

**Department of Education**  
**INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS**  
**Fiscal Year 2011 Budget Request**  
**CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language .....	F-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes .....	F-5
Amounts Available for Obligation .....	F-10
Obligations by Object Classification .....	F-13
Summary of Changes .....	F-14
Authorizing Legislation .....	F-17
Appropriations History .....	F-20
Significant Items in FY 2010 Appropriations Reports .....	F-21
Summary of request .....	F-22
Activities:	
Race to the Top .....	F-27
Investing in innovation .....	F-30
Excellent instructional teams .....	F-33
Improving teacher quality State grants .....	F-39
Ready to teach .....	F-47
Teacher incentive fund .....	F-51
Advanced credentialing .....	F-57
Transition to teaching .....	F-61
Teacher quality partnership .....	F-69
Teachers for a competitive tomorrow .....	F-76
Teach for America .....	F-80
School leadership .....	F-85
Expanding Educational Options .....	F-90
Charter schools grants .....	F-93
Credit enhancement for charter school facilities .....	F-101
Voluntary public school choice .....	F-106
Parental information and resource centers .....	F-112
Smaller learning communities .....	F-118
Magnet schools assistance .....	F-124
Fund for the improvement of education: programs of national significance .....	F-129
Exchanges with historic and whaling and trading partners .....	F-133
Troops-to-teachers .....	F-136
State Tables .....	F-142

## **INNOVATION AND [IMPROVEMENT] INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS<sup>1</sup>**

[For carrying out activities authorized by part G of title I, subpart 5 of part A and parts C and D of title II, parts B, C, and D of title V, and section 1504 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), and by part F of title VIII of the Higher Education Act of 1965, \$1,389,065,000:<sup>2</sup> *Provided*, That \$10,649,000 shall be provided to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards to carry out section 2151(c) of the ESEA:<sup>3</sup> *Provided further*, That from funds for subpart 4, part C of title II of the ESEA, up to 3 percent shall be available to the Secretary of Education for technical assistance and dissemination of information:<sup>4</sup> *Provided further*, That \$671,570,000 shall be available to carry out part D of title V of the ESEA:<sup>5</sup> *Provided further*, That \$88,791,000 shall be used for the projects, and in the amounts, specified in the statement of the managers on the conference report accompanying this Act:<sup>6</sup> *Provided further*, That \$1,000,000 shall be for a national clearinghouse that will collect and disseminate information on effective educational practices and the latest research regarding the planning, design, financing, construction, improvement, operation, and maintenance of safe, healthy, high-performance public facilities for nursery and pre-kindergarten, kindergarten through grade 12, and higher education:<sup>7</sup> *Provided further*, That \$400,000,000 of the funds for subpart 1 of part D of title V of the ESEA shall be for competitive grants to local educational agencies, including charter schools that are local educational agencies, or States, or partnerships of: (1) a local educational agency, a State, or both; and (2) at least one non-profit organization to develop and implement performance-based compensation systems for teachers, principals, and other personnel in high-need schools: *Provided further*, That such performance-based compensation systems must consider gains in student academic achievement as well as classroom evaluations conducted multiple times during each school year among other factors and provide educators with incentives to take on additional responsibilities and leadership roles: *Provided further*, That recipients of such grants shall demonstrate that such performance-based systems

are developed with the input of teachers and school leaders in the schools and local educational agencies to be served by the grant: *Provided further*, That recipients of such grants may use such funds to develop or improve systems and tools (which may be developed and used for the entire local educational agency or only for schools served under the grant) that would enhance the quality and success of the compensation system, such as high-quality teacher evaluations and tools to measure growth in student achievement: *Provided further*, That applications for such grants shall include a plan to sustain financially the activities conducted and systems developed under the grant once the grant period has expired:<sup>8</sup> *Provided further*, That up to 5 percent of such funds for competitive grants shall be available for technical assistance, training, peer review of applications, program outreach and evaluation activities:<sup>9</sup> *Provided further*, That of the funds available for part B of title V of the ESEA, the Secretary shall use up to \$23,082,000 to carry out activities under section 5205(b) and under subpart 2:<sup>10</sup> *Provided further*, That of the funds available for subpart 1 of part B of title V of the ESEA, and notwithstanding section 5205(a), the Secretary may reserve up to \$50,000,000 to make multiple awards to non-profit charter management organizations and other entities that are not for-profit entities for the replication and expansion of successful charter school models<sup>11</sup> and shall reserve \$10,000,000 to carry out the activities described in section 5205(a), including by providing technical assistance to authorized public chartering agencies in order to increase the number of high-performing charter schools: *Provided further*, That the funds referenced in the preceding proviso shall not be obligated prior to submission of a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the planned uses of such funds:<sup>12</sup> *Provided further*, That each application submitted pursuant to section 5203(a) shall describe a plan to monitor and hold accountable authorized public chartering agencies through such activities as providing technical assistance or establishing a professional development program, which may include planning, training and systems development for staff of authorized public chartering

agencies to improve the capacity of such agencies in the State to authorize, monitor, and hold accountable charter schools: *Provided further*, That each application submitted pursuant to section 5203(a) shall contain assurances that State law, regulations, or other policies require that: (1) each authorized charter school in the State operate under a legally binding charter or performance contract between itself and the school's authorized public chartering agency that describes the obligations and responsibilities of the school and the public chartering agency; conduct annual, timely, and independent audits of the school's financial statements that are filed with the school's authorized public chartering agency; and demonstrate improved student academic achievement; and (2) authorized public chartering agencies use increases in student academic achievement for all groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA as the most important factor when determining to renew or revoke a school's charter:<sup>13</sup> *Provided further*, That from the funds for subpart 1 of part D of title V of the ESEA, \$12,000,000 shall be for competitive awards to local educational agencies located in counties in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas that were designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency as counties eligible for individual assistance due to damage caused by Hurricanes Katrina, Ike, or Gustav: *Provided further*, That such awards shall be used to improve education in areas affected by such hurricanes and shall be for such activities as replacing instructional materials and equipment; paying teacher incentives; modernizing or renovating or repairing school buildings; beginning or expanding Advanced Placement or other rigorous courses; supporting the expansion of charter schools; and supporting after-school or extended learning time activities.<sup>14</sup>] *Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2010.*

