments of 1998, VIII-D)</i>	Indefinite <sup>2</sup>	17,186	Indefinite <sup>2</sup>	17,186
<u>Unfunded authorizations</u>				
Occupational and employment information <i>(CTEA section 118)</i>	<u>Indefinite</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>Indefinite</u>	<u>0</u>
Total appropriation		1,944,348		2,018,447
Portion of request subject to reauthorization				729,567

67

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Authorizing Legislation—continued (\$000s)

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 211(a) of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act requires that, of the funds appropriated for Adult Education, the Secretary reserve 1.5 percent, not to exceed \$8 million, for the National Institute for Literacy; 1.5 percent, not to exceed \$8 million, for National Leadership Activities; and 1.72 percent for incentive grants (as authorized under section 503 of the Workforce Investment Act).

<sup>2</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>3</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The Administration is not proposing appropriations language for FY 2010, nor seeking reauthorizing legislation.

**CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

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

	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2001	1,751,250	1,718,600	1,726,600	1,825,600
2001 Advance for 2002	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)
2002	1,801,660	2,006,060	1,818,060	1,934,060
2002 Advance for 2003	0	(807,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)
2003	1,897,617	1,919,560	1,938,060	1,943,346
2003 Advance for 2004	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)
2004	1,597,532	2,101,430	2,101,430	2,109,172
2004 Advance for 2005	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)
2005	1,602,233	2,025,458	2,102,086	2,010,949
2005 Advance for 2006	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)
2006	215,734	1,991,782	1,927,016	1,992,159
2006 Advance for 2007	0	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)
2007	579,552			1,992,170
2007 Advance for 2008	(791,000)	N/A <sup>1</sup>	N/A <sup>1</sup>	(791,000)
2008	1,189,808	2,038,220	1,894,788	1,941,642
2008 Advance for 2009				(791,000)
2009	574,590	1,951,611 <sup>2</sup>	1,863,162 <sup>2</sup>	1,944,348
2009 Advance for 2010				(791,000)
2010	2,018,447			
2010 Advance for 2011	(791,000)			

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

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

## **CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

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

#### **Adult Education National Leadership Activities**

- Conference: The conferees direct that the Department submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations prior to the formal release of any contracting opportunity for USA Learns, which details any cost savings that could be achieved by using commercially-available English language training technologies or solutions along with full justification of any decision to expend funds that might duplicate existing training materials.
- Response: In 2008, the Department issued a request for proposals for outside entities to take over the operation and development of USA Learns and is currently reviewing the proposals submitted. The transfer of the USA Learns portal would not result in any costs to the Department. The Department does not intend to expend any additional funds on USA Learns or create any contracting opportunities related to the portal.

#### **Smaller Learning Communities**

- Conference: The conferees direct that the Department use program funds only for activities related to establishing Smaller Learning Communities within large high schools or small high schools that provide alternatives for students enrolled in large high schools.
- Response: The Department has awarded funds only to applicants that proposed to establish or expand smaller learning communities within large high schools or small high schools that serve as alternatives for students enrolled in large high schools and intends to continue to do so.
- Conference: The conferees direct that the Department consult with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations prior to the release of program guidance for the Smaller Learning Communities grant competitions for fiscal years 2008 and 2009.
- Response: The Department will consult with the Committees on plans for the fiscal year 2009 program competition prior to the public release of program guidance. The Department intends to provide existing grantees with continuation funds from the remaining fiscal year 2008 funds that are available for grants.
- Conference: The conferees direct that the Department submit an operating plan to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations outlining the planned use of the five percent set-aside prior to the obligation of these funds.
- Response: The Department intends to submit a report on FY 2008 and FY 2009 plans for the 5 percent set-aside before obligating any of the funds.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2010 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST

(in thousands of dollars)		Category Code	2008 Appropriation	2009 Appropriation	2010 President's Request	Change from 2009 Appropriation	
Office, Account, Program and Activity	Amount					Percent	
<b>Career, Technical, and Adult Education</b>							
1.	Career and technical education (Carl D. Perkins CTEA):						
	(a)						
	) State grants (CTEA Title I)						
	Annual appropriation	D	369,911	369,911	369,911	0	0.0%
	Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	791,000	791,000	791,000	0	0.0%
	Subtotal		1,160,911	1,160,911	1,160,911	0	0.0%
	(b)						
	) National programs (section 114)	D	7,860	7,860	7,860	0	0.0%
	(c) Tech prep education State grants (Title II)	D	102,923	102,923	102,923	0	0.0%
	Subtotal, Career and technical education		1,271,694	1,271,694	1,271,694	0	0.0%
2.	Adult education (Adult Education and Family Literacy Act):						
	(a)						
	) Adult basic and literacy education State grants (AEFLA and WIA section 503)	D	554,122	554,122	628,221	74,099	13.4%
	(b)						
	) National leadership activities (AEFLA section 243)	D	6,878	6,878	13,346	6,468	94.0%
	(c) National Institute for Literacy (AEFLA section 242)	D	6,468	6,468	0	(6,468)	-100.0%
	Subtotal, Adult education		567,468	567,468	641,567	74,099	13.1%
3.	Smaller learning communities (ESEA V-D, subpart 4)	D	80,108	88,000	88,000	0	0.0%
4.	State grants for training of incarcerated individuals (HE Amendments of 1998, VIII-D)	D	22,372	17,186	17,186	0	0.0%
	<b>Total, Appropriation</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>1,941,642</b>	<b>1,944,348</b>	<b>2,018,447</b>	<b>74,099</b>	<b>3.8%</b>
	Total, Budget authority	D	1,941,642	1,944,348	2,018,447	74,099	3.8%
	Current		1,150,642	1,153,348	1,227,447	74,099	6.4%
	Prior year's advance		791,000	791,000	791,000	0	0.0%
	Outlays	D	1,894,706	2,174,695	1,944,004	(230,691)	-10.6%

<sup>1</sup> Excludes an advance appropriation of \$791,000 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of the following fiscal year.

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

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Summary of Request

Programs in the Career, Technical, and Adult Education account further State and community efforts to improve their career and technical education programs and adult education and literacy systems. The objective of these programs is to develop the academic, career, and technical skills of students in high schools, community colleges, adult education programs, and correctional institutions by helping States develop challenging standards; promoting the integration of academic, career, and technical instruction; and supporting State and local program improvements. Adult education programs support local efforts to provide educational services to adults who lack the basic or English literacy skills needed for them to benefit fully from job training, obtain better jobs, complete secondary education, and become full participants in their children's education. The Career and Technical Education programs were reauthorized through the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006. Adult Education is included in the pending Workforce Investment Act reauthorization. The Smaller Learning Communities program, which is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, is subject to reauthorization. The State Grants for Workforce and Community Transition Training for Incarcerated Individuals program was reauthorized in 2008 by the Higher Education Opportunity Act. The Administration is conducting a comprehensive review of Federal job training programs to assess their effectiveness. This review will inform the Administration's proposals for reauthorization of the Workforce Investment Act and other statutes intended to help individuals prepare for successful employment.

The Administration requests a total of \$2.018 billion for this account, a \$74.1 million increase from the 2009 appropriation level. This request includes \$1.161 billion for **Career and Technical Education State Grants**, \$7.9 million for **Career and Technical Education National Programs**, and \$102.9 million for **Tech Prep Education State Grants**. In addition, the request includes \$628.2 million for **Adult Education State Grants**, \$13.3 million for **Adult Education National Leadership Activities**, \$88 million for the **Smaller Learning Communities program**, and \$17.2 million for **Workforce and Community Transition Training for Incarcerated Individuals State Grants**. The request reflects the Administration's support for programs designed to assist students to stay in school or return to school in order to complete a high school degree or equivalent that will prepare them for the workforce or postsecondary education or training. The request for the Career and Technical Education State Grants and National Programs, as well as for the Tech Prep Education State Grants, is the same as the FY 2009 appropriation level. The request for Adult Education State grants is \$74.1 million more than the FY 2009 level. The requested one-time increase would flow to States that, between fiscal years 2003 and 2008, did not receive their full allocations because of an administrative error, thereby allowing them to recover the additional amounts to which they were entitled, while holding harmless the States that received overpayments. The request includes continuation of a set-aside for English Literacy/Civics Education State Grants, with a \$7.1 million increase to support the unmet needs of immigrants learning English in FY 2010. The program helps States and communities provide limited English proficient adults with expanded access to high-quality English literacy programs linked to civics education. The request for National Leadership Activities is \$6.5 million over the FY 2009 level in order to support coordinated research and dissemination efforts in the area of effective strategies for adult education and literacy programs.

## **CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

The request would eliminate funding for the **National Institute for Literacy** (NIFL) and proposes instead to allocate those funds to the Adult Education National Leadership Activities program. NIFL's broad mission has resulted in a duplication of efforts; as a result, the Administration believes that funds can be spent in a more coordinated and efficient manner without the additional costs of NIFL's personnel and infrastructure.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### Career and technical education: State grants

(Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, Title I)

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
Annual appropriation	\$369,911	\$369,911	0
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	<u>791,000</u>	<u>791,000</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	1,160,911	1,160,911	0

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (Perkins IV), State Grants for Career and Technical Education assist States and Outlying Areas in expanding and improving career and technical education in high schools, technical schools, and community colleges. Each State uses program funds to support a variety of career and technical education programs developed in accordance with its State plan.

The Department allocates funds to States, including the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, through a formula based on State per-capita income and population in three age cohorts (15-19, 20-24, and 25-65). The formula provides for a minimum State allocation of at least 0.5 percent of the total, and a “hold-harmless” provision in the formula ensures that no State’s share of the appropriation is less than its share of the fiscal year 1998 appropriation. A special provision limits the increase a State with an initial allocation of the 0.5 percent minimum may receive, resulting in a number of States that receive an allocation of less than 0.5 percent of the total. If appropriations result in the amount of funds for allocation to States exceeding the amount of funds allocated to States from the FY 2006 appropriation, up to one-third of the additional funds is allotted to States with FY 2006 grant awards that were less than the minimum 0.5 percent grant amount and the remainder would flow to the other States.

In addition, the Pacific territories receive 0.13 percent of the total appropriated for State Grants to operate the same kinds of career and technical education programs as the States. Within that set-aside, Guam receives \$660,000, American Samoa and the Northern Mariana Islands each receive \$350,000, and Palau receives \$160,000. The remaining funds are distributed among Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands in equal shares. Also, 1.25 percent of the total appropriation for State Grants is set aside for grants to federally recognized Indian tribes and tribal organizations, and 0.25 percent is set aside for competitive grants to organizations that primarily serve and represent Hawaiian Natives.

Under the statute:

- Programs must, among other things, integrate academic and career and technical education, promote student attainment of challenging academic and career and technical standards, provide strong linkages between secondary and postsecondary education, and provide professional development for teachers, counselors, and administrators.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

---

- The Secretary and each State must reach agreement on annual levels of performance for a number of “core indicators” specified in the law.
  - The core indicators for secondary education programs focus on student attainment of challenging academic standards, as measured by attainment of the proficient level or above on the statewide assessments required under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA); student attainment of career and technical skill proficiencies; student attainment of a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, or a proficiency credential in conjunction with a secondary school diploma; high school graduation; student placement in postsecondary education, advanced training, military service, or employment; and student participation in and completion of career and technical education programs that lead to employment in fields that are traditionally dominated by one gender.
  - The core indicators for postsecondary education programs focus on student attainment of challenging career and technical skill proficiencies; student attainment of an industry-recognized credential, certificate, or degree; student retention in postsecondary education or transfer to a baccalaureate degree program; student placement in the military or in apprenticeship programs, or placement or retention in employment; and student participation in and completion of career and technical education programs that lead to employment in fields that are traditionally dominated by one gender.
- Within States, at least 85 percent of funds are allocated by formula to local educational agencies (LEAs) and postsecondary institutions, except that a State may reserve up to 10 percent of funds to make grant awards to local agencies in rural areas, and areas with high percentages or high numbers of career and technical education students.
- States may use up to 10 percent of their allocations to carry out State leadership activities, such as professional development, expanding the use of technology, assessing career and technical education services, integrating academic and career and technical education to improve student achievement, preparing students for employment in fields that are traditionally dominated by one gender, delivering career and technical education in correctional institutions, and providing services for special populations.

