

**Department of Education**  
**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**  
**Fiscal Year 2011 Budget Request**

**CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language .....	D-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	D-3
Amounts Available for Obligation.....	D-6
Obligations by Object Classification .....	D-9
Summary of Changes.....	D-10
Authorizing Legislation .....	D-12
Appropriations History .....	D-16
Significant Items in FY 2010 Appropriations Reports.....	D-17
Summary of Request.....	D-21
Activities:	
Effective teaching and learning for a complete education .....	D-23
Effective teaching and learning: literacy:	
Striving readers.....	D-30
Even start .....	D-36
Literacy through schools libraries .....	D-44
National Writing Project.....	D-49
Reading is fundamental/Inexpensive book distribution .....	D-53
Ready-to-learn television .....	D-56
Effective teaching and learning: science, technology, engineering, and mathematics:	
Mathematics and science partnerships .....	D-62
Effective teaching and learning for a well-rounded education:	
Excellence in economic education .....	D-67
Teaching American history.....	D-70
Arts in education .....	D-74
Foreign language assistance .....	D-82
Academies for American history and civics .....	D-87
Close Up fellowships.....	D-90
Civic education .....	D-93
Educational technology State grants .....	D-99
College pathways and accelerated learning .....	D-107
High school graduation initiative .....	D-110
Advanced placement .....	D-115
Javits gifted and talented education .....	D-120
Assessing Achievement .....	D-125
Training and advisory services .....	D-130
Rural education .....	D-135
Supplemental education grants .....	D-144
Comprehensive centers.....	D-147
Native Hawaiian student education.....	D-153
Alaska Native student education.....	D-157
Women's educational equity.....	D-161
State Tables .....	D-165

## [SCHOOL] EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS <sup>1</sup>

For carrying out school improvement activities authorized by [parts A, B, and D of title II, part B of title IV, subparts 6 and 9 of part D of title V, parts A and B of title VI, and parts B and C of title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 ("ESEA"); the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act;] section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002; the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003; [part Z of title VIII of the Higher Education Act ("HEA");] <sup>2</sup> and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, [\$5,228,444,000, of which \$3,363,993,000 shall become available on July 1, 2010, and remain available through September 30, 2011, and of which \$1,681,441,000 shall become available on October 1, 2010, and shall remain available through September 30, 2011, for academic year 2010-2011: <sup>3</sup>

*Provided*, That funds made available to carry out part B of title VII of the ESEA may be used for construction, renovation, and modernization of any elementary school, secondary school, or structure related to an elementary school or secondary school, run by the Department of Education of the State of Hawaii, that serves a predominantly Native Hawaiian student body: <sup>4</sup>

*Provided further*, That from the funds referred to in the preceding proviso, not less than \$1,500,000 shall be for the activities described in such proviso and \$1,500,000 shall be for a grant to the University of Hawaii School of Law for a Center of Excellence in Native Hawaiian law: <sup>5</sup>

*Provided further*, That from the funds referred to in the second preceding proviso, \$500,000 shall be for part Z of title VIII of the HEA: <sup>6</sup>

*Provided further*, That funds made available to carry out part C of title VII of the ESEA may be used for construction: <sup>7</sup>

*Provided further*, That up to 100 percent of the funds available to a State educational agency under part D of title II of the ESEA may be used for subgrants described in section 2412(a)(2)(B) of such Act: <sup>8</sup>

*Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading for section 2421 of the ESEA may be used for activities authorized under section 802 of the Higher Education Opportunity Act: <sup>9</sup>

*Provided further*, That] \$80,989,000, of which \$56,313,000 shall be available to carry out

section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002<sup>10</sup> [*Provided further*, That \$34,391,000 shall be available to carry out part D of title V of the ESEA: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated under this heading may be used to carry out section 5494 under the ESEA:<sup>11</sup> *Provided further*, That], and of which \$17,687,000 shall be available to carry out the Supplemental Education Grants program for the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands:<sup>12</sup> *Provided [further]*, That up to 5 percent of these amounts may be reserved by the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands to administer the Supplemental Education Grants programs and to obtain technical assistance, oversight and consultancy services in the administration of these grants and to reimburse the United States Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for such services<sup>13</sup> . [*Provided further*, That \$9,729,000 of the funds available for the Foreign Language Assistance Program shall be available for 5-year grants to local educational agencies that would work in partnership with one or more institutions of higher education to establish or expand articulated programs of study in languages critical to United States national security that will enable successful students to advance from elementary school through college to achieve a superior level of proficiency in those languages:<sup>14</sup> *Provided further*, That of the funds available for section 2103(a) of the ESEA, \$5,000,000 shall be available to continue a national school leadership partnership initiative as described in the statement of the managers on the conference report accompanying this Act<sup>15</sup>]. (*Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2010.*)

#### NOTES

Language in this account for programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is deleted. The Administration is proposing reauthorizing legislation for that Act. When new authorizing language is enacted, resources will be requested.

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<sup>1</sup> [SCHOOL] <u>EDUCATION</u>	This language reflects the change in the name of the account.
<sup>2</sup> ...part Z of title VIII of the Higher Education Act ("HEA")	This language, which allows funding for the Henry K. Guigni Kupuna Memorial Archives program, is deleted because no funding is requested for the program in fiscal year 2011.
<sup>3</sup> [...of which \$3,363,993,000 shall become available on July 1, 2010, and remain available through September 30, 2011, and of which \$1,681,441,000 shall become available on October 1, 2010, and shall remain available through September 30, 2011, for academic year 2010-2011...]	This language provides for a portion of funds to be appropriated on a forward-funded basis for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, Mathematics and Science Partnerships, Educational Technology State Grants, 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers, State Assessments, Education for Homeless Children and Youths, and Rural Education. This language also provides that a portion of funds for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants is available on an advance-funded basis.
<sup>4</sup> [ <i>Provided</i> , That funds made available to carry out part B of title VII of the ESEA may be used for construction, renovation, and modernization of any elementary school, secondary school, or structure related to an elementary school or secondary school, run by the Department of Education of the State of Hawaii, that serves a predominantly Native Hawaiian student body:]	This language authorizes the use of funds appropriated for the Education for Native Hawaiians program for school construction, renovation, and modernization.
<sup>5</sup> [ <i>Provided further</i> , That from the funds referred to in the preceding proviso, not less than \$1,500,000 shall be for the activities described in such proviso and \$1,500,000 shall be for a grant to the University of Hawaii School of Law for a Center of Excellence in Native Hawaiian law:]	This language earmarks funds appropriated for the Education for Native Hawaiians program for specified grants. This language is deleted because the Administration does not believe that funds for competitive grant programs should be earmarked for specific entities.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<sup>6</sup> [ <i>Provided further</i> , That from the funds referred to in the second preceding proviso, \$500,000 shall be for part Z of title VIII of the HEA:]	This language earmarks funds for the Henry K. Guigni Kupuna Memorial Archives program. This language is deleted because no funding is requested for the Archives in fiscal year 2011.
<sup>7</sup> [ <i>Provided further</i> , That funds made available to carry out part C of title VII of the ESEA may be used for construction:]	This language authorizes the use of funds appropriated for the Alaska Native Education Equity program for construction.
<sup>8</sup> [ <i>Provided further</i> , That up to 100 percent of the funds available to a State educational agency under part D of title II of the ESEA may be used for subgrants described in section 2412(a)(2)(B) of such Act:]	This language allows States to award up to 100 percent of subgrant funds competitively to local educational agencies under the Educational Technology State Grants program.
<sup>9</sup> [ <i>Provided further</i> , That funds made available under this heading for section 2421 of the ESEA may be used for activities authorized under section 802 of the Higher Education Opportunity Act:]	This language authorizes the use of funds appropriated for the Educational Technology State Grants program's national activities to be used for activities carried out through the National Center for Research in Advanced and Digital Technologies.
<sup>10</sup> ... <u>of which</u> , \$56,313,000 shall be available to carry out section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002:	This language specifies the funding level for the Comprehensive Centers program.
<sup>11</sup> [ <i>Provided further</i> , That \$34,391,000 shall be available to carry out part D of title V of the ESEA: <i>Provided further</i> , That no funds appropriated under this heading may be used to carry out section 5494 under the ESEA:]	This language specifies the funding level for the Foreign Language Assistance program. This language also prohibits funds appropriated for the Foreign Language Assistance program from being used for Elementary School Foreign Language Incentive Grants.
<sup>12</sup> ... <u>and of which</u> , \$17,687,000 shall be available to carry out the Supplemental Education Grants program for the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands:	This language specifies the funding level for Supplemental Education Grants to the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>13</sup> <i>Provided [further]</i>, That up to 5 percent of these amounts may be reserved by the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands to administer the Supplemental Education Grants programs and to obtain technical assistance, oversight and consultancy services in the administration of these grants and to reimburse the United States Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for such services.</p>	<p>This language allows the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands to reserve up to 5 percent of their Supplemental Education Grants funds for administration and for technical assistance, oversight, and consultancy services for these grants and to reimburse the United States Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for these services.</p>
<p><sup>14</sup> [<i>Provided further</i>, That \$9,729,000 of the funds available for the Foreign Language Assistance Program shall be available for 5-year grants to local educational agencies that would work in partnership with one or more institutions of higher education to establish or expand articulated programs of study in languages critical to United States national security that will enable successful students to advance from elementary school through college to achieve a superior level of proficiency in those languages:]</p>	<p>This language provides funding under the Foreign Language Assistance program for 5-year grants to local educational agencies in partnership with institutions of higher education (IHEs) to enable students to study languages critical to United States national and economic security in an articulated program of study that helps students become proficient in those languages.</p>
<p><sup>15</sup> [<i>Provided further</i>, That of the funds available for section 2103(a) of the ESEA, \$5,000,000 shall be available to continue a national school leadership partnership initiative as described in the statement of the managers on the conference report accompanying this Act.]</p>	<p>This language earmarks funds for a school leadership partnership initiative under the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program.</p>

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

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

	2009	2010	2011
Discretionary authority:			
Annual appropriation.....	\$5,362,016	\$5,228,444	\$1,890,779
Recovery Act supplemental (PL 111-5)	<u>720,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, adjusted appropriation.....	6,082,016	5,228,444	1,890,779
Comparative transfer to Career, Technical, and Adult Education for Adult Education State Grants (P.L. 111-32)			
	-54	0	0
Comparative transfer to <u>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity</u> for Homeless children and youth education			
	-65,427	-65,427	0
Comparative transfer to <u>Innovation and Instructional Teams</u> for Improving teacher quality State grants			
	-2,947,749	-2,947,749	0
Comparative transfer to <u>Supporting Student Success</u> for 21 <sup>st</sup> Century community learning centers			
	-1,131,166	-1,166,166	0
Comparative transfer to <u>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity</u> for Education for homeless children and youth- Recovery Act			
	-70,000	0	0
Comparative transfer from <u>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity</u> for:			
Early reading first	112,549	0	0
Striving readers	35,371	250,000	0
Even start	66,454	66,454	0
Literacy through school libraries	19,145	19,145	0
High school graduation initiative	0	50,000	0
Comparative transfer from <u>Innovation and Instructional Teams</u> for:			
National writing project	24,291	25,646	0
Reading is fundamental/Inexpensive book distribution	24,803	24,803	0
Ready-to-learn television	25,416	27,300	0
Excellence in economic education	1,447	1,447	0
Teaching American history	118,952	118,952	0
Arts in education	38,166	40,000	0

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

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

	2009	2010	2011
Academies for American history and civics	\$1,945	\$1,815	0
Close up fellowships	1,942	1,942	0
Advanced placement	43,540	45,840	0
Women's educational equity	2,423	2,423	0
<b>Comparative transfer from <u>Supporting Student Success</u>:</b>			
Civic education: We the people	20,076	21,617	0
Civic education: Cooperative education exchange	13,383	13,383	0
Subtotal, comparable appropriation	2,417,523	1,759,869	1,890,799
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	-1,681,441	-1,681,441	0
Advance from prior year .....	<u>1,435,000</u>	<u>1,681,441</u>	<u>1,681,441</u>
Subtotal, comparable budget authority .....	2,171,082	1,759,869	3,572,240
Unobligated balance, start of year .....	62,683	79,041	3,518
Unobligated balance, start of year, Recovery Act	0	9,168	0
Recovery of prior-year obligations.....	3,650	0	0
Unobligated balance, expiring .....	-69	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year .....	-79,041	3,518	0
Unobligated balance, end of year, Recovery Act,	-9,168	0	0
<b>Comparative Transfers:</b>			
Unobligated balance, start of year to <u>Innovation and Instructional Teams</u> for Improving teacher quality State grants to <u>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity</u> .....	0	-40,851	0
Unobligated balance, start of year to <u>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity</u> for Homeless children and youth education	0	-135	0

**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

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

	2009	2010	2011
Unobligated balance, start of year to <u>Supporting Student Success</u> for 21 <sup>st</sup> century community learning centers	0	-\$14,461	0
Unobligated balance, expiring from <u>Innovation and Instructional Teams</u> for Ready-to-learn television	-\$3	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year to <u>Innovation and Instructional Teams</u> for Improving teacher quality State grants.....	40,851	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year to <u>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity</u> for Homeless children and youth education	135	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year to <u>Supporting Student Success</u> for 21 <sup>st</sup> century community learning centers	<u>14,461</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<b>Total, direct obligations .....</b>	<b>2,204,581</b>	<b>1,796,149</b>	<b>\$3,575,758</b>

NOTE: The Administration is proposing to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. FY 2011 funds for affected programs are proposed for later transmittal and will be requested once the legislation is reauthorized.

**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

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

	2009	2010	2011
Printing and reproduction .....	\$3	0	0
Other contractual services:			
Advisory and assistance services.....	575	0	\$29,000
Other services .....	28,826	\$23,603	30,544
Peer review .....	2,045	2,892	3,000
Purchases of goods and services.....	370	0	0
Research and Development.....	<u>250</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>250</u>
Subtotal.....	32,069	26,745	62,794
Grants, subsidies, and contributions .....	21,461,680	1,760,236	3,512,964
Grants, Recovery Act.....	710,832	9,168	0
Interest and dividends .....	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations .....	2,204,581	1,796,149	3,575,758

NOTE: The Administration is proposing to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. FY 2011 funds for affected programs are proposed for later transmittal and will be requested once the legislation is reauthorized.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

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

---

2010 .....	\$1,759,869
2011 .....	<u>1,890,779</u>
Net change .....	+130,910

NOTE: The Administration is proposing to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. FY 2011 funds for affected programs are proposed for later transmittal and will be requested once the legislation is reauthorized.

---

	<u>2010 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<b>Increases:</b>		
<u>Program:</u>		
Initial funding for the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program to support State and local efforts aimed at implementing a comprehensive literacy strategy that provides high-quality literacy instruction and support to students from pre-kindergarten to grade 12.	0	+\$450,000
Initial funding for the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) program to support State efforts to improve the teaching and learning of STEM subjects.	0	+300,000
Initial funding for the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education to support State and local efforts to develop and expand innovative practices to improve teaching and learning in the arts, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, and economics and financial literacy.	0	+265,000
Initial funding for the proposed College Pathways and Accelerated Learning to support programs that prepare students in high-need school districts to enter and succeed in college.	0	+100,000
Increase funding for Assessing Achievement (formerly State Assessments) to support formula and competitive grants to States and other entities to implement college- and career- ready standards and assessments.	410,732	<u>+39,268</u>
Subtotal, increases		\$1,154,268

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Summary of Changes—continued (\$000s)

	<u>2010 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<b>Decreases:</b>		
<u>Program:</u>		
Eliminate funding for the following programs, Striving Readers, Even Start, Literacy through School Libraries, National Writing Project, Reading is Fundamental, and Ready-to-Learn Television because these programs are proposed for consolidation into the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program.	\$413,348	-\$413,348
Eliminate funding for Mathematics and Science Partnerships because it would be replaced by the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics program.	180,478	-180,478
Eliminate funding for the following programs, Excellence in Economic Education, Teaching American History, Arts in Education, Foreign Language Assistance, Academies for American History and Civics, Close Up Fellowships, and Civic Education because these programs are proposed for consolidation into the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education.	226,084	-226,084
Eliminate funding for Educational technology State grants because this program is proposed for consolidation into the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education program's national activities.	100,000	-100,000
Eliminate funding for the following programs, High School Graduation Initiative, Advanced Placement, and Javits Gifted and Talented Education because these programs are proposed for consolidation into the proposed College Pathways and Accelerated Learning.	103,303	-103,303
Decrease funding for the Women's Educational Equity program to provide funding for continuation awards.	2,423	<u>-145</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-1,023,358
Net change		+130,910

**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

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

Activity	2010 Authorized	2010 Estimate	2011 Authorized	2011 Request
Effective teaching and learning for a complete education:				
Effective teaching and learning: literacy ( <i>proposed legislation</i> ):	---	---	To be determined	\$450,000
Striving readers ( <i>ESEA I-E, section 1502</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	\$250,000	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
Even start ( <i>ESEA I-B-3</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	66,454	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
Literacy through school ( <i>ESEA I-B-4</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	19,145	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
National writing project ( <i>ESEA II-C-2</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	25,646	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
Reading is fundamental ( <i>ESEA V-D, subpart 5</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	24,803	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
Ready-to-learn television ( <i>ESEA II-D-3</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	27,300	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
Effective teaching and learning: science, technology, engineering, and mathematics ( <i>proposed legislation</i> ):	---	---	To be determined	\$300,000
Mathematics and science partnerships ( <i>ESEA II, Part B</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	180,478	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
Effective teaching and learning for a well-rounded education ( <i>proposed legislation</i> ):	---	---	To be determined	\$265,000
Excellence in economic education ( <i>ESEA V-D, subpart 13</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	1,447	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
Teaching American history ( <i>ESEA II-C-4</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	118,952	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
Arts in education ( <i>ESEA V-D, subpart 15</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	40,000	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
Foreign language assistance ( <i>ESEA V-D, subpart 9</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	26,928	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
Academies for American history and civics ( <i>American History and Civics Education Act and ESEA V-D</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	1,815	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
Close-up fellowships ( <i>ESEA section 1504</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	1,942	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
Civic education ( <i>ESEA II, Part C-3</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	35,000	0 <sup>1</sup>	0

D-12

**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

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

	Activity	2010 Authorized	2010 Estimate	2011 Authorized	2011 Request
	Educational technology State grants ( <i>ESEA II-D-1 and 2</i> )	0 <sup>1,2</sup>	100,000	0 <sup>1,2</sup>	0
	College pathways and accelerated learning opportunities ( <i>proposed legislation</i> ):	---	---	To be determined	\$100,000
	High school graduation initiative ( <i>ESEA I-H</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	50,000	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
	Advanced placement ( <i>ESEA I-G</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	45,840	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
	Javits gifted and talented education ( <i>ESEA V-D, subpart 6</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	7,463	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
D-13	Assessing Achievement ( <i>ESEA VI-A-1</i> )	0	410,732	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	\$450,000
	Training and advisory services ( <i>CRA IV</i> )	0	6,989	0	6,989
	Rural education ( <i>ESEA VI-B</i> )	0 <sup>1,3</sup>	174,882	To be determined <sup>1,3</sup>	174,882
	Supplemental education grants ( <i>Compact of Free Association Act</i> )	\$19,835 <sup>4</sup>	17,687	\$19,890 <sup>4</sup>	17,687
	Comprehensive centers ( <i>Educational Technical Assistance Act, Section 203</i> )	0 <sup>5</sup>	56,313	0 <sup>5</sup>	56,313
	Native Hawaiian student education ( <i>ESEA VII-B and HEA VIII-Z</i> )	0 <sup>1,6,7</sup>	34,315	To be determined <sup>1,6</sup>	34,315
	Alaska Native student education ( <i>ESEA VII-C</i> )	0 <sup>1,8</sup>	33,315	To be determined <sup>1,8</sup>	33,315
	Women's educational equity ( <i>ESEA V-D, subpart 21</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	2,423	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	2,278
	<u>Unfunded authorizations:</u>				
	Early reading first ( <i>ESEA I-B-2</i> )	0 <sup>9</sup>	0	0 <sup>9</sup>	0
	Special education teacher training ( <i>ESEA, Section 2151(d)</i> )	0 <sup>9</sup>	0	0 <sup>9</sup>	0

**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

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

Activity	2009 Authorized	2009 Estimate	2010 Authorized	2010 Request
Early childhood educator professional development <i>(ESEA, Section 2151(e))</i>	0 <sup>9</sup>	0	0 <sup>9</sup>	0
Teacher mobility <i>(ESEA, Section 2151(f))</i>	0 <sup>9</sup>	0	0 <sup>9</sup>	0
State grants for innovative programs <i>(ESEA, V-A)</i>	0 <sup>9</sup>	0	0 <sup>9</sup>	0
Math now for elementary school and middle school students <i>(America COMPETES Act, Section 6201)</i>	Indefinite <sup>10</sup>	0	0 <sup>10</sup>	0
Summer term education programs <i>(America COMPETES Act, Section 6202)</i>	Indefinite <sup>10</sup>	0	0 <sup>10</sup>	0
Math skills for secondary school students <i>(America COMPETES Act, Section 6203)</i>	\$95,000 <sup>10</sup>	0	\$95,000 <sup>10</sup>	0
Foreign language partnership program <i>(America COMPETES Act, Title VI, Subtitle C)</i>	Indefinite <sup>10</sup>	0	Indefinite <sup>10</sup>	0
Mathematics and science partnership bonus grants <i>(America COMPETES Act, Title VI, Subtitle E)</i>	<u>Indefinite</u> <sup>10</sup>	<u>0</u>	<u>Indefinite</u> <sup>10</sup>	<u>0</u>
Total, definite authorization	\$114,623		\$114,890	
Total, annual appropriation		\$1,659,869		\$1,890,779
Portion of request subject to reauthorization				1,812,790
Portion of request not authorized				56,313

NOTE: The Administration is proposing to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. FY 2011 funds for affected programs are proposed for later transmittal and will be requested once the legislation is reauthorized.

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2011 under new legislation.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

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

<sup>2</sup> Section 2404 of the ESEA requires that from the funds appropriated for Subparts 1 and 2 of Part D, at least 98 percent is to be used to carry out Subpart 1 and not more than 2 percent is to be used to carry out Subpart 2.

<sup>3</sup> The amount appropriated to carry out Title VI, Part B is to be distributed equally between Subparts 1 and 2.

<sup>4</sup> The Compact of Free Association Act authorizes \$12,230 thousand for the Federated States of Micronesia and \$6,100 thousand for the Republic of the Marshall Islands for fiscal year 2005 and an equivalent amount, as adjusted for inflation (calculated as two thirds of the percentage change in the U.S. Gross Domestic Product Implicit Price Deflator, or 5 percent, whichever is less in any one year) for each of the succeeding fiscal years through 2023. The 2011 authorization is calculated based on inflation estimates as of February 2009.

<sup>5</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2009. The President's fiscal year 2011 budget proposes authorizing this program through appropriations language.

<sup>6</sup> The Henry K. Giugni Memorial Archives earmark is authorized through Title VIII, part Z of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, with an indefinite authorization of appropriations.

<sup>7</sup> Of the amount available to carry out Sections 7204 and 7205, \$500 thousand is to be reserved for a direct grant to the Native Hawaiian Education Council to carry out Section 7204.

<sup>8</sup> Of the amount appropriated for Part C, not less than \$7,000 thousand is to be used to support activities specified in Section 7304(d)(2).

<sup>9</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The Administration is not seeking reauthorizing legislation.

<sup>10</sup> The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2010. The Administration is not seeking reauthorizing legislation.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Appropriations History (\$000s)

	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2002 (2002 Advance for 2003)	\$6,338,794 0	\$7,653,084 (1,960,000)	\$8,754,514 (1,765,000)	\$7,837,473 (1,765,000)
2003 (2003 Advance for 2004)	6,784,484 (1,765,000)	7,347,584 (2,265,000)	7,788,329 (1,765,000)	8,001,159 (1,765,000)
2003 Technical amendment	0	0	0	546
2004 (2004 Advance for 2005)	5,042,834 (1,435,000)	5,797,637 (1,435,000)	5,731,453 (1,435,000)	5,800,496 (1,435,000)
2005 (2005 Advance for 2006)	5,940,493 (1,435,000)	5,661,401 (1,435,000)	5,730,632 (1,435,000)	5,619,657 (1,435,000)
2006 (2006 Advance for 2007)	5,332,219 (1,435,000)	5,393,765 (1,435,000)	5,457,953 (1,435,000)	5,255,478 (1,435,000)
2007 (2007 Advance for 2008)	4,973,158 (1,435,000)	N/A <sup>1</sup>	N/A <sup>1</sup>	5,255,478 <sup>1</sup> (1,435,000)
2008 (2008 Advance for 2009) Supp. (PL 110-329)	4,698,276 (1,435,000) 0	5,693,668 (1,435,000) 0	5,198,525 (1,435,000) 0	5,289,076 (1,435,000) 15,000
2009 (2009 Advance for 2010) Recovery Act Supp. (PL 111-5)	4,566,323 (1,435,000) 0	5,399,609 <sup>2</sup> (1,435,000) 1,066,000	5,292,422 <sup>2</sup> (1,435,000) 1,070,000	5,362,016 (1,681,441) 720,000
2010 (2010 Advance for 2011)	5,182,181 (1,681,441)	5,244,644 (1,681,441)	5,197,316 <sup>3</sup> (1,681,441)	5,228,444 (1,681,441)
2011	1,890,779			

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

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

<sup>3</sup> The level for the Senate allowance reflects Committee action only.

## **EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

### **Significant Items in FY 2010 Appropriations Reports**

#### **Striving Readers**

- House: The Committee directs that the Department prepare and submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a comprehensive and integrated fiscal year 2010 implementation plan for K–12 literacy-related activities (i.e. grants, technical assistance, research, development, and evaluation activities) across the Department, including but not limited to activities under Title I School Improvement Grants, Early Reading First, Striving Readers, Reading Is Fundamental, Reach Out and Read, and the Institution of Education Sciences. This plan shall be submitted not less than 60 days after enactment of this Act and 30 days prior to the release of a request for proposals under the Striving Reading program.
- Conference: The conferees direct the Department to prepare an implementation plan for K–12 literacy-related activities including, but not limited to, activities under Title I School Improvement Grants, Striving Readers, Reading is Fundamental, Reach Out and Read, and the Institute of Education Sciences, as proposed by the House. The Senate report did not propose similar report language. This plan shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 30 days prior to release of a request for proposals under the Striving Readers program.
- Response: The Department will provide the Committees with a literacy implementation plan at least 30 days prior to the release of a notice inviting applications under the Striving Reading program.

#### **Ready-to-Learn Television**

- Senate: The Committee expects the increase over fiscal year 2009 to be used for Ready to Learn outreach programs by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.
- Conference: The conferees expect the increase over fiscal year 2009 for Ready to Learn to be used for outreach programs by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting as proposed by the Senate.
- Response: The Department cannot use the increase to support outreach programs being implemented as part of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting's (CPB) Ready to Learn competitive grant award, because fiscal year 2009 was the fifth and final year of all continuation grants under this program, including the outreach grant to CPB. The Department plans to re-compete all Ready-to-Learn Television grants in fiscal year 2010.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Significant Items in FY 2010 Appropriations Reports—continued

#### **High School Graduation Initiative**

House: The Committee directs that the Department provide a briefing to the Committee on the planned use of these funds not less than 30 days prior to the release of a request for proposals.

Conference: The conferees direct the Department to provide a briefing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on the planned uses of funds for this initiative not less than 30 days prior to a request for proposals as proposed by the House.

Response: The Department will provide a briefing to the Committees as requested.

#### **Alaska Native Educational Equity**

Senate: The Committee expects the Department to use some of these funds to address the construction needs of rural schools.

Response: After making awards to continuing grantees, the Department will not have sufficient funds available for new awards to hold a competition for the Alaska Native program in fiscal year 2010.

#### **Rural Education**

Senate: The Committee expects that rural education funding will be equally divided between the Small, Rural Schools Achievement Program, which provides funds to LEAs that serve a small number of students, and the Rural and Low-Income Schools Program, which provides funds to LEAs that serve concentrations of poor students, regardless of the number of students served.