### TITLE III GENERAL PROVISIONS

[Sec. 306. None of the funds made available in the sixth proviso under the heading "Innovation and Improvement" in this Act shall be made available for new awards under the Teacher

Incentive Fund prior to the submission of an impact evaluation plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.<sup>15]</sup>

#### NOTES

All language in this account for programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is deleted because 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.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<sup>1</sup> INNOVATION AND [IMPROVEMENT] INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS	The Administration proposes to rename this account.
<sup>2</sup> [For carrying out activities authorized by part G of title I, subpart 5 of part A and parts C and D of title II, parts B, C, and D of title V, and section 1504 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (“ESEA”), and by part F of title VIII of the Higher Education Act of 1965, \$1,389,065,000:]	This language appropriates funds for the following programs: Advanced Placement, Advanced Credentialing, School Leadership, Troops-to-Teachers, Transition to Teaching, National Writing Project, Teaching American History, Ready-to-Learn Television, Charter Schools Grants, Voluntary Public School Choice, Magnet Schools Assistance, Teacher Incentive Fund, Fund for the Improvement of Education: Programs of National Significance, Reading is Fundamental/Inexpensive Book Distribution, Ready to Teach, Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners, Excellence in Economic Education, Mental Health Integration in Schools, Foundations for Learning, Arts in Education, Parental Information and Resource Centers, Women’s Educational Equity, Close Up Fellowships, and Teach for America.
<sup>3</sup> [Provided, That \$10,649,000 shall be provided to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards to carry out section 2151(c) of the ESEA:]	This language directs \$10,649,000 to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards to carry out the Advanced Credentialing program.
<sup>4</sup> [Provided further, That from funds for subpart 4, part C of title II of the ESEA, up to 3 percent shall be available to the Secretary of Education for technical assistance and dissemination of information:]	This language allows the Secretary to use a portion of the funds for the Teaching American History program to conduct technical assistance and dissemination activities.
<sup>5</sup> [Provided further, That \$671,570,000 shall be available to carry out part D of title V of the ESEA:]	This language specifies the amount provided in this account for programs authorized under part D of title V of the ESEA (the Fund for the Improvement of Education).

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>6</sup> [Provided further, That \$88,791,000 shall be used for the projects, and in the amounts, specified in the statement of the managers on the conference report accompanying this Act:]</p>	<p>This language earmarks funds for projects listed in the explanatory statement accompanying the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010.</p>
<p><sup>7</sup> [Provided further, That \$1,000,000 shall be for a national clearinghouse that will collect and disseminate information on effective educational practices and the latest research regarding the planning, design, financing, construction, improvement, operation, and maintenance of safe, healthy, high-performance public facilities for nursery and pre-kindergarten, kindergarten through grade 12, and higher education:]</p>	<p>This language provides \$1,000,000 for a national clearinghouse of information related to school facilities and describes the requirements for the information to be included in the clearinghouse.</p>
<p><sup>8</sup> [Provided further, That \$400,000,000 of the funds for subpart 1 of part D of title V of the ESEA shall be for competitive grants to local educational agencies, including charter schools that are local educational agencies, or States, or partnerships of: (1) a local educational agency, a State, or both; and (2) at least one non-profit organization to develop and implement performance-based compensation systems for teachers, principals, and other personnel in high-need schools: <i>Provided further</i>, That such performance-based compensation systems must consider gains in student academic achievement as well as classroom evaluations conducted multiple times during each school year among other factors and provide educators with incentives to take on additional responsibilities and leadership roles: <i>Provided further</i>, That recipients of such grants shall demonstrate that such performance-based systems are developed with the input of teachers and school leaders in the schools and local educational agencies to be served by the grant: <i>Provided further</i>, That recipients of such grants may use such funds to develop or improve systems and</p>	<p>This language provides \$400,000,000, within the Fund for the Improvement of Education appropriation, for the Teacher Incentive Fund and describes the eligible grantees and other requirements for that program.</p>

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
tools (which may be developed and used for the entire local educational agency or only for schools served under the grant) that would enhance the quality and success of the compensation system, such as high-quality teacher evaluations and tools to measure growth in student achievement: <i>Provided further</i> , That applications for such grants shall include a plan to sustain financially the activities conducted and systems developed under the grant once the grant period has expired:}]	
<sup>9</sup> [ <i>Provided further</i> , That up to 5 percent of such funds for competitive grants shall be available for technical assistance, training, peer review of applications, program outreach and evaluation activities:}]	This language specifies that 5 percent of funding for the Teacher Incentive Fund may be used for technical assistance, training, peer review of applications, program outreach, and evaluation activities.
<sup>10</sup> [ <i>Provided further</i> , That of the funds available for part B of title V of the ESEA, the Secretary shall use up to \$23,082,000 to carry out activities under section 5205(b) and under subpart 2:}]	This language allows the Secretary to use up to \$23,082,000 of the amount appropriated for Charter Schools Grants for the Per-Pupil Facilities Aid program and the Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program and allows the Secretary to allocate funds between the two programs.
<sup>11</sup> [ <i>Provided further</i> , That of the funds available for subpart 1 of part B of title V of the ESEA, and notwithstanding section 5205(a), the Secretary may reserve up to \$50,000,000 to make multiple awards to non-profit charter management organizations and other entities that are not for-profit entities for the replication and expansion of successful charter school models]...	This language allows the Secretary to reserve up to \$50,000,000 of the funds appropriated for Charter Schools Grants to make awards to charter management organizations and other entities for the replication and expansion of successful charter school models.
<sup>12</sup> ...[and shall reserve \$10,000,000 to carry out the activities described in section 5205(a), including by providing technical assistance to authorized public chartering agencies in order to increase the number of high-performing charter schools: <i>Provided further</i> , That the funds referenced in the	This language requires that the Department reserve \$10,000,000 for national activities, and overrides the statutory maximum of the greater of 5 percent of the appropriation for Charter Schools Grants or \$5,000,000. The language further requires that the Department submit a report to the

**INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS**

**Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes**

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>preceding proviso shall not be obligated prior to submission of a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the planned uses of such funds:]</p>	<p>Congressional Appropriations Committees on the use of these funds prior to their obligation.</p>
<p><sup>13</sup> [<i>Provided further</i>, That each application submitted pursuant to section 5203(a) shall describe a plan to monitor and hold accountable authorized public chartering agencies through such activities as providing technical assistance or establishing a professional development program, which may include planning, training and systems development for staff of authorized public chartering agencies to improve the capacity of such agencies in the State to authorize, monitor, and hold accountable charter schools: <i>Provided further</i>, That each application submitted pursuant to section 5203(a) shall contain assurances that State law, regulations, or other policies require that: (1) each authorized charter school in the State operate under a legally binding charter or performance contract between itself and the school's authorized public chartering agency that describes the obligations and responsibilities of the school and the public chartering agency; conduct annual, timely, and independent audits of the school's financial statements that are filed with the school's authorized public chartering agency; and demonstrate improved student academic achievement; and (2) authorized public chartering agencies use increases in student academic achievement for all groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA as the most important factor when determining to renew or revoke a school's charter:]</p>	<p>This language establishes new application requirements for the State Grants portion of the Charter School Program.</p>

**INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS**

**Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes**

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>14</sup> [<i>Provided further</i>, That from the funds for subpart 1 of part D of title V of the ESEA, \$12,000,000 shall be for competitive awards to local educational agencies located in counties in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas that were designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency as counties eligible for individual assistance due to damage caused by Hurricanes Katrina, Ike, or Gustav: <i>Provided further</i>, That such awards shall be used to improve education in areas affected by such hurricanes and shall be for such activities as replacing instructional materials and equipment; paying teacher incentives; modernizing or renovating or repairing school buildings; beginning or expanding Advanced Placement or other rigorous courses; supporting the expansion of charter schools; and supporting after-school or extended learning time activities.]</p>	<p>This language provides \$12,000,000, within the Fund for the Improvement of Education appropriation, for the grants to local educational agencies located in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas and sets forth the eligible grantees and other requirements for those grants.</p>
<p><sup>15</sup> [Sec. 306. None of the funds made available in the sixth proviso under the heading —Innovation and Improvement" in this Act shall be made available for new awards under the Teacher Incentive Fund prior to the submission of an impact evaluation plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.14]</p>	<p>This language prohibits the Department from making new awards for the Teacher Incentive Fund program until the Department submits an impact evaluation plan to the Congressional Appropriations Committees.</p>

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

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

	2009	2010	2011
Discretionary appropriation	\$996,425	\$1,389,065	\$8,011,441
Recovery Act supplemental (P.L. 111-5)	200,000	0	0
Transfer to <u>Career, Technical, and Adult Education</u> for Adult Education			
State Grants (P.L. 111-32)	-333	0	0
Subtotal, adjusted discretionary appropriation	1,196,092	1,389,065	8,011,441
Comparative transfers to <u>Education Improvement Programs</u> for:			
National writing project	-24,291	-25,646	0
Teaching American History	-118,952	-118,952	0
Academies for American history and civics	-1,945	-1,815	0
Advanced placement	-43,540	-45,840	0
Close Up fellowships	-1,942	-1,942	0
Ready-to-learn television	-25,416	-27,300	0
Reading is fundamental	-24,803	-24,803	0
Excellence in economic education	-1,447	-1,447	0
Arts in education	-38,166	-40,000	0
Women's educational equity	-2,423	-2,423	0
Comparative transfers to <u>Supporting Student Success</u> for:			
Promise neighborhoods	0	-10,000	0
Mental health integration in schools	-5,913	-5,913	0
Foundations for learning	-1,000	-1,000	0
Comparative transfer from <u>Education Improvement Programs</u> for			
Improving teacher quality State grants	2,947,749	2,947,749	0
Comparative transfer from <u>Career, Technical, and Adult Education</u> for			
Smaller learning communities	88,000	88,000	0

**INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS**

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

	2009	2010	2011
<u>Comparative transfer from <u>Higher Education</u> for</u>			
Teachers for a competitive tomorrow	\$2,093	\$2,184	0
Teacher quality partnership	50,000	43,000	0
Recovery Act Teacher quality partnership	<u>100,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, comparable discretionary appropriation	4,094,096	4,162,917	\$8,011,441
<u>Comparative transfer from <u>Education Improvement Programs</u> for</u>			
Improving teacher quality State grants			
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	1,681,441	-1,681,441	-1,681,441
Advance from prior year	<u>1,435,000</u>	<u>1,681,441</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, comparable budget authority	3,847,655	4,162,917	6,330,000
Unobligated balance, start of year	0	49	0
Recovery Act unobligated balance, start of year	0	199,392	0
Recovery of prior-year obligations	49	0	0
Unobligated balance expiring	-16	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year	-49	0	0
Recovery Act unobligated balance, end of year	-199,392	0	0

**INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS**

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

	2009	2010	2011
Comparative transfers:			
Unobligated balance, start of year from <u>Education Improvement Programs</u>	19,024	\$40,851	0
Unobligated balance, start of year from <u>Recovery Act Higher Education</u>	0	\$100,000	0
Unobligated balance expiring end of year to <u>Education Improvement Programs</u>	-3	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year from <u>Education Improvement Programs</u>	-\$40,851	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year from <u>Recovery Act Higher Education</u>	-100,000	0	0
Subtotal, direct obligations	3,526,417	4,203,817	6,330,000
Subtotal, Recovery Act direct obligations	<u>608</u>	<u>299,392</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations	3,527,025	4,503,209	6,330,000