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

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

---

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

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$1,194,331
2006.....	1,182,388
2007.....	1,181,553
2008.....	1,160,911
2009.....	1,160,911

### FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2010, the Administration requests \$1.6 billion for the Career and Technical Education (CTE) State Grant program, the same amount as the 2009 level. Funds would support activities under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (Perkins IV) and would also support the Administration's goal of improving the quality of high school education around the country.

The CTE State Grant program represents a significant Federal investment in secondary education; during school year 2006-07, 63 percent of program funds went to support secondary CTE programs and, during that year, approximately 9.9 million secondary students enrolled in at least one CTE course. However, secondary CTE coursework is not the end of formal career training for many students. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) report *Career and Technical Education in the United States: 1990 to 2005*, students who take CTE courses in high school are likely to pursue some postsecondary education in their lifetime.

Although the students who had taken more CTE courses in high school were more likely to go to work directly after high school, 70 percent of 1992 public high school graduates who had earned at least 4 CTE credits in high school had enrolled in postsecondary education by the year 2000. Furthermore, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics' *Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2008-09 edition*, an associate's degree or higher is the most significant level of postsecondary education or training needed for 12 of the 20 fastest growing occupations. Thus, CTE students need to acquire skills for both work and postsecondary education during their high school years.

Educational and national organizations such as the National Governors Association (NGA) have called for improvement and upgrading of CTE programs as part of a strategy for improving high school education and for preparing high school students to enter the workplace or pursue postsecondary education. In the 2008 report *Accelerating the Agenda: Actions to Improve America's High Schools*, the NGA, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National Association of State Boards of Education, and the Council of Chief State School Officers recommend that the retooling of CTE to improve high school education include increasing the rigor of CTE courses by basing CTE programs on State standards, emphasizing emerging fields such as biotechnology or homeland security rather than traditional trades like carpentry or welding, and expanding college-level learning opportunities for students through such strategies as dual-enrollment programs.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

---

The 2006 reauthorization of the program (Perkins IV) implemented many of these strategies to improve CTE. Perkins IV puts increased emphasis on improving the academic achievement of career and technical education students and makes States accountable for their academic performance along with their attainment of technical skills. In addition, Perkins IV requires States to create at least one program of study, which is defined as a coherent sequence of non-duplicative CTE courses that progress from the secondary to the postsecondary level, include rigorous and challenging academic content along with career and technical content, and lead to an industry-recognized credential or certificate at the postsecondary level or to an associate or baccalaureate degree. These programs can help prepare students for both college and careers.

Furthermore, the Perkins statute requires States to use “valid and reliable” measures of the core indicators of performance and should improve program quality and results through increased State and local accountability and data reporting. While the statute gives States latitude in selecting their measures of performance and in defining the students whose performance is included in those performance measures, the Secretary is not required to approve those measures if he determines that they are not valid and reliable. States must now report on the academic performance and high school completion rates of their CTE students in the same manner as they do under Title I of the ESEA.

The Perkins Act also includes provisions for accountability at the local level as well, requiring States to negotiate with local recipients of funds to establish local adjusted levels of performance for each of the core indicators of performance, just as the Department does with States. If States and local recipients fail to meet at least 90 percent of their targets on one or more of their indicators of performance, they must submit an improvement plan, and they can be sanctioned financially after 3 or more years of failing to meet performance targets.

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

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
State grants	\$1,141,988	\$1,141,988	\$1,141,988
Range of awards to States	\$613-128,508	\$606-128,360	\$606-128,360
Territories allocation	\$1,509	\$1,509	\$1,509
Indian set-aside	\$14,511	\$14,511	\$14,511
Number of grants	30	30	30
Native Hawaiian set-aside	\$2,902	\$2,902	\$2,902
Number of grants	10	10	10

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

#### Performance Measures

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

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

---

cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

In 2007, the Department adopted new performance measures for the program in order to align them with the core indicators of performance specified in section 113 of the reauthorized Perkins Act. As part of its plan to transition to the requirements of Perkins IV, the Department immediately implemented the measures that were based on Elementary and Secondary Education Act requirements (CTE student achievement on the statewide assessments of reading/language arts and mathematics that States must administer under ESEA Title I, and CTE students who graduate from high school, as defined under ESEA Title I), and provided States with another year to implement the remaining measures (secondary education measures for technical skill attainment, secondary school completion, placement, and nontraditional participation and completion, and postsecondary education measures for technical skill attainment; attainment of credentials, certificates, or diplomas; student retention or transfer; student placement; and nontraditional participation and completion).

**Goal: Increase access to and improve educational programs that strengthen education achievement, workforce preparation, and lifelong learning.**

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

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of CTE concentrators meeting the State-established reading/language arts standards.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2008	61	68
2009	64	
2010	69	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of CTE concentrators meeting the State-established mathematics standards.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2008	54	62
2009	57	
2010	63	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of CTE students who graduated in the reporting year.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2008	75	91
2009	78	
2010	91	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

---

**Assessment of progress:** The data show that the program surpassed the targets for 2008 for the percentage of CTE students meeting State-established standards in reading/language arts and mathematics, and the percent of CTE students graduating from high school. As required in the statute, States measured reading/language arts and mathematics achievement by determining how many CTE students attained a level of proficient or advanced on the assessments administered by the State under Title I of ESEA. The percentage of CTE students who graduated from high school was obtained by extracting data on the CTE students who were included in the State's computation of graduation rate as required under Title I of ESEA. The program-level targets are based on the targets negotiated with individual States under section 113 of Perkins IV.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of secondary CTE concentrators attaining technical skills.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2009	80	
2010	80	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of secondary CTE concentrators earning a diploma, GED, or proficiency credential in conjunction with a secondary school diploma.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2009	84	
2010	84	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of secondary CTE concentrators placed in postsecondary education, advanced training, military service, or employment.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2009	86	
2010	86	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of secondary CTE concentrators participating in programs in nontraditional fields.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2009	30	
2010	30	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of secondary CTE concentrators completing programs leading to nontraditional fields.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2009	19	
2010	19	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of postsecondary CTE concentrators attaining technical skills.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2009	68	
2010	68	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of postsecondary CTE concentrators earning an industry-recognized credential, certificate, or degree.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2009	56	
2010	56	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of postsecondary CTE concentrators retained in postsecondary education or transferring to a baccalaureate degree program.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2009	58	
2010	58	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of postsecondary CTE concentrators placed in postsecondary education, advanced training, military service, or employment.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2009	74	
2010	74	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of postsecondary CTE concentrators participating in nontraditional programs.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2009	20	
2010	20	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of postsecondary CTE concentrators completing nontraditional programs.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2009	16	
2010	16	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

In order to encourage consistency in how States collect data for performance indicators, the Department published non-regulatory guidance providing suggested measures, measurement approaches, and data definitions for each indicator. However, not every State opted to adopt the Department's suggested measurement approaches. While the Department continues to

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

---

work with States and provide technical assistance on improving the quality of performance data, the data that the States currently submit have limited validity.

#### Efficiency Measures

The Department has adopted cost per participant as the efficiency measure for this program. This is also the efficiency measure included in the job training common measures adopted by the Office of Management and Budget. Although the Department is able to calculate this measure at the national and State levels, the validity and reliability of the data used for these calculations are questionable. State definitions of participants vary, limiting the validity of comparisons across States. The following chart shows national-level costs per secondary student and per postsecondary student for fiscal years 2004 through 2007. Data for fiscal year 2008 will be available in late 2009.

Year	Cost per secondary student	Cost per postsecondary student
2004	\$64	\$79
2005	75	83
2006	77	77
2007	77	86

#### Other Performance Information

The 2004 National Assessment of Vocational Education (NAVE) found that CTE has positive earnings benefits for high school graduates that go directly to work and for those who enroll in postsecondary education and training. The NAVE report noted that the greatest earnings benefits were for those who pursue significant amounts of postsecondary CTE and attain a degree or credential. The NAVE also concluded that, over the last decade, secondary students who participated in CTE programs increased their academic coursetaking and achievement, in some cases narrowing the gap between them and students who took few or no CTE classes. An interim report on the current National Assessment of Career and Technical Education is due to Congress on January 1, 2010.

#### Program Improvement Efforts

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

- *Providing technical assistance on integrating challenging academic/career technical instruction and developing programs of study.* In 2008, the Department awarded a grant for a model project on developing rigorous programs of study and expects to disseminate information on the project.
- *Issuing non-regulatory guidance on an "as-needed" basis.* This approach allows the Department to address questions and concerns from the field swiftly and as new issues emerge, rather than depending on one document that tries to address every possible area where clarification may be needed. To date, the Department has issued a number of non-regulatory guidance documents addressing such issues as the transition for implementing

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

---

Perkins IV requirements; suggested measurement approaches for performance indicators; and consolidation of Tech Prep funds.

- *Working to encourage all States to use the same measurement approaches for all its measures.* The Department issued non-regulatory guidance with suggested approaches for measuring performance under each performance indicator mandated by the statute. However, the statute specifically allows States to establish their own measures for the performance indicators, and not every State is currently measuring performance in the manner suggested in the non-regulatory guidance. The Department will continue to support Data Quality Institutes that provide assistance on improving the quality of performance data for the program and will also continue to encourage States to adopt the measurement approaches the Department has established.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### Career and Technical Education: National programs

(Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, Section 114)

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$7,860	\$7,860	0

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (Perkins IV) includes an authority for National Programs to support research, development, demonstration, dissemination, evaluation, and assessment activities aimed at improving the quality and effectiveness of career and technical education. Within this authority, Perkins IV specifically calls for the operation of a national center to carry out scientifically based research in career and technical education and a national assessment of career and technical education programs operated under the Act. An interim report on the national assessment is due to Congress on January 1, 2010, and a final report is due on July 1, 2011.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$11,757
2006.....	9,164
2007.....	10,000
2008.....	7,860
2009.....	7,860

### FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2010, the Administration requests \$7.9 million for Career and Technical Education National Programs, the same amount as the 2009 level. The purpose of the program is to fund activities that support implementation of career and technical education programs under the Perkins Act. Funds for FY 2010 would support the National Career and Technical Education Research Center, as well as a project to improve the quality of the performance data States collect and report to the Department. Funds will also be used to continue efforts to help States develop “programs of study” (defined in the statute as coherent sequences of non-duplicative CTE courses that progress from the secondary to the postsecondary level, include

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: National programs

---

rigorous and challenging academic content along with career and technical content, and lead to an industry-recognized credential or certificate at the postsecondary level or an associate or baccalaureate degree.) This project would provide support to States or consortia of States to develop at least one new program of study and an articulation agreement between local agencies and institutions of higher education that is aligned with the program of study.

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

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
National Career and Technical Education Research Center	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500
Improving Program Performance	860	1,000	1,000
Promoting Rigorous Programs of Study	500	2,360	2,360
National Assessment of Career and Technical Education	2,000	0	0

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

In 2007, the Department made a new award for the National Career and Technical Education Research Center called for under Perkins IV. The Department will implement the following performance measures for the new Center: (1) the percentage of scientifically based research studies conducted by the Center that are of high relevance to career and technical education practices; (2) the percentage of products (e.g., instructional approaches, methods, programs, models, and strategies) disseminated to practitioners by the Center that are judged by expert panels to be of high quality; (3) the percentage of technical assistance services that are judged by target audiences to be of high usefulness to educational policy or practice; and (4) the percentage of professional development activities offered by the Center that are judged by participants to be of high quality. The Department will set a baseline for these measures in late 2009, based on results achieved by the Center with FY 2008 funds.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### Career and technical education: Tech prep education State grants

(Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, Title II)

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$102,923	\$102,923	0

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Tech Prep Education program provides grants to States, which in turn provide subgrants to consortia of local educational agencies and postsecondary institutions. The purpose of tech prep is to develop a structural link between secondary and postsecondary institutions that integrates academic and career and technical education and better prepares students to make the transition from high school to college and from college to careers. Each tech prep project is carried out under an articulation agreement between the participants in the consortium and consists of at least 2 years of high school followed by 2 years or more of higher education or apprenticeship. Tech Prep programs are intended to help students to attain a common core of required proficiencies in mathematics, science, reading, writing, communications, and technological skills. The programs are designed to lead to an associate's degree or a postsecondary certificate in a technical career field and, where appropriate, link to courses of study at 4-year institutions.

The Department distributes Tech Prep funds to States using the Career and Technical Education State Grants formula. States may target their Tech Prep funds to local programs by awarding funds to local consortia through a competition, or they may subgrant the funds on a formula basis.