Response: The Department will continue to use half of the Rural Education Achievement Program appropriation for the Small, Rural School Achievement program and half for the Rural and Low-Income School program.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2011 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST

(in thousands of dollars)

Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	2009 Appropriation	2010 Appropriation	2011 President's Budget	Change from 2010 Appropriation	
					Amount	Percent
<b>Education Improvement Programs</b>						
1. Effective teaching and learning for a complete education:						
(a) Effective teaching and learning: Literacy:						
(1) Effective teaching and learning: Literacy (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	450,000	450,000	---
(2) Early reading first (ESEA I-B-2)	D	112,549	0	0	0	---
(3) Striving readers (ESEA I-E, section 1502)	D	35,371	250,000	0	(250,000)	-100.0%
(4) Even start (ESEA I-B-3)	D	66,454	66,454	0	(66,454)	-100.0%
(5) Literacy through school libraries (ESEA I-B-4)	D	19,145	19,145	0	(19,145)	-100.0%
(6) National writing project (ESEA II-C-2)	D	24,291	25,646	0	(25,646)	-100.0%
(7) Reading is fundamental/inexpensive book distribution (ESEA V-D, subpart 5)	D	24,803	24,803	0	(24,803)	-100.0%
(8) Ready-to-learn television (ESEA II-D-3)	D	25,416	27,300	0	(27,300)	-100.0%
Subtotal		308,029	413,348	450,000	36,652	8.9%
(b) Effective teaching and learning: science, technology, engineering, and mathematics:						
(1) Effective teaching and learning: Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	300,000	300,000	---
(2) Mathematics and Science partnerships (ESEA II, Part B)	D	178,978	180,478	0	(180,478)	-100.0%
Subtotal		178,978	180,478	300,000	119,522	66.2%
(c) Effective teaching and learning for a well-rounded education:						
(1) Effective teaching and learning for a well-rounded education (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	265,000	265,000	---
(2) Excellence in economic education (ESEA V-D, subpart 13)	D	1,447	1,447	0	(1,447)	-100.0%
(3) Teaching American history (ESEA II-C-4)	D	118,952	118,952	0	(118,952)	-100.0%
(4) Arts in education (ESEA V-D, subpart 15)	D	38,166	40,000	0	(40,000)	-100.0%
(5) Foreign language assistance (ESEA V-D, subpart 9)	D	26,328	26,928	0	(26,928)	-100.0%
(6) Academies for American history and civics (American History and Civics Education Act and ESEA-V-D)	D	1,945	1,815	0	(1,815)	-100.0%
(7) Close Up fellowships (ESEA section 1504)	D	1,942	1,942	0	(1,942)	-100.0%
(8) Civic education (ESEA II, Part C-3):						
(a) We the People (section 2344)	D	20,076	21,617	0	(21,617)	-100.0%
(b) Cooperative education exchange (section 2345)	D	13,383	13,383	0	(13,383)	-100.0%
Subtotal		222,239	226,084	265,000	38,916	17.2%
(d) Educational technology State grants (ESEA II-D-1 and 2)						
	D	269,872	100,000	0	(100,000)	-100.0%
Subtotal		979,118	919,910	1,015,000	95,090	10.3%
2. College pathways and accelerated learning:						
(a) College pathways and accelerated learning (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	100,000	100,000	---
(b) High school graduation initiative (ESEA I-H)	D	0	50,000	0	(50,000)	-100.0%
(c) Advanced placement (ESEA I-G)	D	43,540	45,840	0	(45,840)	-100.0%
(d) Javits gifted and talented education (ESEA V-D, subpart 6)	D	7,463	7,463	0	(7,463)	-100.0%
Subtotal		51,003	103,303	100,000	(3,303)	-3.2%

NOTES: Category Codes are as follows: D = discretionary program; M = mandatory program.

Programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for which funds are requested in 2011 or which are proposed for consolidation in 2011 require new authorizing legislation.

Multiple programs affected by the proposed ESEA reauthorization have been renamed and moved among accounts, some of which have also been renamed. Totals for fiscal years 2009 and 2010 have been adjusted to be comparable to the fiscal year 2011 President's request.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2011 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST

(in thousands of dollars)

Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	2009 Appropriation	2010 Appropriation	2011 President's Budget	Change from 2010 Appropriation	
					Amount	Percent
<b>Education Improvement Programs (continued)</b>						
3. Assessing achievement (ESEA VI-A-1)	D	410,732	410,732	450,000	39,268	9.6%
4. Training and advisory services (CRA IV)	D	9,489	6,989	6,989	0	0.0%
5. Rural education (ESEA VI-B)	D	173,382	174,882	174,882	0	0.0%
6. Supplemental education grants (Compact of Free Association Act)	D	17,687	17,687	17,687	0	0.0%
7. Comprehensive centers (ETAA section 203)	D	57,113	56,313	56,313	0	0.0%
8. Native Hawaiian student education (ESEA VII-B and HEA VIII-Z)	D	33,315	34,315	34,315	0	0.0%
9. Alaska Native student education (ESEA VII-C)	D	33,315	33,315	33,315	0	0.0%
10. Women's educational equity (ESEA V-D-21)	D	2,423	2,423	2,278	(145)	-6.0%
Subtotal		1,767,577	1,759,869	1,890,779	130,910	7.4%
Total, Appropriation	D	1,767,577	1,759,869	1,890,779	130,910	7.4%
Total, Budget authority	D	1,767,577	1,759,869	1,890,779	130,910	7.4%
Current		1,767,577	1,759,869	1,890,779	130,910	0
Prior year's advance		0	0	0	0	—
Outlays	D	5,393,000	5,145,000	5,145,000	0	0.0%
<b>School Improvement Programs, Recovery Act</b>						
1. Educational technology State grants (ESEA II-D-1 and 2)	D	650,000	0	0	0	---
2. Education for homeless children and youths (MVHAA Title VII-B)	D	70,000	0	0	0	---
Total	D	720,000	0	0	0	---
Outlays	D	7,000	418,000	223,000	(195,000)	-46.7%

NOTES: Programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for which funds are requested in 2011 or which are proposed for consolidation in 2011 require new authorizing legislation.

Multiple programs affected by the proposed ESEA reauthorization have been renamed and moved among accounts, some of which have also been renamed. Totals for fiscal years 2009 and 2010 have been adjusted to be comparable to the fiscal year 2011 President's request.

<sup>1</sup> For comparability, excludes an advance appropriation of \$1,681,441 thousand in fiscal year 2009 and 2010

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Summary of Request

The programs in the Education Improvement Programs (EIP) account support State and local efforts to implement the reforms and educational improvements called for in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). More specifically, the activities in this account provide flexible resources to strengthen instruction and increase student achievement across the core content areas; prepare students to enter and succeed in college; and pay the costs of developing and administering student achievement assessments. The account also includes a variety of smaller programs addressing particular educational needs or special populations.

The fiscal year 2011 appropriation would support the first year of a reauthorized ESEA. The Administration's request for EIP (except for three non-ESEA programs) is proposed for later transmittal pending the enactment of the reauthorization. The Administration is requesting a total of \$1.9 billion for programs in this account, an increase of \$231 million over the 2010 appropriation level. The increase represents a strengthening and expansion of existing ESEA programs under two broad program authorities: **Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education** and **College Pathways and Accelerated Learning**. The budget also reallocates programs across budget accounts in order to better align the budget presentation with the structure of the ESEA as proposed for reauthorization.

The proposed **Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education** request would include funding for three new programs:

- \$400 million for **Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy** to support State and local efforts aimed at implementing and supporting a comprehensive literacy strategy that provides high-quality literacy instruction and support to students from pre-kindergarten through grade 12.
- \$300 million for **Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics** to improve teaching and raise student achievement in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM). The program would support professional development for STEM teachers; implementation of high-quality curriculum, achievement assessments, and instructional materials; and creation or improvement of systems for linking student data on assessments with instructional supports such as lesson plans and intervention strategies.
- \$265 million for **Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education** to support States and high-need school districts in developing and expanding innovative practices that improve teaching and learning in the arts, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, and economics and financial literacy.

The Administration also is proposing a new \$100 million **College Pathways and Accelerated Learning** program to support competitive grants to LEAs for expansion of such activities as Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, dual high school/college enrollment, and "early college high schools" in order to prepare students for secondary school graduation and success in college. This new program would support activities in middle and high schools with concentrations of students from low-income families.

The Administration requests \$450 million for **Assessing Achievement** (formerly State Assessments), an increase of \$39.3 million, to assist States and other entities in implementing

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Summary of Request

college- and career-ready standards and assessments. Formula funds would support States' implementation of the assessments currently required under Title I of the ESEA while they transition to new college- and career-ready standards and assessments that capture a fuller picture of what students know and are able to do. Funds for competitive grants would also support targeted projects to advance States' and other entities' efforts to implement new assessment requirements of the reauthorized Title I and to develop additional assessments that support the improvement of teaching and learning. The program also would include incentives for States and other entities to adopt common, internationally benchmarked college- and career-ready standards.

The 2011 request also includes:

- \$7.0 million for **Training and Advisory Services** to support regional equity assistance centers that provide technical assistance to school districts in addressing educational equity related to issues of race, gender, and national origin;
- \$174.9 million for **Rural Education** to provide resources to rural LEAs and schools that often face unique challenges in implementing ESEA;
- \$17.7 million for **Supplemental Education Grants** program to provide support to the Federated States of Micronesia and to the Republic of the Marshall Islands in place of grant programs discontinued by the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003;
- \$56.3 million for **Comprehensive Centers** to provide comprehensive technical assistance to grantees under the Education Technical Assistance Act of 2002;
- \$34.3 million for **Native Hawaiian Student Education** to provide supplemental education programs and services to Native Hawaiian children and adults, in such areas as teacher training, family-based education, gifted and talented education, special education, higher education, and community-based education learning centers;
- \$33.3 million for **Alaska Native Student Education** to support the development and operation of supplemental education programs and services for Alaska Native children and adults; and
- \$2.3 million for **Women's Educational Equity** to promote gender equity in education through programs that design and implement gender-equity policies and practices.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Effective teaching and learning for a complete education

(Proposed legislation)

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
<i>Effective teaching and learning: literacy</i>	0	\$450,000	+\$450,000
<i>Effective teaching and learning: science, technology, engineering, and mathematics</i>	0	\$300,000	+\$300,000
<i>Effective teaching and learning for a well-rounded education</i>	0	\$265,000	+\$265,000
Total	0	\$1,015,000	+\$1,015,000

---

### PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The proposed Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education programs would strengthen instruction, teaching and learning, and raise student achievement across the core content areas by: (1) developing instructional systems aligned with high-quality kindergarten-through-grade-12 (K-12) college- and career-ready standards; (2) assisting States and local educational agencies (LEAs) to strengthen their pre-kindergarten-through-grade-12 (pre-K-12) literacy programs; (3) assisting States and LEAs to strengthen mathematics and science instruction; and (4) supporting States, LEAs, and nonprofit entities to develop, implement, evaluate, and replicate evidence-based programs in the arts, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, economics and financial literacy, and other subjects.

The Administration's reauthorization proposal will include three programs within the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education authority: (1) Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy; (2) Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics; and (3) Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education. From the total appropriation, the Secretary would also be authorized to reserve up to 10 percent for national research, development, technical assistance, outreach, dissemination, and other activities. Finally, the Secretary would be authorized to use funds from the appropriate program to continue grants made prior to reauthorization for programs being consolidated as part of the reauthorization.

The Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education program would address the need to strengthen instruction, teaching and learning, and raise student achievement across the core content areas, especially in low-performing schools. The Administration believes that this restructuring would improve the capacity of States, districts, and schools to use their resources

## **EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

### **Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education**

---

to drive improvements in the quality of academic instruction in a comprehensive manner. Further, it would spur innovation, facilitate the spread of evidence-based practices, and provide increased flexibility for States and districts to design strategies and programs that best meet the needs of their students.

Safeguards will also be put in place to ensure that geographic location does not dictate results. In particular, programs will be structured to ensure that rural communities have a fair chance to successfully compete.

### **Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy**

#### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy would provide competitive State literacy grants to State educational agencies (SEAs), or SEAs in partnership with appropriate outside entities, in order to support State and local efforts aimed at implementing and supporting a comprehensive literacy strategy that provides high-quality literacy instruction and support to students from pre-kindergarten through grade 12. The Department would be permitted to reserve funds for competitive State Capacity-Building Grants that would support State efforts to become more competitive for a State Literacy Grant in future years.

In awarding State Literacy Grants, the Department would give a priority to SEAs that have adopted and are implementing a set of high-quality K-12 reading/language arts college- and career-ready standards. States would be permitted to reserve funds for State-level activities, that support a coherent approach to funding and implementing high-quality evidence-based literacy instruction in high-need schools and would align Federal and State funds and programs, including Title I, Title II, and IDEA Part B, to support this approach. States would use their remaining funds to make subgrants to high-need LEAs and partnerships to improve literacy instruction at the local level, including, for example, through online curriculum and technology-based approaches. States would be required to use the remaining amount for Comprehensive Literacy Subgrants to support the implementation of comprehensive literacy programs at the local level.

#### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$450 million for Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy. The request would support the first year of the new program, which would replace several narrowly targeted programs that support the improvement of education in reading, writing, and language arts.

Research and assessment data provide strong justification for a continued Federal investment in a large-scale evidence-based literacy program. Findings released in October 2009 from the Department's Early Childhood Longitudinal Study conclude that, at kindergarten entry, children from families with incomes below the poverty threshold had significantly lower reading scores than children from families living at or above the poverty threshold. The effects of

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education

---

socioeconomic status persist; according to the 2007 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), the most recent results available for the NAEP reading assessment show that more than half (56 percent) of fourth-grade students in high-poverty schools scored below the basic reading level, compared with only 18 percent in low-poverty schools.<sup>1</sup> About half of eighth-grade students in high-poverty schools scored below the basic reading level, compared with only 14 percent in low-poverty schools. These data also demonstrate that, overall, an alarming number of our Nation's children are not reading at grade level. It is clear that many of the Nation's students are unable to read at a level that would enable them to graduate from high school with the skills they need to be college- and career-ready.

The Administration strongly believes that, to best prepare students for successful adult lives, educators must have the support they need to provide developmentally appropriate, explicit, and systematic instruction from pre-K through 12<sup>th</sup> grade. Federal literacy programs have historically focused on specific age ranges of students, which has created or perpetuated a tendency in the field to implement segmented improvements to literacy instruction. The Administration believes that State and local efforts will be more coherent and more likely to drive dramatic improvements in student achievement if they have a comprehensive pre-K-12 focus.

The fiscal year 2010 appropriation created a more comprehensive pre-K-12 literacy program through Striving Readers; the reauthorized program would build on that reform and seek to ensure that the elements of a comprehensive literacy program are embedded in State and local strategies, strengthen performance expectations, and support the identification and testing of innovative methods of teaching reading, writing, and language arts.

The Department also would use funds allocated for Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy to pay continuation costs for grants made prior to reauthorization under Striving Readers, Even Start tribal and migrant programs, and Ready to Learn Television programs.

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

	<u>2011</u>
State Literacy Grants	
Amount for grants	\$ 230,703
Number of grants	15-25
Peer review of new award applications	\$2,000
National activities set-aside	\$25,856

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purpose of this analysis, low-poverty schools are defined as those where 25 percent or less of the students were eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch, and high-poverty schools are defined as those where more than 75 percent of the students were eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education

---

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

	<u>2011</u>
Continuations for antecedent programs	<u>\$191,441</u>
Total, Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy	\$450,000

---

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$191,441 thousand would be provided to fund continuation awards for grants made under the following programs prior to enactment of the reauthorization: Striving Readers (\$161,350), Even Start tribal and migrant programs (\$2,791), and Ready-to-Learn Television (\$27,300).

### Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics

#### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) program would provide competitive grants to SEAs (or SEAs in partnership with appropriate outside entities), in order to support State and local efforts aimed at implementing and supporting a comprehensive STEM strategy for the provision of high-quality STEM instruction and support to students from pre-K-12. Grantees and subgrantees would be required to focus on mathematics or science, or both, and could also include technology or engineering. In awarding State agency STEM grants, the Department would give a priority to SEAs that have adopted and are implementing a set of K-12 college- and career-ready standards in, at a minimum, mathematics. States would be permitted to reserve funds for State-level activities, so as to support a coherent approach to funding and implementing high-quality evidence-based STEM instruction in high-need schools. States would be required to use their remaining grant funds to make subgrants to high-need LEAs and eligible partnerships to improve STEM instruction at the local level, including, for example, through online curriculum and other technology-based approaches to STEM education. The Department would be permitted to reserve funds for competitive State Capacity-Building grants that would support State efforts to become more competitive for a State agency STEM grant in future years.

#### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$300 million for the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics. The request would support the first year of the new program, which would replace the existing Mathematics and Science Partnership program in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Improving American students' achievement in STEM fields is vital to ensuring the economic well-being of our country and is a priority of the Administration. Projections from the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) indicate that over 80 percent of the fastest-growing occupations (such as those in the healthcare- and computer-related fields) are

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education

---

dependent on knowledge of mathematics, science, technology, and engineering. On the 2006 Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) mathematics assessment, the United States ranked 24<sup>th</sup> out of 30 countries belonging to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, which represents the world's most advanced countries; and 17<sup>th</sup> out of 30 on the science assessment. For the United States to remain competitive in the global economy, build and maintain a highly skilled workforce, and nourish technological innovation, we must improve STEM teaching and learning, and ensure access to rigorous courses of study for all students.

A 2007 report from the Department's National Center for Education Statistics, *Advanced Mathematics and Science Course-taking in the Spring High School Senior Classes of 1982, 1992, and 2004*, indicates that high school graduates' completion of mathematics and science courses increased between 1982 and 2004 and that greater percentages of graduates had taken advanced mathematics and science courses in 2004 compared to 1982. However, graduates in the highest socioeconomic status (SES) quartile were consistently more likely than graduates in the lowest SES quartile to have completed advanced-level coursework in mathematics. Moreover, the gap between these quartiles grew between 1982 and 2004; the gap was 18 percentage points in 1982 but 35 percentage points in 2004. In science, graduates in the highest SES quartile also consistently completed the most advanced level of science courses at higher rates than their peers in the other three cohorts.

Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics would help to address these concerns by focusing on the teaching and learning of STEM subjects in a manner that is aligned with college- and career- ready standards. The activities supported would be more competitive, more accountable, and more likely to result in significant achievement gains than those carried out under previous Federal math and science programs. Moreover, the Department is planning to work closely with the National Science Foundation and other Federal science agencies to implement a coordinated STEM education strategy that optimizes the delivery of services and minimizes duplication and inefficiency. Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics will be a key element of that strategy.

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

	<u>2011</u>
Amount for grants	\$269,600
Number of grants	15-25
Peer review of new award applications	\$400
National activities set-aside	<u>\$30,000</u>
Total, Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM	\$300,000

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education

---

#### Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education

##### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education would provide competitive grants to high-need local educational agencies (LEAs), State educational agencies (SEAs) in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs and other entities to support the development and expansion of innovative practices and interdisciplinary programs to improve teaching and learning in the arts, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, economics and financial literacy, and other subjects.

##### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$265 million in 2011 for the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program. The request would support the first year of the new program, which would replace several narrowly targeted programs that support the improvement of education in the arts, foreign language, history, civics and government, and economics.

The Administration believes that all students should receive high-quality instruction in the core academic subject areas. However, the existing range of Federal programs that focus on the teaching and learning of specific subjects, including the arts, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, and economics and financial literacy is too fragmented to provide State and district officials with the tools they need to strengthen instruction and increase student achievement in the comprehensive manner required. Nor are the current programs well-structured to enable educators and policymakers to identify the most effective practices to replicate. Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education would address these problems by consolidating the existing funding streams into a single comprehensive program that drives resources to where they are most needed and in a manner that will more effectively address local needs and generate information on what works.

The Department also would use funds allocated for Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education to pay continuation costs under Arts in Education, Foreign Language Assistance, Teaching American History, Civic Education, and Excellence in Economic Education.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education

---

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

	<u>2011</u>
Amount for grants	\$137,591
Number of grants	15-20
Peer review of new award applications	\$200
National activities set-aside	\$15,310
Continuations for antecedent programs	<u>\$111,899</u>
Total, Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education	\$265,000

---

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$111,899 thousand would be provided to fund continuation awards for grants made under the following programs prior to enactment of the reauthorization: Arts in Education (\$15,257), Foreign Language Assistance (\$29,296), Teaching American History (\$50,000), Civic Education (\$3,346), and Excellence in Economic Education (\$14,000).

#### National Activities

From the amount requested for the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education programs, the Administration would reserve \$71.2 million in 2011 to support a range of national activities, including research, technical assistance, prize awards, dissemination, financial literacy, and other activities. The Department may also use funds to strengthen the use of technology in the core academic subjects, including through grants to help build States' capacity to implement technology-enabled curriculum, assessments, professional development, and supporting tools and resources. National Activities funds could also be used to provide assistance to public telecommunications agencies, such as the Public Broadcasting Service, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and other entities to create high-quality educational content for children.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Department has not yet developed performance measures for this proposed program, but will do so later in 2010. These measures would likely include the percentage of students who perform above proficiency in core academic subjects as measured against their States' K-12 standards.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Striving readers

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

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$250,000	0	-\$250,000

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2011 under new legislation.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Striving Readers program provides grants to eligible entities to support efforts to improve literacy instruction in high-need schools. In fiscal year 2010, Congress included appropriations language that changed Striving Readers from an adolescent literacy program to a comprehensive literacy development and education program intended to advance the literacy skills, including pre-literacy skills, reading, and writing, of students from birth through grade 12.

From the total fiscal year 2010 appropriation, the Department will reserve: (1) one-half of 1 percent for grants to the Department of the Interior/Bureau of Indian Education and one-half of 1 percent for the Outlying Areas; (2) \$10,000,000 for formula grants to States for the establishment or support of a State Literacy Team with expertise in literacy development and education for children from birth through grade 12 to assist the State in developing a comprehensive literacy plan; and (3) up to 5 percent for national activities. The remaining funds will be used to award competitive grants to States.

Each State educational agency (SEA) that receives a competitive grant must award at least 95 percent of its allocation competitively to local educational agencies (LEAs) or, for the purposes of providing early literacy services, to LEAs or other nonprofit providers of early childhood education that partner with a public or provide nonprofit organization or agency with a demonstrated record of effectiveness in improving the early literacy development of children from birth through kindergarten entry and in providing professional development in early literacy. SEAs are required to: (1) give priority to such agencies or other entities serving greater numbers or percentages of disadvantaged children; and (2) ensure that at least 15 percent of the subgranted funds are used to serve children from birth through age 5, 40 percent to serve students in kindergarten through grade 5, and 40 percent to serve students in middle and high school. Further, States must equitably distribute funds between middle and high schools.

An SEA may reserve up to 5 percent of its allocation for leadership activities, including technical assistance and training, data collection, reporting, and administration. Eligible entities receiving subgrants must use Striving Readers funds for services and activities that have the characteristics of effective literacy instruction through professional development, screening and

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Striving readers

---

assessment, targeted interventions for students reading below grade level, and other research-based methods of improving classroom instruction and practice.

In fiscal years 2005 through 2009, the Striving Readers program supported competitive grants to implement and evaluate reading interventions for middle- or high-school students reading significantly below grade level. Projects have focused on the implementation and evaluation of strategies for improving the reading achievement of students reading 2 or more years below grade level, including by providing professional development in reading instruction for secondary-school teachers in the core academic subjects and supporting the implementation of reading curricula that are appropriate for teenage students.

The Striving Readers program was created through fiscal year 2005 appropriations language that provided the Department with considerable flexibility. In report language, Congress directed the Department to “make competitive grants to develop, implement, evaluate, and bring to scale reading interventions for middle- or high-school student who are reading significantly below grade level, prioritizing services to those schools and districts with one or more high or middle schools that include a significant number of students reading below grade level.” In addition, Congress directed the Department to give competitive preference to schools that agreed to participate in randomized research studies, and to balance grants between projects serving middle schools and projects serving high schools.

The Department followed these directives in awarding grants to the first cohort of current grantees in 2006. The Department made awards to local educational agencies (LEAs) eligible to receive funds under Part A of Title I of the ESEA that had one or more high schools or middle schools with significant numbers of students reading below grade level or at risk of not meeting Title I adequate yearly progress requirements. The Department permitted eligible LEAs to apply in partnership with institutions of higher education and public or private (nonprofit or for-profit) organizations, and permitted State educational agencies (SEAs) to apply on behalf of eligible LEAs and in partnership with other entities. The Department established two absolute priorities: (1) grantees must use program funds only to serve students who attend schools eligible to receive funds under Part A of Title I and who are in grades 6 through 12; and (2) grantees must (a) implement school-level strategies designed to increase reading achievement by integrating enhanced literacy instruction throughout the curriculum and the entire school, (b) implement an intensive, targeted intervention for students reading at least 2 years below grade level, and (c) carry out a rigorous, independent evaluation of the project that must include an evaluation of the targeted intervention and must use an experimental research design. Awards were made for 5 years.

In conducting the second competition in 2009, the Department limited eligibility to SEAs applying on behalf of the SEA and one or more LEAs that have governing authority over Title I-eligible schools that serve any of grades 6 through 12. Applicants were required to include at least five schools in their applications. The notice included two absolute priorities all applicants were required to meet. The first required applicants to implement a supplemental literacy intervention for students with reading skills that are 2 or more years below grade level during the second, third, and fourth years of the 4-year project period. The second absolute priority required applicants to evaluate the effectiveness of the supplemental literacy intervention using an experimental research design. In an effort to ensure that the project included a sufficient

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Striving readers

---

number of struggling readers to detect an impact, applicants also were required to provide State or other assessment data for the 2 most recent school years that demonstrated that each school included in the application had a minimum of 75 struggling readers during each of those years.

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)
2006 .....	\$29,700
2007 .....	31,870
2008 .....	35,371
2009 .....	35,371
2010 .....	250,000

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not seeking separate funding for Striving Readers for fiscal year 2011. In place of this program and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs, the Administration proposes to create a broader program, Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy, that addresses the need to strengthen instruction and increase achievement across the content areas. This new program would replace current ESEA programs that support improvement of education in reading, writing, mathematics and science, arts, foreign language, history, civics and government, and economics.

A component of this new Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program would provide competitive grants to States specifically to support the development and implementation of comprehensive State and local strategies for providing high-quality literacy programs for students from pre-kindergarten through grade 12. This approach would build on the foundation laid by the fiscal year 2010 appropriation for the Striving Readers program by replacing the patchwork of literacy funding streams in current law with a single comprehensive, coherent, and flexible program. The Administration believes that this approach would ensure that States and high-need LEAs have in place a solid infrastructure across the grade levels to support high-need schools in implementing high-quality, developmentally appropriate, and systematic literacy instruction. Under the Administration's proposal for the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program, State and local educational agencies that receive grants or subgrants would be required to develop (or update) and implement a comprehensive pre-K-12 literacy plan that includes high-quality literacy instruction for adolescent students.

The fiscal year 2011 request for Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy would include funds to pay 2011 continuation costs for the Striving Readers grants made in previous years.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Striving readers

---

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Amount for competitive grants	\$34,821	\$223,500	0
Continuation	\$34,821	\$10,506	0
New	0	\$212,994	0
Total number of competitive grants			
Continuation	16	8	0
New	0	25-30	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$1,500	0
Amounts for formula grants			
State Literacy Team grants	0	\$10,000	0
Bureau of Indian Education	0	\$1,250	0
Outlying Areas	0	\$1,250	0
National activities (including evaluation)	\$550	\$12,500	0

NOTE: In fiscal year 2011, continuation costs of approximately \$161,350 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2011 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Goal: To enhance the overall level of reading achievement in middle and high schools through intensive literacy interventions for struggling readers and improvements in literacy instruction across the curriculum, and to help build a strong scientific research base around adolescent literacy.**

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Striving readers

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of adolescent students reading significantly below grade level who demonstrate a gain in their reading achievement at a minimum of one grade level or its equivalent after participating in an intensive literacy intervention over an academic year.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		34.14
2008	36.14	42.59
2009	44.14	44.83
2010	46.14	
2011	48.14	

**Assessment of progress:** At the end of 2008-09 school year, 44.83 percent of adolescent students participating in the targeted literacy intervention component of the program demonstrated a gain of at least one grade level in reading achievement, exceeding the target for 2009. The Department established targets for 2009, 2010, and 2011 based on 2008 data.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students in schools participating in the Striving Readers program who score at or above proficient on the State's assessment in reading/language arts.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		58.45
2007	60.45	59.32
2008	61.32	62.40
2009	64.40	60.22
2010	66.40	
2011	68.40	

**Assessment of progress:** The percentage of students in Striving Readers schools who scored at or above proficient on State reading assessments decreased to 60.22 percent in spring 2009, missing the target. The Department established targets for 2009, 2010, and 2011 based on 2008 data.