NOTE

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

**INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS**

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

	2009	2010	2011
Personnel compensation and benefits:			
Personnel compensation:			
Full-time permanent, Recovery .....	\$23	\$1,033	0
Other than full-time permanent, Recovery.....	5	0	0
Civilian personnel benefits, Recovery .....	<u>7</u>	<u>255</u>	0
Subtotal.....	35	1,288	0
Travel .....	0	5	0
Printing and reproduction.....	4	0	0
Other contractual services:			
Advisory and assistance services .....	6,603	60,193	\$115,296
Advisory and assistance services, Recovery .....	0	8,100	0
Peer review .....	259	6,192	21,200
Peer review, Recovery .....	573	168	0
Other services .....	39,414	0	5,000
Research and development contracts.....	3,869	0	0
Operation/maintenance of equipment.....	<u>380</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal .....	51,098	74,653	141,496
Grants, subsidies, and contributions .....	3,475,888	4,137,432	6,188,504
Grants, Recovery .....	<u>0</u>	<u>289,836</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, obligations .....	3,526,417	4,203,817	6,330,000
Subtotal, Recovery obligations .....	608	299,392	0
Total, direct obligations.....	3,527,025	4,503,209	6,330,000

NOTE

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

**INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS**

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

---

2010.....	\$4,162,917
2011.....	<u>6,330,000</u>
Net change .....	+2,167,083

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>		
Funding for the Race to the Top program to create incentives for State and local reforms and innovations designed to lead to significant improvements in student achievement, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment rates, and to significant reductions in achievement gaps.	0	+\$1,350,000
Funding for Investing in Innovation to expand innovative strategies and practices that have been shown to be effective in improving educational outcomes for students and to test and evaluate promising practices, strategies, or programs for which there is potential but whose efficacy has not yet been systematically studied.	0	+500,000
Initial funding for the new Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program to provide formula grants to States and LEAs to promote and enhance the teaching profession.	0	+2,500,000
Initial funding for the new Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund to support State and local efforts to improve the effectiveness of the education workforce in high-need schools.	0	+950,000
Initial funding for the Teacher and Leader Pathways program to fund competitive grants to LEAs to support the creation or expansion of high-quality pathways into teaching and school leadership.	0	+405,000

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

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

	<u>2010 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<b>Increases:</b>		
<u>Program:</u>		
Initial funding for the Expanding Educational Options program to support competitive grants to State educational agencies, charter school authorizers, charter management organizations, local educational agencies and other nonprofit organizations to start or expand effective charter and other autonomous schools. A portion of the funds would also support competitive grants to LEAs, and to SEAs in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs, to develop and implement programs of public school choice that increase the range of high-quality educational options available to students.	0	+\$490,000
Increase for the Magnet Schools Assistance program to support magnet schools that are part of a court-ordered or court-approved desegregation plan to eliminate, reduce, or prevent minority group isolation in elementary and secondary schools.	\$100,000	<u>+10,000</u>
Subtotal, increases		+6,205,000
<b>Decreases:</b>		
<u>Program:</u>		
Eliminate funding for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants and Ready to Teach and redirect the funding to the proposed Effective Teachers and Leaders program.	2,958,449	-2,958,449
Eliminate funding for the Teacher Incentive Fund and the Advanced Credentialing program and redirect the funding to the proposed Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund.	410,649	-410,649
Eliminate funding for the Transition to Teaching, Teacher Quality Partnership, Teachers for a Competitive Tomorrow, Teach for America, and School Leadership programs and redirect the funding to the proposed Teacher and Leader Pathways program.	136,111	-136,111

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

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

---

	<u>2010 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<b>Decreases:</b>		
<u>Program:</u>		
Eliminate funding for the Charter Schools Grants, Voluntary Public School Choice, Parental Information and Resource Centers, and Smaller Learning Communities programs and redirect the funding to the proposed Expanding Educational Options program.	\$409,104	-\$409,104
Net reduction in funding for FIE Programs of National Significance resulting from the elimination of non-competitive earmarks and special purpose grants.	125,461	-100,461
Eliminate funding for the Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners program.	8,754	-8,754
Request funding for the Troops to Teachers program directly through the Department of Defense (DOD) appropriation.	14,389	<u>-14,389</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-4,037,917
Net change		+2,167,083

**INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS**

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

Activity	2010 Authorized	2010 Estimate	2011 Authorized	2011 Request
Race to the Top ( <i>proposed legislation</i> )	--	--	To be determined	\$1,350,000
Investing in Innovation ( <i>proposed legislation</i> )	--	--	To be determined	500,000
Excellent instructional teams:				
Effective teachers and leaders:				
Effective teachers and leaders State grants ( <i>proposed legislation</i> )	--	--	To be determined	2,500,000
Improving teacher quality State grants ( <i>ESEA II-A</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	\$2,947,749	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
Ready to teach ( <i>ESEA V-D-8</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	10,700	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
Teacher and leader innovation fund:				
Teacher and leader innovation fund ( <i>proposed legislation</i> )	--	--	To be determined	950,000
Teacher incentive fund ( <i>ESEA V-D-1</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	400,000	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
Advanced credentialing ( <i>ESEA II-A-5-2151(c)</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	10,649	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
Teacher and leader pathways:				
Teacher and leader pathways ( <i>proposed legislation</i> )	--	--	To be determined	405,000
Transition to teaching ( <i>ESEA II-C-1-B</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	43,707	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
Teacher quality partnership ( <i>HEA II-A</i> )	Indefinite	43,000	Indefinite <sup>2</sup>	0
Teachers for a competitive tomorrow ( <i>America COMPETES Act VI-A-1</i> )				
Baccalaureate STEM and foreign language teacher training ( <i>Sec. 6113</i> )	\$151,200 <sup>3</sup>	1,092	\$151,200 <sup>2</sup>	0
Masters STEM and foreign language teacher training ( <i>Sec. 6114</i> )	125,000 <sup>3</sup>	1,092	125,000 <sup>2</sup>	0

F-17

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Authorizing Legislation (\$000s)