Under the 2006 Perkins Act (Perkins IV), tech prep programs are subject to the same accountability measures as the Career and Technical Education State Grants. These measures require tech prep programs to continuously improve students' academic and technical skill proficiencies and their placement and retention in further education and employment. In addition, States must require local recipients that have failed to meet their performance targets for 3 consecutive years to resubmit their applications for Tech Prep funds. States also have the option of terminating these subgrants.

The 2006 Act includes a provision that allows States to consolidate the Tech Prep funds they receive under the Act with the funds they receive for Career and Technical Education State Grants. States that choose to consolidate Tech Prep funds must distribute these funds in accordance with the requirements of the Career and Technical Education State Grants program, to carry out activities authorized under that program. These States are not required to report performance data separately for the funds they receive under the Tech Prep program.

## VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: Tech prep education State grants

---

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

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

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$105,812
2006.....	104,754
2007.....	104,753
2008.....	102,923
2009.....	102,923

### FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2010, the Administration requests \$102.9 million for the Tech Prep Education State Grants program, the same amount as the 2009 level. Program funds would support grants to consortia of school districts (or other agencies that provide secondary career and technical education (CTE)) and institutions of higher education (IHEs) to develop and implement programs of non-duplicative, sequential courses of study that incorporate at least 2 years of secondary education and 2 years of postsecondary education with work-based learning experiences. States reported that there were 2.6 million students enrolled in Tech Prep programs during school year 2006-07, accounting for 16.4 percent of all CTE enrollment that year.

The Tech Prep program essentially provides funding for local agencies to set up, at the local level, programs similar to the rigorous programs of study that the Perkins Act requires under State Grants. The reauthorized Perkins Act defines programs of study as coherent sequences of non-duplicative CTE courses that progress from the secondary to the postsecondary level, include rigorous and challenging academic content along with career and technical content, and lead to an industry-recognized credential or certificate at the postsecondary level or to an associate or baccalaureate degree. The local setting of a secondary school working directly with an IHE also provides the opportunity for implementation of tech prep programs that are dual enrollment programs, in which high school students take college courses for credit as part of their sequential coursework.

The increased emphasis on improving the academic achievement of CTE students present in Perkins IV provides an opportunity for using Tech Prep to expand the role of dual-enrollment programs in improving the academic achievement, technical skills, career and postsecondary outcomes for secondary students who enroll in CTE programs. The National Center for Education Statistics' 2005 report, *Dual Enrollment of High School Students at Postsecondary Institutions: 2002-03*, found that only 5 percent of institutions offering dual-enrollment programs had programs specifically geared towards high school students at risk of educational failure. However, 39 percent of those programs reported that their primary focus of the program was CTE, and for another 21 percent. The focus was on CTE and academics equally. Thus, Tech Prep and dual-enrollment programs can be used effectively to help students who do not seem to

## VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: Tech prep education State grants

---

be college-bound to improve their academic and CTE outcomes and provide them with positive experiences that will prepare them for further postsecondary study or career training later in life.

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

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Number of grants	53	53	53
Range of grants	\$55-11,252	\$55-11,252	\$55-11,252
Average award	\$1,942	\$1,942	\$1,942

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

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

Under Perkins IV, States must report on the performance of Tech Prep students under the core indicators of performance specified in section 113 of the Act. In 2007, the Department adopted new performance measures for the program in order to align them with the indicators under that Act. As part of its plan to transition to the requirements of Perkins IV, the Department immediately implemented the measures that were based on Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requirements (student achievement on the statewide assessments of reading/language arts and mathematics that States must administer under ESEA Title I, and high school graduation, as defined under ESEA Title I), and provided States with another year to implement the remaining measures (secondary education measures for technical skill attainment, secondary school completion, placement, and nontraditional participation and completion, and postsecondary education measures for technical skill attainment; attainment of credentials, certificates, or diplomas; student retention or transfer; student placement; and nontraditional participation and completion).

Note that States that consolidate all of their Tech Prep funds under section 202 of the Perkins Act do not run separate Tech Prep programs and are not required to report performance data for the program. During school year 2008-09, 24 States consolidated all of their Tech Prep funding.

## VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: Tech prep education State grants

---

**Goal:** Increase access to and improve educational programs that strengthen education achievement, workforce preparation, and lifelong learning.

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

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Tech Prep concentrators meeting the State-established reading/language arts standards.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2008	63	63
2009	65	
2010	66	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Tech Prep concentrators meeting the State-established reading/mathematics standards.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2008	38	58
2009	40	
2010	59	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Tech Prep students who graduated in the reporting year.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2008	75	77
2009	76	
2010	80	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

**Assessment of progress:** The data show that the program met the 2008 target for the percentage of Tech Prep students meeting State-established standards in reading/language arts and surpassed the 2008 targets for the percentage of Tech Prep students meeting State-established standards in mathematics and the percentage of Tech Prep students graduating from high school. As required in the statute, States measured reading/language arts and mathematics achievement by determining how many Tech Prep students attained a level of proficient or advanced on the assessments administered by the State under ESEA Title I. The percentage of Tech Prep students who graduated from high school was obtained by extracting data on the Tech Prep students who were included in the State's computation of graduation rate as required under ESEA Title I. Note that the Department does not negotiate separate targets with States on the attainment of Tech Prep students on these indicators; however, States are required to report on the performance of Tech Prep students on the indicators. The program-level targets are based on the targets negotiated with individual States for the CTE State grants program under section 113 of Perkins IV.

## VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: Tech prep education State grants

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of secondary Tech Prep concentrators attaining technical skills.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2009	80	
2010	80	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of secondary Tech Prep concentrators earning a diploma, GED, or proficiency credential in conjunction with a secondary school diploma.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2009	84	
2010	84	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of secondary Tech Prep concentrators placed in postsecondary education, advanced training, military service, or employment.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2009	86	
2010	86	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of secondary Tech Prep concentrators participating in programs in nontraditional fields.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2009	30	
2010	30	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of secondary Tech Prep concentrators completing programs in nontraditional fields.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2009	19	
2010	19	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of postsecondary Tech Prep concentrators attaining technical skills.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2009	68	
2010	68	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of postsecondary Tech Prep concentrators earning an industry-recognized credential, certificate, or degree.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2009	56	
2010	56	

## VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: Tech prep education State grants

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of postsecondary Tech Prep concentrators retained in postsecondary education or transferring to a baccalaureate degree program.		
Year	Target	Actual
2009	58	
2010	58	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of postsecondary Tech Prep concentrators placed in postsecondary education, advanced training, military service, or employment.		
Year	Target	Actual
2009	74	
2010	74	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of postsecondary Tech Prep concentrators participating in nontraditional programs.		
Year	Target	Actual
2009	20	
2010	20	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of postsecondary Tech Prep concentrators completing nontraditional programs.		
Year	Target	Actual
2009	16	
2010	16	

In order to encourage consistency in how States collect data for performance indicators, the Department published non-regulatory guidance providing suggested measures, measurement approaches, and data definitions for each of the indicators. However, not every State has opted to adopt the Department's suggested measurement approaches. While the Department continues to work with States and to provide technical assistance on improving the quality of performance data, the data that the States currently submit have limited validity.

### Efficiency Measures

The Department has adopted cost per participant as the efficiency measure for this program. This is also the efficiency measure for the common job training measures adopted by the Department and other agencies. However, the validity and usefulness of the data used for these calculations are questionable. State definitions of participants vary widely, limiting the validity of comparisons across States. Furthermore, to date, States have not consistently identified the number of Tech Prep program participants separately from the number of participants under the Career and Technical Education State Grant program. The table below shows national-level costs per Tech Prep participants for fiscal years 2003 through 2007. Data for fiscal year 2008 will be available in spring of 2010.

	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
<b>Cost per participant</b>	\$47	\$41	\$43	\$44	\$47

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### Program Improvement Efforts

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

- *Funding efforts to develop programs of study.* The Department has funded a project to assist States in developing the programs of study described in Perkins IV, and will disseminate information on project activities and outcomes as they develop.
- *Issuing non-regulatory guidance on an “as-needed” basis.* This approach allows the Department to address questions and concerns from the field swiftly and as new issues emerge, rather than depending on one document that tries to address every possible area where clarification may be needed. To date, the Department has issued a number of non-regulatory guidance documents addressing such issues as the transition for implementing Perkins IV requirements and suggested measurement approaches for performance indicators.
- *Working to encourage all States to use the same measurement approaches for all its measures.* The Department issued non-regulatory guidance with suggested approaches for measuring performance under each performance indicator mandated by the statute. However, the statute specifically allows States to establish their own measures for the performance indicators, and not every State is currently measuring performance in the manner suggested in the non-regulatory guidance. The Department will continue to offer Data Quality Institutes that provide assistance on improving the quality of performance data for the program and will also continue to encourage States to adopt the measurement approaches the Department has established.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants

(Adult Education and Family Literacy Act and Workforce Investment Act, Section 503)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$554,122 <sup>2</sup>	\$628,221 <sup>2</sup>	+\$74,099

---

<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> FY 2009 appropriations language provides a \$68 million set-aside for English Literacy and Civics Education grants. The request for FY 2010 would continue this policy.

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Under the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA), adult education grants to the States and Outlying Areas support programs that assist adults in becoming literate and in obtaining the knowledge and skills necessary for employment and self-sufficiency; assist adults who are parents in obtaining the educational skills necessary to become full partners in the educational development of their children; and assist adults in the completion of a secondary education.

### Adult Education State Grants

The Department awards formula grants to States and Outlying Areas. The formula provides an initial allotment of \$250,000 for each State and \$100,000 to each Outlying Area. Any additional funds are distributed on the basis of each State's share of qualifying adults. Qualifying adults are defined in AEFLA as individuals aged 16 and older who are without a high school diploma or the equivalent, who are beyond the age of compulsory education in their States, and who are not currently enrolled in school. AEFLA also includes a "hold-harmless" provision that ensures that each State receives at least 90 percent of its previous year's amount. If funding is insufficient to satisfy the hold-harmless provision, each State receives the same proportion of available funding as in the previous year.

States may use up to 12.5 percent of their grant for State leadership activities and an additional 5 percent or \$65,000 (whichever is greater) for State administration. At least 82.5 percent of a State's grant must be used for local awards; of this amount, up to 10 percent may be used to educate incarcerated and other institutionalized individuals. Of the funds provided by the State agency to eligible entities, at least 95 percent must be used for instructional activities.

States make grants to local entities that provide adult basic education, English literacy, adult secondary education, workplace literacy, and family literacy services. Local service providers include local educational agencies, community colleges, and community- and faith-based organizations. In distributing funds, States must give equitable access to all types of agencies

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### **Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants**

---

and institutions that have the ability to provide adult education programs. States, in awarding funds to local providers, must consider the extent to which these providers offer programs that, among other things, have measurable goals for client outcomes, can demonstrate past effectiveness in improving the literacy skills of adults and families, serve individuals who are most in need of literacy services, are built on a strong foundation of research about effective practices, and coordinate with other available resources in the community.

The State's leadership funds are used for State activities to improve adult education and literacy services, including professional development to improve the quality of instruction, technology assistance for local providers, and monitoring and evaluating the quality of local programs. States can also use a portion of their State leadership funds for financial incentives to reward local programs for high performance or exemplary program coordination.

To promote continuous program improvement, the Secretary and each State must reach agreement on annual performance targets for a number of "core indicators" in the areas of literacy skill improvement; placement in, retention in, or completion of postsecondary education, training, unsubsidized employment, or career advancement; and attainment of a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent.

The Secretary reserves 1.72 percent of the total Adult Education appropriation to award incentive grants to States that exceed the agreed-upon performance levels for the AEFLA and other employment programs. Funds are transferred to the Secretary of Labor and are awarded along with funds reserved from the other programs.

### **English Literacy and Civics Education (EL/Civics) State Grants**

The Department also awards formula grants to States for English literacy and civics education from funds set aside from the Adult Education appropriation. Using Immigration and Naturalization Service data on the number of legal immigrants, the Department allocates 65 percent of funds based on each State's share of a 10-year average of immigrants admitted for legal permanent residence. The remaining 35 percent is allocated to States that have experienced recent growth in immigration, as measured by the average of the number of immigrants in the 3 most recent years. No State receives an award of less than \$60,000. States received EL/Civics formula grants for the first time in fiscal year 2000.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$569,672
2006.....	563,975
2007.....	563,975
2008.....	554,122
2009.....	554,122

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants

---

#### FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$628 million for Adult Education State Grants, \$74.1 million more than the 2009 level. The increase would include \$67 million for States that did not receive the full allocation they were entitled to during fiscal years 2003-2008 due to an administrative error.