The fiscal year 2010 appropriation for the Striving Readers program would expand it to provide support for the improvement of literacy instruction for students from birth through grade 12. The Department will determine the need for additional performance measures for the redesigned program.

### Other Performance Information

All grantees are conducting rigorous experimental or quasi-experimental evaluations of their targeted interventions to determine their effectiveness. The Department released year-1 reports on the implementation of the targeted and whole-school interventions from the eight fiscal year 2006 grantees in 2008, and released studies that provided preliminary results from 2 years of implementation, including year-1 impact findings, in fall 2009. The key research questions that the impact studies address are: (1) do the specific supplemental literacy and classroom-based strategies employed by the grantee significantly improve reading proficiency among students?; and (2) do the school-level classroom-based literacy improvement strategies significantly improve student performance on state assessments in reading/language arts? Three of the

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Striving readers

---

eight evaluations found that the targeted intervention had statistically significant positive impacts on reading test scores for either middle or high school students. It is important to note that the evaluations are ongoing and the first impact reports examine only the first 2 years of implementation. As the evaluations continue and more students are added to the study samples, the Department will have more reliable findings on impacts. For more information, please visit <http://www.ed.gov/programs/strivingreaders/performance.html>.

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Even start

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

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$66,454	0	-\$66,454

---

<sup>1</sup>The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2011 under new legislation.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

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

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Even start

---

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

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

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

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$99,000
2007 .....	82,283
2008 .....	66,454
2009 .....	66,454
2010 .....	66,454

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funding for the Even Start program for fiscal year 2011. In place of several, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that seek to improve student achievement in specific subject areas (including programs that promote reading and literacy), the Administration proposes to create a broader program, Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy, that addresses the need to strengthen instruction and increase achievement across the content areas. This new program would replace current ESEA programs that support improvement of education in reading, writing, mathematics and science, arts, foreign language, history, civics and government, and economics.

One component of the new, Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program, would provide competitive grants to States specifically to support the development and implementation of comprehensive State and local strategies for providing high-quality literacy programs designed to increase student achievement in high-need LEAs for students from pre-kindergarten through grade 12. This approach would replace the patchwork of literacy funding streams in current law with a single comprehensive, coherent, and flexible program. The Administration believes that this approach would help ensure that States and high-need LEAs have in place a solid infrastructure across the grade levels to support high-need schools in implementing high-quality, developmentally appropriate, and systematic literacy instruction. Under the Administration's proposal for the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program, State and local educational agencies that receive grants or subgrants would be required to develop (or update) and implement a comprehensive pre-K- through-12 literacy plan that includes high-quality literacy instruction for children from preschool through age 8 (the population served by the Even Start

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Even start

---

program), and would be permitted to use funds to support family literacy activities. The Administration's request also includes over \$600 million for Adult Education State grants, which assists adult parents in obtaining the necessary educational skills to become full partners in the educational development of their children.

In addition, the Administration supports the Early Learning Challenge Fund (ELCF), included in legislation (H.R. 3221) that has passed the House of Representatives and is pending in the Senate. The ELCF would provide grants to support State efforts to increase the number of children from low-income families in high-quality care by creating statewide standards and monitoring systems, enhancing the early childhood workforce through training and professional development, and providing more information to parents and the public.

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

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Amount distributed to States	\$61,138	\$61,138	0
Average State award	\$1,176	\$1,176	0
Range of State awards	\$306 - \$6,873	\$306 - \$7,263	0
Evaluation and technical assistance	\$1,993	\$1,993	0
Set-aside for migrant children, the Outlying Areas, and Indian tribes			
Amount for grants	\$3,323	\$3,323	
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$15	0
Number of State-awarded projects	514	514	0
Indian tribes projects:			
Continuation	4	4	0

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Even start

---

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Migrant projects:			
New	0	5-10	0
Continuation	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total projects	524	431-436	0
Number of children served	21,540	21,540	0
Number of adults served	15,320	15,320	0

NOTE: In fiscal year 2011, continuation costs for the Migrant children and Indian Tribes projects totaling approximately \$2,791 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

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

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

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Even start

---

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

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Even Start adults who achieve significant learning gains on measures of reading/English language acquisition, as measured by the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS) and the Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE).		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2006</b>	72.1	64.3
<b>2007</b>	70.9	73.1
<b>2008</b>	71.2	69.9
<b>2009</b>	73.0	
<b>2010</b>	73.6	

**Assessment of progress:** In 2008, 69.9 percent of Even Start adults achieved significant learning gains on measures of reading/English language acquisition, as measured by the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS) and the Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE), missing the target. The data for this measure have been recalculated to include results only from the CASAS and TABE results in accordance with the text of the measure; in prior years, the program also included results from the Basic English Skills Test (BEST) in the reporting for this measure, which did not accurately reflect a response to the measure. States report the usage of the BEST to assess a significant number of adults; for example, in 2008, about half of the adults tested on measures of reading/English language acquisition were assessed using that assessment. If those adults were included in the calculation of this measure, the 2008 actual would be 72.5 percent, exceeding the target. No targets are shown for 2011 because the Administration is proposing to consolidate this program.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Even Start adults with a high school completion goal who earn a high school diploma.		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2006</b>	60.8	77.6
<b>2007</b>	60.8	68.5
<b>2008</b>	60.8	75.0
<b>2009</b>	70.0	
<b>2010</b>	72.0	

**Assessment of progress:** In 2008, 75.0 percent of Even Start adults with a high school completion goal earned a high school diploma, which exceeded the target. No targets are shown for 2011 because the Administration is proposing to consolidate this program.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Even start

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Even Start adults with General Equivalency Diploma (GED) attainment goal who earn a GED.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	45.3	47.3
2007	45.3	48.9
2008	48.0	58.2
2009	45.0	
2010		

**Assessment of progress:** In 2008, 58.2 percent of Even Start adults with a high school completion goal earned a GED, exceeding the target of 48.0 percent. No targets are shown for 2011 because the Administration is proposing to consolidate this program.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Even Start children who are entering kindergarten achieving significant gains on receptive language, as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT – III).		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	84.6	75.3
2007	84.6	75.0
2008	85.0	77.1
2009	80.0	
2010	82.0	

**Assessment of progress:** In 2005, the Department defined significant gains as a gain of 4 points or more on the PPVT-III. In 2008, 77 percent of Even Start children entering kindergarten achieved significant gains on receptive language, falling short of the target of 85.0 percent. No targets are shown for 2011 because the Administration is proposing to consolidate this program.

<b>Measure:</b> The number of letters preschool-aged Even Start children can identify, as measured by the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		15
2007	16	16
2008	17	18
2009	17	
2010		

**Assessment of progress:** On average, Even Start children could identify 18 letters in 2008, exceeding the target. No targets are shown for 2011 because the Administration is proposing to consolidate this program.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Even start

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of preschool-aged children participating in Even Start programs who demonstrate age-appropriate oral language skills, as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT – III).		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		66
2008	67	69
2009	68	
2010	69	

**Assessment of progress:** The purpose of this measure is to determine the percentage of preschool-aged Even Start participants who enter kindergarten with sufficient language skills. In 2008, 69 percent of preschool-aged children demonstrated age-appropriate oral language skills, exceeding the target. No targets are shown for 2011 because the Administration is proposing to consolidate this program.

### Other Performance Information

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

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

In order to learn more about the effectiveness of instructional services, the Institute of Education Sciences used Even Start evaluation funds to conduct the *Even Start Classroom Literacy Interventions and Outcomes (CLIO)* study. The study tested whether two research-based, literacy-focused preschool and parenting education curricula were more effective than existing Even Start instructional services, and the extent to which research-based parenting education curricula that focus on child literacy add value to the CLIO preschool curricula. The final report, released in September 2008, found that the CLIO combined curricula had statistically significant positive impacts on support for print knowledge and literacy resources in the classroom, the

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Even start

---

amount of parenting education time spent on child literacy, parent interactive reading skill and parent responsiveness to their child, and child social competence. The combined curricula did not, however, demonstrate statistically significant impacts in numerous other areas, including parent English reading skills, and several child outcome measures including expressive language, receptive vocabulary, phonological awareness, print knowledge, and grammar. It is important to note, however, that this evaluation was not designed to answer questions about the Even Start program's performance, but rather to study the impact of two specific curricula implemented in the Even Start context as compared to the impact of regular Even Start instructional services.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Literacy through schools libraries

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

FY 2011 Authorization: 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$19,145	0	-\$19,145

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2011 under new legislation.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Literacy through school libraries

---

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

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$19,486
2007 .....	19,485
2008 .....	19,145
2009 .....	19,145
2010 .....	19,145

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not seeking separate funding for the School Libraries program for fiscal year 2011. The Administration proposes creating a new program, Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy, that would provide competitive grants allowing States and districts to implement comprehensive literacy strategies, with the flexibility to target funds to grades where they are most needed and focused on low-performing schools. This new program includes a focus on high-quality curricula and instructional materials aligned with K-12 standards that are reflective of college and career readiness.

This new program would provide competitive grants to States specifically to support the development and implementation of comprehensive State and local strategies for providing high-quality literacy programs for students from pre-kindergarten through grade 12. This approach would replace the patchwork of literacy funding streams in current law. The Administration believes that such a coherent yet flexible approach would help ensure that States and high-need LEAs have a solid infrastructure across grade levels to support high-need schools in implementing high-quality, developmentally appropriate, and systematic literacy instruction. Under the Administration's proposal, State and local educational agencies that receive grants or subgrants would be required to develop (or update) and implement a comprehensive pre-K-12 literacy plan.

Activities to expand school or classroom library services would be an authorized activity under the program, and LEAs whose plans call for increasing their library collections, opening their facilities for longer hours, or providing professional development to school librarians would be able to use program funds for those activities. With this comprehensive literacy program in place, the Administration does not believe that a separate, narrow categorical program for school libraries would be needed.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Literacy through school libraries

---

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Amount for local awards	\$18,560	\$18,571	0
Number of new awards	57	55-65	0
Number of schools served	590	590	0
Amount for peer review of applications	\$191	\$191	0
Amount for evaluation	\$189	\$191	0
Amount for the DOI Bureau of Indian Education	\$96	\$96	0
Amount for the Outlying Areas	\$96	\$96	0

NOTE: Fiscal year 2009 excludes \$13 thousand in unobligated funds transferred to the Career, Technical, and Adult Education account to help support the Adult Education State Grants program. Authority to transfer available funds that would otherwise lapse was provided in Section 804 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (P.L. 111-32).

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measure

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

The Department recently revised the program's performance measures. The new measures are: (1) the percentage of students in schools served by the Literacy Through School Libraries program who are proficient in reading; (2) the number of books and media resources purchased per student, pre- and post-grant, compared to the national average; and (3) the difference in the number of purchases of school library materials (books and media resources) between schools participating in the Literacy Through School Libraries program and the national average. The Department expects to have baseline data for the new measures in spring 2010.

##### Other Performance Information

In 2009, the Department completed an evaluation of the program to determine: (1) how districts allocate grant funds and target them to schools with the greatest need for improved library resources; (2) how funds are used (e.g., to buy books, improve technology, increase library hours, or provide professional development for library and reading staff); (3) the effects of the program on staff collaboration and coordination; and (4) how reading achievement scores vary

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Literacy through school libraries

---

in schools that received grants compared to schools that did not. The study addressed these questions by examining data from grantee performance reports, a school library survey of grantees and matched comparison schools, and annual school-level student test score data. The study is posted at: <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oepd/ppss/reports.html#libraries>.

Key findings of the study include:

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Literacy through school libraries

---

- Grantees acquired substantially more books in the 2005-06 grant year than did nongrantees (with means of 1,611 and 784 books, respectively), although nongrantees still had more books in their library collections at the end of the year than did grantees (11,892 for nongrantees and 9,451 for grantees).
- About twice as many classroom teachers, paraprofessionals, and reading specialists in grantee schools received professional development related to school libraries compared with nongrant staff members (for example, a mean of 9.5 to 4.7 classroom teachers, respectively) in 2005-06. However, the mean number of both grantee and nongrant staff members receiving professional development decreased in 2005-06 compared to 2003-04, especially for classroom teachers (from 14.1 to 9.5 for grantees and from 11.1 to 4.7 for nongrantees).
- Grantees were more likely than nongrantees to have library media staff members: (1) assist teachers in designing, implementing, and evaluating research projects for students (42 percent versus 24 percent); (2) work with the principal and/or teachers on curriculum issues (40 percent versus 23 percent); (3) participate in team meetings (36 percent versus 23 percent); and (4) coordinate training programs on integrating educational technology into the curriculum for teachers and other staff members (42 percent versus 22 percent).
- No definitive statement can be made as to whether the Literacy Through School Libraries program was associated with changes in student test scores. The program feature that most clearly was associated with improved test results was an increase in the number of books per student that were purchased by the library. Some differences appeared by instructional level, with grantee status showing a stronger relationship to student test scores at the elementary-school level and an increase in the number of books per student showing a stronger relationship at the secondary-school level. However, because of the lack of a true experimental design, the findings cannot support causal inferences that attribute observed differences in student reading achievement to participation in the program.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### National Writing Project

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title II, Part C, Subpart 2)

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$25,646	0	-\$25,646

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is authorized in 2010 through appropriations language. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2011 under new legislation.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The National Writing Project (NWP) is a nationwide nonprofit educational organization that promotes and supports K-16 teacher training programs in the effective teaching of writing. The NWP consists of a network of sites through which teachers in every region of the United States gain access to best practices and research findings about the teaching of writing and the use of writing in the learning process. To provide these services, the NWP contracts with institutions of higher education and nonprofit education providers to operate small (\$100,000 or less) teacher training programs. Federal funds support 50 percent of the costs of these programs, and recipients must contribute an equal amount. A national advisory board provides advice and reviews NWP programs and activities.

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

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$21,533
2007 .....	21,533
2008 .....	21,581
2009 .....	24,291
2010 .....	25,646

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not seeking separate funding for the National Writing Project (NWP) program in fiscal year 2011. In place of this program and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs, the Administration proposes to create a broader title within the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization, Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education. This would include a new literacy program, Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy, which would provide competitive grants to States and districts to support the development and implementation of comprehensive State and local strategies for providing

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### National writing project

---

high-quality literacy programs for students from pre-kindergarten through grade 12. This approach would replace the patchwork of literacy funding streams in current law.

From the amount requested for Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education, the Administration would reserve funds to support a range of national activities, including research, technical assistance, prize awards, dissemination, and creation of a clearinghouse. The NWP program authority provides earmarked assistance to a specific entity, and the Administration believes that competing funds rather than earmarking them will lead to higher-quality programs and improved student outcomes. Organizations such as the National Writing Project would be encouraged to compete for such national activities funding available under the new program to create high-quality, educational content for children.

Furthermore, NWP has a long history of success raising additional revenue through partnering with nonprofit groups on core activities, lobbying, and seeking grants from foundations and is well positioned to continue its activities without further Federal support.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Number of project sites	197	200	0
Number of States (including D.C., Puerto Rico, & the Virgin Islands)	50	50	0

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

#### Performance Measures

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

The Department recently adopted one annual performance measure designed to provide information on the quality of NWP professional development programs, and changes in the classroom teaching practices of teachers who participate in such training. This measure is: the percentage of sites that surpass all NWP quality review criteria in the areas of: a) overall adherence to the NWP model; and b) structural support and strategic effectiveness.

Data for this measure are not yet available. Data for this measure are collected by NWP, through the NWP site peer review. The Department's goal was originally to establish a baseline for this measure by fall 2009, using data from the 2008 NWP training sessions. However, the Department does not yet have the data, and is currently following up with NWP to determine the status of NWP's collection. The peer review process used to collect data for this measure was

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### National writing project

---

designed, developed, and implemented by the NWP. This process rates structural support and strategic effectiveness for each site using the following criteria: a) adequacy of institutional partnerships i.e., between universities serving as host institutions and schools in the service area; b) development and deployment of teacher leadership; and c) instructors' knowledge of the educational context and challenges in the site geographic area. Reviewers, who are primarily teachers from other NWP sites, use a structured protocol to rate sites using the following scale: 2 = meets or exceeds all criteria; 1 = requires technical assistance; and 0 = not recommended for funding. Three types of NWP professional development programs offered at each site (summer institute, in-service programs, and continuity programs) are considered in this review, as well as each site's overall adherence to the NWP professional development model.

### Efficiency Measures

Two efficiency measures have been adopted for the NWP program. These measures are: 1) the average annual Federal cost per contact hour for educators participating in NWP training and professional development; and 2) the average annual total cost per contact hour for educators participating in NWP training and professional development.

These measures provide the average annual total cost, as well as the annual Federal cost, to support a single contact hour of NWP programming to an individual participant. Contact hours are calculated at the site level, on a "per program" basis, by identifying the total number of participants in each NWP program multiplied by the average number of hours per participant for that program. Contact hour calculations are averaged across all 196 NWP sites to obtain a national average for a single year period. The average national total cost per contact hour is calculated by using NWP sites' total income from all sources, including NWP Federal appropriations, as the base. Data for these measures are collected and analyzed by the NWP. The Department's goal was originally to establish baselines by fall 2009, using data from NWP training sessions held in 2007 and 2008. However, the Department does not yet have the data, and is currently following up with NWP to determine the status of NWP's collection.

### Other Performance Information

While the Department has not conducted any evaluations of this program, NWP has employed two approaches to determine the effectiveness of its programs. The first approach focuses on teacher satisfaction and impact on educational practice. The second approach attempts to measure effects on student performance through writing assessments.

Each year, data on teacher satisfaction are collected through a survey developed by Inverness Research Associates, under contract to the NWP. This survey and a follow-up survey on the effect of the program on teaching practice are administered to all summer institute participants. Approximately 2,800 teachers participate in each survey conducted. The NWP has reported every year that over 98 percent of participating teachers rate the NWP as good or excellent. While teachers who participated in the program almost invariably reported that they gained concrete teaching strategies and access to more up-to-date research by attending the summer institute, it is not possible with the survey data to determine whether actual classroom teaching practices of participating teachers improved.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### National writing project

---

In 1999, the NWP commissioned the Academy for Educational Development (AED) to conduct a 3-year national evaluation of the project. The goal of the evaluation was to collect data on how student writing is taught in classrooms, the conditions that support student achievement in writing, and the outcomes for students with teachers who have participated in NWP institutes and workshops. There were four sources of data for this evaluation, including teacher assignments and student work, timed writing prompts, teacher interviews and surveys, and background data from other sources. The study concluded that “most 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade students in the study classes demonstrated adequate or strong levels of achievement in their writing and made statistically significant gains in rhetorical effectiveness and control of the conventions of writing.”

While both the survey and AED study suggest that the NWP support programs may have positive effects on teacher effectiveness and student outcomes, neither approach is sufficiently rigorous to yield reliable information on the effectiveness of NWP-supported interventions. For example, in the AED study, data showed a significant increase in the writing skills of students in the NWP teachers' classrooms, but the study failed to compare these gains to comparable control groups or carefully matched comparison groups. Therefore, it is not yet possible to draw any reliable conclusions about the impact of the NWP on student learning in NWP classrooms relative to other comparable non-NWP classrooms.

The Department has encouraged the NWP to conduct a far more rigorous, independent national program evaluation, and in November 2006, the NWP contracted with SRI International, located in Menlo Park, CA, to conduct a 4-year evaluation. The national evaluation began in fiscal year 2007. Throughout the evaluation design phase, the Department routinely offered detailed feedback to the NWP to augment the rigor and quality of this work. An interim report that was originally scheduled for publication in fiscal year 2009 is now expected in 2010, and the final report is expected in fiscal year 2011.

**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

---

**Reading is fundamental/Inexpensive book distribution**

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 5)

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$24,803	0	-\$24,803

---

<sup>1</sup>The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2011 under new legislation.

---

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The Reading is Fundamental/Inexpensive Book Distribution program awards a 5-year contract, subject to review each year, to Reading is Fundamental, Inc. (RIF) to provide aid to local nonprofit groups and volunteer organizations that serve low-income children through book distribution and reading motivation activities. RIF is a nonprofit literacy organization whose program work focuses on three core principles: book ownership, motivational activities, and family and community involvement in children's reading. Through the efforts of volunteers and nonprofit organizations in every State and U.S. territory, RIF programs provide millions of children with new, free books and literacy resources.

Federal funds provide up to 75 percent of the costs of books, with the remainder obtained from private and local sources. Migrant and seasonal farmworker programs may receive up to 100 percent of the costs of books. RIF, in selecting its nonprofit recipients, must give priority to groups that serve children with special needs, such as children from low-income families, homeless children, and children with disabilities.

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

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$25,043
2007 .....	25,043
2008 .....	24,606
2009 .....	24,803
2010 .....	24,803

**FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration is not seeking separate funding for the Reading is Fundamental program for fiscal year 2011. In place of several, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that seek to improve student achievement in specific subject areas (including programs that promote reading

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Reading is fundamental/Inexpensive book distribution

and literacy), the Administration proposes to create a broader program, Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy, that addresses the need to strengthen instruction and increase achievement across the content areas. This new program would replace current ESEA programs that support improvement of education in reading, writing, mathematics and science, arts, foreign language, history, civics and government, and economics.

A component of the new Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program would provide competitive grants to States specifically to support the development and implementation of comprehensive State and local strategies for providing high-quality literacy programs designed to increase student achievement in high-need LEAs for students from pre-kindergarten through grade 12. This approach would replace the patchwork of literacy funding streams in current law with a single, comprehensive, coherent, and flexible program. The Administration believes that this approach would help ensure that States and high-need LEAs have in place a solid infrastructure across the grade levels to support high-need schools in implementing high-quality, developmentally appropriate, and systematic literacy instruction. Under the Administration's proposal for the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program, local grantees would be permitted to partner with nonprofit organizations, such as RIF, to further the implementation of the LEA's comprehensive literacy plan.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Book funds			
Federal share	\$19,435	\$19,435	0
Local match	<u>\$5,866</u>	<u>\$5,866</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	\$25,301	\$25,301	0
Books distributed	14,717,570	14,717,570	0
Children served	4,101,660	4,101,660	0
Number of sites	16,340	16,340	0
Average Federal share per child (for books and services, whole dollars)	\$4.79	\$4.79	0
Federal cost per book (whole dollars)	\$1.32	\$1.32	0
Books per child	3.6	3.6	0
Technical assistance	\$3,083	\$3,083	0
Support services and management	\$2,285	\$2,285	0

NOTE: Figures for 2009 and 2010 are estimates based on activity supported during fiscal year 2008 with fiscal year 2007 funds, which is the most recent year for which information is available.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Reading is fundamental/Inexpensive book distribution

---

#### 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.

**Goal: To motivate low-income children to read.**

**Objective:** *To distribute books and to provide reading strategies to low-income children, their families, and service providers.*

<b>Measure:</b> The number of low-income children who receive books and reading services through the Reading is Fundamental program.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2006	3,759,960	4,351,128
2007	3,769,244	4,141,351
2008	3,700,000	
2009	3,750,000	
2010	4,200,000	

**Assessment of Progress:** The measure gauges the extent to which the program provides books and reading services to low-income children. RIF estimates this number by multiplying the number of children served by the percentage of children who are eligible for free- and reduced- lunch as reported by local projects. The Department established the 2010 target using 2007 data. It is important to note that these data represent the total number of children served with Federal funds; 79 percent of children served in 2007-08 with 2007 funds were eligible for free- and reduced-price lunch. The number of participants decreased from 2006 to 2007 because a few programs that served large numbers of children withdrew or were no longer eligible for the program. No target is shown for 2011 because the Administration is proposing to consolidate this program.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Ready-to-learn television

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

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$27,300	0	-\$27,300

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is authorized in 2010 through appropriations language. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2011 under new legislation.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Ready-to-Learn (RTL) Television program is designed to facilitate student academic achievement by supporting the development and distribution of educational video programming for preschool and elementary school children and their parents, caregivers, and teachers. At least 60 percent of the funding must be used to:

- Develop educational programming for preschool and elementary school children and the accompanying support materials and services that may be used to promote the effective use of such programming;
- Develop programming (and digital content containing RTL-based children's programming) that is specifically designed for nationwide distribution over public television stations' digital broadcasting channels and the Internet, along with accompanying resources for parents and caregivers; and
- Support contracts with public telecommunications and related entities to ensure that programs are widely distributed.

Remaining funds may be used to develop and disseminate education and training materials, including interactive programs that are designed to promote school readiness through the effective use of educational video programs.

Only public telecommunications entities are eligible to receive awards. In addition, applicants must have the capacity to: develop and distribute high-quality educational and instructional television programming that is accessible by disadvantaged preschool and elementary school children; contract with the producers of children's television programming; negotiate these contracts in a manner that returns an appropriate share of income from sales of program-related products; and, target programming and materials to meet specific State and local needs, while providing educational outreach at the local level.

Grantees are required to consult with the Secretaries of Education and Health and Human Services on strategies to maximize the use of quality educational programming for preschool

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Ready-to-learn television

---

and elementary school children. Grantees must also coordinate activities with other Federal programs that have major training components related to early childhood development.

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

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$24,255
2007 .....	24,255
2008 .....	23,831
2009 .....	25,416
2010 .....	27,300

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not seeking separate funding for the Ready-to-Learn (RTL) television program in fiscal year 2011. In place of this program and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs, the Administration proposes to create a broader title within the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization, Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education. This would include a new literacy program, Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy, which would provide competitive grants to States and districts to support the development and implementation of comprehensive State and local strategies for providing high-quality literacy programs for students from pre-kindergarten through grade 12. This approach would replace the patchwork of literacy funding streams in current law.

From the amount requested for the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education programs, the Administration would reserve funds to support a range of national activities, including research, technical assistance, prize awards, dissemination, and creation of a clearinghouse. Public telecommunications entities—such as the Public Broadcasting Service, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and other entities—would be encouraged to compete for such national activities funding available under this program to create high-quality, educational content for children.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Number of new awards	0	5	0
Number of continuation awards	3	0	0
New award funding	0	\$27,280	0
Continuation award funding	\$25,416	0	0
Peer review of new award applications	<u>0</u>	<u>\$20</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	25,416	27,300	0

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Ready-to-learn television

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Over the last few years, the Department has supported various strategies to obtain more timely and accurate information on the extent to which activities supported through the RTL program may improve learning outcomes for children. The Department developed new GPRA goals and measures to provide information on the impact and quality of RTL programming and outreach. The Department also used the fiscal year 2005 competition to dramatically re-design the management and implementation of core program activities. For example, all programming content developed under current awards must be clearly linked to, and informed by, scientifically based research in reading and early literacy. Instead of a single, large award to one grantee, the Department made three smaller awards to different grantees (two programming grantees and one outreach grantee) that focus more strategically on specific core program activities. To ensure that the effects of programming-related activities are more carefully measured, both programming grantees are conducting rigorous evaluations that use experimental or quasi-experimental designs. Grantee evaluators must also meet periodically with an outside advisory panel of expert evaluators.

#### Performance Measures

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

**Goal: The Ready to Learn television program will enhance the learning strategies of preschool and early elementary school children.**

**Objective 1:** *Develop, produce, and distribute high-quality televised educational programming for preschool and early elementary school children.*

**Objective 2:** *Develop and implement high-quality targeted outreach strategies (including Ready to Learn products and services).*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Ready to Learn children's television programming deemed to be of high quality.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2008		50
2009	75	75
2010	100	

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Ready-to-learn television

---

**Measure:** The percentage of Ready to Learn targeted outreach products and services deemed to be of high quality.

Year	Targets	Actual
2008		72
2009	82	50
2010	92	

#### Assessment of progress:

Expert panel members are asked to review a random sample of current RTL television programming, including individual episodes from different television programs, as well as a selection of outreach products and services, and provide a quality rating using criteria developed by the Department. Expert panel members rated products based on a 5-point Likert scale. They are also asked to provide a summary of their overall assessments of the quality of each product. In order for any particular episode or product to achieve a rating of “high quality,” an overall score of 4.0 out of 5.0 must be assigned.

In 2008, 50 percent of RTL programs (2 of 4) for which episodes were reviewed were considered by expert panel members to be of “high quality,” and 72 percent of RTL outreach products (8 of 11), were considered to be of “high quality.” Likewise, in 2009, 75 percent of RTL programs (3 of 4) for which episodes were reviewed, and 50 percent of RTL outreach products (4 of 8), were considered to be of “high quality.”