Activity	2010 Authorized	2010 Estimate	2011 Authorized	2011 Request
Teach for America ( <i>HEA XIII-F</i> )	\$20,000	\$18,000	\$25,000 <sup>2</sup>	0
School leadership ( <i>ESEA II-A-5-2151 (b)</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	29,220	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
Expanding educational options:				
Expanding educational options ( <i>proposed legislation</i> )	--	--	To be determined	\$490,000
Charter schools grants ( <i>ESEA V-B-1</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	256,031 <sup>5</sup>	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
Credit enhancement for charter school facilities ( <i>ESEA V-B-2</i> )	0 <sup>4</sup>	0 <sup>5</sup>	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
Voluntary public school choice ( <i>ESEA V-B-3</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	25,819	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
Parental information and resource centers ( <i>ESEA V-D-16</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	39,254	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
Smaller learning communities ( <i>ESEA V-D, subpart 4</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	88,000	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
Magnet schools assistance ( <i>ESEA V-C</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	100,000	To be determined <sup>6</sup>	110,000
FIE programs of national significance ( <i>ESEA V-D-1</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	125,461	To be determined <sup>6</sup>	25,000
Exchanges with historic whaling and trading partners ( <i>ESEA V-D, subpart 12</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	8,754	0 <sup>7</sup>	0
Troops-to-teachers ( <i>ESEA II-C-1-A</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	14,389	0 <sup>8</sup>	0

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Authorizing Legislation (\$000s)

Activity	2010 Authorized	2010 Estimate	2011 Authorized	2011 Request
<u>Unfunded authorizations</u>				
Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate Programs ( <i>America COMPETES Act, VI-A-II</i> )	Indefinite <sup>9</sup>	0	0 <sup>9</sup>	0
Star schools ( <i>ESEA V-D-7</i> )	<u>0<sup>10</sup></u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0<sup>10</sup></u>	<u>0</u>
Total definite authorization	\$320,000		0	
Total appropriation		\$4,162,917		\$6,330,000
Portion of request subject to reauthorization				6,330,000

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.

<sup>2</sup> The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2011 under new legislation.

<sup>3</sup> The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2011.

<sup>4</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2004. The program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

<sup>5</sup> The FY 2010 appropriation permits the Secretary to use, from the amount appropriated for Charter Schools Grants, up to \$23,082 thousand for Charter School Facilities Incentive grants and Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities. The Department anticipates using \$14,782 thousand for the Charter School Facilities Incentive grants program and \$8,300 thousand for the Credit Enhancement program.

<sup>6</sup> Reauthorization legislation is being sought for FY 2011.

<sup>7</sup> The Administration is not proposing appropriations language nor seeking reauthorizing legislation for FY 2011.

<sup>8</sup> In FY 2011 the program is proposed for transfer to the Department of Defense in FY 2011 under new legislation.

<sup>9</sup> The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2010. The Administration is not seeking reauthorizing legislation.

<sup>10</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The Administration is not seeking reauthorizing legislation.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Appropriations History (\$000s)

	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2004	\$807,400	\$807,959	\$782,133	\$1,102,628
2005	885,181	669,936	1,154,894	1,092,642
2006	1,307,871	708,522	1,308,785	936,488
2007	850,966	N/A <sup>1</sup>	N/A <sup>1</sup>	837,686
2008	922,018	982,354	962,889	985,517
2009	867,517	976,846 <sup>2</sup>	944,314 <sup>2</sup>	996,425
Recovery Act Supplemental (PL 111-5)	0	225,000	0	200,000
2010	1,489,949	1,347,363	1,234,787 <sup>3</sup>	1,389,065
2011	6,330,000			

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

<sup>2</sup> The levels for the House and Senate allowances reflect action on the regular annual 2009 appropriations bill, which proceeded in the 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.

## **INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS**

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

#### **Arts in Education**

House: The Committee requests that the Department of Education produce comprehensive reports on the status of all arts education disciplines in U.S. public schools when implementing future Fast Response Statistical Surveys and National Assessment of Education Progress evaluations.

Response: The Department will include information on the status of all arts education disciplines in U.S. public schools in future Fast Response Statistical Survey and National Assessment of Education Progress evaluation reports that address arts education.

#### **Teacher Incentive Fund**

House: The Committee intends that the Institute of Education Sciences oversee the conduct of this TIF evaluation, which shall employ rigorous scientific methods including, to the extent practicable, random assignment.

Response: The Institute of Education Sciences will conduct a study of the Teacher Incentive Fund using a random assignment design to look at the effectiveness of performance-based incentives for teachers and principals on student achievement. Administrative records will be used to measure student achievement. The study will also use surveys of grantees, teachers, and principals to collect information on project implementation and teacher mobility.

#### **Smaller Learning Communities**

House: The Committee directs that the Department consult with the House Committee on Appropriations prior to the release of program guidance for the fiscal year 2010 Smaller Learning Communities grant competition. Further, the Committee directs the Department to submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate an operating plan outlining the planned use of the five percent set-aside prior to the obligation of these funds.

Response: The Department will consult with the House Committee on Appropriations prior to the release of a notice inviting applications for the fiscal year 2010 Smaller Learning Communities grant competition and will submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate an operating plan outlining the planned use of the five percent set-aside prior to the obligation of those funds.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2011 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST

Office, Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	2009 Appropriation	2010 Appropriation	2011 President's Budget	Change from	
					2010 Appropriation	2010 Appropriation
<b>Innovation and Instructional Teams</b>						
1. Race to the Top (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	1,350,000	1,350,000	--
2. Investing in innovation (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	500,000	500,000	--
3. Excellent instructional teams:						
(a) Effective teachers and leaders:						
(1) Effective teachers and leaders State grants (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	2,500,000	2,500,000	--
(2) Improving teacher quality State grants (ESEA II-A)	D	1,266,308	1,266,308	0	(1,266,308)	-100.0%
Annual appropriation	D	1,681,441	1,681,441	0	(1,681,441)	-100.0%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	10,700	10,700	0	(10,700)	-100.0%
(3) Ready to teach (ESEA V-D, subpart 8)	D	2,958,449	2,958,449	2,500,000	(458,449)	-15.5%
Subtotal						
(b) Teacher and leader innovation fund:						
(1) Teacher and leader innovation fund (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	950,000	950,000	--
(2) Teacher incentive fund (ESEA V-D-1)	D	97,270	400,000	0	(400,000)	-100.0%
(3) Advanced credentialing (ESEA section 2151(c))	D	10,649	10,649	0	(10,649)	-100.0%
Subtotal						
(c) Teacher and leader pathways:						
(1) Teacher and leader pathways (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	405,000	405,000	--
(2) Transition to teaching (ESEA II-C-1-B)	D	43,707	43,707	0	(43,707)	-100.0%
(3) Teacher quality partnership (HEA II-A)	D	50,000	43,000	0	(43,000)	-100.0%
(4) Teachers for a competitive tomorrow (America COMPETES Act VI-A-1):						
(a) Baccalaureate STEM and foreign language teacher training (Sec. 6113)	D	1,092	1,092	0	(1,092)	-100.0%
(b) Masters STEM and foreign language teacher training (Sec. 6114)	D	1,092	1,092	0	(1,092)	-100.0%
(5) Teach for America (HEA VIII-F)	D	0	18,000	0	(18,000)	-100.0%
(6) School leadership (ESEA section 2151(b))	D	19,220	29,220	0	(29,220)	-100.0%
Subtotal						
Subtotal						
Subtotal	D	115,111	136,111	405,000	268,889	197.6%
Subtotal	D	3,181,479	3,505,209	3,855,000	349,791	10.0%