The request includes appropriations language that would allow States that were underpaid in fiscal years 2003-2008 to receive the amounts that they were underpaid for those years while holding harmless those States that were overpaid. Based on initial data received from the Census Bureau, the Department believes that \$67 million will be sufficient to fund the underpayments. The 2010 request would also increase the set-aside for English Literacy/Civics Education State Grants to \$75 million, \$7.1 million more than the FY 2009 level.

The need for adult education services persists in the U.S. The results of a survey conducted in 2006 by the National Council of State Directors of Adult Education highlight this need. Of the 43 States that responded to the survey, 40 confirmed that they had students on waiting lists. Within the 43 responding States, 66 percent of the local programs that responded confirmed that they had students on waiting lists. In some States, such as New York, programs have eliminated their waiting lists because the wait times could be as long as 1 or 2 years, and have resorted instead to a lottery system. A conservative estimate, resulting from the survey data, suggests that there are at least 90,000 adults who do not have access to services.

The Census Bureau reports a "status dropout rate," which represents the proportion of young people, ages 16 through 24, who are out of school and who have not earned a high school credential or equivalent. In October 2000, nearly 11 percent of students in that age group were not enrolled in high school and had not received a high school diploma or equivalent. In October 2006, status dropouts in the same age group showed a slight decline to 9.3 percent. For minority groups, the rates are higher: a 10.7 percent rate for blacks; 22.1 percent for Hispanics; and 36.2 percent for Hispanics born outside of the United States. Again, rates for these groups indicate some improvement in the last 6 years, but continue to raise serious concerns for the futures of these young adults.

Some students drop out of school for the very reason they need school: because they lack the skills to be successful and graduate on time. Some of these students go on to access adult education services. According to the summary of findings from the 2003 National Assessment of Adult Literacy (NAAL), certain subgroups of adult learners have shown little or no progress on measures associated with fundamental English language skills. The assessment, which examined prose, document, and quantitative literacy among adult learners, showed that when compared to the 1992 NAAL, black and Asian/Pacific Islander scores increased both in prose and document literacy. During the same period, however, Hispanic learners decreased in competency on both measures. In addition, the overall percentage of adults who scored "proficient" in prose and document literacy on the NAAL declined between 1992 and 2003. These data underscore both the need to continue to serve this population and to work to improve the effectiveness of the services provided.

The demand for skilled workers continues to grow, although some predict that the growth in the number of skilled workers will slow down in pace. Furthermore, the requirements to be a skilled worker in the 21<sup>st</sup> century are greater than those of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In a white paper

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants

commissioned by the National Association of Manufacturers, labor economist Anthony Carnevale asserts that retirements of the “baby boom” generation and stagnant workforce investments could leave 5.3 million skilled U.S. jobs without a skilled U.S. worker to fill them by 2010. The same trend is found in the “2005 Skills Gap Report: A Survey of the American Manufacturing Workplace,” produced by the National Association of Manufacturers and Deloitte Consulting, which looked at the relationship between the needs of manufacturers and workers’ skills. More than 80 percent of the firms responding to a survey conducted for this report indicated that they are experiencing a shortage of qualified workers overall; 13 percent reported severe shortages; 68 percent indicated moderate shortages; and 90 percent of respondents indicated a moderate to severe shortage of qualified skilled production employees, including such frontline workers as machinists, operators, craft workers, distributors, and technicians.

Adult education programs that serve immigrants tend to have the longest waiting lists. At the same time, immigration to the United States continues at a rapid pace. The most recent American Community Survey data from 2007 counted 38 million foreign-born persons residing in the United States, compared to 31 million in 2000 and just under 20 million in 1990. These data provide support for the requested increase for the English Literacy/Civics Education State grants.

Finally, the Department has significant evidence that Adult Education is an effective program, having made significant improvements in program management and participant data quality. The program has also demonstrated consistent improvements on measures of student performance and other program goals, such as job attainment and retention. The Department has increased the availability of research-based instructional materials for adult education teachers, and all States are now using standardized assessments to measure student-learning gains. In addition, the Department has dramatically improved the quality and breadth of data collected through the program’s National Reporting System.

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

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Adult basic and literacy State grants	\$477,652	\$476,465	\$543,338
Range of awards to States	\$833-61,939	\$750-66,054 <sup>1</sup>	\$744-78,494 <sup>1</sup>
Total participants (estimated)	2,554,760	2,548,413	2,840,735
English literacy and civics education			
State grants	\$66,710	\$67,896	\$75,000
Range of awards to States	\$60-15,959	\$60-15,748 <sup>1</sup>	\$60-17,404 <sup>1</sup>
Number of students served (estmated)	226,423	230,450	254,561
Incentive grants (maximum)	\$9,760	\$9,761	\$9,883
Range of awards	\$822-2,148	\$800-2,500	\$815-2,555

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants

---

<sup>1</sup> Grant estimates for 2009 and 2010 assume formulae under current law.

#### 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.

The Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA), enacted as Title II of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) of 1998, identifies three core indicators that must be used to assess State performance. These are: (1) demonstrated improvements in skill levels in reading, writing, and speaking English; numeracy and problem-solving; English language acquisition, and other literacy skills; (2) placement in, retention in, or completion of postsecondary education, training, unsubsidized employment, or career advancement; and (3) receipt of a secondary school diploma or a recognized equivalent. The statute requires that the Department report annually to the Congress on State performance; the Department's 2008 report provided 2005-06 State data on the performance of all adult education students on each of the indicators. The 2009 report will be available spring 2009.

In addition to the statutory indicators, the Department is collecting data for two other measures: (1) the percentage of adults with a goal to enter postsecondary education or training who enroll in a postsecondary education or training program; and (2) the percentage of adults with an employment goal who obtain a job by the end of the first quarter after their program exit quarter.

**Goal: To support adult education systems that result in increased adult learner achievement in order to prepare adults for family, work, citizenship, and future learning.**

**Objective:** *Provide adult learners with opportunities to acquire basic foundation skills (including English language acquisition), complete secondary education, and transition to further education and training and to work.*

Year	Target	Actual
2005	42	40
2006	39	39
2007	42	38
2008	44	39
2009	46	
2010	48	

**Assessment of progress:** States report data annually against the core indicators required under the statute. The most recent State-reported student outcomes are from the 2007-2008

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants

---

school year. GPRA targets for 2001-05 proved unrealistic, thus, they were revised from 2006 forward.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of adults enrolled in English literacy programs who acquire the level of English language skills needed to complete the levels of instruction in which they enrolled.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	45	37
2006	38	37
2007	40	39
2008	42	39
2009	44	
2010	46	

**Assessment of progress:** States report data annually against the core indicators required under the statute. The most recent State-reported student outcomes are for the 2006-07 school year. Performance has improved slightly over the last 4 years, but the program is not yet reaching the GPRA targets. Targets for 2006-10 were adjusted to reflect realistic, yet ambitious, goals for this measure.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of adults with a high school completion goal who earn a high school diploma or recognized equivalent.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	46	51
2006	46	49
2007	52	59
2008	53	62
2009	54	
2010	55	

**Assessment of progress:** States report data annually against the core indicators required under the statute. The most recent State-reported student outcomes are for the 2007-08 school year. For the past 4 years, the program has exceeded its GPRA targets. Targets for 2008-2010 are based on performance against these measures and reflect ambitious performance goals based on recent data.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of adults with a goal to enter postsecondary education or training who enroll in a postsecondary education or training program.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	30	34
2006	33	35
2007	37	55
2008	39	55
2009	41	
2010	43	

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of adults with an employment goal who obtain a job by the end of the first quarter after their program exit quarter.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	40	37
2006	40	48
2007	41	61
2008	41	61
2009	42	
2010	42	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of adults who retained employment in the third quarter after exit.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		64
2007	66	73
2008	66	69
2009	66	
2010	66	

**Assessment of progress:** States report annually on three of the common job training common measures. States have consistently exceeded the targets for two of these measures. The third measure was added in 2006, and States have exceeded the targets for this measure for the last 2 years. The Department will consider adjusting the targets based on past performance.

### Efficiency Measures

The Department has developed two efficiency measures for the Adult Education State Grants program. These are: (1) annual cost per participant, and (2) cost per student learning gain. The first measure was established under the Federal Government's common performance measures initiative for job training programs, and the Department has collected sufficient data to report this measure through the National Reporting System. The second measure captures the average Federal cost for a student to advance to at least the next higher educational level in an Adult Education program or to earn a high school diploma or General Educational Development (GED) credential.

<b>Measure:</b> The annual Federal cost per participant.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	\$217	\$227
2006	215	
2007	215	
2008	215	
2009	215	
2010	214	

**Assessment of progress:** This measure reflects the average annual Federal cost per participant for Adult Education programs. Data do not include State and local resources, which account for a large proportion of Adult Education funds. Because funds are available for 27 months, States would typically report FY 2006 costs by January 2009. Several States

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants

---

received reporting extensions, however, and so the FY 2006 data will be delayed until spring 2009.

<b>Measure:</b> The annual Federal cost per student learning gain or high school diploma/GED attainment.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2005</b>	\$475	\$502
<b>2006</b>	451	
<b>2007</b>	428	
<b>2008</b>	407	
<b>2009</b>	407	
<b>2010</b>	407	

**Assessment of progress:** This measure examines the annual Federal cost for Adult Education students who advance to at least the next higher educational level or who attain a high school diploma or GED certificate. As improved assessment and scientifically based curricula are implemented in more Adult Education programs, the cost per learning gain or high school/GED attainment may decrease. Because funds are available for 27 months, States would typically report FY 2006 costs by January 2009. Several States received reporting extensions, however, and so the FY 2006 data will be delayed until spring 2009.

### Program Improvement Efforts

The Department continues to undertake the following improvement efforts for this program:

- *Provide training to all States and Outlying Areas to improve the overall quality of program performance data collected and reported by State and local programs.* The Department continues to provide technical assistance to States in order to promote the use of performance data for program improvement activities and to promote strong State and local performance accountability systems.
- *Improve the availability of program performance data to enable comparisons across States.* The Department continues to take action to increase the availability of quality performance data. The program office annually verifies the accuracy of performance and financial data reported by the States, including the two cost efficiency measures, and makes these data available through an online database.
- *Investigate States' barriers to collecting participants' earnings data, either through Unemployment Insurance (UI) records or through other means allowed by State law.* The Department continues to work with the Office of Management and Budget and the Department of Labor to pursue the collection of participant earnings data through UI employment records in States that have legislative or policy limits on utilizing the individual social security numbers. Findings from this investigation may inform future policy decisions.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### Adult education: National leadership activities

(Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, section 243)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$6,878	\$13,346	+\$6,468

---

<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

Adult Education national leadership and evaluation activities, as authorized under the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA), address major policy priorities in adult education, including program improvement, accountability, professional development, and increasing access to learning opportunities for adults. Under this authority, the Department supports applied research, development, dissemination, evaluation, and program improvement activities to assist States in their efforts to improve the quality of adult education programs. Examples of these activities include: evaluations of the effectiveness of adult education programs, training institutes, national and international adult literacy surveys, and technical assistance on using technology to improve instruction.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$9,096
2006.....	9,005
2007.....	9,005
2008.....	6,878
2009.....	6,878

### FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2010, the Administration requests \$13.3 million for National Leadership Activities, \$6.5 million more than the 2009 level.

The 2010 request would support the continuation and initiation of activities intended to upgrade the skills and effectiveness of adult educators in teaching English language content and skills to

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: National leadership activities

---

adult learners, with particular emphasis on adults working to complete a General Educational Development (GED) credential and adults with learning disabilities. In addition, funds would be used to continue to support States in implementing the Adult Education State Grant program's uniform data collection and accountability system, including assistance on using data for program improvement. The Department recognizes the need for a strong, centralized effort to improve research, dissemination, and technical assistance for adult education and literacy programs. Therefore, the Department will consider using funds to support a center that would provide practitioners with the most current scientifically based research on adult education and literacy in order to help them improve the effectiveness of their programs.