The Department has on-going concerns with a single television program (*Martha Speaks*) for which panel members have assigned a score below 4.0 for the second year in a row. The Department has scheduled a meeting with the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS), and the show’s producers to discuss plans for improving the series, and for addressing the issues identified by expert panel members. Likewise, the Department has concerns regarding the overall quality of RTL outreach products and services, and is currently working to make sure grantees implement the expert panel recommendations.

#### Efficiency Measures

A single efficiency measure has also been developed for the RTL program. This measure is dollars leveraged from non-Federal sources over 5 years (the length of each current award) per Federal dollar dedicated to core non-outreach program activities. Because high quality children’s television programs are so expensive to develop, produce, and distribute, Federal support for new programming through the RTL programs is typically used by grantees to attract additional revenue from the private sector. In most cases, in order to have sufficient funds to develop a high quality children’s program, upwards of 75 percent (the Federal contribution is typically 20 to 25 percent) of development costs are routinely covered by non-Federal dollars. In this program, quality is directly affected by the extent to which grantees succeed in using Federal dollars to leverage additional funds from alternate sources. This measure will be used to compare the relative success of RTL grantees in leveraging non-Federal investments for the development and production of new children’s television programs.

Data for this measure are not yet available. The Department is currently working to define “core non-outreach program activities,” and obtain data for each of these areas of work for previous

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Ready-to-learn television

---

grantees under the RTL program. Because grantees typically are not expected to establish annual leveraging targets, and there is no set schedule for obtaining matching funds, the only truly meaningful unit of analysis for purposes of comparing grantee performance is the entire 5-year award period. As a result, this measure will be implemented as a long-term efficiency measure, and data to establish a baseline will not likely become available until after fiscal year 2010, when the project period expires for current grantees.

### Other Performance Information

Both RTL programming grantees are currently implementing multiple formative studies that should improve many aspects of their projects, and summative evaluations that are designed to provide evidence on the extent to which children's television programming contributes to gains in early literacy. Final results are expected in fiscal year 2011, after the no-cost extension year available to current grantees.

#### *Evaluations of Programming Content*

Formative studies supported by RTL grantees generally analyze a wide range of issues, such as appeal, comprehension, age appropriateness, and integration of literacy-based curricula—including the extent to which episodes effectively incorporate pre-literacy learning objectives such as letter recognition, differentiation of phonemes, and rhyming. Findings from these formative studies provide ongoing feedback to producers and developers as they develop new programming content.

Summative evaluations supported by RTL grantees use rigorous evaluation methodologies, and while most of these ongoing evaluations are not yet complete, the results available to date are generally positive. For example, Chicago Public Television's initial summative evaluation of a children's program called *Word World* was designed to test, in a large-scale randomized control trial (1,000+ children), the effectiveness of viewing episodes of the new television series in improving early literacy learning skills among children in the target audience. The sample for this study included six geographic areas of the country, and groups from diverse economic backgrounds. More specifically, the *Word World* summative evaluation is design to test:

Whether daily viewing of *Word World* episodes in preschool classrooms over a 6-week period results in gains in knowledge of print conventions, letter recognition, phonemic awareness, episode-specific vocabulary, and/or episode-specific word recognition (as measured by comparison of a pre- to post-assessment).

Whether educational effects of *Word World* are moderated by children's family income level, gender, initial verbal language skills (as assessed by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-4 (PPVT-IV)), and region of the country.

Whether educational effects are mediated by children's interest and attention while viewing (as determined from both teacher viewing logs and from the *Word World* Content Test section on children's knowledge about show characters).

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Ready-to-learn television

---

Results of this study to date suggest that regular viewing of *Word World* may improve preschool children's learning of specific literacy skills. Significant results were found in the overall sample for: the learning of vocabulary words that occurred in the *Word World* episodes viewed (a 5.6 percent gain was found between pre- and post-test for children in the experimental condition group, compared to a 2.4 percent gain for children in the control group), and in the recognition of printed words that occurred in the episodes viewed (a 3.9 percent gain was found for children in the experimental condition group, compared to a 1.1 percent gain for children in the control group). Significant results were also found for particular subgroups. Specifically, significant gains in phonemic awareness were found for: pre-k children from homes where parents' level of education was high school or less; pre-k children who scored in the lower third on the baseline verbal vocabulary assessment (the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test); and pre-K children from lower income homes where English is spoken as a second language.

#### *Evaluations Supporting Outreach*

CPB is partnering with PBS to promote public awareness of RTL literacy-based programming at the national and local levels through a targeted outreach campaign that utilizes social marketing research. Social marketing research generally measures the appeal and demand of outreach messages, products, and resources deployed in local public broadcasting markets. This research is designed to ensure that new RTL programming reaches target audiences with engaging literacy-based content. Outreach studies that are intended to measure specific impacts of RTL outreach on children's literacy will also be implemented in two to three communities in large target markets.

Collectively these research activities should provide a comprehensive examination of how families interact with children to support their learning; what barriers impede effective engagement of children, families, and caregivers; how television programming may be utilized to meet some of the educational needs of low income families; and the role various technology platforms may play in enhancing learning through targeted programming and outreach.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Mathematics and science partnerships

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

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$180,478	0	-\$180,478

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2011 under new legislation.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Mathematics and science partnerships

---

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

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$182,160
2007 .....	182,160
2008 .....	178,978
2009 .....	178,978
2010 .....	180,478

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not seeking separate funding for Mathematics and Science Partnerships for fiscal year 2011. In place of this program, the Administration proposes to create the Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) program through the pending Elementary and Secondary Education (ESEA) reauthorization.

The new program would provide competitive grants to SEAs (or SEAs in partnership with appropriate outside entities) to support State and local efforts aimed at implementing and supporting a comprehensive STEM strategy for the provision of high-quality STEM instruction and support to students from prekindergarten through grade 12. Grantees and subgrantees would be required to focus on mathematics or science, or both, and could also include technology or engineering. In awarding State STEM grants, the Department would give priority to SEAs that have adopted and are implementing a set of K-12 college- and career-ready standards in, at minimum, mathematics. States would be permitted to reserve funds for State-level activities to support the development and implementation of a coherent approach to funding and implementing high-quality evidence-based STEM instruction in high-need schools. States would be required to use their remaining grant funds to make subgrants to high-need LEAs and eligible partnerships to improve STEM instruction at the local level, including, for example, through online curriculum and technology-based approaches. In addition, as a component of the Administration's governmentwide effort to support and improve STEM education, the proposed Investing in Innovation program would dedicate a further \$150 million towards STEM projects and include a cross-cutting emphasis on technology.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Amount distributed to States	\$178,083	\$179,583	0
Range of State formula grants	\$890-20,038	\$898-\$21,178	0
Average State formula grant	\$3,180	\$3,225	0
Evaluation	\$895	\$895	0

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Mathematics and science partnerships

---

#### 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.

**Goal: To improve the quality of mathematics and science teachers and increase both the number of highly qualified mathematics and science teachers and the achievement of students participating in Mathematics and Science Partnerships programs.**

**Objective:** *Demonstrate the effectiveness of professional development activities for Mathematics and Science Partnerships teachers through increased achievement on assessments of mathematics and science content knowledge.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Mathematics and Science Partnerships teachers who significantly increase their content knowledge, as reflected on project-level pre- and post-assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	Baseline	78
2008	79	70
2009	80	
2010	81	

**Assessment of progress:** The target is based on 2007 baseline data. In 2008, the program missed its target of 79 percent. No target is shown for fiscal year 2011 because the program is proposed for consolidation.

**Objective:** *Increase the percentage of students in classrooms of Mathematics and Science Partnerships teachers who score at the basic level or above in State assessments of mathematics and science.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students in classrooms of Mathematics and Science Partnerships teachers who score at the basic level or above in State assessments of mathematics or science.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	Baseline	60
2008	61	51
2009	62	
2010	63	

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Mathematics and science partnerships

**Measure:** The percentage of students in classrooms of Mathematics and Science Partnerships teachers who score at the proficient level or above in State assessments of mathematics or science.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	Baseline	44
2008	45	46
2009	46	
2010	47	

**Assessment of progress:** The targets are based on 2007 baseline data. In 2008, the program fell below its target of 61 percent of students scoring at the basic level or above in State assessments of mathematics or science. The program did, however, exceed its target of 45 percent of students who score at the proficient level or above in State assessments of mathematics or science. No target is shown for fiscal year 2011 because the program is proposed for consolidation.

**Objective:** *Increase the percentage of Mathematics and Science Partnerships projects that use an experimental or quasi-experimental design for their evaluations, that conduct their evaluations successfully, and whose evaluations yield scientifically valid results.*

**Measure:** The percentage of Mathematics and Science Partnerships projects that report using an experimental or quasi-experimental design for their evaluations.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	Baseline	37
2008	38	42
2009	39	
2010	40	

**Measure:** The percentage of Mathematics and Science Partnerships projects that use an experimental or quasi-experimental design for their evaluations, and, in addition, whose evaluations are conducted successfully and yield scientifically valid results.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	Baseline	12
2008	13	20
2009	14	
2010	15	

**Assessment of progress:** The State coordinator collects program performance information from annual performance reports and rates them using a rubric developed for the Department. In 2008, the program exceeded its goals for this objective. No target is shown for fiscal year 2011 because the program is proposed for consolidation.

### Efficiency Measure

The efficiency measure for Mathematics and Science Partnerships focuses on increasing the percentage of State educational agencies that submit complete and accurate data for the program's performance measures in a timely manner.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Mathematics and science partnerships

---

**Measure:** The percentage of State educational agencies that submit complete and accurate data on program performance measures in a timely manner.

Year	Target	Actual
2006	Baseline	94
2007	100	100
2008	100	96
2009	100	
2010	100	

**Assessment of progress:** The program made its goal for 2007 but fell below it for 2008. Data for 2009 will be available in the summer of 2010.

#### Other Performance Information

The Department is using evaluation funds to collect and analyze annually descriptive data from partnerships supported by the program. Partnerships provide a narrative description of their activities annually; these narratives contain information about teacher participation, growth in teacher content knowledge, and student learning.

In 2005, the Department hired a contractor to aggregate data supplied by partnerships. The contractor and Department staff work closely with States and partnerships to help ensure that the data are consistent across States and projects. A particular challenge is aggregating data from projects that vary widely in terms of the length of the professional development provided, the number of teachers served, the grade levels taught by the teachers served, and whether the projects focus on mathematics, science, or a combination of the two.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### **Excellence in economic education**

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 13)

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$1,447	0	-\$1,447

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2011 under new legislation.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Excellence in Economic Education program supports a competitive grant to a national nonprofit education organization to promote economic and financial literacy among students in kindergarten through grade 12.

The authorizing legislation requires the grantee to dedicate 25 percent of its grant to national activities that develop and support effective relationships with State and local economic education organizations; promote effective teaching of economics; support research and evaluation on effective teaching of economics; and disseminate materials that foster economic literacy.

The remaining 75 percent must be used to award subgrants to State educational agencies (SEAs), local educational agencies (LEAs), and State or local economic, personal finance, or entrepreneurial education organizations to support teacher training; economics curriculum development; evaluations on the impact of economics education on students; research on economics education; the creation of school-based student activities to promote consumer, economic, and personal finance education; and the replication of best practices in the effective teaching of economics and financial literacy education. Subgrant recipients must secure a 50 percent match from non-Federal sources, which may be provided in cash or in-kind. Program funds must be used to supplement, not supplant, other Federal, State, and local funds spent for economics and financial literacy.

In 2004, the National Council on Economic Education, now named the Council for Economic Education, received a 1-year grant to implement this program. The Council subsequently received a 5-year grant in 2005 to continue the work begun in 2004, including the expansion of current programs, the development of new programs, and strengthening its network of State councils and over 200 university-based centers.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Excellence in economic education

---

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

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$1,473
2007 .....	1,473
2008 .....	1,447
2009 .....	1,447
2010 .....	1,447

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not seeking separate funding for the Excellence in Economics Education program for fiscal year 2011. In place of several, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that seek to improve student achievement in specific subject areas, the Administration proposes to create a broader program, Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education, that addresses the need to strengthen instruction and increase achievement across the content areas, especially in low-performing schools. The new program would replace current ESEA programs that support improvement of education in reading, writing, mathematics and science, arts, foreign language, history, civics and government, and economics. High-need LEAs, SEAs in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs, and nonprofit organizations in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs would be eligible to apply for competitive grants whose activities could include, among other things, the development, implementation, and evaluation of successful programs; dissemination of evidence-based practices; and, scaling up effective programs.

The Department believes that efforts to enable more students to become financially literate should be a priority, and will likely make that a focus of competitions under the new program. In addition, the Department of Education has joined with the Department of the Treasury to promote a new initiative, the National Financial Capability Challenge, that will encourage educators and schools to incorporate financial education into their curricula and to reward innovation and effective teaching. Other Department initiatives include implementation of Congress' amendments to the TRIO and GEAR UP programs (in the Higher Education Opportunity Act) that encourage grantees to coordinate their financial and economic literacy activities with existing school-based efforts. Examples of these activities include financial planning for postsecondary education and financial literacy counseling for students and their parents.

The Administration's budget proposal would provide funds to continue Excellence in Economics Education grants from the appropriation for the new Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Excellence in economic education

---

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Funding for subgrants	\$1,085	\$1,085	0
Funding for direct grantee activities	\$362	\$362	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 those requested in FY 2011 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

In 2004, the Department developed one performance measure for this program: the percentage of students taught by teachers trained under the Excellence in Economic Education program who demonstrated improved understanding of personal finance and economics. This measure proved applicable only to the small segment of subgrantees focused on classroom teaching.

In 2006, the Department worked with the Council on Economic Education, the program grantee, to refine the reporting process for subgrantees and to strengthen data collection. Following that effort, the Council has required subgrant applicants to recruit a significant sample of participating teachers whose students would be given pre- and post-tests in economics or personal finance, or both. Students of teachers participating in the subgrantee programs funded during the 2007-08 school year were the first to be tested. These tests are aligned with the Council's National Content Standards in Economics, and the Department will receive performance data for the first year of the 2007-08 subgrant cohort in spring 2010.

In 2008, under the Data Quality Initiative, the Department approved 3 new performance measures that will draw data from comprehensive assessments of student performance across projects, grade levels, and geographic regions. The first data should be available in July 2010.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Teaching American history

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title II, Part C, Subpart 4)

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$118,952	0	-\$118,952

---

<sup>1</sup> The GPRA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2011 under new legislation.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Teaching American History (TAH) program supports competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to promote the teaching of traditional American history in elementary and secondary schools as a separate academic subject. Grants made prior to fiscal year 2008 were awarded for 3 years. Beginning in 2008, the Department has awarded 3-year grants, with 2 additional years for grantees demonstrating effective performance during the first 3 years.

Grants are used to improve the quality of history instruction by supporting professional development for teachers of American history, including elementary school teachers who teach history as a part of the general curriculum. In order to receive a grant, an LEA must agree to carry out the proposed activities in partnership with one or more of the following: an institution of higher education, a nonprofit history or humanities organization, a library, or a museum.

In recent years, appropriations language has permitted the Department to reserve up to 3 percent of funding for national activities. Primary TAH national activities have included an annual grantee conference, a national implementation study, and the funding of the National History Education Clearinghouse, housed at George Mason University in Virginia.

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

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$119,790
2007 .....	119,790
2008 .....	117,904
2009 .....	118,952
2010 .....	118,952

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Teaching American history

---

#### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not seeking separate funding for the Teaching American History program for fiscal year 2011. In place of several narrowly targeted programs focused on student achievement in specific subject areas, the Administration proposes to create a broader program, Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education, that addresses the need to strengthen instruction and increase achievement across content areas, especially in low-performing schools. The new program would replace current ESEA programs that support improvement of education in reading, writing, mathematics and science, arts, foreign language, history, civics and government, and economics. High-need LEAs, SEAs in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs, and nonprofit organizations in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs would be eligible to apply for competitive grants whose activities could include among other things, the development, implementation, and evaluation of successful programs; dissemination of evidence-based practices; and, scaling up effective programs. The Administration believes that the new program would better target teachers in need of program services in a way that the TAH program does not, as discussed in the program performance section below.

The Administration's budget proposal would provide funds to continue TAH grants through their conclusion, from the appropriation for the new Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Amount for new awards	\$116,302	\$116,327	0
Number of new awards	121	110-120	0
Range of awards	\$400-2,000	\$400-2,000	0
Number of teachers served	19,200	19,300	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$250	\$225	0
Evaluation	\$400	\$400	0
National Activities	\$2,000	\$2,000	0

---

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$50,000 thousand for Teaching American History grants initiated with FY 2008 funds would be provided from the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program. The Department funds 3-year projects under this program entirely from the funds available in the fiscal year during which the awards are first made. Beginning in 2011, grantees (initially from the 2008 cohort) that demonstrate adequate progress may receive 1 or 2 more years of funding. Funds for such continuations would be provided from the appropriation provided in the fiscal year during which the continuation grant is awarded.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Teaching American history

---

#### 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 2011 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department recently established new performance measures for the program. The fiscal year 2009 grantees will be the first grantees to collect and report data to the Department that address the new measures. Data will come from grantees' annual performance reports, and baseline data should be available in the fall of 2010. The new performance measures are:

- The average percentage change in the scores (on a pre-post assessment of American history) of participants who complete at least 75 percent of the professional development hours offered by the project. Each project's assessment will be aligned with the content of the project, and at least 50 percent of its questions will come from a validated test of American history; and
- The percentage of TAH participants who complete 75 percent or more of the total hours of professional development offered.

##### Efficiency Measures

The Department also has developed two new efficiency measures for the program: (1) the cost per TAH participant who completes 75 percent or more of the total hours of professional development offered; and (2) the cost per teacher hour of professional development attended. Baseline data are expected to be available in the spring of 2010.

##### Other Performance Information

In 2005, the Department completed a 3-year evaluation of the TAH program. The evaluation addressed questions related to the characteristics of funded activities; the types of instructional training and support services teachers are receiving, including the specific subjects and areas of American history in which teachers receive training; and the qualifications and characteristics of teachers who participate in the grant projects. Results showed that TAH-funded programs were successful in providing teachers with professional development on a broad range of American history topics. For example, two-thirds of project directors reported "a great deal" or "substantial" amount of improvement in teachers' content knowledge and 29 percent indicated that student performance increased "a great deal" or "substantially."

The evaluation also found, however, that TAH grants were not reaching those teachers most in need of services. Approximately 74 percent of participating teachers had more than 5 years of

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Teaching American history

---

teaching experience, and many were already certified in history or a history-related field. Further analysis showed that a majority of TAH participants had 14 or more years of teaching experience and held advanced degrees in history. These findings, combined with the fact that many teachers voluntarily participated in time-intensive TAH projects, suggest that TAH projects likely reach those teachers most interested in American history, not those most in need of additional professional development.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Arts in education

---

#### Arts in education

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 15)

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$40,000	0	-\$40,000

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2011 under new legislation.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Arts in Education program authorizes awards to VSA Arts, a national organization that sponsors programs to encourage the involvement of, and foster greater awareness of the need for, arts programs for persons with disabilities, and to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts for its arts education programs for children and youth. If the amount appropriated for the program is less than \$15 million, these two organizations receive the entire amount.

The program also authorizes national demonstration and Federal leadership activities to encourage the integration of the arts into the school curriculum. Allowable activities under the statute include: (1) research on arts education; (2) development and dissemination of information about model school-based arts education programs; (3) development of model State arts education assessments based on State academic achievement standards; (4) development and implementation of curriculum frameworks in the arts; (5) development of model professional development programs in the arts for teachers and administrators; (6) support of collaborative activities with Federal agencies or institutions involved in arts education, arts educators, and organizations representing the arts, including State and local arts agencies involved in art education; and (7) support of model projects and programs to integrate arts education into the regular elementary school and secondary school curriculum.

The Department supports a number of arts education activities through grants to local educational agencies (LEAs), State educational agencies (SEAs), nonprofit organizations, institutions of higher education, organizations with expertise in the arts, and partnerships of these entities. Model Development and Dissemination grants support the development, documentation, evaluation, and dissemination of innovative models that seek to integrate and strengthen arts instruction in elementary and middle schools and improve students' academic performance and achievement in the arts. Professional Development for Arts Education grants support the development of professional development programs for music, dance, drama, and visual arts educators. In addition, the fiscal year 2008 appropriation included funding for a

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Arts in education

---

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) survey on arts education in public elementary and secondary schools. NCES has completed its development of the survey items and has begun collecting data nationwide using the Fast Response Survey System (FRSS) during this current school year. The Department expects to have results from the FRSS in early 2011.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$35,277
2007 .....	35,277
2008 .....	37,533
2009 .....	38,166
2010 .....	40,000

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not seeking separate funding for the Arts in Education program for fiscal year 2011. In place of this program and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that focus on specific subject areas (including programs that provide instruction in the arts), the Administration proposes to create a broader program, Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education, that addresses the need to strengthen instruction and increase student achievement across the content areas, especially in low-performing schools.

The fiscal year 2010 appropriation funded numerous separate programs focused on the teaching and learning of specific subjects with different purposes, requirements, and authorized activities. While each of these programs has worthy goals, the result of these fragmented funding streams has been inefficiencies at the Federal, State, and local levels. To compete for funds, eligible entities have had to deal with numerous small grant competitions with different applications and requirements, rather than focusing on improving outcomes for students. To manage programs, the Department has focused on running separate grant competitions and monitoring compliance, rather than providing strong support and directing funding to the most proven or promising practices.

The new Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program would allow States and districts to identify how to best meet the needs of their students and teachers, and allow the Department to focus funding on programs that improve student achievement, especially for students in high-need schools. High-need LEAs, SEAs in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs, and nonprofit organizations (including VSA and the Kennedy Center) in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs would be eligible to apply for competitive grants whose activities could include, among other things, the development, implementation, evaluation of innovative programs; dissemination of evidence-based practices; and scaling up effective programs.

The Administration believes that instruction and involvement in the arts are essential to a well-rounded education and may have an impact on improving student achievement and increasing

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Arts in education

---

graduation rates. Eligible entities that are interested in developing, implementing, or expanding high-quality, innovative practices, strategies, or programs for arts education would be eligible to apply for funding under the new Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program.

The fiscal year 2011 request for Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education would include funds to pay 2011 continuation costs for Arts in Education grants made in previous years.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
<b>VSA Arts</b>			
Total funds available	\$8,639	\$9,060	0
Participating Programs:			
State-initiated and National programs	2,681	2,989	0
District/local sites	3,159	3,146	0
<b>John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts</b>			
Total funds available	\$6,838	\$6,838	0
Participants:			
Theater for Young Audiences	52,000	40,000	0
Theater for Young Audiences On-tour	165,000	170,000	0
Arts Management Fellows, Interns and Seminar Participants	2,115	2,600	0
Professional Development for Teachers	700	730	0
Performance Plus	31,000	34,000	0
National Symphony Orchestra (NSO) Education	60,800	61,700	0
NSO American Residencies	13,785	15,000	0
Model School Initiatives	17,200	15,700	0
Any Given Child	54,250	84,250	0
Student Participation:			
Career Development for Aspiring Performers	637	646	0
Audiences	9,219	8,900	0

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Arts in education

---

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
American College Theater Festival:			
Students	30,500	31,500	0
Teachers	6,475	6,525	0
Audience	627,500	627,550	0
Partners in Education:			
Teachers Served	25,000	27,000	0
<b>National Demonstration and Leadership Activities</b>			
<b><i>Model Arts Program</i></b>			
Total funds available	\$13,697	\$14,616	0
Amount for new awards	\$932	\$8,694	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$12,465	\$5,372	0
Number of new awards	4	28	0
Number of continuation awards	48	20	0
Peer review of new award applications	0 <sup>1</sup>	\$200	0
Interagency transfer to NEA for Arts Education Partnership	\$300	\$350	0
<b><i>Professional Development for Arts Educators</i></b>			
Total funds available	\$8,506	\$9,000	0
Amount for new awards	\$1,971	0	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$6,535	\$7,752	0
Amount for supplemental awards	0	\$1,248	0
Number of new awards	5	0	0
Number of continuation awards	24	29	0
Number of supplemental awards	0	18-22	0
<b><i>Evaluation</i></b>	<b>\$486</b>	<b>\$486</b>	<b>0</b>

---

NOTE: FY 2011 continuation costs of approximately \$15,257 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program.

<sup>1</sup> There were no peer review costs in fiscal year 2009 because the new grantees under the Model Arts and Professional Development for Arts Educators programs were selected from fiscal year 2008 unfunded applications.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Arts in education

---

#### 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 2011 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Goal: To help ensure that all program participants meet challenging State academic content standards in the arts.**

*Objective: Activities supported with Federal funds will improve the quality of standards-based arts education for all participants.*

<b>Measure:</b> The total number of students who participate in standards-based arts education sponsored by the JFK Center for the Performing Arts and VSA Arts.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	743,257	768,240
2007	757,830	786,263
2008	772,405	1,356,225
2009	779,691	
2010	795,285	
2011	811,191	

<b>Measure:</b> The number of low-income students who participate in standards-based arts education sponsored by the JFK Center for the Performing Arts.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		50,632
2007	51,645	26,814
2008	52,657	34,973
2009	53,670	
2010	54,743	
2011	55,838	

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Arts in education

---

<b>Measure:</b> The number of students with disabilities who participate in standards-based arts education sponsored by VSA Arts.		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2006</b>		123,049
<b>2007</b>	125,510	126,363
<b>2008</b>	127,971	190,161
<b>2009</b>	130,432	
<b>2010</b>	133,040	
<b>2011</b>	135,701	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of teachers participating in the JFK Center for the Performing Arts program who receive professional development that is sustained and intensive.		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2006</b>		16.4
<b>2007</b>	17.4	17.1
<b>2008</b>	18.4	19.0
<b>2009</b>	19.4	
<b>2010</b>	20.4	
<b>2011</b>	21.4	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of teachers participating in VSA Arts programs who receive professional development that is sustained and intensive.		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2006</b>		17.5
<b>2007</b>	18.5	17.0
<b>2008</b>	19.5	18.0
<b>2009</b>	20.5	
<b>2010</b>	21.5	
<b>2011</b>	22.5	

**Assessment of Progress:** This series of annual performance indicators assesses the number of students and teachers served by the Kennedy Center and VSA Arts.

Data collected in 2005 represented a baseline of 728,683 for the total number of students who participate in standards-based arts education sponsored by both the Kennedy Center and VSA Arts. The Department established targets for subsequent years based on an annual 2 percentage point increase from the 2005 baseline. Between 2005 and 2008, the combined participation figure for the Kennedy Center and VSA Arts has increased steadily, and in 2008, it exceeded the target by more than 500,000 students. The 1-year jump in 2008 was, according to reports from the two grantees, largely attributable to improved data collection.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Arts in education

---

Data collected in 2006 represent the baseline for the four remaining measures in this series. The number of low-income students is based on students who are eligible to receive free and reduced-priced meals, as reported by school-level personnel, while the number of students with disabilities is based on local-level counts of students in both self-contained and inclusive classrooms. (In 12 States, however, some counts were based on IDEA child-count averages for inclusive settings only.) Targets for the number of low-income students and students with disabilities who participate in standards-based arts education sponsored by the Kennedy Center and VSA Arts, respectively, increase annually by 2 percentage points from the 2006 baseline. In 2008, the Kennedy Center did not meet its performance target, but did show an increase of more than 8,000 low-income students. VSA Arts has shown a sizable increase in the number of students with disabilities who participate in standards-based arts education between 2006 and 2008. In 2008, VSA Arts reported an increase of more than 67,000 students over the baseline.