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

Office, Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	2010		2011		Change from	
		Appropriation	Appropriation	President's Budget	2010 Appropriation	Amount	Percent
(in thousands of dollars)							
<b>Innovation and Instructional Teams (continued)</b>							
4. Expanding educational options:							
(a) Expanding educational options (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	490,000	490,000	—	—
(b) Charter schools grants (ESEA V-B-1) <sup>1</sup>	D	216,031	256,031	0	(256,031)	-100.0%	-100.0%
(c) Credit enhancement for charter school facilities (ESEA Title V-B-2) <sup>1</sup>	D	0	0	0	0	—	—
(d) Voluntary public school choice (ESEA V-B-3)	D	25,819	25,819	0	(25,819)	-100.0%	-100.0%
(e) Parental information and resource centers (ESEA V-D-16)	D	39,254	39,254	0	(39,254)	-100.0%	-100.0%
(f) Smaller learning communities (ESEA V-D-4)	D	88,000	88,000	0	(88,000)	-100.0%	-100.0%
Subtotal	D	369,104	409,104	490,000	80,896	19.8%	19.8%
5. Magnet schools assistance (ESEA-V-C)	D	104,829	100,000	110,000	10,000	10.0%	10.0%
6. Fund for the improvement of education programs of national significance (ESEA V-D-1) <sup>2</sup>	D	115,965	125,461	25,000	(100,461)	-80.1%	-80.1%
7. Exchanges with historic whaling and trading partners (ESEA V-D-12)	D	8,754	8,754	0	(8,754)	-100.0%	-100.0%
8. Troops-to-teachers (ESEA I-C-1-A)	D	14,389	14,389	0	(14,389)	-100.0%	-100.0%
Total, Appropriation	D	3,794,520	4,162,917	6,330,000	2,167,083	52.1%	52.1%
Total, Budget authority	D	3,548,079	4,162,917	8,011,441	3,848,524	92.4%	92.4%
Current <sup>3</sup>	D	2,113,079	2,481,476	6,330,000	3,848,524	155.1%	155.1%
Prior year's advance	D	1,435,000	1,681,441	1,681,441	0	0.0%	0.0%
Outlays	D	997,000	1,088,000	1,127,000	39,000	3.6%	3.6%
<b>Innovation and Improvement, Recovery Act</b>							
1. Teacher incentive fund (ESEA V-D-1)	D	200,000	0	0	0	—	—
Outlays	D	35	90,000	70,000	(20,000)	(0)	(0)

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> From the amount appropriated for Charter Schools, the appropriations acts permitted the Secretary to use up to \$21,031 thousand in FY 2009 and up to \$23,082 thousand in FY 2010 for Charter School Facilities Incentive Grants and Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities.

<sup>2</sup> Adjusted for comparability. Excludes \$10,000 thousand from Fund for the Improvement of Education Programs of National Significance that was appropriated in FY 2010 for Promise Neighborhoods, which is in the Supporting Student Success account in FY 2011.

<sup>3</sup> Excludes advance appropriations of \$1,681,441 thousand in fiscal year 2009 and 2010 that become available on October 1 of the following fiscal year.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Summary of Request

Programs in the Innovation and Instructional Teams account support the goals of implementing innovative and effective approaches and strategies in four key areas: providing incentives for States and local educational agencies to implement comprehensive reforms and innovations; testing, evaluating, and expanding innovative strategies and practices; increasing the supply of effective teachers and principals; and providing parents with options for the education for their children within the public school system. The Administration requests a total of \$6.33 billion for programs in this account.

The new structure of this account, named —Innovation and Improvement” in fiscal years FY 2004 through FY 2010, reflects the framework of the Administration’s proposal for reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). A key objective of this proposal is to increase efficiency at the Federal, State, and local levels by consolidating currently authorized programs with similar purposes. In fiscal year 2010, for example, the Department’s appropriation contained numerous separate programs focused on teaching and school leadership issues 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 level; grantees have had to deal with numerous small grant competitions with different applications and requirements, rather than focusing on improving outcomes for students; and the Department has focused on running separate grant competitions and monitoring compliance with different programs, rather than providing strong support and directing funding to the most proven or promising practices. The Administration expects that the new structure for programs in this account will 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.

### System-wide Reform and Innovation

The Administration requests \$1.85 billion to support efforts to drive State and local reform and innovation. Specifically, the request includes:

- \$1.35 billion for the new **Race to the Top** program to create incentives for State and local reforms and innovations designed to lead to significant improvements in student achievement, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment rates, and to significant reductions in achievement gaps.
- \$500 million for the new **Investing in Innovation** program, to expand innovative strategies and practices that have been shown to be effective in improving educational outcomes for students and to test and evaluate promising practices, strategies, or programs for which there is potential but whose efficacy has not yet been systematically studied.