In addition, 2010 funds would support activities to address the need to increase the literacy and workforce skills of our Nation's native-born adult population as well as the growing need to meet the English language acquisition, literacy, and workforce skills needs of the immigrant population. With the elimination of the National Institute for Literacy (NIFL), the Department would take over NIFL's ongoing and priority activities and consolidate them with Adult Education National Leadership Activities where appropriate. Some activities to address the needs mentioned above would include:

- Continued support for the Adult English Language Education Technical Assistance Network (AELETAN), which supports adult English language learners (ELLs) by providing research-based resources for adult ELL educators and targeted technical assistance to States in need of improving their professional development systems for teachers of adult ELLs.
- Continued support for the Student Achievement in Reading (STAR) network, which supports the development of research-based practices and materials intended to improve the teaching of adult reading. For FY 2010, the Department would extend the network to adult education classrooms in new local programs and into additional States (from the current 26) and maintain trainers assisting local program educators with the implementation of evidence-based reading strategies. FY 2010 funding would also include support for a Family Literacy Initiative.
- Continued work on a multi-year project to assist States in improving mathematics outcomes for low-skilled adults. Activities include the creation of publications and tools specific to improving adult numeracy, promoting teacher quality, and identifying evidence-based practices and products. FY 2010 funding would support field testing of a professional development model.
- Establishment of an Adult Workforce Transition Initiative that would include competitive grants to partnerships of local adult education providers and community colleges for the development or enhancement of promising workforce transition models that will enable adults to move into new careers in a changing economy. The partnerships would include the participation and support of business and industry to ensure that the career pathways address the industry-recognized skills required by each workforce sector.
- Continued support for the National Diffusion of Standards in Action project, designed to promote States' use of content standards through teacher training materials. FY 2010 funding would also support a project to help States analyze the extent to which their adult

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: National leadership activities

---

education content standards prepare adult students for the demands of postsecondary education and the 21<sup>st</sup> century workplace.

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

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
English Language TA Network	832	1,200	1,200
Adult Workforce Transition Grants	0	0	5,000
Additional Technical assistance	6,046	5,678	7,146

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

**Goal: To support research, evaluation, information dissemination, and other activities to help States improve adult education, and literacy programs.**

**Objective:** *To support adult education systems that result in increased adult learner achievement in order to prepare adults for family, work, citizenship, and future learning.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of States submitting high-quality learner assessment data under the National Reporting System (NRS).		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2005</b>	96	80
<b>2006</b>	100	80
<b>2007</b>	100	85
<b>2008</b>	100	90
<b>2009</b>	100	
<b>2010</b>	100	

**Assessment of progress:** The targets have not been met for this measure, although the percentage of States reporting high-quality data has increased significantly, from 65 percent in 2003, to 80 percent in 2005 and 2006, 85 percent in 2007, and 90 percent in 2008. The target for 2006 and beyond is that 100 percent of States will provide consistent, high-quality assessment data regarding adult learners. Through National Leadership Activities, the Department offers technical assistance and guidance designed to help all States meet high standards for the collection and reporting of these data.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### Adult education: National Institute for Literacy (Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, Section 242)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$6,468	0	-\$6,468

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2004. 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 National Institute for Literacy (NIFL) was created in 1991 to: (1) provide national leadership on issues related to literacy; (2) coordinate literacy services and policy; and (3) serve as a national resource for adult education and literacy programs through dissemination of the best and most current information and by supporting the creation of new ways to offer services of proven effectiveness. Through a variety of capacity-building activities, NIFL supports the development of State, regional, and national literacy services. NIFL's activities are intended to incorporate the input of adult learners in planning and implementation, build on and enhance existing efforts in the field, leverage resources from agency and private-sector partners, and promote collaborations among individuals and groups who have an interest in adult and family literacy. NIFL was reauthorized in the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA) in 1998.

Appropriations for NIFL have supported both program activities and administrative expenses, including operational costs as well as personnel compensation and benefit costs. The statute designates an interagency group, composed of the Secretaries of Education, Labor, and Health and Human Services, to administer and set policy for NIFL. The appropriations have also supported the work of NIFL's Advisory Board, which is appointed by the President. The Board is responsible for providing independent advice on NIFL's operations and works with the interagency group to help set NIFL's goals and plan its programs. Beginning in 2002, and through 2008, NIFL has received a \$5 million set-aside from the Reading First appropriation for the dissemination of information related to scientifically based reading research and effective programs. The Reading First program did not receive funding in FY 2009 and the Administration is not requesting funds for the program in FY 2010; therefore, NIFL did not receive the \$5 million set-aside in FY 2009 and also would not receive it in FY 2010.

Approximately \$3.5 million of NIFL's 2009 AEFLA appropriation will support grants for the Literacy Information and Communications Systems (LINCS), a system of 6 regional centers that carries out much of NIFL's technical assistance and dissemination activities. The Department

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: National Institute for Literacy

---

would continue to maintain this service for the adult literacy field and those who rely on LINCS as a communication and resource tool, mitigating any impact on its users.

NIFL's 2009 appropriations will support activities that were established with direction from the Interagency Group and guidance from its Advisory Board. Those activities include the dissemination of information and resources, translation of research into guidance and tools that can be used in practice, identification of high-performing programs, development of practices and policies that produce desirable outcomes, and support for research on literacy acquisition. Initiatives that have been supported with funds appropriated to NIFL include, among other things:

- Reading — NIFL has supported activities intended to develop practitioners' ability to teach language and language skills, such as fluency, vocabulary and comprehension, and other elements of reading to General Educational Development (GED)-level students. NIFL has been examining reading instruction at the highest level of adult education in order to develop guidance for practitioners working with those learners who are most likely to move to postsecondary education and training. The guidance documents supported with funds from FY 2009 and earlier are expected in 2010.
- Learning Disabilities/Bridges to Practice — The *Bridges to Practice* project is intended to help adult educators learn to recognize learning disabilities in adult students, screen for learning disabilities, and identify appropriate academic and job preparation activities for adults with learning disabilities. In FY 2009, NIFL plans to implement an updated, streamlined system of professional development using new materials based on the findings of a comprehensive literature review completed in 2008.
- Literacy Information and Communications System (LINCS) — *LINCS* includes (1) an online library of more than 10,000 catalogued literacy resources, 12 electronic discussion lists, and 12 special collections of materials on specific topics, and (2) training and technical assistance for States and local providers who are seeking to improve the use of technology in teaching and learning.

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

Funding levels for the past 5 years were as follows:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$6,638
2006.....	6,572
2007.....	6,583
2008.....	6,468
2009.....	6,468

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funds for the National Institute for Literacy. The Administration believes that NIFL's broad mission and the lack of clear management oversight have led to a diffuse and incoherent system of delivery as well as duplication of efforts with other Department of Education and Federal offices. The Administration believes it would be a more efficient use of resources for other Departmental offices to carry out the functions currently authorized for NIFL.

A recent review of Federal efforts in support of basic literacy and skills services showed that at least nine Federal agencies, each with its own priorities, goals, and approaches, currently have responsibilities in this area. NIFL has not always fulfilled its coordination function effectively and as a result, there have been few successful examples of joint projects that leveraged the resources of multiple offices or agencies. In addition, in a recent review of NIFL's work, the Department has found that several of the projects supported by NIFL duplicate the efforts of other Federal programs, non-profit organizations, and foundations.

The review also determined that resource planning by NIFL has mostly been short-term in nature and that NIFL has supported many smaller contracts and activities, requiring significant human resources to manage, rather than larger projects focused on the most important needs of a target audience. Nearly half of NIFL's \$6.5 million 2009 AEFLA appropriation will support expenses for personnel and overhead, largely the result of NIFL's status as an entity that operates somewhat independently from the Department. Moreover, approximately half of NIFL's 2008 \$5.0 million appropriation from Reading First has supported printing and dissemination costs, functions that require little expert or technical skills to administer.

Under the request, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE), the office that administers both the Adult Education State Grant program and the Adult Education National Leadership Activities, would take primary responsibility for the adult literacy agenda at the Department of Education, and would absorb the resources now appropriated to NIFL. All of those resources would fund program activities rather than Federal staffing. Given the overlap in purpose and authorized activities between OVAE's National Leadership Activities program and NIFL, the Administration believes that shifting resources to OVAE will lead to a more coordinated and focused agenda for the adult education community. In order to maintain a consistent level of service to the adult literacy field, the Department will continue the activities begun under NIFL that are of value to the field and consistent with the Administration's goals.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

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

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Disseminating high-quality information	\$2,760	\$2,539	0
Translating research into practice	596	348	0
Supporting rigorous research	<u>550</u>	<u>375</u>	<u>0</u>
Total program costs	3,906	3,262	0
Personnel, compensation, and benefits	\$1,782	\$1,763	0
Other (non-personnel costs)	<u>780</u>	<u>1,443</u>	<u>0</u>
Total administrative costs	2,562	3,206	0
Number of full-time equivalent personnel	16	14	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.

In 2008, the Department worked with NIFL staff to revise the Institute's performance measures in order to gauge more accurately NIFL's effectiveness in serving its target populations, provide a more comprehensive review of NIFL's work, and address NIFL's coordination role. The measures are partially adapted from a set of common measures developed as part of a cross-Department effort to achieve consistency in assessing the performance of ED technical assistance programs.

**Goal: To provide knowledge and resources to improve literacy instruction across the lifespan.**

**Objective:** *Recipients state that information based on scientific research (or the most rigorous research available) provided by NIFL prepares them to improve instruction.*

There are two measures under this objective. The first measure records the percentage of recipients who report that they are likely to implement instructional practices grounded in scientifically based research (or the most rigorous research available), following the receipt of technical assistance through NIFL programs. Baseline data, which were collected for this measure in 2008, showed that 289 individuals received training through LINCS in 2008. Of those individuals, 97 percent reported that they would be likely to implement instructional practices grounded in scientifically based research.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: National Institute for Literacy

---

The second measure relates to the first one and records the percentage of recipients of the technical assistance who can demonstrate that they implemented instructional practices grounded in scientifically based research within 6 months of receiving the technical assistance. In 2008, 34 recipients of the technical assistance provided through LINCS received the assistance at least 6 months prior to the close of the fiscal year and thus received a follow-up survey. Of those 34 recipients, 29 percent demonstrated that they had implemented instructional practices acquired from the training within 6 months of receiving the training.

NIFL intends to collect data from all recipients of its technical assistance. The *Bridges to Practice* training has undergone significant revisions and has not been fully operational since 2006.

**Objective:** *NIFL effectively disseminates high-quality information to improve instructional practice and/or service delivery.*

For this measure, NIFL tallies the number of its products that are determined to be of high quality by an independent peer review panel. NIFL intended for the panel to review 12 products in 2008, but fell short of that goal. Instead, NIFL created two products, which were reviewed by an expert review panel. The panel determined that both products were of high quality, although the methodology used by the Institute's contractor for translating the panel's review into a rating would not necessarily support such a judgment.

**Objective:** *NIFL effectively coordinates support for Federal literacy research efforts.*

This measure will assess the coordination function of NIFL and will be implemented through the administration of a survey. It is the percentage of Federal program managers and key agency policy staff who consider NIFL effective in coordinating support of reliable and replicable research on literacy and basic skills across Federal agencies. The Department will work with NIFL to establish baseline data for this measure in 2009.

### Efficiency Measure

In 2008, the Department worked with NIFL to revise its efficiency measure: the percentage of funding used for product development that supports high-quality products. This measure is a function of the dissemination measure. Since the peer review panel deemed NIFL's products to be of high quality, 100 percent of the funding used for product development in 2008 was determined to have supported high-quality products.

### Other Performance Information

The Department conducted a review of NIFL's functions in 2008, and found a need for NIFL to improve the accountability systems for its partners, employees, and contractors. Less than a quarter of contracts awarded in fiscal year 2007 were completed within the original performance period. Up until 2008, employees did not operate under official performance agreements. Few of NIFL's Federal partners have contributed funding to joint projects and, thus, holding its Federal partners accountable has been difficult for NIFL. The review also revealed a need for NIFL to focus its limited resources on fewer projects, but of high impact, instead of funding many smaller projects that have little identifiable impact. An independent review of NIFL's dissemination function, the Partnership for Reading, found that it was not of sufficient scope and

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: National Institute for Literacy

---

quality to yield reliable information. Independent reviews of the LINCS and *Bridges to Practice* projects indicated that while the training provided was addressing needs in the literacy field, the training had programmatic design flaws that needed to be addressed.