The Department also has established targets for the percentage of teachers participating in Kennedy Center and VSA Arts programs who receive sustained and intensive professional development based on an annual 1 percentage point increase from the 2006 baseline. Recent performance data show that grantees are making progress. In 2008, the Kennedy Center reported a teacher participation rate of 19 percent, an increase of nearly 2 percentage points over the previous year. VSA Arts' performance data show an increase between 2006 and 2008, but do not meet the Department's 2007 or 2008 performance targets.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of teachers participating in the Professional Development for Arts Educators program who receive professional development that is sustained and intensive.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2006</b>		87
<b>2007</b>	88	100
<b>2008</b>	89	92
<b>2009</b>	90	93
<b>2010</b>	91	
<b>2011</b>	92	

**Assessment of Progress:** This indicator focuses on the Professional Development for Arts Educators program and examines the percentage of teachers who receive instruction that occurs regularly over the course of the school year (including summer) and requires committed participation so that it makes a difference in teaching and student learning. Data collected in 2006 represent the baseline for this indicator and are the basis for targets for subsequent years. In 2007, grantees reported that 100 percent of teachers participating in the program received professional development that was sustained and intensive, which was higher than the target of 88 percent. In 2008, the percentage of teachers who received sustained and intensive professional development decreased slightly to 92 percent, but was still above the target of 89 percent. In 2009, the percentage of teachers who received sustained and intensive professional development increased to 93 percent, which exceeded the target of 90 percent. The Department continues to work with grantees to ensure that definitions for "sustained and intensive" are used consistently across projects.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Arts in education

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students participating in arts models programs who demonstrate proficiency in mathematics compared to those in control or comparison groups.		
Year	Control	Treatment
2007	81.0	82.2
2008	60.4	80.4
Change	-20.6	-1.8

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students participating in arts models programs who demonstrate proficiency in reading compared to those in control or comparison groups.		
Year	Control	Treatment
2007	72.4	76.5
2008	61.4	76.1
Change	-11.0	-0.4

**Assessment of Progress:** The Department developed two indicators that focus on the Model Arts program and its impact on student achievement, specifically the percentage of Model Arts students who demonstrate proficient levels of achievement on State assessments in mathematics and in reading, compared to control or comparison groups. For the school year 2007-2008, the students in the treatment groups performed better than those in the control groups on both reading and mathematics measures. Both the treatment and control groups showed declines in performance between school years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008, although the declines in scores were smaller for the treatment group. The Department expects to have 2009 performance data available this spring.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Foreign language assistance

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

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$26,928	0	-\$26,928

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2009. The program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2011 under new legislation.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

Beginning in fiscal year 2008, the Congress provided funds for 5-year grants to LEAs, in partnership with institutions of higher education (IHEs), for the establishment or expansion of articulated programs of study in critical-need languages. Funded projects are designed to provide students with a program of study in a critical-need language, beginning in elementary school and continuing through college, enabling them to attain a superior level of proficiency in languages critical to U.S. national security and economic prosperity.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Foreign language assistance

---

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

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$21,780
2007 .....	23,780
2008 .....	25,655
2009 .....	26,328
2010 .....	26,928

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not seeking separate funding for the Foreign Language Assistance program in fiscal year 2011. In place of several, narrowly targeted programs that focus on specific subject areas, the Administration proposes to create a broader program, Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education, that addresses the need to strengthen instruction and increase achievement across content areas, especially in low-performing schools.

The fiscal year 2010 appropriation funded numerous separate programs focused on the teaching and learning of specific subjects with different purposes, requirements, and authorized activities. While each of these programs had worthy goals, the result of these fragmented funding streams has been inefficiencies at the Federal, State, and local levels with numerous small grant competitions with different applications and requirements, rather than focusing on improving outcomes for students. To manage programs, the Department has focused on running separate grant competitions and monitoring compliance, rather than providing strong support and directing funding to the most proven or promising practices.

The new Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program, which would replace current ESEA programs that support improvement of education in reading, writing, mathematics and science, arts, foreign language, history, civics and government, and economics, will allow States and districts to determine how best to meet the needs of their students and teachers, and allow the Department to focus funding on strategies that improve student achievement, especially for students in high-need schools. High-need LEAs, SEAs in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs, and nonprofit organizations in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs would be eligible to apply for competitive grants whose activities could include, among other things, the development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative programs; dissemination of evidence-based practices; and, scaling up effective programs. Grants could support, among other things, the creation of articulated foreign language programs that begin in the elementary and secondary grades and are designed to enable participants to gain true fluency as they continue their study through college.

From the fiscal year 2011 appropriation for College Pathways and Accelerated Learning, the Department would pay for continuation of FLAP grants made in previous years.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Foreign language assistance

---

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
<u>SEA Grants</u>			
Number of new grants	3	6	0
Funding for new grants	\$501	\$900	0
Number of continuing grants	0	3	0
Funding for continuing grants	0	\$481	0
 <u>LEA Grants</u>			
Number of new grants	36	35 <sup>1</sup>	0
Funding for new grants	\$8,740	\$7,001	0
Number of continuing grants	49	36	0
Funding for continuing grants	\$11,536	\$8,717	0
 <u>LEA-IHE Partnership Grants</u>			
Number of new grants	12	30	0
Funding for new grants	\$3,169	\$6,168	0
Number of continuing grants	8	20	0
Funding for continuing grants	\$2,167	\$3,561	0
 Peer review of new award applications	 \$80	 \$100	 0

---

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$29,296 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program.

<sup>1</sup>Grants to LEAs will be made by funding additional applicants from the slate developed from the FY 2009 competition.

#### 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 2011 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

This program has been among the programs that receive help from the Department's Data Quality Initiative (DQI), which provides contractor assistance to selected programs to increase the capacity of Department staff and grantees to obtain better outcome information from grant programs. The contractor has worked with the Department to strengthen outcome measures, identify and address data deficiencies, and improve processes and reporting instruments so that the Department can collect uniformly high-quality data from grantees. Through this work, the

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Foreign language assistance

---

Department established five new performance measures for FLAP LEA grantees and two new performance measures for SEA grantees. LEAs awarded grants prior to fiscal year 2008 reported on four of these measures in 2008. LEAs that received grant awards in fiscal year 2008 and beyond must report on all five LEA measures, or at least those that are appropriate for their programs. SEAs that received grant awards in fiscal year 2008 and beyond report on both SEA measures.

The following objectives and performance measures apply to the LEA projects:

**Goal: Assist local and State educational agencies in establishing, improving, or expanding foreign language study for elementary and secondary school students.**

**Objective:** *To expand foreign language study in non-critical languages for students served by the FLAP.*

The measures under this objective are: (1) the number of students participating in foreign language instruction in the targeted non-critical language(s) in the schools served by FLAP; and (2) the average number of minutes per week of foreign language instruction in the targeted non-critical language(s) provided in the schools served by FLAP. The Department collected baseline data for these measures in 2009 and is in the process of setting targets for this measure. The number of students was 27,841 and the average number of minutes per week was 510.

**Objective:** *To expand foreign language study in critical languages for students served by the FLAP.*

The measures under this objective are: (1) the number of students participating in foreign language instruction in the targeted critical language(s) in the schools served by FLAP; and (2) the average number of minutes per week of foreign language instruction in the targeted critical language(s) provided in the schools served by FLAP. The Department collected baseline data for these measures in 2009 and is in the process of setting targets for this measure. The number of students was 28,831 and the average number of minutes per week was 179.

**Objective:** *To improve the foreign language proficiency of students served by the FLAP.*

The measure is the number of students in FLAP projects who meet ambitious project objectives for foreign language proficiency. Grantees will begin reporting on this measure in 2009, with data available in 2010.

The following objective and two measures apply to the SEA projects:

**Objective:** *To improve foreign language teaching.*

The measures are: (1) the number of teachers in the State receiving training as a result of the FLAP SEA project; and (2) the number of schools that use the assessments, standards, or curriculum developed by the FLAP SEA projects in the State. The Department collected

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Foreign language assistance

---

baseline data for these measures in 2009 and is in the process of setting targets for this measure. The number of teachers was 244 and the number of schools was 64.

### Other Performance Information

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

The Department and the DQI contractor developed and obtained OMB approval for a unique annual performance report that includes the new measures, along with a companion guidance document to assist grantees in completing the performance reports consistently and accurately. The Department also included these revised measures in the fiscal year 2009 and 2010 grant competition notices inviting applications.

**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

---

**Academies for American history and civics**

(American History and Civics Act of 2004 and Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D)

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$1,815	0	-\$1,815

---

<sup>1</sup>The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2011 under new legislation.

---

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The Academies for American History and Civics program supports intensive workshops for teachers and students in the areas of history and civics. The Presidential Academies for the Teaching of American History and Civics offer workshops of at least 2 weeks to new and veteran teachers on such topics as the development and functions of local, State, and Federal Government and significant issues in the history of the United States. The Congressional Academies for Students of American History and Civics offer similar workshops to high school students in order to enrich their understanding of American history and civics.

Institutions of higher education, museums, libraries, and other public and private agencies, organizations, and institutions (including for-profit organizations), and consortia of such entities, are eligible to apply for these competitive grants. Applicants must demonstrate expertise in historical methodology or the teaching of history. All grantees must also provide a plan to evaluate program effectiveness.

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

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$1,980
2007 .....	1,980
2008 .....	1,945
2009 .....	1,945
2010 .....	1,815

**FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration is not seeking separate funding for the Academies for American History and Civics program for fiscal year 2011. In place of several narrowly targeted programs focused on student achievement in specific subjects, the Administration proposes to create a broader

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Academies for American history and civics

---

Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program that addresses the need to strengthen instruction and increase achievement across content areas, especially in low-performing schools. While the Administration recognizes the importance of ensuring that our Nation's students and teachers are knowledgeable in these subjects and believes that continued provision of Federal funding in support of that objective is appropriate, the current program is too small to accomplish its goals in a manner that can have a national impact. Three or four small grants can serve only a handful of students and teachers and can do little to improve history and civics education on a broader scale. (In FY 2009, the program funded two Presidential Academies, that trained 70 teachers, and one Congressional Academy, that served 102 students). The level of effort required to administer and monitor the program on behalf of the Department, in addition to the effort required of applicants to apply for support, likely exceeds the potential benefits of the program.

Under the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program, high-need LEAs, SEAs in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs, and nonprofit organizations in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs would be eligible to apply for competitive grants that could be used for such activities as establishing academies for teachers and students in history, civics, and other disciplines.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Total budget authority	\$1,945	\$1,815	0
Amount for Presidential Academies	\$1,165	\$1,015	0
Number of continuation awards	2	2	0
Amount for Congressional Academies	\$780	\$800	0
Number of new awards	0	0	0
Number of continuation awards	1	1	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 results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The performance measure for this program is the average percentage gain on an assessment after participation in an academy, as measured through pre- and post-assessments. Data are collected through grantee annual performance reports. In addition, each grantee must conduct

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Academies for American history and civics

---

an evaluation to track its progress toward specific objectives and performance measures that assess its impact on teaching, learning, and other outcomes for project participants.

**Goal: To increase content knowledge of students and teachers in American history and civics.**

**Objective:** *Demonstrate the effectiveness of the Academies in increasing understanding of American history and civics.*

<b>Measure:</b> The average percentage point gain on a teacher assessment after participation in the Presidential Academy of the Academies for American History and Civics.		
Year	Target	Actual
2008		26
2009	27	22
2010	28	

<b>Measure:</b> The average percentage point gain on a student assessment after participation in the Congressional Academy of the Academies for American History and Civics.		
Year	Target	Actual
2008		19
2009	20	-3
2010	21	

**Assessment of progress:** Because the Academies deliver a variety of instructional content, grantees create and administer their own assessments to measure participant gains. In 2009, teachers participating in the Presidential Academy averaged post-test scores of 22 percent above their pre-test scores. (As the measure is calculated, an improvement from, for instance, 50 to 61 correct answers out of 100 would be counted as a 22 percent improvement.) That same year, students in the Congressional Academy had an average gain of -3 percent between pre- and post-tests. The grantee reported that the questions on the student assessment were too broad and didn't accurately test the content studied in the Congressional Academy.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Close Up fellowships

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I, Part E, Section 1504)

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$1,942	0	-\$1,942

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2011 under new legislation.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program is administered by the Close Up Foundation of Washington, D.C. and provides fellowships to middle- and secondary- school students from low-income families and their teachers to enable them to participate in the Close Up program. Participants spend 1 week in Washington attending seminars on government and current events and meeting with leaders from the three branches of the Federal Government. Up to 30 percent of the total appropriation may be used to pay for the expenses of teachers accompanying participating students. Through its Program for New Americans, the program also funds similar activities to increase the understanding of the Federal Government among students whose families emigrated to the United States within the past 5 years, and their teachers.

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

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$1,454
2007 .....	1,454
2008 .....	1,942
2009 .....	1,942
2010 .....	1,942

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not seeking separate funding for the Close Up Fellowships program for fiscal year 2011. In place of several narrowly targeted programs focused on student achievement in specific subject areas (including programs that provide instruction in civics and government), the Administration proposes to create a broader program, Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education, that addresses the need to strengthen instruction and increase achievement across content areas, especially in low-performing schools. The new

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Close Up fellowships

---

program would replace current ESEA programs that support improvement of education in reading, writing, mathematics and science, arts, foreign language, history, civics and government, and economics. High-need LEAs, SEAs in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs, and nonprofit organizations in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs would be eligible to apply for competitive grants whose activities could include, among other things, the development, implementation, and evaluation of successful programs; dissemination of evidence-based practices; and, scaling up effective programs.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
<b>Program for Middle and Secondary School Students</b>			
Total Federal share	\$1,042	\$1,042	0
Total participants	13,616	13,616	0
Total number of Close Up fellowships	1,190	1,190	0
<b>Program for Middle and Secondary School Teachers</b>			
Total Federal share	\$598	\$598	0
Total participants	1,840	1,840	0
Total number of Close Up fellowships	242	242	0
<b>Program for New Americans</b>			
Total Federal Share	\$302	\$302	0
Total participants	655	655	0
Total number of Close Up fellowships	178	178	0

---

NOTE: Data for the 2009 program output measures reflect the 2008 program-reporting period beginning July 1, 2008, and extended through August 31, 2009. Data for the 2010 program output measures are projections for the 2009 program-reporting period beginning July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010.

### 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.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Close Up fellowships

---

**Goal:** To improve participants' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding the three branches of government.

**Objective:** Continue to secure non-Federal funding to multiply the impact of the federally funded fellowships.

<b>Measure:</b> The ratio of Federal to non-Federal funding that is allocated for teachers and economically disadvantaged students through the Close-Up Fellowships program.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	0.62	0.59
2007	0.59	0.53
2008	0.56	0.56
2009	0.53	
2010	0.50	

**Assessment of progress:** The Department established a measure for the Close Up Fellowships program of increasing the share of funding for economically disadvantaged students and their teachers that comes from non-Federal sources. The Department calculates the measure as the total Federal appropriation divided by the total amount of non-Federal funds raised. The performance targets are based on the grantees' past performance in obtaining non-Federal contributions, and the grantee has continually met or exceeded targets. No targets are shown for 2011 because the program is proposed for consolidation.

### Other Performance Information

Recent surveys conducted by the Close Up Foundation provide some evidence of greater student knowledge of government, politics, and public engagement after participation in the program, as reported by their teachers. Data from the 2007-2008 program survey indicate that approximately 92 percent of high school student participants reported that the program helped them to understand current political issues. More than three-quarters of the students indicated that the program was effective in helping them to develop citizenship skills, such as acquiring and using information; making decisions about policies; communicating; and promoting political interests or beliefs. In addition, approximately 90 percent of participating teachers who responded to the survey rated the student program as good or excellent, and 79 percent indicated that they use Close-Up's publication *Current Issues* in their classroom. The Close Up Foundation conducted these surveys, and the results have not been verified or otherwise subjected to external analysis.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Civic education

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

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1,2</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
We the People	\$21,617	0	-\$21,617
Cooperative Education Exchange	<u>13,383</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-13,383</u>
Total	35,000	0	-35,000

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2011 under new legislation.

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

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

### **We the People**

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

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Civic education

---

critically, and remain poised under pressure. Public officials and community members serve as judges in the competition.

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

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

### Cooperative Education Exchange

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

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

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Civic education

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	<u>We The People</u>	<u>Cooperative Education Exchange</u>
	(\$000s)	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$17,039	\$12,072
2007 .....	17,039	12,072
2008 .....	20,056	11,861
2009 .....	20,076	13,383
2010 .....	21,617	13,383

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not seeking separate funding for the Civic Education program for fiscal year 2011. In place of several, narrowly targeted programs that seek to improve student achievement in specific subject areas, the Administration proposes to create a new program, Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education, which addresses the need to strengthen instruction and increase achievement across content areas. Organizations with expertise in civics, government, and economic education, in partnership with States and districts, would be encouraged to apply for funding.

The fiscal year 2011 request for Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education would include funds to pay continuation costs for the competitive grants awarded under the Cooperative Education Exchange authority.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
<b>We the People:</b>			
Statutory earmark to Center for Civic Education	\$20,076	\$21,617	0
<b>Cooperative Education Exchange Program:</b>			
Statutory earmarks to:			
Center for Civic Education	\$5,019	\$5,019	0
National Council on Economic Education	<u>5,019</u>	<u>5,019</u>	<u>0</u>
Earmark total	10,037	10,037	0
Number of competitive awards:			
New awards	1	2	0
Continuation awards	2	1	0

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Civic education

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Competitive award funding			
New awards	\$1,337	\$2,672	0
Continuation awards	<u>1,999</u>	<u>664</u>	<u>0</u>
Competitive awards, total	3,336	3,336	0
Peer review of applications for new awards	\$10	\$10	0
Total funds, Cooperative Education Exchange	\$13,383	\$13,383	0

NOTE: Continuation costs of \$3,345 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2011 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of teachers participating in training or professional development activities provided as part of the "We the People" program that have demonstrated improved quality of instruction through an evaluation.		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2006</b>		96
<b>2007</b>	94	97
<b>2008</b>	97	96.7
<b>2009</b>	98	
<b>2010</b>	98	

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Civic education

---

**Assessment of progress:** The target was narrowly missed for 2008, but these data are self-reported by the grantee and the Department has ongoing concerns about data reliability that make them difficult to interpret. Working with consultants, the Center for Civic Education created a 12-question survey to collect data on the extent to which participating teachers report that professional development improved the quality of classroom instruction. The survey is administered after participating teachers return to their respective classrooms and the resulting response rates in previous years have been below the level considered by the National Center for Education Statistics to be necessary to ensure that possible nonresponse bias is minimized.

### Other Performance Information

#### *We the People*

#### Evaluation

In 2006–2007, the RMC Research Corporation conducted a quasi-experimental study to examine the effects of the *We the People* program on students' political knowledge, civic skills, and civic attitudes. The study included 822 program participants who were compared to 735 students in matching high school government classes with similar demographics. The study also compared the scores from the *We the People* students to the scores of 119 political science students at two universities. The evaluation found that participating students made significantly greater gains than comparison students in their understanding of core values and principles of democracy, constitutional limits on governmental institutions, and rights and responsibilities of citizenship. The study also found improvements in the *We the People* participants' ability to analyze issues, to debate, to persuade, and to achieve group consensus. This evaluation was commissioned by the Center for Civic Education. The Department cannot assess the rigor of its methodology or validity of its findings.

#### Audit

On November 20, 2009, the Department's Office of the Inspector General issued the final report of its audit of the Center for Civic Education's administration of grant funds awarded under the We the People Program and Cooperative Civic Education and Economic Education Exchange Program, which covered the Center for Civic Education's fiscal year from August 1, 2007, through July 31, 2008. The final report is available on the Department's website at: <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2010/a09i0010.doc>. The Office of the Inspector General concluded that the Center for Civic Education:

- Did not administer the funds awarded to it under the We the People and Cooperative Civic Education and Economic Education Exchange Program in compliance with applicable laws and regulations and grant award provisions; and that it
- Did not have a financial management system that met required standards for administering the Federal education grants. Its financial management system did not have controls to limit use of grant funds to the authorized period of availability or to prevent funds from being expended after the liquidation period; procedures to minimize time between receipt and expenditure of grant funds; or adequate procedures for

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Civic education

---

determining the reasonableness, allocability, and allowability of costs charged to the grants.

Because of these deficiencies, the Office of the Inspector General found that the Center for Civic Education held cash beyond its immediate needs. Of the \$7.4 million in grant funds reviewed during the audit, the Office of the Inspector General concluded that \$1.2 million in unallowable costs and \$4.7 million in unsupported costs were charged to the grants. Among the unallowable costs were charges to the grants for costs obligated after the period of availability and/or expended after the liquidation period, printing of textbooks sold to school districts (retail sales), employee settlement payments, travel and other business costs that were either specifically questioned or were unrelated to the grants, and costs that should have been charged as indirect costs. The unsupported costs included personnel costs that were charged to grants using predetermined percentages or for the allocation of other costs that benefited more than one Center for Civic Education program or activity.

Based on the results of its audit, the Office of the Inspector General concluded that there is no assurance that costs charged to the We the People and Cooperative Civic Education and Economic Education Exchange Program grants, and costs not reviewed as part of our audit, were allowable and documented in accordance with Federal requirements. The Office of the Inspector General also found that the Center for Civic Education did not distribute the number of free textbooks for which it charged the We the People grant and did not properly execute and monitor certain contracts supported with grant funds. The Office of the Inspector General has recommended that the Department designate the Center for Civic Education as a "high-risk grantee," determine the quantity of additional textbooks that the Center for Civic Education should be required to distribute under the We the People grant, and either request that the Center for Civic Education return funds to the Department or adjust active grants for improper charges and unsupported costs charged to the grants, as appropriate. The Center for Civic Education has appealed the audit findings. The Department is in the process of determining the proper steps to take in response to these findings.

### Cooperative Education Exchange

A number of recent studies and research papers have been written on various aspects of the Cooperative Education Exchange program, including a 2005 evaluation of the *Civitas Latin America* program conducted by WestEd, but the evaluations do not provide sufficient information about the effectiveness of the programs on key variables such as student achievement and teacher classroom practice. Similarly, the National Council on Economic Education has conducted evaluations of its activities, but these evaluations are not of sufficient scope or rigor to provide reliable information on the extent to which the programs affect teacher classroom practice or their effects on student achievement.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### **Educational technology State grants**

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

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1,2</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$100,000	0	-\$100,000

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2011 under new legislation.

<sup>2</sup> Section 2404 of the ESEA requires that from the funds appropriated for Subparts 1 and 2 of Part D, at least 98 percent is to be used to carry out Subpart 1 and not more than 2 percent is to be used to carry out Subpart 2.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Educational technology State grants

---

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

Beginning in the fiscal year 2006 appropriations act, Congress has annually included language allowing States to award up to 100 percent of funds competitively. However, for the \$650 million provided under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, SEAs are required to follow the distribution requirements set forth in the authorizing statute.

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

In addition, the Department may reserve up to 2 percent of the amount appropriated for the program for national coordination and technical assistance activities. The Department has used these funds to conduct a required study on the conditions and practices under which educational technology: (1) is effective in improving student achievement; and (2) increases the ability of teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction. The Department also has supported a range activities, from research to workshops, to assist States with (1) improving the quality of technology-related teacher preparation and professional development programs; (2) examining data use and data systems issues, including the development of interoperability and technical standards; and (3) evaluating the impact of online learning and virtual schooling on student achievement.

The program is forward funded. Funds become available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available for 15 months through September 30 of the following year. These funds are available for obligation until the end of fiscal year 2011.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$272,250
2007 .....	272,250
2008 .....	267,494
2009 .....	269,872
Recovery Act.....	650,000
2010 .....	100,000

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Educational technology State grants

---

#### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not seeking separate funding for the Educational Technology State Grants program for fiscal year 2011. Instead, the Administration proposes to encourage the infusion of technology across programs in order to improve teaching and learning and build State and local capacity to support the effective integration of technology into curricula and instruction. The Administration believes that technology is integral in improving educational quality for students. However, the existing Federal programs that focus on the use of technology is too fragmented to provide State and district officials with the tools they need to strengthen instruction and increase student achievement in the comprehensive manner required. Nor are the current programs well-structured to infuse technology across the program areas and enable educators and policymakers to identify the most effective practices to replicate.

For example, the Administration proposes to support the integrated use of technology through the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education program, which would address the need to strengthen instruction and increase student achievement across the content areas, especially in low-performing schools. This new program would allow States and districts to identify how to best meet the academic needs of their students and teachers in specific content areas. High-need LEAs, SEAs in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs, and nonprofit organizations in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs would be eligible to apply for competitive grants with which to undertake, among other things, the development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative uses of technology in classroom instruction or professional development; dissemination of evidence-based practices; and scaling up effective programs. SEAs also would be eligible for funds, under the program's national activities authority, to help strengthen the use of technology in the core academic subjects, including through the development and implementation of technology enabled curriculum, assessments, professional development, and supporting tools and resources. The program would support States, districts, and schools in their efforts to use technology to transform teaching and learning so as to better meet the needs of their students and to ensure that students are college- and career-ready.

In addition, using technology to drive improvements in educational quality would be a major emphasis of the Administration's requested \$500 million for a reauthorized Investing in Innovation Fund as well as several other programs, including Promoting Public School Choice, College Pathways and Accelerated Learning, Effective Teachers and Leaders, and English Learners.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Educational technology State grants

---

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Amount for State grants	\$903,044	\$96,775	0
Range of awards	\$4,515-99,340	\$484-10,792	0
Amount for BIE	\$6,859	\$735	0
Amount for Outlying Areas	\$4,572	\$490	0
National activities set-aside	\$5,397	\$2,000	0

---

NOTE: The fiscal year 2009 figures include the \$650,000 thousand provided under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. States are required to report on Recovery and Reinvestment funds and funds from the fiscal year 2009 regular appropriation separately.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

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

The primary goal of the Educational Technology State Grants program is to improve the academic achievement of students, particularly students who attend high-poverty or low-performing schools, through the use of technology in schools. The Department has established several performance measures to assess the extent to which LEAs receiving substantial amounts of program funds are able to demonstrate that: (1) they have fully and effectively integrated technology into curriculum; (2) teachers have met State technology standards; and (3) students have met their State's technology literacy standards by the eighth grade. The Department is collecting data for these measures through ED Facts data collections and grantee performance reports. The Department expects to assess the quality and availability of these data in spring 2010 to determine the feasibility of establishing baseline and annual performance targets.

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

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Educational technology State grants

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage point difference in Internet access between classrooms in high- and low-poverty schools.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	0	5
2006	0	Not collected
2007	0	
2008	0	
2009	0	
2010	0	

**Assessment of Progress:** Low-poverty schools are defined as schools with less than 35 percent of their students eligible for free or reduced-price lunches, while high-poverty schools are defined as schools with 75 percent or more of their students eligible. The target for this measure is to have no difference in Internet access between high- and low-poverty schools. Data collected by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) are shown above for 2005. The Department discontinued the NCES Internet access surveys, with the last survey released in 2006, and plans to collect data for this measure using *EDFacts*. Data submitted by States for school year 2007-08 covered only 53,863 schools nationwide and were too incomplete to report. The Department is working with States to enable them to report more complete data in the future.

The NETTS report provides some additional information on this measure. For school years 2004-05 and 2006-07, there were no statistically significant differences in Internet access between classrooms in high- and low-poverty schools. Further, for school year 2006-07, 72 percent of teachers in elementary grades, 55 percent in middle school grades, and 49 percent in high school grades reported that students had high-speed Internet access within their classrooms. Differences in school location (rural, suburban, and urban) also were not significant predictors of classroom Internet access.

Recently, the Department completed a comprehensive State-level monitoring report that examines: (1) the distribution of awards between formula and competitive grants and (2) information on how States address areas assessed through the Department's GPRA measures, specifically technology literacy, technology integration, and professional development. The report found that in fiscal year 2008, approximately 25 percent of States distributed 100 percent of their EETT formula funds competitively and focused their grant strategies on strengthening professional development and developing technology-rich classrooms or 21<sup>st</sup> century learning environments. The remaining States continued to distribute 50 percent of funds by formula and 50 percent through a competitive process. In terms of how States are addressing the Department's GRPA measures, the report noted that States differ widely in how they define technology literacy, with 46 percent of the States using a unique State-specific definition, 34 percent using the State Educational Technology Directors Association's (SETDA) definition, and 20 percent providing no specific definition for LEAs. The report also found that technology integration is evident in subgrants in all 50 States, but only 29 of those States explicitly identify technology integration as an area of focus in their competitive subgrant competition. In the area of professional development, the report found that 36 States spent more than the minimum requirement of 25 percent on professional

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Educational technology State grants

---

development with a majority of States and districts focusing their professional development on the integration of technology into the curriculum or on how to utilize data and formative assessment to support individualized student learning.