These resources will build on the foundation the Department is now creating with the Race to the Top and Investing in Innovation funds appropriated under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

### Excellent Instructional Teams

The budget includes approximately \$3.85 billion for the new **Excellent Instructional Teams** programs, which would help States and local educational agencies (LEAs) promote and

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Summary of Request

enhance the education profession and improve teacher and principal effectiveness. Funds would also be used to foster teacher collaboration, to create instructional teams, and to recruit, prepare, support, and retain effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders, especially in high-need LEAs, schools, fields, and subjects. These programs would also help States and LEAs ensure the equitable distribution of qualified and effective teachers and effective principals.

The new programs would replace an array of current activities that address teaching and school leadership issues: **Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, Ready to Teach, Teacher Incentive Fund, Advanced Credentialing, Transition to Teaching, Teacher Quality Partnership, Teachers for a Competitive Tomorrow, Teach for America, and School Leadership.**

### Expanding educational options

The Administration requests \$490 million for the new **Expanding Educational Options** program to support competitive grants to State educational agencies (SEAs), charter school authorizers, charter management organizations, local educational agencies and other nonprofit organizations to start or expand high-performing autonomous schools, including charter schools. A portion of the funds would also support competitive grants to LEAs, and to SEAs in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs, to develop and implement a comprehensive choice program that increases the range of high-quality educational options available to students and helps improve the academic achievement of students attending low-performing schools. All grantees would also be required to fund or operate parent information and outreach programs to make families and students aware of these options.

This new program would replace currently funded programs that aim to increase the school options, including **Charter Schools Grants, Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities, Charter Schools Facilities Grants, Voluntary Public School Choice, Parental Information and Resource Centers, and Smaller Learning Communities.**

### Other programs

Lastly, the request includes:

- \$110 million, a \$10 million increase, for **Magnet Schools Assistance** to operate magnet schools that are part of a court-ordered or court-approved desegregation plan to eliminate, reduce, or prevent minority group isolation in elementary and secondary schools.
- \$25 million for the **Fund for the Improvement of Education: Programs of National Significance** to support nationally significant projects to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education, including a data quality initiative designed to improve the quality, analysis, and reporting of Department of Education elementary and secondary education data.

The request would eliminate funding for the **Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners**, which earmarks funding for activities and programs carried out by certain entities in Massachusetts, Alaska, Mississippi, and Hawaii.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Summary of Request

Finally, the request would not include funding for the **Troops to Teachers** program; the Administration proposes to request funds for this program directly through the Department of Defense appropriation.

The Administration will work closely with the Congress to enact an ESEA reauthorization proposal and carry out a fundamental restructuring of Federal funding for education. The 2011 request for this account reflects enactment of this proposal. However, if ESEA is not reauthorized prior to the 2011 appropriation, the Administration would still seek an additional \$2.4 billion for programs in this account, including \$1.35 billion for Race to the Top, \$500 million for Investing in Innovation, \$800 million (a \$400 million increase) for the Teacher Incentive Fund, \$50 million for the new Teacher Recruitment Campaign, \$79.2 million (a \$50 million increase) for School Leadership, and \$310 million (a \$53.97 million increase) for the Charter Schools Program.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Race to the Top

(Proposed legislation)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
0	\$1,350,000	+\$1,350,000

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Administration proposes \$1.35 billion in fiscal year 2011 funding for Race to the Top. This program would be modeled after the Race to the Top program authorized under Section 14006 of the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act of 2009 (ARRA) and would be part of the reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The purpose of the program would be to create incentives for State and local reforms and innovations designed to lead to significant improvements in student achievement, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment rates, and to significant reductions in achievement gaps; and encourage the broad identification, dissemination, adoption, and use of effective policies and practices and the cessation of ineffective ones. For FY 2011, the Administration would continue to emphasize the four reforms included in the ARRA: adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy; building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction; recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most; and turning around our lowest-performing schools.

The Department would make Race to the Top awards on a competitive basis to State educational agencies (SEAs) or local educational agencies (LEAs) based on applicants' recent records of increasing student academic achievement, increasing high school graduation rates, decreasing achievement gaps, and progressing on other measures, such as college persistence and completion rates and the effectiveness of teachers and school leaders. In addition, the Department would make awards to SEAs and LEAs with a record of and commitment to putting in place conditions for innovation and reform and based on the quality and likelihood of success of the applicant's comprehensive and coherent plan for improving student achievement and attaining the other objectives of the program. The Secretary would be permitted to limit eligibility to either SEAs or to LEAs in a given year.

The Department would award Race to the Top grants for up to 4 years. To receive continuation grants, a grantee would be required to demonstrate that it is meeting the performance targets specified in its application and approved by the Secretary. If a grantee is not meeting performance targets, the Secretary would be permitted to delay providing continuation grants until the grantee meets them or, if performance targets are not met in a timely fashion, to discontinue the grant. If a grantee meets its annual performance targets early, the Secretary would be permitted to award funds before the date established in the initial grant award.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Race to the Top

---

The Department would reserve up to 1 percent of the appropriated funds for technical assistance, outreach, dissemination, and other national activities.

### **FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST**

For 2011, the Administration requests \$1.35 billion for the Race to the Top program. The request would support the first year of the program, under the reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The program would drive educational improvement in States and LEAs by providing a financial incentive for system-wide reform.

The Department's implementation of the Race to the Top program under ARRA has generated considerable excitement across the Nation. To better position themselves for a grant, numerous States have changed State laws to align with the Race to the Top criteria published in the Federal Register on November 18, 2009. The enthusiasm generated by this initial effort should carry over to the reauthorized program allowing States that are unsuccessful in the first two competitions to compete for funding. In addition, by making LEAs eligible for direct grants, the Department expects to invigorate district-level reform efforts. These local efforts, along with efforts that will be underway in LEAs that are participating in State reform plans funded in the first two Race to the Top competitions, will foster an atmosphere of reform and innovation that has the potential to dramatically improve American education. Continuation of the program through the reauthorization should, thus, result in major benefits through the broad identification, dissemination, adoption, and use of effective policies and practices, and the cessation of ineffective ones. These factors argue clearly for building on the momentum created by the initial competitions and providing funding at the requested level.