#### Program Improvement Efforts

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

- *Revise the interagency agreement to reestablish agency duties and procedures, improve coordination of resources, and ensure effective management oversight of NIFL.* In reviewing the functions, management, and goals of NIFL, the Department determined that it was appropriate to undertake a thorough review of the existing interagency agreement in order to engage all of the interagency stakeholders in planning NIFL's goals and projects.
- *Determine a schedule for periodic independent evaluations of major program activities.* NIFL will plan to evaluate major program activities in order to plan future projects more effectively.
- *Improve the alignment between grantee reporting requirements and NIFL's official program measures.* NIFL is in the process of making sure that its grantees report data and information that will inform program managers of the performance of the program as a whole.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### Smaller learning communities

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 4)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$88,000	\$88,000	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 Smaller Learning Communities program supports competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to enable those agencies to create smaller, more personalized learning environments in large schools. LEAs use the funds to, among other things: (1) study the feasibility of creating a smaller learning community or communities; (2) research, develop, and implement strategies for creating smaller learning communities; and (3) provide professional development for school staff in innovative teaching methods that would be used in the smaller learning community or communities.

In fiscal years 2000 through 2009, appropriations language has directed the Department to make awards only to support the creation of smaller learning communities in large high schools. For purposes of this program, the Department has defined a large high school as a school that includes grades 11 and 12 and serves at least 1,000 students in grades 9 and above. Strategies for creating smaller learning communities within large high schools include establishing "houses" or career academies, block scheduling, and teacher advisory systems. In fiscal years 2000 through 2009, appropriations language also authorized the Department to reserve a portion of program funds for evaluation, technical assistance, school networking, peer review of applications, and program outreach activities.

The Department has made two types of awards under this program: (1) implementation grants, which have provided both 3-year and 5-year awards to support the creation or expansion of smaller learning communities; and (2) planning grants, which have provided 1 year of funding to help LEAs plan smaller learning communities. Fiscal year 2003 was the fourth and last year that the Department made planning grants.

This is a forward-funded program. Up to 5 percent of the funds may be used for national activities and become available for obligation on October 1 of the fiscal year in which the funds are appropriated and remain available for 24 months. The remaining funds, to be used for grants, become available on July 1 of the fiscal year in which the funds are appropriated and remain available for 15 months, through September 30 of the following year.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Smaller learning communities

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$94,476
2006.....	93,531
2007.....	93,531
2008.....	80,108
2009.....	88,000

### FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$88 million for the Smaller Learning Communities (SLC) program in fiscal year 2010, the same as the fiscal year 2009 level. This request is consistent with the Administration's goal of supporting programs designed to increase on-time high school completion rates and improve the preparedness of high school graduates to complete college-level work successfully.

Every year, nearly one-third of all public high school students fail to graduate on time with their high school class. Of those students, many decide to leave high school before completing their degree. Students drop out of school for a variety of reasons. A 2006 report created for the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, "The Silent Epidemic: Perspectives of High School Dropouts," surveyed students who left school without a high school diploma. Nearly half of respondents said that they dropped out of high school because they were bored and disengaged. Nearly 70 percent of respondents said they were not motivated or inspired to work hard. Two-thirds of that group claimed that they would have worked harder if more had been demanded of them. The report suggests that there are supports that schools can provide to help students stay in high school, such as improving teaching and curricula to make school more relevant to students and to enhance the connection between school and work. The report also suggests a variety of strategies to ensure that students are known and do not go through their high school career anonymously. Parents and students need to be engaged and know that the adults in the school care that the students attend and succeed.

The creation of smaller learning communities in large high schools is one way for school districts to make large high schools more relevant and personal and to ensure that students are known as individuals. Smaller learning communities do not, by themselves, ensure students' success in and completion of high school. However, restructuring large, impersonal high schools into smaller learning communities or environments, where students are known, both personally and academically, is important in creating the conditions for teachers to provide relevant, personal instruction in order for students to succeed.

After changing the structure of large high schools, improving and enhancing what happens within the classrooms of the restructured high schools is the critical second step for improving the achievement of high school students. Most students will say that they aim to graduate from college, but of those students who graduate from high school and enter a 4-year institution, less than 60 percent earn a bachelor's degree and just one-fourth of students entering a community

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Smaller learning communities

---

college complete either an associate's or bachelor's degree within 6 years of entering college. Of the beginning college students who come from low-income families, only 40 percent complete a 2- or 4-year degree within 6 years, (*Toward Universal Higher Education: The Role for Public Policy*," Center for American Progress, 2008). *Ready or Not: Creating a High School Diploma That Counts*," produced by the American Diploma Project in 2008, reported that more than 70 percent of high school graduates enter 2- and 4- year colleges, but that 53 percent of those students must take at least one remedial English or math course during their college careers. High schools must ensure that college-going students are prepared for and able to successfully complete challenging, college-level curricula.

Recent grant competitions for Smaller Learning Communities funds have required grantees to implement research-based improvements in curriculum and instruction, and also to use program funds to link the grants to broader high school reforms through research, technical assistance, and program outreach. In the 2008 competition, the Department set an absolute priority requiring applicants to develop projects to prepare all students to succeed in postsecondary education and careers. Applicants had to demonstrate that they would use grant funds to: (1) provide intensive interventions to help students who enter high school with reading/language arts or mathematics skills that are significantly below grade level to "catch up" quickly and attain proficiency by the end of 10<sup>th</sup> grade; (2) enroll students in a coherent sequence of rigorous English language arts, mathematics, and science courses that equip them with the skills and content knowledge needed to succeed in postsecondary education and careers without need for remediation; (3) provide tutoring and other academic supports to help students succeed in rigorous academic courses; (4) deliver comprehensive guidance and academic advising to students and their parents, including assistance in selecting courses and planning a program of study that provides the academic preparation needed to succeed in postsecondary education; and, (5) increase opportunities for students to earn postsecondary credit through Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, or dual-credit programs. Additionally, the Department set a competitive preference priority and awarded four additional points to applicants that proposed to support the implementation of academic and structural interventions in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Research suggests that creating new small high schools may be more effective than reforming large high schools, although there is little research that specifically addresses the impact of smaller learning communities on student achievement. However, creating new small schools may not always be a financially feasible or even desirable option for every school district. There are many benefits of large high schools that are sacrificed in small high schools. Smaller learning communities within larger schools have the advantages of the economies of scale achieved in large high schools as well as the advantages found in smaller learning environments. The Department emphasizes, through the priorities from recent program competitions, that student outcomes do not improve simply by restructuring large high schools. Rather, what occurs within those restructured high schools, the quality of the teaching and learning, is what is critical to determining the students' success.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Smaller learning communities

---

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

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Number of new implementation grants	55 <sup>1,2</sup>	16 <sup>1,3</sup>	7 <sup>1,3</sup>
New implementation grants	\$26,330	\$32,674	\$13,406
Average implementation grant	\$2,118	\$2,000	\$2,000
Number of continuation awards	51 <sup>4</sup>	38 <sup>4</sup>	55 <sup>4</sup>
Continuation awards	\$49,349	\$51,415	\$70,203
Number of schools served	193	143	174
Peer review/national activities	\$4,005	\$3,911	\$4,391

---

<sup>1</sup>The Department provides 3 years of funding for each grant from a single year's appropriation. Projects successfully implemented may then receive additional funds in year 4.

<sup>2</sup>Grants awarded in FY 2008 were funded from both FY 2007 and FY 2008 funds and totaled \$116,467 thousand.

<sup>3</sup>The data provided for new grants in FY 2009 and FY 2010 are projections only. Since this is a forward-funded program, the FY 2009 appropriation will fund new awards in 2010 and the FY 2010 appropriation would fund new awards in 2011.

<sup>4</sup>FY 2008 funds would support 2-year continuation awards to grantees selected in FY 2006. FY 2009 funds support 2-year continuation awards to grantees selected in FY 2007. FY 2010 funds would support 2-year continuation awards to grantees selected in FY 2008.

#### 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.

The Department collects data for four outcome measures. Data for those measures are presented here. The Department and OMB decided to track data by each cohort of grantees in order to make more meaningful comparisons of the impact of the Department's priorities, guidance, and technical assistance from one cohort of grantees to another. As a result, each cohort (from 2004 on) reports 5 years of data for the 5 years of the grant. Each cohort of grantees will be measured against the same targets as any other cohort of grantees for each year of the grant. Targets for years 2 through 5 of each grant were reset in 2008, based on the actual performance of the prior cohorts. The data reported below represents the grantees first receiving funds in fiscal year 2004 and, as such, 2009 is their final year of reporting. Therefore, there are no 2010 targets for this cohort.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Smaller learning communities

---

**Goal:** To assist high schools in creating smaller learning communities that can prepare all students to achieve to challenging standards and succeed in college and careers.

**Objective:** Students in schools receiving smaller learning communities implementation grants will demonstrate continuous improvement in achievement in core subjects, as well as exhibit positive behavioral changes.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Communities grants scoring at or above proficient on State mathematics assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		53.9
2006	60	52.8
2007	62	51.6
2008	64	
2009	66	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Communities grants scoring at or above proficient on State reading assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		59.8
2006	60	59.2
2007	62	53.4
2008	64	
2009	66	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of graduates in schools receiving Smaller Learning Communities grants who enroll in postsecondary education, apprenticeships, or advanced training for the semester following graduation.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		82.2
2006	83	83.7
2007	84	81.5
2008	85	
2009	86	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Communities grants who graduate from high school.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		84.7
2006	87	84.7
2007	88	80.9
2008	89	
2009	90	

**Assessment of progress:** The data for performance measures are provided by grantees in their annual performance reports. The Department does not verify these data, although the Department is providing its grantees with assistance in improving the quality of the data provided in the reports. The Department collects data by cohorts of grantees, which may

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Smaller learning communities

---

explain significant increases or decreases in the actual data. Since these are 5-year grants, there will be 5 years of data for each cohort.

#### Efficiency Measures

<b>Measure:</b> The cost per student (in dollars) demonstrating proficiency or advanced skills in reading.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2005</b>		\$435
<b>2006</b>	\$425	442
<b>2007</b>	415	464
<b>2008</b>	405	
<b>2009</b>	395	

<b>Measure:</b> The cost per student (in dollars) demonstrating proficiency or advanced skills in mathematics.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2005</b>		\$483
<b>2006</b>	\$475	506
<b>2007</b>	465	518
<b>2008</b>	455	
<b>2009</b>	445	

**Assessment of progress:** The Department calculates the cost by dividing the amount of program funds granted in a given year by the number of students served by the SLC program who score proficient or above on State reading and mathematics assessments.

#### Other Performance Information

MDRC has conducted rigorous quasi-experimental evaluations of two reform models frequently used by Smaller Learning Communities grantees: the Talent Development model and First Things First. In this study, which was not limited to schools that received Federal Smaller Learning Communities support, MDRC studied schools that had combined smaller learning communities' reforms with strategies to improve curriculum and instruction. A 2001 Smaller Learning Communities grant supported the implementation of the Talent Development model in the five Philadelphia schools that were the subject of this study. For first-time ninth graders, the Talent Development model produced substantial gains in attendance, academic course credits earned, and promotion rates during the ninth-grade year. The students were 8 percentage points more likely to graduate on time. First Things First significantly increased rates of student attendance and graduation, reduced dropout rates, and improved student performance on State reading and math assessments when it was implemented by one urban school district. The implementation of the First Things First model in five Houston high schools included in this evaluation was supported by a 2000 Smaller Learning Communities grant.

Many districts implementing Smaller Learning Communities projects have focused on the ninth grade, particularly through an intervention called "freshman academies" that provides tailored, intensive programs of study designed to ease the transition to high school for ninth-grade students. In 2004, the Department funded the "Enhanced Reading Opportunities Study" to assess the impact of two supplemental reading interventions for struggling ninth-grade students.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Smaller learning communities

---

As part of the study, the reading interventions were implemented within participating freshman academies. The evaluation examined: whether the interventions in the freshman academies improve reading proficiency, the effects on students' attendance and coursetaking, students' achievement in subsequent grades, and the characteristics of students who benefit most from participation in the interventions. The first interim report on findings from this evaluation was released in 2008. Overall, it showed that the students in classes using the two intervention programs improved their reading performance 26 percent over where they would have been without the interventions. The second-year results will be released in 2009.