#### Efficiency Measure

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of monitoring reports that the Department sends within 45 days after a monitoring visit (both on-site and virtual)		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		0
2008	50	0
2009	75	
2010	100	
2011	100	

**Assessment of Progress:** The Department has taken steps to initiate a new monitoring protocol that integrates information from five formula grant programs administered by the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education into a comprehensive monitoring report. Since the Department began to implement this new monitoring protocol in fiscal year 2007, the Educational Technology State grant program has made some improvement in the average amount of time it takes to issue a monitoring report, from 258 days in fiscal year 2006 to 56 days in fiscal year 2007 but then up to 90 days in 2008, which was more than double the efficiency goal of 45 days. The Department has established a performance target for 2010 of 100 percent of reports meeting the 45-day goal, and expects to have additional efficiency data available this spring.

#### Other Performance Information

To assess the implementation of the Educational Technology State Grants program and the extent to which States and districts have created conditions for schools and teachers to use technology effectively in improving teaching and learning, the Department conducted a multiyear national evaluation, the National Educational Technology Trends Study (NETTS). The NETTS addressed three primary research areas: (1) student and teacher access to technology; (2) teacher preparedness to use technology effectively in their classrooms; and (3) effective integration of technology into curriculum and instruction. The study also examined the differences in State strategies for the use of program funds, the types of activities supported, and the various approaches that States use to address the needs of low-income children.

In 2007, the Department released a 2-volume report from the study, *National Educational Technology Trends Study: State Strategies and Practices*, which documented State educational technology policies and programs, including the role of the Educational Technology State Grants program in State efforts. The study examined survey and case study data to document State priorities for educational technology, perceptions of State and district administrators on technology-related needs, and challenges experienced by States in the administration of the Educational Technology State Grants program during its first 2 years of operation. The report noted that, by 2004, 42 States had student technology standards, with 18 States having "stand-

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Educational technology State grants

---

alone” standards, 16 States having technology standards embedded within other academic content standards, and the remaining 8 States having both stand-alone technology standards and embedded standards.

The report also found that a majority of States had not met the second goal of the program, which is to assist students in becoming technologically literate by the end of eighth grade. Only 18 States had included student technology literacy as a specific priority for their Educational Technology State Grants and approximately 13 States had required program applicants to focus specifically on student technology literacy in their competitive grant applications. Further, only two States reported using Statewide assessments of students' proficiency with technology and more than one-third of States reported that they were undecided as to whether, or how, they would assess students' technology literacy in future years. In the area of teachers' use of technology, a majority of States reported having at least minimum standards for teachers' use of technology; yet, few were formally assessing teachers' technology skills at the State level.

In terms of effective integration of technology in classrooms, the Department's 2009 report, *Implementing Data-Informed Decision Making in Schools: Teacher Access, Supports and Use*, which used survey data collected through NETTS, noted an increase in the percentage of teachers who reported using technology to develop curricula or assignments from 31 percent in school year 2004-2005 to 47 percent in school year 2006-2007. The report also found that teacher access to student data systems increased significantly from 48 percent in 2005 to 74 percent in 2007. Yet, even with this increase in access, the systems often lacked the types of data that teachers need in making informed and relevant instructional decisions. Teachers who had access to a student data system reported that the data most frequently available to them were student attendance data (74 percent) and grades (67 percent). Only 55 percent of these teachers reported having access to their current students' performance on benchmark or diagnostic assessments.

In May 2009, the Department released the *Evaluation of the Enhancing Education Through Technology Program: Final Report*, which includes two rounds of survey data collected through NETTS along with trend data and analysis of implementation strategies at the State, district, and school levels. Findings from the evaluation show that the prevalence of Internet access in high- and low-poverty schools remained unchanged between school years 2004–2005 and 2006–2007. In the area of the technology-centered professional development, the study found that about half of the States had defined standards for teacher technology competency. Of the 11 States that reported data, the percentage of teachers meeting technology proficiency standards ranged from 8 to 100. Similarly, in the area of technology integration, approximately half of the States reported either not having a definition of full integration of technology or not collecting data on the percentage of districts meeting their standard. For the 15 States that reported percentages, the percentage of the State's districts fully integrating technology ranged from 0 to 100. Data for this measure were reported for all districts in the State, not those receiving the Educational Technology State Grant funds specifically. Lastly, in the area of student technology literacy, 6 States reported conducting Statewide assessments of student technology proficiency and 25 States reported relying on districts to measure their students' technology skills. Of the 12 States that reported data, the percentage of technologically literate students ranged from 10 to 100.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Educational technology State grants

---

Beyond findings on specific performance measures, the evaluation also examined the Educational Technology State Grants program and educational uses of technology more broadly. The study found that schools across the country are increasingly equipped with high-speed Internet access and, between 2005 and 2007, teachers reported an increase in their use of technology for their own work. Additionally, 86 percent of surveyed teachers indicated that they had recently participated in technology-related professional development; however, approximately 20 percent of those teachers reported that their professional development did not incorporate any of seven research-identified best practices, which suggests that the quality of technology-related professional development could be improved. Further, teachers in high-poverty schools were consistently more likely than those in low-poverty schools to express a need for additional technology-related professional development in school year 2006–07. A copy of the final NETTS evaluation report is available on the Department's website [www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/netts/finalreport.pdf](http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/netts/finalreport.pdf).

Since the NETTS evaluation focused solely on program implementation, it is also important to look at other research that assessed the impacts of technology on student learning and academic achievement. In 2009, the Department released *The National Study of the Effectiveness of Educational Technology Interventions* final report, a 2-year congressionally mandated study that examined the effectiveness of educational technology and its impact on student achievement. The study found no significant difference in student achievement between the classrooms that used computer-based reading and mathematics products and those classrooms that did not. In addition, only 1 of the 10 products tested had a statistically significant impact on increasing student achievement in 4th grade reading. A copy of the final report is available on the Department's website <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20094041/pdf/20094042.pdf>.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### College pathways and accelerated learning

(Proposed Legislation)

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
0	\$100,000	+\$100,000

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program would support efforts to increase graduation rates and preparation for college matriculation and success by providing college-level and other accelerated courses and instruction in middle and high schools that enroll concentrations of students from low-income families and in high schools with low graduation rates. The program would also fund accelerated learning opportunities for students across the performance spectrum, including those who exceed proficiency standards, in high-poverty elementary schools. Local educational agencies (LEAs), as well as LEAs in partnership with State educational agencies or other entities, would be eligible to apply. Competitive grants would be awarded for multiple years and could be extended based on demonstrated positive results. Grants would support strategies that could include expanding the availability of Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate (AP/IB) courses, dual-enrollment programs that allow students to take college-level courses and earn college credit while in high school, and “early college high schools” that allow students to earn a high school degree and an Associate’s degree or 2 years of college credit simultaneously. In order to receive a grant, applicants would be required to demonstrate an evidence base for the activities that they propose to implement.

The Department would be authorized to reserve up to 5 percent of the amount available for grants to carry out research on promising models. In addition, the Department would use program funds to make grants to States for statewide strategies that may include the payment of advanced placement test fees for students from low-income families.

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$100 million in 2011 for the proposed College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program, which would be created through the Administration’s ESEA reauthorization proposal. The request would support the first year of the program, and would replace the current Advanced Placement, Javits Gifted and Talented Education, and High School Graduation Initiative programs. The new College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program would address the need to increase graduation rates and college preparedness, especially in high-poverty, low-performing schools and provide accelerate learning opportunities

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### College pathways and accelerated learning

---

for more students. The Administration believes that this restructuring would improve the capacity of LEAs and schools to use their resources to drive improvements in the quality of academic instruction in a more comprehensive manner. Further, it would provide increased flexibility for districts and schools to design strategies and programs that best to meet the needs of their students. The Department would also use fiscal year 2011 funds to continue grants made prior to the enactment of the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization under the Advanced Placement Incentive, Javits Gifted and Talented Education, and the High School Graduation Initiative programs.

Research shows that students who participate in an accelerated high school curriculum have a higher probability of success in higher education. According to the Department's 2000 follow-up of the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS: 88/2000), 96 percent of students in the lowest socio-economic status quintile who participated in AP enrolled in postsecondary education programs, compared to 39 percent for those who did not participate. A 2006 study, *The Toolbox Revisited* by Clifford Adelman, confirms the significance of those data. Adelman found that participation in a challenging curriculum, including programs such as AP and IB, is a key factor associated with a student's completion of a bachelor's degree and has a stronger correlation than high school test scores, class rank or GPA. The same study concluded that the impact of a challenging curriculum on rates of completion of a bachelor's degree is even higher for African-American and Hispanic students than it is for White students.

Dual-enrollment programs can be similarly effective in increasing college preparedness in low-performing schools. Besides introducing the "college culture" to secondary school students whose parents often did not get a college degree, dual-enrollment schools allow low-income students to reduce costs by avoiding remedial courses and graduating from college early or on time. A 2007 report by the Community College Research Center, funded by the Department, reported that: "Dual enrollment participants had more positive outcomes on a range of short- and long-term measures than their similar non-participants. Moreover, students from groups typically underrepresented in higher education, such as males and those from low-income families, appeared to benefit from dual enrollment participation to a greater degree than other participants."

Early college high schools go a step further than dual-enrollment and AP/IB programs by providing students from low-income families with the course instruction and support they need to graduate from high school with 2 years of college credit already earned. A 2008 Early College High School Initiative report, funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, reported that early college high school students scored significantly higher than comparable high school students on State assessments and that early college high school classes often demonstrate higher levels of rigor than their college equivalents.

The College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program would also help school districts implement strategies for serving students who exceed proficiency standards in the context of providing an enriched, challenging curriculum more broadly. High-achieving students are often underserved because school districts are not able to provide the instructional program needed to keep them engaged and progressing. By supporting accelerated learning opportunities that provide college-level instruction to high school students, as well as accelerated learning opportunities for the full range of students in elementary school, the program will serve many

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### College pathways and accelerated learning

---

more gifted students, and probably more effectively, than are served by the current Javits program.

Although students who drop out, or are at risk of doing so, are often thought of as low achievers who need a watered-down curriculum to keep them in school, educators find that often the opposite is the case. Students may drop out because they are bored with and not challenged by the standard curriculum. Efforts to introduce AP, IB, and other accelerated curricula in schools with concentrations of at-risk students have recently shown strong success, as demonstrated by the increasing numbers of students from low-income families taking and passing advanced placement tests. Thus, the College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program will address the needs of students at risk of dropping out, not just those who are already high achievers.

The program will also complement the Graduation Promise Initiative, included in legislation (H.R. 3221) that has passed the House of Representatives and is pending in the Senate.

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

	<u>2011</u>
Funding for grant awards	\$ 16,700
Total number of grants	20
Peer review of new award applications	\$300

---

NOTE: Approximately \$63,000 thousand would be provided to fund continuation awards for grants made under the High School Graduation Initiative (\$45,000 thousand), Javits Gifted and Talented Education (\$3,000 thousand), and Advanced Placement Incentive Grants (\$15,000 thousand) programs. In addition, approximately \$20,000 thousand would be used for grants to States for AP test fees.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Department has not yet developed performance measures for this proposed program, but will do so later in 2010. These measures would likely include student outcomes such as college preparedness, matriculation, and completion.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### High school graduation initiative

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

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$50,000	0	-\$50,000

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program was authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2011 under new legislation.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The High School Graduation Initiative (formerly the School Dropout Prevention program) provides assistance to help schools implement comprehensive efforts to increase high school graduation rates. Each local educational agency (LEA) or State educational agency (SEA) that receives funds under the program must implement proven strategies for increasing the number of students who graduate and for assisting youth who leave high school before graduating to reenter and complete their schooling. LEAs and SEAs are eligible for competitive grants to develop, implement, expand, and evaluate prevention and reentry strategies that increase high school graduation rates. These strategies may include activities: (1) for early and continued identification of students at risk of not graduating; (2) to provide at-risk students with services designed to keep them in school; (3) to identify and encourage youth who have left school without graduating to reenter and graduate; (4) to implement other comprehensive approaches, such as dividing large schools into smaller learning communities; and (5) to implement transition programs that help students successfully transition from middle school to high school. At appropriation levels of \$75 million or less, the Department makes competitive awards for up to 5 years to SEAs or LEAs to implement effective high school graduation and reentry strategies in schools and districts that serve students in grades 6 through 12 and have annual school dropout rates that are above their State's average.

In fiscal year 2010 the Congress appropriated \$50 million for this program, after 3 years of no funding. The Department will use these funds to support projects that create or expand academically rigorous educational options that are specifically designed to meet the unique needs of out-of-school youth and students who are at risk of dropping out. Eligible programs could include college-based programs, international high school programs for recent immigrants, and models geared towards students who are overage for their grade.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### High school graduation initiative

---

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

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$4,851
2007 .....	0
2008 .....	0
2009 .....	0
2010 .....	50,000

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not seeking separate funding for the High School Graduation Initiative for fiscal year 2011. Instead, the Administration proposes to create, through the ESEA reauthorization, a broader program, College Pathways and Accelerated Learning, that supports efforts in high-poverty middle and high schools to provide students with accelerated learning opportunities (such as Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, dual high school/college enrollment, and early college high schools). Although students at risk of dropping out are often not considered appropriate for enrollment in these types of programs, educators find that giving them the opportunity to enroll and succeed in demanding courses can be a successful approach, as many students lose interest in and subsequently leave school because they are unchallenged by the standard curriculum. At-risk students are thus likely to be a critical target population for the new program.

In addition, high schools with high dropout rates will receive major assistance through the Title I School Turnaround program (formerly School Improvement Grants). Under the Department's recent program regulations and the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal, Title I secondary schools with a graduation rate below 60 percent may receive priority for School Turnaround funds. These school improvement grants will provide hundreds of millions of dollars to help restructure significant numbers of the Nation's "dropout factories".

Finally, the new College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program and the other activities in the 2011 budget that focus on high schools will be complemented by the Graduation Promise Initiative, included in legislation (H.R. 3221) that has passed the House of Representatives and is pending in the Senate.

Under our reauthorization proposal, High School Graduation Initiative continuation grants would be funded from the appropriation for the new College Pathways and Accelerated Learning initiative.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### High school graduation initiative

---

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Amount for new awards	0	\$45,000	0
Number of new awards	0	25	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$200	0
National activities, including technical assistance and dissemination	0	\$4,800	0

---

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$45,000 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for College Pathways and Accelerated Learning initiative in fiscal year 2011.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made towards achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2011 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

In fiscal year 2005, the Department held a competition for the School Dropout Prevention program (the former name of the High School Graduation Initiative) and made 3-year awards to two State educational agencies; in fiscal year 2006, the Department made two more awards from the same slate. There are currently two performance measures for this program.

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

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### High school graduation initiative

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

**Assessment of Progress:** The State event dropout rate has been defined as the percentage of private and public high school students who left high school between the beginning of one school year and the beginning of the next without earning a high school diploma or its equivalent. The data above reflect the average State event dropout rate for the four SEAs from States that received funds in fiscal years 2005 and 2006. 2009 data will be available in February 2010.

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

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

**Assessment of Progress:** Only one grantee proposed a project that targeted students for reentry; thus, the data presented above reflect data from one SEA. 2009 data will be available in February 2010.

### Other Performance Information

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

In October 2008, the Department issued a regulation that established a uniform measure for calculating high school graduation rates that will be used by all States in calculating adequate yearly progress under Title I. This "4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate" is defined as the

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### High school graduation initiative

---

number of students who graduate in 4 years with a regular high school diploma divided by the total number of students in the entering 9<sup>th</sup> grade cohort, adjusted for students who enter or leave the cohort when they change schools. The regulation requires reporting the 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, in the aggregate and disaggregated by subgroups at the high school, district, and State levels, on report cards providing results of assessments administered in the 2010-2011 school year. The Department gave States the option of applying for an extension of this deadline, and four States have applied. Having access to data on graduation rates that have been calculated in a uniform manner will allow researchers to make comparisons across States and districts.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Advanced placement

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

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$45,840	0	-\$45,840

---

<sup>1</sup>The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2011 under new legislation.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title I, Part G of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) authorizes two programs: the Advanced Placement Test Fee program and the Advanced Placement Incentive program. The purpose of both programs is to support State and local efforts to increase access to Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) classes and tests for low-income students. The statute requires the Department to give priority to funding the Advanced Placement Test Fee program, with remaining funds allocated to Advanced Placement Incentive grants.

*Advanced Placement Test Fee Program:* The Department makes 1-year competitive awards to State educational agencies to enable them to cover part or all of the cost of test fees of low-income students who are enrolled in an AP or IB class and plan to take an AP or IB test. Funds from the program subsidize test fees for low-income students to encourage them to take AP or IB tests and obtain college credit for high school courses, reducing the time and cost required to complete a postsecondary degree. In determining the amount of the grant awarded to a State for a fiscal year, the Department considers the number of children eligible to be counted under the ESEA Title I Basic Grants formula.

*Advanced Placement Incentive Program Grants:* The Department makes 3-year competitive awards to State educational agencies (SEAs), local educational agencies (LEAs), or national nonprofit educational entities with expertise in providing advanced placement services. Grants must be used to expand access for low-income individuals to advanced placement courses and programs. Eligible activities include teacher training, development of pre-advanced placement courses, activities to enhance coordination and articulation between grade levels in order to prepare students for academic achievement in AP or IB courses, the purchase of books and supplies, and activities to enhance the availability of and expand participation in online AP or IB courses.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Advanced placement

---

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

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$32,175
2007 .....	37,026
2008 .....	43,540
2009 .....	43,540
2010 .....	45,840

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not seeking separate funding for the Advanced Placement program for fiscal year 2011. In place of several narrowly targeted programs that seek to improve student achievement in high schools or to provide an accelerated curriculum, the Administration proposes to create a broader College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program that addresses the need to better prepare students attending schools with concentrations of students from low-income families to enter and succeed in college. The new program would also promote the instruction of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses in high-poverty middle and high schools in addition to other strategies (such as dual high school/college enrollment and early college high schools) for expanding accelerated curriculum options in those schools. It would also provide grants to States for payment of advanced placement test fees for students from low-income families.

The Administration's budget proposal would provide funds to continue Advanced Placement Incentive grants through their conclusion, from the appropriation for the new College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Total Budget Authority	\$43,540	\$45,840	0
Test fee program	\$15,482	\$18,615	0
Number of grants	41	41	0
Number of tests taken by low-income students	378,272	435,013	0
Incentive program grants	\$28,058	\$27,225	0
Continuation grants	\$14,191	\$27,225	0
Number of grants	20	38	0
Grant supplements	\$245	0	0

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Advanced placement

---

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
New grants	\$13,622	0	0
Number of grants	18	0	0

---

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$14,500 thousand and test fee costs of approximately \$20,000 would be provided from the appropriation for College Pathways and Accelerated Learning in fiscal year 2011.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, indicators, and performance data and targets, 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 2011 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Goal: To increase the numbers of low-income high school students prepared to pursue higher education.**

**Objective:** Encourage a greater number of low-income and other underrepresented categories of students to participate in the AP and IB programs and pass the exams.

Measure: The number of AP tests taken by low-income public school students nationally.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	209,411	267,286
2007	230,352	286,028
2008	328,932	325,567
2009	378,272	
2010	435,013	
2011	500,265	

**Assessment of progress:** Based on data from the College Board, low-income students took 325,567 AP exams in May 2008. Though this was a 13.8 percent increase from 2007, the target was not met in 2008. It is important to note that the Department recalibrated the targets for 2008, 2009, and 2010 to better reflect the dramatic increases in appropriations in 2006 and 2007, and that the program came very close to meeting the significantly higher 2008 target. 2009 data will be available in the spring of 2010.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Advanced placement

<b>Measure:</b> The number of Advanced Placement tests taken by minority (Hispanic, Black, Native American) public school students nationally.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	336,000	359,372
2007	376,000	413,847
2008	421,000	473,666
2009	544,716	539,269
2010	626,423	
2011	720,387	

**Assessment of progress:** Data for this measure are obtained from the College Board and capture the effects of efforts to increase minority students' participation in the AP program. The target was not met in 2009.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Advanced Placement tests passed (tests receiving scores of 3-5) by low-income public school students nationally.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	38.5	37.5
2007	39	35.6
2008	39.5	34.5
2009	39.8	
2010	40.2	
2011	40.4	

**Assessment of progress:** This measure calculates the number of AP exams passed by low-income public school students in relation to the total number of AP exams taken by those students. Data for this measure are obtained from the College Board and capture the effects of efforts to increase low-income students' success on AP exams. The target was not met in 2008. One likely reason for the decline in the pass rate since 2006 is the significant (22 percent) increase in the number of exams taken by low-income students. 2009 data will be available in the spring of 2010.

<b>Measure:</b> The number of Advanced Placement tests passed (tests receiving scores of 3-5) by low-income public school students nationally.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	90,009	95,350
2007	99,000	97,142
2008	128,941	106,586
2009	150,552	
2010	174,875	
2011	203,108	

**Assessment of progress:** Data for this measure are obtained from the College Board and capture the effects of efforts to increase low-income students' AP exam success rate. In May

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Advanced placement

2008, low-income students passed 106,586 tests, an increase of almost 10 percent from 2007 but below the target. 2009 data will be available in the spring of 2010.

<b>Measure:</b> The ratio of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate tests taken in public high schools served by API grants to the number of seniors enrolled at those schools.						
Year	Target			Actual		
	2006 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2009 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2009 Cohort
<b>2006</b>				0.46		
<b>2007</b>	0.55			0.53		
<b>2008</b>	0.66			0.60	0.65	
<b>2009</b>	0.79	0.78	baseline	.62	.79	.97
<b>2010</b>		0.93	1.03			
<b>2011</b>		1.10	1.09			

**Assessment of progress:** This indicator measures the number of AP and IB tests taken in high schools served by API grants, divided by the total number of seniors enrolled at each school. In 2009, the 2008 cohort of grantees offered 0.79 AP/IB exams per senior enrolled, which was an increase from 0.65 in 2008. This measure, referred to as the “Challenge Index,” was developed by the *Washington Post* in order to assess the performance of high schools. The Department established baselines for this measure in 2006 for the 2006 cohort, and established the baseline for the 2009 cohort in 2009. The 2006 cohort did not meet its target in 2009. The 2008 cohort made its goal for 2009.

### Efficiency Measure

<b>Measure:</b> The cost per passage of an Advanced Placement test by a low-income public school student.		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2007</b>	\$95.22	\$94.76
<b>2008</b>	\$94.76	\$91.29
<b>2009</b>	\$91.29	
<b>2010</b>	\$91.29	
<b>2011</b>	\$91.29	

**Assessment of progress:** The Department’s efficiency measure for the Advanced Placement Test Fee program is the cost per passage of an Advanced Placement test by a low-income student. Data for 2006 and 2007 were calculated by dividing the total expenditures for the Test Fee program from June 1, 2006 to May 30, 2007, by the total number of tests passed by low-income students benefitting from the Test Fee program. Beginning in 2008, the data for this measure are calculated by dividing the total amount States report spending on AP test fees by the total number of tests passed by low-income students. 2009 data will be available in the spring of 2010.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Javits gifted and talented education

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

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$7,463	0	-\$7,463

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2011 under new legislation.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

The 2008 competition helped sharpen the program's focus by funding projects that will scale up and evaluate models designed to increase the number of gifted and talented students from underrepresented groups who, through gifted and talented education programs, perform at high levels of academic achievement. Applicants were required to provide: (1) evidence from one or more scientifically based research and evaluation study indicating that the proposed model raised the achievement of gifted and talented students from one or more underrepresented group in one or more core subject area; (2) evidence from one or more scientifically based

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Javits gifted and talented

---

research and evaluation study that the proposed model resulted in the identification of and provision of services to increased numbers of gifted and talented students from underrepresented groups who participate in gifted and talented programs; (3) evidence that the applicant has expertise within its leadership team in gifted and talented education, research and program evaluation, content knowledge in one or more core academic subject areas, and working with underrepresented groups; (4) a sound plan for implementing the model in multiple settings or with multiple populations; and, (5) a research and evaluation plan that employs an experimental or quasi-experimental design to measure the impact of the model on the achievement of students from underrepresented groups, including students who are economically disadvantaged or limited English proficient, or who have disabilities, and on the number of these students who are identified as gifted and talented and served through gifted and talented programs. Seven projects from this competition were first funded in 2008, and eight additional projects from the 2008 slate were funded for the first time in fiscal year 2009.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$9,596
2007 .....	7,596
2008 .....	7,463
2009 .....	7,463
2010 .....	7,463

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not seeking separate funding for the Javits Gifted and Talented Education program for fiscal year 2011. In place of this program and several other narrowly targeted programs focused on high school achievement and on provision of accelerated instruction (including provision of that instruction to gifted and talented students) with different purposes, requirements, and authorized activities, the Administration proposes to create a broader College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program. The new College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program would target Federal support on preparation for college entrance and success through such activities as dual enrollment, early college high schools, and Advanced Placement in schools with concentrations of low-income students. Gifted and talented students would be an important target population for this program, because they are likely to need an advanced or accelerated curriculum in order to stay engaged in school and progress academically. Gifted high school students will benefit from the new program's focus on provision of college-level instruction, and from an accountability system that incorporates and encourages growth beyond basic proficiency. Students who attend schools in high-poverty areas and have already exceeded State proficiency standards are less likely to have access to the instruction they need (and often less likely to be identified as gifted) and, thus, will benefit from the program's targeting of resources on those schools. Finally, the new program would also support projects that benefit gifted and talented elementary school students.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Javits gifted and talented

---

Activities to strengthen the education of gifted and talented students could also be funded under the Excellent Teachers and Leaders program (in the Innovation and Instructional Teams account), which would provide funds for professional development for teachers and school leaders, particularly in high-need or low-performing schools.

The Administration's budget proposal would provide funds to continue Javits Gifted and Talented Education grants, from the appropriation for the new College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
<b>Research and demonstration activities</b>			
Funding for new awards	\$2,803	0	0
Number of new awards	8	0	0
Average new award	\$377	0	0
Funding for continuation awards	\$2,708	\$5,723	0
Number of continuation awards	7	15	0
Average continuation award	\$387	\$381	0
Research and development center	\$1,952	\$1,740	0

---

NOTE: In fiscal year 2011, continuation costs of approximately \$3,000 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for College Pathways and Accelerated Learning.

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

#### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2011 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department established three measures to assess the impact of the program. These measures focus on the quality of project designs, professional development, and significant academic achievement in targeted student populations. The Department collects data for these measures every 2 years by convening an expert panel of scientists and practitioners to review information from a sample of annual performance reports and self-evaluations prepared by grantees. Baselines for these measures were set in 2005 and 2006.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Javits gifted and talented

---

**Goal:** To improve the teaching and learning of gifted and talented students through research, demonstration projects, personal training, and other activities of national significance.

**Objective:** *Develop models for developing the talents of students who are economically disadvantaged, are limited English proficient, or have disabilities.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Javits Gifted and Talented Education project designs for effective professional development focusing on gifted and talented education with average reviewer ratings for quality of high and above.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	91	
2007	92	100
2008	93	
2009	93	
2010	94	
2011	95	

**Assessment of Progress:** In 2005, the baseline year, 9 of the 10 sampled projects received ratings of high or above for effective designs for professional development focusing on gifted and talented education. In 2007, each of the five sampled projects received such a rating, exceeding the target of 92 percent. Data for 2009 should be available in March 2010.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of new evidence-based Javits Gifted and Talented Education project designs with average reviewer ratings for quality of high and above.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	71	
2007	72	100
2008	73	
2009	73	
2010	74	
2011	75	

**Assessment of Progress:** In 2005, the baseline year, 7 of the 10 sampled projects received ratings of high or above for quality of evidence-based project designs. In 2007, each of the five sampled projects received such a rating, exceeding the target of 72 percent. Data for 2009 should be available in March 2010.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Javits gifted and talented

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Javits Gifted and Talented Education projects with significant gains in academic achievement among target student populations.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	90	
2007	91	100
2008	92	
2009	93	
2010	93	
2011	94	

**Assessment of Progress:** In 2005, the baseline year for this measure, 9 of the 10 sampled projects showed significant gains in academic achievement among target student populations. Although the expert panel determined that these projects showed such gains, it noted, among other things, that the program needed better empirical measures for judging how high-ability students improve and that most project evaluations were not structured to compare achievement results with a control group. The panel suggested that program staff work with the projects on developing and reporting valid and reliable student achievement data that would help measure the impact of specialized gifted and talented curricula on student learning. In response, the Department conducted site visits and additional monitoring to identify projects in need of technical assistance and is working with projects to ensure the collection of reliable achievement data in accordance with original grant proposals. In 2007, each of the five sampled projects demonstrated significant gains in academic achievement among target student populations, exceeding the target of 91 percent. Data for 2009 should be available in March 2010.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Assessing Achievement

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

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$410,732	\$450,000	+\$39,268

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2011.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requires States to test all students annually in grades 3 through 8 and once in high school in reading (or language arts) and mathematics, and to administer annual assessments in science for each of three grade spans specified in the law. Furthermore, States must assess the English proficiency of all limited English proficient students annually. The annual assessments in reading and mathematics are used to determine whether States, local educational agencies (LEAs), and schools are making adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward the goal of all students attaining proficiency by 2013-2014; the science and language proficiency assessments are not required for the determination of adequate yearly progress.

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

The Grants for State Assessments program, authorized by Section 6111, provides formula grants to States to pay the costs of developing the standards and assessments required by ESEA Title I. Once a State has put in place those standards and assessments, it may use program funds to pay for the administration of the assessments and for other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and LEAs are held accountable for results. Such activities may include, among other things, developing standards and assessments in subjects other than those required by Title I, expanding the range of testing accommodations for students with disabilities and for limited English proficient students, professional development aligned with State standards and assessments, and developing multiple measures to ensure the validity and reliability of State assessments.

Under the funding formula, 0.5 of 1 percent of the appropriation is reserved for the Department of the Interior/Bureau of Indian Education and 0.5 of 1 percent goes to the Outlying Areas.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Assessing achievement

---

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

Section 6112 of the ESEA authorizes Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments, a competitive grant program under which the Department makes awards to support efforts by States, or consortia of States, to: (1) improve the quality, validity, and reliability of State academic assessments; (2) measure student academic achievement through the use of multiple measures from multiple sources; (3) chart student progress over time; and (4) use comprehensive instruments such as performance- and technology-based assessments. To date, the Department has made 33 awards under the program.

In each year beginning with fiscal year 2005, the Congress has first provided \$400 million for the State Assessment grants, with any remaining funds going to Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$407,563
2007 .....	407,563
2008 .....	408,732
2009 .....	410,732
2010 .....	410,732

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2011, the Administration requests \$450 million for the renamed Assessing Achievement program, an increase of \$39.3 million over the 2010 level. The request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2011 under reauthorized legislation, and it is based on the Administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization proposal, which generally seeks to continue support for the four areas of reform outlined in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA): making improvements in teacher and leader effectiveness and ensuring that all schools have highly qualified teachers and leaders; making progress toward college and career-ready standards and rigorous assessments that will improve both teaching and learning; improving achievement in low-performing schools, by providing intensive support and effective interventions in schools that need them the most, and; gathering information to improve student learning, teacher performance, and college and career-readiness through enhanced data systems that track progress.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Assessing achievement

---

Through formula and competitive grants, the reauthorized Assessing Achievement program would support the continued improvement of existing State assessments, including the appropriate assessment of students with disabilities and English learners, as well as the development of and transition to assessments of college- and career-ready standards. These assessments will be designed to support improved teaching and learning and a fairer approach to accountability that looks at student growth and school progress.

From the \$450 million requested for fiscal year 2011, the Department would continue to award \$400 million to States through a formula based on States' share of students aged 5 through 17, and the remaining \$50 million would be awarded on a competitive basis.

Formula grants funds would flow to all States that have committed to implementation of college- and career- ready standards and assessments. Those funds would enable the States to continue to improve their assessments to ensure that: (1) they reflect and support good instructional practice by eliciting complex responses and demonstrations of knowledge and skills consistent with the goal of students becoming college and career ready by the time of high school graduation; and (2) they include all students, with appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities and English learners. Funds could be used to develop or implement assessment systems aligned with common college- and career-ready standards; develop or improve assessments of English language proficiency, develop or improve native language assessments, expand the range of accommodations available to English learners and students with disabilities, support the use of technology to enhance assessment as well as transitions to computer-based assessment, and develop or improve interim and formative assessments aligned with college- and career-ready standards

Funds for competitive grants would be awarded to support assessment activities that advance State efforts to implement new assessment requirements contained in the reauthorized Title I of the ESEA and to develop additional assessments that support the improvement of teaching and learning. Funds would be used to develop or improve common assessments in science or other subjects aligned with college- and career-ready standards; rigorous end-of-course exams; formative and interim assessments aligned with college- and career-ready standards; common assessments and accommodations for students with disabilities and English learners, including native language assessments and assessments of English proficiency; research on assessments, including on performance assessments, to enhance their validity, reliability, and alignment with standards, and to improve alignment with curricula and instructional materials; and other activities to improve assessment development, administration, reporting, and use.

If Congress completes a fundamental overhaul of ESEA that includes the President's proposed reforms, the Administration would seek additional funds for certain ESEA programs including for Assessing Achievement.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Assessing achievement

---

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
<b>Grants for State Assessments</b>			
Estimated number of awards	52	52	52
Range of awards	\$255-32,776	\$256-32,776	\$256-32,776
Average award	\$7,107	\$7,107	\$7,107
BIE and Outlying Areas	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
<b>Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments</b>			
Amount for new awards	\$8,657	\$10,657	\$50,000
Number of new awards	6	7	10
Range of awards	\$1,000-\$2,000	\$1,000-2,000	\$8,000-12,000
Peer review of new award applications	\$75	\$75	\$250

#### 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 2011 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

To date, the Department has granted approval to 22 States for their reading and language arts, mathematics, and science assessments. An additional 16 States have received approval of their reading and language arts assessments and mathematics assessments, but have not yet received approval of their science assessments. In addition, two States had previously received approval of their reading and language arts assessments and mathematics assessments but recently made changes to their assessment systems and had to re-submit evidence that their assessments still comply with the Title I requirements for those subjects. Twenty-nine States have submitted evidence regarding the extent to which they have met the requirements for science assessments but the Department has not yet made final decisions regarding their status.

Fourteen States currently do not have approval of their reading/language arts, mathematics, or science assessments and have been granted special status because they need additional time to come into compliance with the Title I assessment requirements. Of those, six are under mandatory oversight status, which required those States to formally submit to the Department a timeline detailing what the State would do to come into compliance with the assessment requirements within 1 year. Two States are operating under a memorandum of agreement

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Assessing achievement

---

because they needed 2 years to come into compliance. The remaining six States have entered into compliance agreements with the Department because it will take them 2 to 3 additional years to come into compliance. The Department placed conditions on the fiscal year 2009 Title I, Part A grant awards for all of the States with special status. In addition, the Department will be reviewing the progress of the States that are currently under mandatory oversight status in 2010 to determine if they have completed the work they needed to do to come into compliance.

In fall of 2009, the Department conducted a pilot review of grantee products to obtain baseline data for address the performance measures for the Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments program established in 2007. These measures assess the extent to which funded projects produce significant research regarding assessments, in particular regarding accommodations and alternate assessments for students with disabilities, and whether grantees disseminate information on advances in assessments resulting from the Enhanced Assessment Instruments Grants. The Department reviewed final products from six of the eight grantees that received fiscal year 2005 funding under the program. Two grantees had received an extension of their grant periods and were still conducting grant activities at the time of the pilot review. The Department will review final products from these two grantees in the spring of 2010 and will report baseline data on these measures in 2011 based on the fiscal year 2005 cohort of grantees. The Department expects to report data from the fiscal year 2006 cohort at that time.

### Efficiency Measures

The Department adopted an efficiency measure that tracks the average number of days per peer review session it takes the Department to issue an initial standards and assessment decision letter to a State. The target for this measure is 90 business days or less.

Year	Target	Actual
2006	90	60.45
2007	90	56.00
2008	90	78.23
2009	90	100.9
2010	To be determined	
2011	To be determined	

**Assessment of progress:** The average number of days to issue an initial decision letter to a State increased between 2008 and 2009, from 78.23 business days to 100.9.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Training and advisory services

(Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IV)

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$6,989	\$6,989	0

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

The fiscal year 2008 Training and Advisory Services program competition included four invitational priorities to encourage applications for projects that would address current needs in the area of educational equity, particularly barriers to providing all students with a high-quality education. Those four priorities invited applications for: (1) projects to help school boards and other responsible governmental agencies address the over-representation of minorities in special education, the under-representation of minorities in gifted and talented programs, or both, through technical assistance products, services, training, and other informational resources; (2) projects to provide school boards and other responsible governmental agencies with resources, services, and training on successful strategies for providing limited English proficient students with access to a high-quality education; (3) projects to support equity in education by ensuring equal access to well-qualified teachers for all students, including students who are economically disadvantaged or racial and ethnic minorities; and, (4) projects to disseminate, to school boards and other responsible governmental agencies, materials and technical assistance that promote equity by addressing the special needs of high-risk students (such as, effective approaches to school dropout prevention and reentry), including racial and ethnic minorities.

The fiscal year 2009 appropriation included \$2.5 million for one-time grants for local educational agencies (LEAs) that are facing challenges in creating student assignment plans that comply with the 2007 Supreme Court decision declaring unconstitutional plans based on race. The

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Training and advisory services

---

Department made 11 awards to school districts seeking technical assistance to develop and implement student assignment plans that avoid the re-segregation of schools and facilitate student diversity, while maintaining compliance with the Supreme Court decision.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$7,113
2007 .....	7,113
2008 .....	6,989
2009 .....	9,489
2010 .....	6,989

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2011, the Administration requests \$7.0 million for the Training and Advisory Services program, the same as the fiscal year 2010 level. The fiscal year 2011 funds would support the 1<sup>st</sup> year of 3-year grants to 10 regional Equity Assistance Centers (EACs).

To support the goal of equal access for all students, the requested funds for fiscal year 2011 would provide support to the EACs for such activities as: training on how to develop curricula so that all students receive an education that prepares them for successful entry into college or a career; instructing school officials on how to prevent sexual harassment and combat biases that can lead to hate crimes and bullying; helping educators select appropriate educational programs to meet the needs of limited English proficient students; assistance in increasing participation by minorities and females in advanced mathematics and science courses; and working with LEAs to ensure that their reform and educational restructuring plans consider the needs of all students. The Centers' activities help to ensure that all children have equal access to quality education and the opportunity to develop strong academic skills in reading, mathematics, and other core subject areas.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Amount for continuation awards	\$6,969	\$6,969	0
Number of continuation awards	10	10	0
Amount for new awards	\$2,489 <sup>1</sup>	0	\$6,900
Peer review of new award applications	\$11	0	\$69
Number of new awards	11	0	10

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Training and advisory services

---

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Data collection	\$20	\$20	\$20

<sup>1</sup> The Congress appropriated \$2.5 million in FY 2009 for one-time grants to LEAs for assistance with student assignment plans that comply with the 2007 Supreme Court decision.

#### 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 2011 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department gathers data to inform the program's performance measures through customer surveys administered by the Library of Congress's Federal Research Division. About 48 percent of the targeted customer group responded to the 2006 survey. With assistance from the Department's Data Quality Initiative (DQI) contractor, the Department made revisions to the survey and took steps to increase the response rate, and in 2007 and 2008 the rate increased to almost 76 percent. In 2009, the response rate dropped to 71 percent.

The number of clients surveyed has varied across years. In 2006 and 2009, the centers identified approximately one-third fewer clients compared to 2007 and 2008, (233 clients surveyed in 2006; 307 in 2007; 350 in 2008; and 205 in 2009). This may be because 2006 and 2009 mark the first year of a 3-year grant cycle.

Still, 15 respondents in 2009 indicated that their organization had not received services from the EAC or that they didn't know if their organization had received those services, compared to 21 in 2006, 34 in 2007, and 35 in 2008. The Department will work with the centers on interpretation of their clients' responses.

**Goal: To support access and equity in public schools and help school districts solve equity problems in education related to race, sex, and national origin.**

**Objective:** *Provide high-quality technical assistance and training to public school districts in addressing equity in education.*

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Training and advisory services

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of customers of Equity Assistance Centers that develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices for eliminating, reducing, or preventing harassment, conflict, and school violence.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		66
2007	67	50
2008	68	56
2009	69	52
2010	70	
2011	71	

**Assessment of progress:** From 2007-2009, the actual percentage of customers responding positively to this measure was below the target. The targets are based on the 2006 baseline data. In 2006, the response rate was only 48 percent. Since then, the survey was revised and the response rate increased. Therefore, responses from the past 3 years may more accurately reflect the needs of the target audience.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of customers of Equity Assistance Centers that develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices for ensuring that students of different race, sex, and national origin have equitable opportunity for high-quality instruction.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		71
2007	72	82
2008	73	89
2009	74	85
2010	75	
2011	76	

**Assessment of progress:** Results have exceeded the target each year. However, approximately 5 percent of respondents indicated that they did not know whether their organization had developed, implemented, or improved its policies and practices in this area.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of customers who report that the products and services they received from the Equity Assistance Centers are of high quality.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		92
2008	90	95
2009	90	95
2010	90	
2011	90	

**Assessment of progress:** This measure was implemented in 2007. Customers have responded very positively on the quality of the products and services they have received. No respondents rated the quality as “low” or “very low.”

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Training and advisory services

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of customers who report that the products and services they received from the Equity Assistance Centers are of high usefulness to their policies and practices.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		85
2007	86	88
2008	87	94
2009	88	92
2010	89	
2011	90	

**Assessment of progress:** The program has exceeded its targets and customers have responded positively to the usefulness of the products and services they received from the centers.

### Efficiency Measures

The Department implemented a measure of administrative efficiency to assess the Training and Advisory Services program and other technical assistance programs. The measure is the percentage of grant funds that each EAC carries over for each year of operations. The Department established a second efficiency measure for the program: the number of working days it takes the Department to send monitoring reports to grantees following a monitoring visit. The program office conducted 2 site visits at the end of fiscal year 2009, the pilot year. The Department will have baseline data for this measure once the reports have been mailed.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Equity Assistance Center grant funds carried over in each year of the project.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		<1
2007	10	<1
2008	10	<1
2009	10	4
2010	10	
2011	10	

**Assessment of progress:** The EACs have carried over less than 1 percent of their grant funds on average for 2006, 2007, and 2008, and 4 percent in 2009, better than the target of 10 percent.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Rural education

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

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined<sup>1,2</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$174,882	\$174,882	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; the program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2011.

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

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

#### **SMALL, RURAL SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (Subpart 1)**

To be eligible to receive funds under the SRSA program, an LEA must: (1) (a) have a total average daily attendance (ADA) of less than 600 students; or (b) serve only schools that are located in counties that have a population density of fewer than 10 persons per square mile; and (2) serve only schools that (a) have a National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) locale code of 7 (rural) or 8 (rural near an urban area); or (b) are located in an area of the State defined as rural by a governmental agency of the State.

## **EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

### **Rural education**

---

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

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

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

### **RURAL AND LOW-INCOME SCHOOL PROGRAM (Subpart 2)**

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

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

LEAs use program funds for: (1) teacher recruitment and retention; (2) teacher professional development; (3) educational technology; (4) parental involvement activities; (5) activities authorized under Part A of Title IV (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities); (6) activities authorized under Part A of Title I (Grants to LEAs); and (7) activities authorized under Title III (Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students).

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

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

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$168,918
2007 .....	168,918
2008 .....	171,854
2009 .....	173,382
2010 .....	174,882

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is requesting \$174.9 million for the Rural Education program, the same as the fiscal year 2010 level. The request would support the program's first year of operation under the reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The request would maintain an average LEA award under the Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) program of approximately \$21,000 and an average LEA subgrant under the Rural and Low-Income Schools (RLIS) program of approximately \$58,000.

The Rural Education program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2011 under reauthorized legislation. For the reauthorization, the Administration is proposing to update the criterion by which a district is designated as rural, extend REAP-Flex to RLIS subgrantees, and authorize national support for technical assistance, research, and other activities, including demonstration grants to help rural districts overcome their unique constraints.

The Administration supports funding for Rural Education because of the significant challenges that rural LEAs face in meeting the objectives of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The program provides rural districts with supplemental resources to help meet those challenges.

According to the report *Status of Education in Rural America*, released by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in July 2007, during the 2003-04 school year over half of all operating school districts and one-third of the Nation's public schools were located in rural areas, with one-fifth of all public school students enrolled at these schools. The small size of many rural schools and districts creates a different set of problems from those of urban schools and districts. For example, rural schools and districts generally cannot derive the benefits of economies of scale and, thus, face greater per-pupil costs in providing staff or transportation services. Adjusted for geographic cost differences, operating expenditures per student in 2003-04 were higher in rural districts than in city and suburban districts.

Poverty, less access to advanced courses, and low expectations are other challenges that NCES found are encountered by many rural school children. In school year 2003-04, nearly half of students in rural remote areas attended schools with moderate or high poverty levels. This is greater than all other locales except large and mid-size cities. During the 2002-03 school year, 69 percent of rural high school students attended schools that offered Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate courses, compared to 93 percent of city and

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

96 percent of suburban high school students. College enrollment among rural individuals 18- to 24-years old was the lowest of all locales in 2004, at 27 percent, compared to a national average of 34 percent.

In addition, because of size and location, many small, rural districts have faced difficulty in meeting the ESEA requirement that students receive instruction in the core academic subjects from teachers who are fully certified by the State, have demonstrated competency in the subjects they teach, and are effective at improving student academic outcomes. Rural teachers are frequently called upon to teach multiple subjects, which challenges teachers to obtain multiple certifications needed to meet the statutory definition of “highly qualified.” A 2003 national survey conducted by the Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL) found that 57 percent of secondary school teachers in rural schools with 250 or fewer students teach multiple subjects. Another national study, conducted in 2005 by Edvantia, the successor to AEL, found the “highly qualified” requirements, geographic and social isolation, and lower pay to be the greatest challenges to rural district recruitment and retention of teachers. Rural Education funds can help rural LEAs meet the challenge of recruiting and retaining a staff of highly qualified and effective teachers.

Rural districts frequently receive allocations under State formula grant programs that are too small to allow the LEA to address effectively the purposes for which the funds are appropriated. For example, in fiscal year 2008, the median total allocation received by districts eligible for SRSA in fiscal year 2009 under three current Federal formula grant programs (Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, Educational Technology State Grants, and Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants) was \$16,815.

Recognizing that rural districts frequently receive small allocations from Federal formula grants, the Rural Education statute provides flexibility, through the “alternative uses of funds” authority, to LEAs eligible to receive funds under the SRSA program. This flexibility, commonly referred to as “REAP-Flex,” is important to these districts because it allows them to make more effective use of their small Federal formula allocations. An eligible LEA may use its formula allocations under the covered programs to carry out authorized activities or for activities authorized under Part A of Title I, Title III (Language Instruction) or Part B of Title IV (21st Century Community Learning Centers). Fifty-six percent of eligible districts notified their respective State of their intention to take advantage of this authority in fiscal year 2007. Yet, even when the eligible LEAs consolidate their allocations under these programs, they typically do not have enough money to provide effective educator professional development, strengthen school safety, or address the other statutory objectives in a meaningful manner. Rural Education program funds help to make up the difference and assist rural LEAs in financing and implementing approaches to meeting ESEA requirements and addressing the other challenges they face.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
<b>Small, rural school achievement</b>			
Total funding	\$86,691	\$87,441	\$87,441
Estimated number of LEAs receiving grants	4,100	4,100	4,183
Average LEA grant	\$21	\$21	\$21
Average award per student (whole \$)	\$82	\$83	\$80
Range of awards to LEAs	0-\$60	0-\$60	0-\$60
<b>Rural and low-income schools</b>			
Total funding	\$86,691	\$87,441	\$87,441
Amount for State grants	\$85,795	\$86,567	\$86,567
Amount for BIE	\$433	\$437	\$437
Amount for outlying areas	\$433	\$437	\$437
Amount for evaluation	\$30	0	0
Estimated number of States receiving grants	41	41	39
Estimated number of LEAs receiving subgrants	1,497	1,497	1,662
Average State grant	\$2,093	\$2,111	\$2,242
Average LEA subgrant	\$57	\$58	\$53
Average award per student (whole \$)	\$29	\$29	\$26
Range of awards to States	\$18-7,107	\$18-7,171	\$37-9,478
Estimated range of subgrants to LEAs	\$1-634	\$1-639	\$1-573

NOTE: FY 2011 data may change as a result of the introduction of new locale codes, which will be included in the ESEA reauthorization proposal.

#### 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 2011 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

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

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

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of SRSA-participating LEAs that make adequate yearly progress after 3 years.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	95	92
2007	96	92
2008	96	85
2009	97	
2010	97	
2011	98	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of RLIS-participating LEAs that make adequate yearly progress after 3 years.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	64	53
2007	70	58
2008	76	51
2009	82	
2010	88	
2011	94	

**Assessment of Progress:** When LEAs reported baseline data for 2005, the Department found that 95 percent of LEAs participating in SRSA and 58 percent of LEAs participating in RLIS made AYP. With the baseline data in place, the Department established performance targets to reflect a yearly increase of 1 percentage point every 2 years over the baseline in the number of SRSA LEAs that make AYP, in order to reach 100 percent by the year 2014. Similarly, the Department also adjusted the performance targets for the RLIS program to reflect an annual increase of 6 percentage points over the baseline in the number of LEAs that make AYP. SRSA grantees of 3 or more years in the program demonstrated a decrease in 2008. After an increase in 2007, RLIS grantees of 3 or more years in the program dropped to 51 percent meeting AYP in 2008. SRSA continues to have a greater proportion of grantees making AYP than RLIS, perhaps reflecting the fact that RLIS districts are larger and, thus, may have more subgroups that are counted in AYP determinations. Data for 2009 are expected in October 2010.

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in reading/language arts in each year through the 2013-2014 academic year.		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2007</b>		70
<b>2008</b>	74	74
<b>2009</b>	78	
<b>2010</b>	82	
<b>2011</b>	86	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in mathematics in each year through the 2013-2014 academic year.		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2007</b>		66
<b>2008</b>	71	71
<b>2009</b>	76	
<b>2010</b>	81	
<b>2011</b>	86	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in reading/language arts in each year through the 2013-2014 academic year.		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2007</b>		69
<b>2008</b>	74	64
<b>2009</b>	79	
<b>2010</b>	84	
<b>2011</b>	88	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in mathematics in each year through the 2013-2014 academic year.		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2007</b>		64
<b>2008</b>	70	62
<b>2009</b>	75	
<b>2010</b>	80	
<b>2011</b>	85	

**Assessment of Progress:** The Department established baselines for student proficiency in both programs using data from the 2006-07 school year. Among SRSA districts, the percentage of students who scored proficient or better on their State reading and mathematics assessments increased from 2007 to 2008, meeting the targets for both measures. RLIS districts showed a

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

decline in the percentage of students who score proficient or better on both reading and mathematics assessments, failing to meet the targets for both measures. The performance targets for these measures reflect the Department's goal that 100 percent of students enrolled in districts participating in both the SRSA and RLIS programs will be proficient by 2014. Data for fiscal year 2009 are expected in October 2010.

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

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of eligible school districts using the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility authority.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	65	60
2007	65	56
2008	65	54
2009	65	
2010	65	
2011	65	

**Assessment of Progress:** While this measure was developed to capture the percentage of eligible districts actually using the flexibility authority, the best available information is on the number of districts reporting to the State their intent use this authority. Since there is little reason to believe that LEAs would provide this notification and not use the authority, reported intent serves as a reasonable proxy. In fiscal year 2008, 54 percent of eligible districts reported their intent to use the flexibility authority. Data for 2009 are expected in October 2010.

### Program Efficiency Measures

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of SRSA program grants awarded by August 30 of each fiscal year.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		100
2007	80	100
2008	80	100
2009	80	100
2010	80	
2011	80	

**Assessment of Progress:** Due to difficulty in processing over 4,000 SRSA grants to LEAs in a timely manner in the early years of the program, the Department established a measure to track the efficiency of this task. The Department has had great success since creating the measure, not only exceeding its target of obligating 80 percent of SRSA awards by August 30, but obligating 100 percent each year. Data for 2010 are expected in October 2010.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

#### Other Performance Information

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

The Department is currently conducting an evaluation of the RLIS program. The purpose of this study is to examine the implementation at the State and district levels. Specifically, the Department will obtain information on State RLIS priorities and monitoring, State progress toward achieving RLIS goals, characteristics of RLIS districts, uses of RLIS funds, and student achievement and AYP trends in participating districts. An interim report, based on responses from RLIS coordinators in nine States, was released in December 2009. The report indicated that the coordinators saw RLIS as a supplemental program, rather than as a stand-alone program, and they believed that their subgrantee LEAs use their funds to make AYP. All nine States in the sample require RLIS districts to engage in a comprehensive planning process and to address gaps identified through local needs assessments, and seven of the States include RLIS as part of an integrated planning process that requires LEAs to show how they plan to use funding from Federal programs. The interim report also described that, on average, RLIS districts have more students than other rural LEAs but fewer students than all LEAs nationally, that student-to-teacher ratios in RLIS LEAs are higher than in other rural LEAs but similar to the national average, and that per-pupil expenditures are substantially lower in RLIS LEAs than in other rural LEAs and the national average. The final report is expected to be available in spring 2010.

Section 6224(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act requires the Department to prepare a biennial report to Congress on the RLIS program. The report must describe the methods SEAs have used to award grants and provide technical assistance, how LEAs and schools have used RLIS funds, and the progress made toward meeting the goals and objectives outlined in the SEA applications. The Department will submit its biennial report to Congress for school years 2004-05 and 2005-06 in early 2010 and plans to submit the report for school years 2006-07 and 2007-08 in late 2010.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Supplemental education grants

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

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): \$19,890<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$17,687	\$17,687	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The Act authorizes \$12,230 thousand for the Federated States of Micronesia and \$6,100 thousand for the Republic of the Marshall Islands for fiscal year 2005 and an equivalent amount, as adjusted for inflation (calculated as two thirds of the percentage change in the U.S. Gross Domestic Product Implicit Price Deflator, or 5 percent, whichever is less in any 1 year), for each of the succeeding fiscal years through 2023. The 2011 authorization is calculated based on inflation estimates as of February 2009.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

The Act eliminated the participation of the FSM and the RMI in the following Department of Education programs: ESEA Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies; Career and Technical Education Grants under Title I of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006; Adult Basic and Literacy Education State Grants; Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunities Grants; and Federal Work-Study. However, they remain eligible for participation in other Department programs, including the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act State Grants and programs under Part A, Subpart 1 of Title IV of the Higher Education Act, as well as ED, HHS, and DOL competitive programs. Also, the Act eliminated FSM and RMI participation in programs under Title I (other than Job Corps) of the Workforce Investment Act (DOL) and Head Start (HHS).

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Supplemental education grants

---

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

The FSM and RMI may request technical assistance from ED, HHS, or DOL, on a reimbursement basis. Each year’s appropriations act has also permitted the FSM and the RMI to reserve up to 5 percent of their grants for administration and such technical assistance.

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

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$18,001
2007 .....	18,001
2008 .....	17,687
2009 .....	17,687
2010 .....	17,687

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$17.7 million, the same as the fiscal year 2010 level, to maintain funding for Supplemental Education Grants to the RMI and FSM. The request would ensure the continuation of services for residents of the RMI and the FSM. Over 40 percent of the funding in fiscal years 2005 and 2006 was used to support early childhood education. The RMI and FSM have also used Supplemental Education Grants for education improvement programs, vocational and skills training, and professional development.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000)

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Grant to Federated States of Micronesia	\$11,801	\$11,801	\$11,801
Grant to Republic of the Marshall Islands	5,886	5,886	5,886

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Supplemental education grants

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

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

A December 2006 Government Accountability Office report entitled *Compacts of Free Association: Micronesia and the Marshall Islands Face Challenges in Planning for Sustainability, Measuring Progress, and Ensuring Accountability* documented both the continuing need for improvement in the public education systems of the Freely Associated States and the difficulties in obtaining and reporting performance data for this program. The RMI, according to the report, was not able to measure progress towards its educational goals because the data the Republic collected were inadequate, inconsistent, and incomplete. Tests to measure achievement were not administered in 2005 and 2006, and some of the tests the Republic used were not aligned with the curriculum used in the RMI and, thus, were not adequate measures of student achievement. The FSM also lacked consistent performance outcomes and measures; measures and outcomes had been established but had constantly changed, making it difficult to track progress. Both entities face continuing challenges in improving the quality of education due to a lack of qualified teachers, poor facilities, and a high absentee rate among students and teachers.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Comprehensive centers

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

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$56,313	\$56,313	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2009. The program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. The Administration's FY 2011 budget proposes authorizing this program through appropriations language.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

The Department provided initial grants for 20 new Comprehensive Centers from fiscal year 2005 funds, and a grant for 1 additional center from fiscal year 2006 funds. The system includes 16 *regional centers* that work with the State educational agencies (SEAs) within their geographic regions to help them implement school and district improvement measures and objectives. The regional centers provide technical assistance to SEAs to increase their capacity to assist districts and schools in meeting the key goals of the ESEA.