In addition, the Department carried out a descriptive evaluation of the Smaller Learning Communities program that examined FY 2001 grantees' implementation of smaller learning communities, school data on students' academic and behavioral outcomes, and differences in SLC approaches. Among other things, the study measured the extent to which schools funded in FY 2001 implemented all of the key features of the SLC program by the end of the grant period, rating them as high, moderate, or low implementers after assessing a set of defined features, such as common planning time for teachers. Most schools examined for the study adopted freshman or career academies as the primary approach for creating smaller learning communities. The study rated, as high or moderately implementing, 46 of 58 freshman academies and 34 of 44 career academies. The Department released this evaluation in 2008.

### Program Improvement Efforts

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

- *Provide technical assistance to grantees to assist them to prepare students to graduate high school ready for college.* The Department will sponsor thematically organized meetings for grantees, providing them with "college knowledge."
- *Develop a plan for phasing in the use of data collected from States (school-level data on student performance on standardized assessments and graduation rates) through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) submission system instead of collecting those data directly from grantees.* School-level data on student performance on standardized assessments and graduation rates are expected to be available through the EDEN submission system in the next several years.
- *Make performance data for active grants and for all school years available to the public.* The Department is working to publicize grantee performance data for all active grants by the end of 2009.
- *Produce and disseminate a guide for grantees on methods for improving the validity and reliability of the data they report on student enrollment in postsecondary education.* The program office is responding to the needs of grantees in order to improve the data collection methods and the quality of data.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### Grants to States for workplace and community transition training for incarcerated individuals

(Higher Education Amendments of 1998, Title VIII, Part D)

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$17,186	\$17,186	0

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Under this program, the Department makes grants to State correctional agencies to assist and encourage incarcerated individuals to acquire postsecondary education, counseling, and vocational training.

Program participants are provided opportunities to pursue postsecondary education certificates or associate or bachelor's degrees. Following their release from prison, they may also receive employment counseling and other related services for up to 2 years to help ensure their successful reintegration into society.

Individuals are eligible to participate if they have obtained a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, are 35 years of age or younger, are incarcerated in a State prison (which may be a pre-release facility), are eligible for parole or release within 7 years, and have not been convicted of a criminal offense against a victim who is a minor, a sexually violent offense, or murder. Services may be provided to participants for up to 7 years, of which up to 2 years may be devoted to study in a graduate education degree program or to coursework to prepare individuals to take college level courses. (The 2008 reauthorization extended the maximum age for participants from 25 to 35, and the maximum time an individual is eligible to participate prior to release from 5 to 7 years, although it also added some new restrictions on the types of offenses for which participating individuals can have been incarcerated.)

On an annual basis, grantees may receive up to \$3,000 per eligible student for tuition, books, and materials, and up to \$300 per student for related services such as career development, substance abuse counseling, parenting skills training, and health education.

The Department distributes funds to States under a formula based on the number of eligible students in each State. In order to receive a grant, a State correctional agency must demonstrate how it will integrate the proposed program with existing State correctional programs – such as adult education, vocational training, and graduate education degree programs – and State industry programs.

State correctional agencies receiving grants must provide annual evaluation reports to the Secretary. These reports must include measures of program completion, student academic and

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Grants to States for workplace and community transition training for incarcerated individuals

---

vocational skill attainment, success in job placement and retention, and recidivism, using data elements and definitions prescribed by the Secretary.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$21,824
2006.....	22,770
2007.....	22,770
2008.....	22,372
2009.....	17,186

### FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests funding of \$17.186 million, the same as the 2009 level, to help State correctional agencies assist and encourage eligible incarcerated individuals to acquire postsecondary education, counseling, and vocational training.

In 2008, nearly 200,000 individuals in State correctional facilities were eligible to participate in this program. This count may increase based on revisions to the eligibility rules in the reauthorized legislation. The Department will receive updated State counts of eligible individuals in the summer of 2009.

The Department has some evidence that the program is producing positive outcomes. Early data on the academic gains of participating students are promising. States report that an increasing percentage of participants are obtaining degrees and certificates, for example through occupational training programs.

Annual grantee reports also provide anecdotal evidence indicating that States are using program funds for innovative and effective activities. Some States have reported increased student academic and vocational skill attainment, success in job placement and retention, and reduced recidivism.

- Arizona's program won a 2008 "Innovations in American Government Award," from the Ash Institute of Democratic Governance and Innovation at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government. With 515 participants in 2008, the program has expanded to seven prisons and become an integral part of the State's Department of Corrections' Transition Program.
- Kansas's Youth Offenders program adopted a standardized curriculum from the National Center for Construction Education and Research that is now in use in secondary and postsecondary education across the State. Program completers in Kansas are entered into a national registry accessible by employers seeking to verify participants' skills training.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Grants to States for workplace and community transition training for incarcerated individuals

---

- The recidivism rate among completers of Louisiana’s program, 6.8 percent, is substantially lower than the recidivism rate of 22.4 percent among non-participants in the State. In 2008, the program had 581 participants in 11 correctional institutions.
- Iowa has documented employment for 102 of the 155 program participants who have been released, and has created a waiting list for individuals who want to participate in the program.

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

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Average State award	\$447	\$331	\$331
Range of awards	\$27–2,428	\$21-1,865	\$21-1,865
Number of awards	50	50	50

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

**Goal: Contribute to the reduction of recidivism by providing incarcerated individuals with educational services.**

**Objective:** *Improve the vocational and academic achievement of students served through State Grants for Incarcerated Individuals.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students in the facility participating in the program completing a postsecondary education certificate, associate of arts, or bachelor's degree during the program year.		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2005</b>	50.0	23.5
<b>2006</b>	23.5	38.5
<b>2007</b>	25.5	41.7
<b>2008</b>	26.5	
<b>2009</b>	27.5	
<b>2010</b>	28.5	

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Grants to States for workplace and community transition training for incarcerated individuals

---

**Assessment of progress:** In 2006, approximately 39 percent of students in the program's participating facilities completed a postsecondary education certificate, associate of arts, or bachelor's degree, exceeding the target of 25.5 percent. In 2007, nearly 42 percent of participants completed a postsecondary certificate, associate of arts, or bachelor's degree, exceeding the target of 26.5 percent. The higher than expected completion rates among program participants may be at least partially explained by grantees increasingly offering shorter-term occupational training programs. Program completion rates have not changed as much among individuals in BA and AA degree programs. Data on 2008 performance will be available in the summer of 2009. Data reported for 2004 and prior years are not comparable, as they include participants who completed individual courses only (in addition to those obtaining degrees and certificates).

**CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

**Career and Technical Education State Grants**

State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	19,311,200	0	19,217,606	19,217,606	0
Alaska	4,214,921	0	4,214,921	4,214,921	0
Arizona	24,786,970	0	25,047,298	25,047,298	0
Arkansas	12,068,187	0	11,989,737	11,989,737	0
California	128,508,264	0	128,360,005	128,360,005	0
Colorado	15,568,781	0	15,782,973	15,782,973	0
Connecticut	10,056,520	0	10,020,303	10,020,303	0
Delaware	4,845,374	0	4,803,968	4,803,968	0
District of Columbia	4,214,921	0	4,214,921	4,214,921	0
Florida	60,806,360	0	60,428,537	60,428,537	0
Georgia	38,505,354	0	38,592,850	38,592,850	0
Hawaii	5,709,942	0	5,709,941	5,709,941	0
Idaho	6,568,703	0	6,499,494	6,499,494	0
Illinois	44,936,238	0	44,837,143	44,837,143	0
Indiana	25,572,913	0	25,818,445	25,818,445	0
Iowa	12,134,049	0	12,103,307	12,103,307	0
Kansas	11,035,131	0	10,961,229	10,961,229	0
Kentucky	17,905,647	0	17,905,647	17,905,647	0
Louisiana	21,041,943	0	21,041,943	21,041,943	0
Maine	5,709,942	0	5,709,941	5,709,941	0
Maryland	16,521,018	0	16,440,022	16,440,022	0
Massachusetts	18,583,628	0	18,687,903	18,687,903	0
Michigan	39,826,146	0	40,835,345	40,835,345	0
Minnesota	17,783,491	0	17,697,927	17,697,927	0
Mississippi	13,363,550	0	13,363,550	13,363,550	0
Missouri	23,261,201	0	23,405,180	23,405,180	0
Montana	5,468,522	0	5,363,650	5,363,650	0
Nebraska	7,042,650	0	7,053,557	7,053,557	0
Nevada	7,878,704	0	8,031,665	8,031,665	0
New Hampshire	5,709,942	0	5,709,941	5,709,941	0
New Jersey	24,257,812	0	24,078,336	24,078,336	0
New Mexico	8,933,828	0	8,858,892	8,858,892	0
New York	58,287,518	0	57,403,836	57,403,836	0
North Carolina	35,070,414	0	35,752,471	35,752,471	0
North Dakota	4,214,921	0	4,214,921	4,214,921	0
Ohio	44,972,909	0	45,028,414	45,028,414	0
Oklahoma	15,094,180	0	15,094,180	15,094,180	0
Oregon	14,051,953	0	14,063,250	14,063,250	0
Pennsylvania	45,000,763	0	44,795,856	44,795,856	0
Rhode Island	5,709,942	0	5,709,941	5,709,941	0
South Carolina	18,890,827	0	19,078,798	19,078,798	0
South Dakota	4,353,301	0	4,294,134	4,294,134	0
Tennessee	23,392,150	0	23,882,364	23,882,364	0
Texas	93,446,248	0	92,532,081	92,532,081	0
Utah	12,585,693	0	12,925,301	12,925,301	0
Vermont	4,214,921	0	4,214,921	4,214,921	0
Virginia	25,221,860	0	25,292,041	25,292,041	0
Washington	21,965,335	0	21,617,410	21,617,410	0
West Virginia	8,428,617	0	8,428,617	8,428,617	0
Wisconsin	21,668,585	0	21,594,496	21,594,496	0
Wyoming	4,214,921	0	4,214,921	4,214,921	0
American Samoa	347,510	0	347,509	347,509	0
Guam	655,303	0	655,304	655,304	0
Northern Mariana Islands	347,510	0	347,509	347,509	0
Puerto Rico	18,458,484	0	18,458,484	18,458,484	0
Virgin Islands	613,021	0	605,536	605,536	0
Freely Associated States	158,862	0	158,862	158,862	0
Indian set-aside	14,511,391	0	14,511,388	14,511,388	0
Undistributed (non-State allocations)	2,902,278	0	2,902,278	2,902,278	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,160,911,269</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,160,911,000</b>	<b>1,160,911,000</b>	<b>0</b>

**CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

**Tech Prep Education State Grants**

State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	1,994,292	0	1,994,293	1,994,293	0
Alaska	250,163	0	250,163	250,163	0
Arizona	1,880,272	0	1,880,272	1,880,272	0
Arkansas	1,186,046	0	1,186,047	1,186,047	0
California	11,251,821	0	11,251,825	11,251,825	0
Colorado	1,393,615	0	1,393,615	1,393,615	0
Connecticut	868,931	0	868,931	868,931	0
Delaware	229,550	0	229,550	229,550	0
District of Columbia	134,677	0	134,677	134,677	0
Florida	4,815,872	0	4,815,873	4,815,873	0
Georgia	3,074,413	0	3,074,414	3,074,414	0
Hawaii	411,510	0	411,510	411,510	0
Idaho	623,977	0	623,977	623,977	0
Illinois	4,049,329	0	4,049,330	4,049,330	0
Indiana	2,463,650	0	2,463,651	2,463,651	0
Iowa	1,244,304	0	1,244,304	1,244,304	0
Kansas	1,065,568	0	1,065,569	1,065,569	0
Kentucky	1,862,268	0	1,862,269	1,862,269	0
Louisiana	2,188,456	0	2,188,457	2,188,457	0
Maine	525,512	0	525,512	525,512	0
Maryland	1,540,547	0	1,540,547	1,540,547	0
Massachusetts	1,648,212	0	1,648,213	1,648,213	0
Michigan	3,641,766	0	3,641,767	3,641,767	0
Minnesota	1,735,277	0	1,735,278	1,735,278	0
Mississippi	1,389,869	0	1,389,869	1,389,869	0
Missouri	2,177,835	0	2,177,836	2,177,836	0
Montana	428,023	0	428,023	428,023	0
Nebraska	708,987	0	708,988	708,988	0
Nevada	527,487	0	527,487	527,487	0
New Hampshire	376,158	0	376,159	376,159	0
New Jersey	2,187,234	0	2,187,235	2,187,235	0
New Mexico	833,848	0	833,848	833,848	0
New York	5,242,846	0	5,242,848	5,242,848	0
North Carolina	2,993,351	0	2,993,352	2,993,352	0
North Dakota	313,151	0	313,151	313,151	0
Ohio	4,446,192	0	4,446,194	4,446,194	0
Oklahoma	1,569,862	0	1,569,862	1,569,862	0
Oregon	1,290,703	0	1,290,703	1,290,703	0
Pennsylvania	4,235,352	0	4,235,353	4,235,353	0
Rhode Island	338,543	0	338,543	338,543	0
South Carolina	1,730,084	0	1,730,085	1,730,085	0
South Dakota	352,942	0	352,942	352,942	0
Tennessee	2,231,641	0	2,231,641	2,231,641	0
Texas	8,391,455	0	8,391,458	8,391,458	0
Utah	1,195,556	0	1,195,557	1,195,557	0
Vermont	237,187	0	237,188	237,188	0
Virginia	2,417,794	0	2,417,795	2,417,795	0
Washington	2,036,850	0	2,036,850	2,036,850	0
West Virginia	876,614	0	876,614	876,614	0
Wisconsin	2,105,226	0	2,105,227	2,105,227	0
Wyoming	233,729	0	233,729	233,729	0
American Samoa	0	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0	0
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	1,919,765	0	1,919,766	1,919,766	0
Virgin Islands	54,653	0	54,653	54,653	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0	0
Undistributed (non-State allocations)	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>102,922,965</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>102,923,000</b>	<b>102,923,000</b>	<b>0</b>

**CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

**Adult Basic and Literacy Education State Grants**

State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	8,889,627	0	8,980,137	11,762,064	2,781,927
Alaska	955,033	0	887,056	891,613	4,557
Arizona	8,457,731	0	9,986,282	10,972,652	986,370
Arkansas	5,363,882	0	5,293,194	6,832,184	1,538,990
California	61,939,252	0	66,053,930	78,494,090	12,440,160
Colorado	5,539,024	0	5,718,803	5,747,825	29,022
Connecticut	4,860,848	0	4,374,764	4,259,381	(115,383)
Delaware	1,388,104	0	1,437,530	1,444,875	7,345
District of Columbia	1,253,989	0	1,137,242	1,231,519	94,277
Florida	27,094,693	0	28,163,001	37,383,808	9,220,807
Georgia	14,551,989	0	15,847,729	18,921,940	3,074,211
Hawaii	1,797,001	0	1,617,301	1,603,202	(14,099)
Idaho	1,997,609	0	1,989,371	1,999,510	10,139
Illinois	19,271,089	0	17,749,209	17,839,142	89,933
Indiana	9,376,069	0	9,110,273	9,156,466	46,193
Iowa	3,894,299	0	3,504,870	3,290,846	(214,024)
Kansas	3,647,359	0	3,282,624	3,180,717	(101,907)
Kentucky	8,340,777	0	8,430,118	11,630,074	3,199,956
Louisiana	8,982,860	0	8,538,521	9,756,890	1,218,369
Maine	1,918,122	0	1,726,310	1,715,424	(10,886)
Maryland	7,408,152	0	7,253,951	7,290,745	36,794
Massachusetts	8,425,316	0	7,684,895	7,723,871	38,976
Michigan	14,349,799	0	12,914,820	12,698,583	(216,237)
Minnesota	5,887,863	0	5,299,077	4,813,035	(486,042)
Mississippi	6,132,544	0	6,107,194	7,561,492	1,454,298
Missouri	8,930,745	0	8,626,428	8,670,171	43,743
Montana	1,349,029	0	1,214,127	1,203,232	(10,895)
Nebraska	2,356,262	0	2,120,636	1,979,368	(141,268)
Nevada	3,506,566	0	4,265,382	5,733,683	1,468,301
New Hampshire	1,691,208	0	1,539,687	1,547,549	7,862
New Jersey	12,721,187	0	11,452,913	11,672,234	219,321
New Mexico	3,384,569	0	3,571,628	3,589,778	18,150
New York	32,127,108	0	29,741,809	32,425,231	2,683,422
North Carolina	14,300,395	0	15,129,770	19,926,858	4,797,088
North Dakota	1,134,296	0	1,020,867	935,430	(85,437)
Ohio	16,682,578	0	15,014,321	14,999,785	(14,536)
Oklahoma	5,843,854	0	5,550,278	5,578,446	28,168
Oregon	4,865,954	0	4,763,216	4,787,399	24,183
Pennsylvania	18,682,377	0	16,814,140	16,524,851	(289,289)
Rhode Island	2,048,694	0	1,985,858	1,995,979	10,121
South Carolina	7,696,715	0	7,870,469	9,923,348	2,052,879
South Dakota	1,285,301	0	1,156,771	1,142,543	(14,228)
Tennessee	10,953,570	0	11,187,891	15,089,122	3,901,231
Texas	40,077,444	0	44,501,162	53,083,407	8,582,245
Utah	2,873,718	0	2,586,347	2,499,342	(87,005)
Vermont	990,747	0	891,673	868,921	(22,752)
Virginia	10,958,612	0	10,686,673	10,740,848	54,175
Washington	7,421,544	0	7,173,006	7,209,390	36,384
West Virginia	3,777,905	0	3,596,484	4,798,618	1,202,134
Wisconsin	7,344,713	0	6,610,242	6,313,316	(296,926)
Wyoming	833,326	0	749,994	743,619	(6,375)
American Samoa	214,478	0	229,267	263,513	34,246
Guam	366,306	0	394,267	434,528	40,261
Northern Mariana Islands	274,609	0	328,223	473,255	145,032
Puerto Rico	10,735,837	0	12,037,548	19,169,905	7,132,357
Virgin Islands	399,371	0	466,271	712,383	246,112
Freely Associated States	34,869	0	31,382	28,244	(3,138)
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0	0
Undistributed (non-State allocations)	9,825,582	0	9,829,068	9,954,756	125,688
<b>Total</b>	<b>487,412,500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>486,226,000</b>	<b>553,221,000</b>	<b>66,995,000</b>

NOTE: Due to an administrative error in fiscal years 2003 through 2008, 23 States did not receive their full allocations. The FY 2010 estimates reflect a one-time request for additional funds to correct the underpayments. No corrective action would be taken with respect to overpayments.

**CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

**English Literacy and Civics Education State Grants**

State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	187,432	0	201,871	223,100	21,229
Alaska	92,105	0	96,271	106,395	10,124
Arizona	1,087,454	0	1,104,871	1,221,062	116,191
Arkansas	149,557	0	157,146	173,672	16,526
California	15,958,686	0	15,747,494	17,403,528	1,656,034
Colorado	728,891	0	736,763	814,243	77,480
Connecticut	869,081	0	880,534	973,133	92,599
Delaware	129,424	0	135,151	149,364	14,213
District of Columbia	187,382	0	184,304	203,685	19,381
Florida	6,752,735	0	7,238,996	8,000,261	761,265
Georgia	1,411,296	0	1,540,420	1,702,414	161,994
Hawaii	427,075	0	430,251	475,497	45,246
Idaho	149,295	0	148,858	164,512	15,654
Illinois	3,079,546	0	3,032,701	3,351,625	318,924
Indiana	410,405	0	421,831	466,192	44,361
Iowa	259,884	0	252,194	278,716	26,522
Kansas	276,606	0	280,004	309,450	29,446
Kentucky	269,756	0	281,964	311,616	29,652
Louisiana	206,118	0	207,417	229,229	21,812
Maine	89,847	0	93,246	103,052	9,806
Maryland	1,489,411	0	1,525,233	1,685,630	160,397
Massachusetts	1,875,032	0	1,935,947	2,139,535	203,588
Michigan	1,295,444	0	1,300,460	1,437,219	136,759
Minnesota	836,841	0	866,787	957,940	91,153
Mississippi	86,717	0	90,041	99,510	9,469
Missouri	458,000	0	459,989	508,362	48,373
Montana	60,000	0	60,000	60,000	0
Nebraska	198,521	0	200,730	221,839	21,109
Nevada	648,751	0	693,712	766,664	72,952
New Hampshire	160,685	0	164,317	181,597	17,280
New Jersey	3,498,331	0	3,567,920	3,943,129	375,209
New Mexico	227,476	0	227,813	251,770	23,957
New York	8,466,763	0	8,675,479	9,587,806	912,327
North Carolina	851,924	0	919,040	1,015,687	96,647
North Dakota	60,000	0	60,000	60,000	0
Ohio	869,987	0	902,864	997,811	94,947
Oklahoma	258,141	0	265,568	293,496	27,928
Oregon	587,910	0	578,559	639,401	60,842
Pennsylvania	1,405,849	0	1,458,310	1,611,669	153,359
Rhode Island	228,398	0	227,267	251,167	23,900
South Carolina	230,606	0	253,968	280,676	26,708
South Dakota	60,000	0	60,000	60,000	0
Tennessee	434,267	0	472,914	522,647	49,733
Texas	5,369,325	0	5,302,129	5,859,709	557,580
Utah	305,438	0	319,055	352,607	33,552
Vermont	60,000	0	60,000	61,793	1,793
Virginia	1,706,753	0	1,791,125	1,979,483	188,358
Washington	1,458,887	0	1,483,182	1,639,156	155,974
West Virginia	60,000	0	60,000	60,000	0
Wisconsin	419,824	0	447,914	495,018	47,104
Wyoming	60,000	0	60,000	60,000	0
American Samoa	0	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0	0
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	258,001	0	233,390	257,933	24,543
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0	0
Undistributed (non-State allocations)	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>66,709,857</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>67,896,000</b>	<b>75,000,000</b>	<b>7,104,000</b>

**CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

**State Grants for Training of Incarcerated Individuals**

State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	403,869	0	310,247	310,247	0
Alaska	72,276	0	55,521	55,521	0
Arizona	754,684	0	579,737	579,737	0
Arkansas	261,565	0	200,931	200,931	0
California	2,428,162	0	1,865,279	1,865,279	0
Colorado	416,009	0	319,572	319,572	0
Connecticut	405,555	0	311,542	311,542	0
Delaware	157,479	0	120,973	120,973	0
District of Columbia	88,238	0	67,783	67,783	0
Florida	1,533,535	0	1,178,039	1,178,039	0
Georgia	755,696	0	580,514	580,514	0
Hawaii	78,571	0	60,357	60,357	0
Idaho	139,494	0	107,157	107,157	0
Illinois	716,242	0	550,206	550,206	0
Indiana	418,932	0	321,817	321,817	0
Iowa	196,708	0	151,108	151,108	0
Kansas	152,533	0	117,174	117,174	0
Kentucky	210,983	0	162,074	162,074	0
Louisiana	772,331	0	593,294	593,294	0
Maine	27,202	0	20,896	20,896	0
Maryland	449,056	0	344,958	344,958	0
Massachusetts	128,478	0	98,695	98,695	0
Michigan	813,809	0	625,156	625,156	0
Minnesota	189,964	0	145,927	145,927	0
Mississippi	368,912	0	283,392	283,392	0
Missouri	472,886	0	363,264	363,264	0
Montana	65,981	0	50,686	50,686	0
Nebraska	97,230	0	74,691	74,691	0
Nevada	228,181	0	175,285	175,285	0
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	560,674	0	430,701	430,701	0
New Mexico	98,916	0	75,986	75,986	0
New York	1,175,077	0	902,677	902,677	0
North Carolina	707,924	0	543,817	543,817	0
North Dakota	41,252	0	31,690	31,690	0
Ohio	988,485	0	759,340	759,340	0
Oklahoma	370,710	0	284,774	284,774	0
Oregon	27,876	0	21,414	21,414	0
Pennsylvania	841,460	0	646,397	646,397	0
Rhode Island	67,330	0	51,722	51,722	0
South Carolina	474,235	0	364,300	364,300	0
South Dakota	79,807	0	61,307	61,307	0
Tennessee	278,876	0	214,228	214,228	0
Texas	2,292,940	0	1,761,402	1,761,402	0
Utah	71,939	0	55,262	55,262	0
Vermont	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	477,382	0	366,718	366,718	0
Washington	295,736	0	227,180	227,180	0
West Virginia	113,304	0	87,038	87,038	0
Wisconsin	422,191	0	324,321	324,321	0
Wyoming	40,241	0	30,912	30,912	0
American Samoa	0	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0	0
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	141,292	0	108,539	108,539	0
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0	0
Undistributed (non-State allocations)	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>22,372,208</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17,186,000</b>	<b>17,186,000</b>	<b>0</b>