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

Each center developed a 5-year plan for carrying out authorized activities. The plan of each regional center addresses the needs of the SEAs in its region in meeting the student

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

achievement goals of the ESEA. The content centers' plans address the priorities established by the Department and the States. Each center has an advisory board that advises the center on: (1) allocation of resources; (2) strategies for monitoring and addressing the educational needs of the region (or the needs of the regional centers in the case of the content centers); (3) maintaining a high standard of quality in the performance of its activities; and (4) carrying out the center's activities in a manner that promotes progress toward improving student academic achievement.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$56,257
2007 .....	56,257
2008 .....	57,113
2009 .....	57,113
2010 .....	56,313

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2011, the Administration requests \$56.3 million, the same as the fiscal year 2010 level, to support the Comprehensive Centers program and the first year of funding for the second cohort of centers funded under the Education Technical Assistance Act of 2002 (ETAA).

The Department provided funding to the first cohort of Comprehensive Center grantees under the ETAA in 2005. The 16 regional centers have focused entirely on assisting SEAs in the implementation of ESEA requirements and helping the SEAs to increase their own capacity to assist districts and schools in meeting their student achievement goals. The five content centers have identified, organized, and translated key research and provided in-depth knowledge, expertise, and analyses to the regional centers and the States in each of their content areas: assessment and accountability, high schools, instruction, innovation and improvement, and teacher quality. In fiscal year 2010, the Department is providing the existing centers with a sixth year of funding in order to allow adequate time to plan a new competition that is aligned with the Administration's priorities. Initial findings from the current evaluation will be available in 2010 for use in structuring the new competition. Further, current law requires the Department to establish regional advisory committees for the purpose of assessing the educational needs of the country by region. The committees must solicit input from regional stakeholders and produce a report based on those assessments, which the Department will consider in structuring the new competition. The Department plans to hold the competition in spring 2011, and the fiscal year 2011 appropriation will provide the first year of funding for the new grants.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

In fiscal year 2009, the 16 existing regional centers focused more of their work than in the past on long-term, multi-year projects. Some examples of this work include helping SEAs to:

- Analyze, revise, and improve their standards;
- Increase their understanding of assessment issues, including alternate assessments, modified assessments, and formative assessments;
- Investigate, design, and implement models of “tiered intervention” for struggling students; and,
- Analyze existing institutional structures and helping develop improvements to statewide systems of support.

The content centers continue to supply research-based products and services for the regional centers and the States they serve. Their work has also evolved, with less emphasis on creating products and an increasing emphasis on assisting the regional centers in using existing products. The content centers have increased their professional development efforts, offering “webinars,” online professional learning communities, and in-person assistance to help regional staffs provide more coordinated assistance to SEAs. In 2008, year 4 of their grants, additional program funds became available due to a decrease in the funding needed for the national evaluation. As a result, 13 centers (both regional and content centers) received \$2.5 million dollars in supplemental funds to assist States in addressing issues related to assessments for students with disabilities and those with limited English proficiency.

The Department has not yet determined the structure of the fiscal year 2011 competition. Currently, the Department envisions that the new centers will help States increase their capacity to support their districts and schools, providing technical assistance in at least the following areas:

- Developing infrastructures to improve teaching and learning, with a focus on helping students graduate from high school with the necessary skills and coursework to succeed in college;
- State and district improvement processes and strategies designed to ensure the equitable distribution of highly effective teachers and principals;
- Developing and implementing statewide systems of support for districts and schools; and,
- Expanding or enhancing large-scale State and district data systems, to include improved accessibility of data at the State, district, and school levels.

The 2011 budget request also includes funding to begin an evaluation of the new centers.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
<b>Comprehensive centers</b>			
Number of centers	21	21	20-25
Center awards	\$57,113	\$56,313	\$55,713
Average award	\$2,720	\$2,682	\$2,653
Evaluation	0	0	\$500
Peer review of new award applications	0	0	\$100

#### 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 2011 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

In response to deficiencies identified in the antecedent comprehensive centers, the Department placed strong emphasis on creating a performance-based framework for the new centers that includes, among other things, annual performance measures. These measures were created as part of a Department-wide effort to bring consistency to the assessment of performance across technical assistance programs through the creation of common performance measures. The measures are designed to analyze the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the services provided by the centers, the extent to which each of the centers meets the objectives of its respective plan, and whether their services meet the educational needs of the SEAs, LEAs, and schools.

As part of the Department's national evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers, initiated in 2006, the contractor analyzes and reports on information gathered from the current centers. Panel reviews and surveys conducted in 2007, 2008, and most recently in 2009, have informed the performance measures. Data from 2009 will be available in July 2010.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

**Goal:** To improve student achievement in low-performing schools under the ESEA.

**Objective:** *Improve the quality of technical assistance.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of all Comprehensive Centers' products and services that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products and services.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		34
2008	40	39
2009	46	
2010	52	
2011	59	

**Assessment of progress:** The evaluator will provide more detailed information on the nature, quantity, and quality of the products reviewed once the evaluation has been completed.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of all Comprehensive Centers' products and services that are deemed to be of high relevance to educational policy or practice by target audiences.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		74
2008	75	83
2009	76	
2010	77	
2011	78	

**Assessment of progress:** As part of the national evaluation, an independent firm collects survey data from a random sample of SEA and intermediate education agency staff who have participated in Regional Centers' projects and Regional Center staff who have participated in Content Centers' projects.

**Objective:** *Technical assistance products and services will be used to improve results for children in the target areas.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of all Comprehensive Centers' products and services that are deemed to be of high usefulness to educational policy or practice by target audiences.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		48
2008	52	64
2009	56	
2010	60	
2011	65	

**Assessment of progress:** As part of the national evaluation, an independent firm collects survey data from a random sample of SEA staff and intermediate education agency staff who have participated in Regional Centers' projects and Regional Center staff who have participated in Content Centers' projects.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

#### Efficiency Measures

The Department is implementing a common measure of administrative efficiency to assess the Comprehensive Centers program and other technical assistance programs. The measure is the percentage of grant funds that the centers carry over for each year of operations. Data for the measure are available each year in early September, after Department staff have reviewed data for the previous 12-month budget cycle, and are presented in the table below. The Department also established a second efficiency measure for the program: the number of working days following a monitoring visit that it takes the Department to send a monitoring report to grantees. The program office implemented this new measure in 2009 and established a baseline of 81 working days with a goal of reducing that number to 45 working days in 2010.

**Objective:** *Improve the operational efficiency of the program.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Comprehensive Center grant funds carried over in each year of the project.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2006</b>		40
<b>2007</b>	30	15
<b>2008</b>	20	6
<b>2009</b>	10	4
<b>2010</b>	10	
<b>2011</b>	10	

**Assessment of progress:** The 40 percent carryover in the baseline year is likely the result of the centers receiving their initial grant awards several months into the beginning of the first award year. Since then, grantees have reduced the amount of funds they carry over each year.

#### Other Performance Information

In addition to providing data for the performance measures, the national evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers will assess: (1) the extent to which the centers have met the objectives of their respective technical assistance plans and the educational needs of SEAs, and (2) whether the centers' assistance has expanded SEAs' capacity to provide technical assistance to help LEAs and schools meet their statutory requirements. The evaluation will also examine the centers' responses to changing SEA technical assistance needs, SEAs' reliance on the centers compared to other technical assistance sources, the overall costs for SEAs in providing ESEA-related technical assistance, and the estimated dollar value of the centers' products and services to SEAs. Evaluation findings covering the 2006-07 program year will be available in the first interim report in early 2010. The second interim report, covering the 2007-08 program year is scheduled for mid-2010, and a final report covering the 2008-09 program year, for early 2011. In order to more fully capture the complexity of the technical assistance work, the contractor will also produce case studies, based on a review of the work in 10 SEAs. The case studies will be available as part of the second interim report. A new national evaluation will be initiated in 2011.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### **Native Hawaiian student education**

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

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined<sup>1, 2, 3</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$34,315	\$34,315	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; the program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2011.

<sup>2</sup> The Henry K. Giugni Memorial Archives earmark is authorized through title VIII, part Z of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, with an indefinite authorization of appropriations.

<sup>3</sup> Of the amount available to carry out Sections 7204 and 7205 of ESEA, \$500 thousand is to be reserved for a direct grant to the Native Hawaiian Education Council to carry out Section 7204.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Native Hawaiian Student Education program supports the provision of supplemental education services to the Native Hawaiian population. Competitive grants are awarded to eligible applicants for a variety of authorized activities in such areas as teacher training, family-based education, gifted and talented education, special education, higher education, and community-based education learning centers. Eligible applicants include Native Hawaiian educational organizations and community-based organizations, public and private nonprofit organizations, agencies, and institutions with experience in developing or operating Native Hawaiian programs or programs of instruction in the Native Hawaiian language, and other entities. In recent years, the appropriation for this program has also included earmarked awards for the Hawaii Department of Education (for school construction) and for the University of Hawaii School of Law (for a Center of Excellence in Native Hawaiian Law). For fiscal year 2010, the appropriations language also includes an earmark for the University of Hawaii Academy for Creative Media to establish, maintain, and modernize the Henry K. Giugni Kupuna Memorial Archives at the University of Hawaii.

The program also supports the activities of the Native Hawaiian Education Council. The Council uses funds directly and is authorized to make grants to facilitate its coordination of the educational and related services and programs available to Native Hawaiians. It also provides administrative support and financial assistance to island councils authorized by the statute. The Council receives a minimum award of \$500,000 annually.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Native Hawaiian student education

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$33,908
2007 .....	33,907
2008 .....	33,315
2009 .....	33,315
2010 .....	34,315

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2011, the Administration requests \$34.3 million for the Native Hawaiian Student Education program, the same amount as appropriated for fiscal year 2010. Program funds would continue to be used for education-related services to the Native Hawaiian population. Federal support through this program is justified by the educational status and continuing needs of Native Hawaiians. Program grants support projects intended to improve the educational achievement of Native Hawaiian students by developing programs tailored to the educational and cultural needs of those students.

Results from Hawaii's statewide assessment for 2008 show that an achievement gap persists between Native Hawaiian students and students in Hawaii in general. In all assessed grades, 45 percent of Native Hawaiian students demonstrated grade-level proficiency in reading and 26 percent demonstrated grade-level proficiency in mathematics, compared to 62 percent in reading and 42 percent in mathematics for Hawaiian students in general. This gap between Native Hawaiians and their peers remains consistent across grade levels. In 5<sup>th</sup> grade, while 57 percent of all Hawaiians met or exceeded proficiency in reading and 44 percent met or exceeded proficiency in mathematics, 37 percent and 28 percent of Native Hawaiians met these levels in reading and mathematics, respectively. In 8<sup>th</sup>-grade reading, 65 percent of all students in Hawaii met or exceeded proficiency in reading and 35 percent met this level in mathematics, compared to 49 percent in reading and 19 percent in mathematics for Native Hawaiians. The Department is expecting to receive 2009 data from the Hawaii Department of Education in early 2010.

In recent years, the Congress has earmarked a portion of funding for this program for awards to specific entities. The fiscal year 2011 request would continue the appropriation at the fiscal year 2010 level. However, as the Administration believes that competing funds rather than earmarking them will lead to higher-quality programs and improved student outcomes, the request would discontinue funding for the earmarks, including the new earmark for the Giugni Memorial Archives.

The Native Hawaiian Student Education program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2011 under reauthorized legislation. For the reauthorization, the Administration will propose to give grantees flexibility to conduct activities that are designed to meet the needs of Native Hawaiian students, and are aligned with current priorities, such as recruiting and retaining effective

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Native Hawaiian student education

---

teachers and school leaders, promoting achievement and equity, and turning around low-performing schools. The proposal would also require grantees to report on Title I academic achievement measures for the Native Hawaiian students served by their projects.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Amount for new awards	\$8,453	\$2,895	\$14,891
Number of new awards	16	7	30
Amount for continuation awards	\$21,223	\$27,117	\$18,586
Number of continuation awards	31	38	22
Earmarks in appropriation	\$3,000	\$3,000	0
Native Hawaiian Education Council	\$500	\$500	\$500
Giugni Memorial Archives	0	\$500	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$87	\$303	\$338

---

NOTE: FY 2009 excludes \$52 thousand in unobligated funds transferred to the Career, Technical, and Adult Education account to help support the Adult Education State Grants program. Authority to transfer available funds that would otherwise lapse was provided in Section 804 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (P.L. 111-32).

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

The Department established new performance measures for this program in 2008 that, consistent with the GAO recommendation discussed below, should more accurately and reliably gauge the effectiveness of this program. The new indicators will measure the percentage of Native Hawaiian students in schools served by the program who meet or exceed proficiency standards for reading, mathematics, and science on the State's annual assessments; the percentage of Native Hawaiian children participating in early education programs who demonstrate school readiness in literacy as measured by the Hawaii School Readiness Assessment (HSRA); the percentage of students in schools served by the program who graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma in 4 years; and the percentage of students receiving Hawaiian language through a grant under the program who meet or exceed proficiency standards in reading on a test of the Hawaiian language. The Department will use these measures beginning with the fiscal year 2009 cohort of new grantees and will have baseline data in early 2011.

The Department continues to collect data on the old indicators, which apply to grants made prior to the 2009 cohort. On these measures, in 2008 the number of Native Hawaiian children

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Native Hawaiian student education

---

participating in grantees' early education programs who improved on measures of school readiness and literacy remained relatively steady with the previous year at 60 percent; students participating in the program who met or exceeded proficiency standards in mathematics, science, or reading increased from 66 percent to 70 percent; and the percentage of teachers involved in professional development activities that address the unique education needs of Native Hawaiians increased marginally from 79 percent to 80 percent. The Department has had concerns regarding the accuracy of the data from each of these measures. In the case of the proficiency measure, the Department is not changing the language of the measure but will begin obtaining the data directly from the Hawaii Department of Education. This action should ensure greater accuracy.

### Other Performance Information

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) released a report on the program in March 2008. GAO recommended that the Department, the Native Hawaiian Education Council, and the island councils do more to fulfill their roles and responsibilities under the statute. Regarding the Department specifically, GAO recommended that the Secretary report to Congress on program activities, establish performance measures that cover a greater proportion of the grantees' activities, track grant activities more closely, and provide more guidance and assistance to grantees and the Native Hawaiian Education Council. The Department continues to work on each of these recommendations. Most notably, the Department revised the GPRA measures and developed guidance documents for grantees on their implementation.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Alaska Native student education

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

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined<sup>1,2</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$33,315	\$33,315	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; the program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2011.

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

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Alaska Native Student Education program supports supplemental educational programs and services to Alaska Natives. The program awards competitive grants to eligible applicants for a variety of authorized activities, such as teacher training and student enrichment programs. Eligible applicants include Alaska Native organizations, educational entities with experience in developing or operating Alaska Native programs or programs of instruction conducted in Alaska Native languages, cultural and community-based organizations, and other entities. At least \$1 million must be used for parenting education activities.

Projects supported by these grants include the development and implementation of curricula and educational programs that address needs of the Alaska Native student population, professional development activities for educators, the development and operation of home instruction programs for Alaska Native preschool children that help ensure the active involvement of parents in their children's education, family literacy services, student enrichment programs in science and mathematics, and dropout prevention programs.

Section 7304(d)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act requires the following grants to be awarded annually: \$1 million for cultural education programs operated by the Alaska Native Heritage Center; \$1 million for a cultural exchange program operated by the Alaska Humanities Forum; \$2 million for an Alaska Initiative for Community Engagement; and \$2 million for the Cook Inlet Tribal Council's Partners for Success program, a dropout prevention program.

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Alaska Native student education

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$33,908
2007 .....	33,907
2008 .....	33,315
2009 .....	33,315
2010 .....	33,315

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2011, the Administration requests \$33.3 million for the Alaska Native Student Education program, the same amount as appropriated for fiscal year 2010. The request would support the continued provision of education-related services to the Alaska Native population and would fund the program's first year of operation under a reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Data on the educational performance of Alaska Native students demonstrate the continuing need for this program. The spring 2009 Alaska standards-based assessment results indicated that Alaska Native and American Indian students in the State continue to lag behind their peers in academic performance. (Because Alaska Natives constitute 95 percent of the State's American Indian/Alaska Native (AI/AN) student population, it is reasonable to consider the AI/AN scores as proxies for Alaska Native achievement.) Fifty-seven percent of AI/AN students achieved at least at the proficient level on the 4<sup>th</sup>-grade reading assessment, compared to 78 percent of all 4<sup>th</sup>-grade students, and 56 percent of AI/AN students achieved proficiency in mathematics, compared to 74 percent of all 4<sup>th</sup>-grade students. Eighth-grade assessments show similar results. Sixty-five percent of AI/AN students demonstrated proficiency on the 8<sup>th</sup>-grade reading assessment, compared to 82 percent of all 8<sup>th</sup>-grade students, and 49 percent of AI/AN students achieved at the proficient level or higher in mathematics, compared to 66 percent of all 8<sup>th</sup>-grade students.

Data from the 2009 and 2007 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) show a similar achievement gap. (Data presented for reading are based on the 2007 NAEP assessment; 2009 NAEP reading results are expected to be released in spring 2010; data presented for mathematics are based on the 2009 NAEP assessment.) In 4<sup>th</sup>-grade reading, AI/AN students in Alaska averaged a score of 188, while the overall national average was 221. There were similar differences in 8<sup>th</sup>-grade reading (236 to 263), 4<sup>th</sup>-grade mathematics (216 to 240), and 8<sup>th</sup>-grade mathematics (262 to 283). In terms of proficiency, only 10 percent of AI/AN students in Alaska scored at or above proficient in 4<sup>th</sup>-grade reading, compared to 33 percent of all American 4<sup>th</sup>-graders; 9 percent of AI/AN 8<sup>th</sup>-graders in Alaska were at or above proficient in reading, compared to 31 percent of all 8<sup>th</sup>-graders. Fourteen percent of AI/AN students in Alaska scored at or above proficient in 4<sup>th</sup>-grade mathematics, compared to 39 percent of all 4<sup>th</sup>-graders; and 15 percent of AI/AN 8<sup>th</sup>-graders in Alaska were at or above proficient in mathematics, compared to 34 percent of all 8<sup>th</sup>-graders.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Alaska Native student education

---

According to the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development, in the 2007-08 school year the “event dropout rate” among Alaska Natives and American Indian students in Alaska in grades 7 through 12 was 8.5 percent. This was higher than the rate for any other racial or ethnic group in the State and well above the statewide rate of 5.3 percent. Further, Alaska’s *Report Card to the Public: 2007-2008* reported that the American Indian/Alaska Native high school graduation rate was 48 percent, while the statewide figure was 63 percent.

Alaska’s geography and population patterns add to the challenge of delivering quality educational services to Alaska Native students. The State has many rural districts, which often house few schools spread out over large remote areas. The State’s largest five school districts enroll 73 percent of the student population, while 40 of the State’s 54 districts together enroll 11 percent. Alaska Native students are disproportionately enrolled in small, rural, and isolated schools.

Program grants help address these barriers by developing programs tailored to the educational and cultural needs of Alaska Native students in order to improve their performance in the classroom.

The program provides earmarked assistance to specific entities, and the Administration believes that competing funds rather than earmarking them will lead to higher-quality programs and improved student outcomes. The fiscal year 2011 request would continue the appropriation at the fiscal year 2010 level but would discontinue funding for the earmarks. The Administration’s reauthorization proposal will align the authorized activities with current priorities, such as recruiting and retaining effective teachers and school leaders, promoting achievement and equity, and turning around low-performing schools. The proposal would also require grantees to report on Title I academic achievement measures for the Alaska Native students served by their projects.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Amount for new awards	\$14,826	\$1,498	\$14,706
Number of new awards	30	3	30
Amount for continuation awards	\$12,313	\$25,817	\$18,276
Number of continuation awards	22	45	33
Earmarks	\$6,000	\$6,000	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$176	0	\$333

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Alaska Native student education

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

The Department established new performance measures (or, for one measure, strengthened data collection methods) for this program in 2008 that should more accurately and reliably gauge the effectiveness of this program. The new indicators will measure the percentage of Alaska Native students in schools served by the program who meet or exceed proficiency standards for reading, mathematics, and science on the State's annual assessments; the percentage of Alaska Native children participating in early learning and preschool programs who demonstrate school readiness in language and literacy as measured by the Revised Alaska Developmental Profile (RADP); and the percentage of students in schools served by the program who graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma in 4 years. The Department will use these measures beginning with the fiscal year 2009 cohort of new grantees and will have baseline data in fall 2010.

The Department continues to collect data on the old indicators, which apply to existing grantees. On these measures, in 2008, students participating in the program who met proficiency standards in mathematics, science, and reading increased from 35 percent to 38 percent, Alaska Native children participating in funded early learning and preschool programs who made improvements in school readiness increased 10 percentage points to 79 percent, and the dropout rate among program participants remained at the 2007 level of 2 percent. However, the Department has concerns regarding the validity and reliability of each of these indicators, leading the Department to revise the program's GPRA measures. The new proficiency measure has been improved by making the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development the single source of data; the school readiness measure has been improved by using a single, valid and reliable instrument as the assessment tool; and the graduation measure has been improved through the use of a uniform definition tied to the Title I regulatory definition of the graduation rate.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Women's educational equity

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 21)

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$2,423	\$2,278	-\$145

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; the program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. Reauthorizing language is sought for FY 2011.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA) program promotes educational equity for girls and women, including those who face multiple aspects of discrimination based on gender and on race, ethnicity, national origin, disability, or age. The program provides funds to help educational agencies and other institutions meet the requirements of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.

At least two-thirds of the funding for WEEA must support projects, of up to 4 years in duration, that focus on local implementation of gender-equity policies and practices. The remaining funds may be used for research and development, including model training programs for teachers and other school personnel, and the development of (a) assessment instruments and methods to assist local educational agencies (LEAs) in replicating exemplary gender equity programs, and (b) policies and programs to address and prevent sexual harassment.

The most recent competition, held in fiscal year 2009, included three absolute priorities and one competitive preference priority. Applicants were required to address at least one of the following two priorities: (1) support for activities to enable students to achieve proficiency or advanced proficiency in mathematics, and (2) support for activities to enable students to achieve proficiency or advanced proficiency in science. All applicants were required to address the priority for projects to collect pre- and post-intervention test data to assess the impact of the projects on the academic achievement of student participants relative to appropriate comparison or control groups.

To be considered for up to 10 competitive preference priority points, applicants had to propose to support activities and interventions aimed at improving the academic achievement of secondary school students at greatest risk of not meeting challenging State academic standards and not completing high school. The Department made 13 grants to a combination of local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and nonprofit entities.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Women's educational equity

---

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

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$2,926
2007 .....	1,879
2008 .....	1,846
2009 .....	2,423
2010 .....	2,423

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is requesting \$2.3 million for the Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA) program for fiscal year 2011, \$145,000 less than the fiscal year 2010 level. Fiscal year 2011 funds would support third year continuation awards for grants made initially with fiscal year 2009 funds. The Administration would continue the WEEA program under the proposed reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

In recent decades, girls and women have made enormous progress in education, and in most areas the "gender gap" has been eliminated or even reversed. But some important gaps persist most notably in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) disciplines and at certain education levels and with certain populations. Scores on the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) show that gender differences in mathematics have varied between 1 and 3 percentage points in recent years, with only slight fluctuations between 1990 and 2009; both males and females surpassed their 2007 results on the 2009 assessment at the 8<sup>th</sup>-grade level while scoring the same in 2009 as 2007 at the 4<sup>th</sup>-grade level. However, these generally positive trends mask some important variations between subgroups of girls and boys by family income level and race/ethnicity. On the 2009 mathematics assessment, at the 8<sup>th</sup>-grade level, Hispanic girls scored an average of 27 points lower than white girls and black girls scored 3 points lower than their Hispanic counterparts. Similarly, on the 2005 science assessment, at the 8<sup>th</sup>-grade level, Hispanic girls scored an average of 32 points lower than white girls and black girls scored 3 points lower than their Hispanic counterparts.

Even though girls as a whole achieve at relatively the same levels as boys in K-12 education, they are much less likely than boys to pursue majors in STEM fields and less likely than boys to persist in those majors. Girls' interest and participation in science and mathematics activities declines as they advance through school, and women who choose a major in science, engineering, or technology in college are more likely to switch to non-science majors than are their male counterparts. Further, according to a 2000 report of the Congressional Commission on the Advancement of Women, Minorities in Science, Engineering and Technology Development, *Land of Plenty: Diversity as America's Competitive Edge*, only 19 percent of the science, engineering, and technology workforce is female. While the number of women employed in these fields has increased, women remain underrepresented relative to their numbers in the civilian workforce.

A 2004 GAO study, *Women's Participation in the Sciences Has Increased, but Agencies Need to Do More to Ensure Compliance with Title IX*, reported that the proportion of science students who are women has grown, but to a lesser extent at the graduate level than the undergraduate level. The proportion of faculty in the sciences who are female has also increased, but they

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Women's educational equity

---

continue to lag behind male faculty in salary and rank. Twenty-nine percent of women academics employed in the STEM fields in 4-year colleges were tenured compared to 58 percent of men, according to the report produced by the Congressional Commission on the Advancement of Women, Minorities in Science, Engineering and Technology Development.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Amount for new awards	\$2,405	0	0
Amount for continuation awards	0	\$2,423	\$2,278
Number of awards	13	13	13
Peer review of new award applications	\$18	0	0

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, and 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 2011 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Goal: To promote gender equity in education in the United States.**

**Objective:** *To ensure equal access to mathematics and science educational courses, programs, and careers for women and girls.*

The Department's Data Quality Initiative (DQI) contractor began working with WEEA program staff in fiscal year 2009 to improve the quality of the program's performance data through improved performance measures and guidance to grantees. The Department incorporated five new performance measures into the notice inviting applications for fiscal year 2009. They are, (1) the percentage of female students served by the WEEA program who achieve proficiency on State mathematics assessments; (2) the percentage of female students served by the WEEA program who achieve advanced proficiency on State mathematics assessments; (3) the percentage of female students served by the WEEA program who achieve proficiency on State science assessments; (4) the percentage of female students served by the WEEA program who achieve advanced proficiency on State science assessments; and, (5) the percentage of WEEA projects whose female participants demonstrate statistically significant mean increases in achievement compared to mean increases of a comparison group, based on pre- and post-test data.

All grantees that received an award under the fiscal year 2009 competition must provide data for the fifth measure. The design of each grantee's program determines which of the first four

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Women's educational equity

---

measures must be reported on each year. Of the 13 grantees, 11 have the goal of raising achievement in mathematics; 8 have the goal of raising achievement in science; and, 2 have the goal of raising achievement in both subjects. Data from year one will be available in December 2010.

### Other Performance Information

In 2008, the Department released the study, *Early Implementation of Public Single-Sex Schools: Perceptions and Characteristics*, which was supported with WEEA funds. The study examined the effects of single-sex schooling on student achievement and other outcomes, especially for at-risk students. Site visits to 10 schools (8 single-sex and 2 coed), surveys, and a literature review informed this study. The study provides descriptive findings that could provide the basis for further investigations.

The study results indicate that single-sex schooling can be helpful. Among the academic outcomes, 10 percent had mixed results across sex or grade levels, 35 percent favored single-sex schooling, 2 percent favored coed schooling, and 53 percent favored neither single-sex nor coed schooling. Overall, the literature review findings suggest that there are more socio-emotional factors than academic factors favoring single-sex schools. In addition, more socio-emotional outcomes favor girls in single-sex schools than boys in single-sex schools. Survey results show that teachers believe that both girls and boys benefit from single-sex schooling, but for different reasons. The survey results also highlight the lack of professional development on single-sex education. Fewer than half of the teachers surveyed from single-sex schools received any professional development on single-sex education.

The WEEA program statute required the Department to issue a report on the status of educational equity for girls and women. This 2004 report, *Trends in Educational Equity of Girls and Women* (National Center for Education Statistics), reported significant educational achievement and attainment gains for women over the past 40 years. The report also pointed out that, in 2001, men still earned a greater percentage of doctoral degrees across most fields, and females still lag further behind in more technical fields, such as engineering (earning 17 percent of degrees) and computer and information sciences (earning 18 percent of degrees).