The ultimate goal of the proposed Race to the Top program would be to improve educational outcomes for students, and the program would be strongly focused on the applicant's recent record of positive outcomes, commitment to innovation and reform, and the quality and likelihood of success of its plan to dramatically improve student outcomes. The program's structure, which would permit the Secretary to define criteria for competitions based on the areas in need of focus in a given year, along with the requirement that States and districts set ambitious performance targets while having the flexibility to use funds in a manner that supports the implementation of their reform plans, would foster creative thinking and accountability for results.

Continuation of the Race to the Top program will also complement the proposed Investing in Innovation program, which would promote the development and expansion of innovative practices for which there is evidence of effectiveness.

The Administration will work closely with the Congress to enact an ESEA reauthorization proposal and carry out a fundamental restructuring of Federal funding for education. The 2011 request for this program reflects enactment of this proposal. If Congress does not reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act prior to the 2011 appropriation, the Administration believes its requested increase should be devoted to programs best positioned to reform K-12 education. As such, the Administration would still seek \$1.35 billion in fiscal year 2011 for the Race to the Top program.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Race to the Top

---

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

	<u>2011</u>
Amount for new awards	\$1,334,500
Evaluation, technical assistance, and dissemination	\$13,500
Peer review of applications	\$2,000

#### **PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

The Department is currently developing performance measures for this program. The measures will focus on the extent to which grantees' improve student achievement, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment rates; reduce achievement gaps; and improve the effectiveness of teachers and school leaders.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Investing in innovation

(Proposed legislation)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
0	\$500,000	+\$500,000

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The proposed Investing in Innovation program would be modeled after the Innovation Fund authorized under Section 14007 of the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act of 2009 (ARRA) and would be part of the reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The purpose of the proposed program would be to promote the development and expansion of innovative practices for which there is evidence of effectiveness.

The Department would make Investing in Innovation awards on a competitive basis to local educational agencies (LEAs) that have demonstrated that they have improved student achievement and closed achievement gaps, or to nonprofit organizations, in consortium with one or more schools or LEAs, that have helped LEAs or schools improve student achievement and close achievement gaps.

The Investing in Innovation program will employ a rigorous, three-tier framework that directs the highest level of funding to programs with the strongest support in evidence, but also provides significant support for promising programs that are willing to undergo rigorous evaluation. Grantees would use funds to (1) scale up practices, strategies, or programs for which there is strong evidence that the proposed activity has had a significant effect on improving student achievement, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, or increasing high school graduation rates; (2) validate and expand practices, strategies, or programs for which there is moderate evidence that the proposed activity has had a significant effect on those same outcomes; or (3) develop and test promising practices, strategies, or programs for which there is potential and some research-based findings, but whose efficacy has not yet been systematically studied. Each grantee would be required to conduct or participate in an independent evaluation of its project and to commit to expanding their project, if effective, after the grant period expires. The Department would give priority to applicants that propose to serve students who are at risk of educational failure or otherwise in need of special assistance and support.

The Department would reserve a portion of the appropriated funds for technical assistance, dissemination, prize awards, and other national activities.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Investing in innovation

---

#### **FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST**

For 2011, the Administration requests \$500 million for the proposed Investing in Innovation (i3) program. The request would support the first year of the new program, which is proposed for inclusion in the reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The program would help ensure that schools and districts have access to innovative strategies and practices that have been shown to be effective in improving educational outcomes for students.

Already, the Department's implementation of the Investing in Innovation Fund under ARRA has generated considerable excitement across the Nation. Hundreds of potential applicants have demonstrated interest in competing for program funds. The enthusiasm generated by this initial effort should carry over to the reauthorized program. At the same time, the Department's use of a three-tier evidence framework, as described above, has encouraged the field to focus on expanding the implementation of practices that are proven and evaluating practices that are promising. The tiered structure steers a middle path between programs that prescribe activities from Washington and those that leave complete discretion to localities. Investing in Innovation allows grantees to choose the best means to achieve improved outcomes, provided that programs are grounded in evidence or committed to building evidence of what works. Finally, greater involvement by the private sector, in supporting applicants and providing matching funds, is also expected. Continuation of the program through the reauthorization should result in major benefits to American education, as more innovations are tested, validated, and scaled up.

The ultimate goal of the proposed Investing in Innovation program will be to improve educational outcomes for students by developing, identifying, and scaling up effective practices, and consequently the program would be strongly focused on both innovation and evidence. The program's focus on supporting projects for which there is either evidence of effectiveness, or projects for which there is a strong research-based framework but less empirical evidence, would increase the likelihood that funded projects succeed and that we learn more about what works from this investment. The focus on strong evidence and the requirement for rigorous program evaluations will also help expand local capacity to properly evaluate implementation and impact, and determine whether educational interventions are effective.

The Investing in Innovation program also complements the proposed Race to the Top (RTT) program, which the Administration is also proposing to continue through ESEA reauthorization. The RTT program is focused on creating system-wide reform and the conditions that foster educational innovation and success, thus creating the conditions for innovative and effective local projects that could benefit from funding from Investing in Innovation.

As a component of the Administration's governmentwide effort to support and improve STEM education, \$150 million of the new program's funds would be dedicated to STEM projects. The reauthorized Investing in Innovation program would also include a cross-cutting and cross-curricular emphasis on educational technology. The Administration is also considering requesting authority to make targeted prize awards that provide incentives for breakthrough innovations from entities that might not otherwise apply for Federal funding.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Investing in innovation

---

The STEM and education technology activities supported through Investing in Innovation will be part of a coordinated Federal strategy developed in partnership with the Institute of Education Sciences, the National Science Foundation, and other Federal agencies. The agencies will:

- Clarify and align evidence standards so that recipients of development grants understand the type and quality of evidence their research projects must generate to be eligible for i3 validation or scale-up grants; and
- Identify the innovations that are yielding the most promising evidence of effectiveness – that would merit further Federal investment in replication and validation using rigorous evaluation – to assess their suitability for scale-up.

As a preliminary plan for the remaining funds, the Department would require applicants for fiscal year 2011 funding to propose projects that develop or expand innovations that (a) support effective teachers and principals, (b) improve the use of data, (c) complement and support the implementation of high standards and high-quality assessments, or (d) are designed to turn around persistently low-performing schools. The Department may also give preference to applications that propose to develop or expand innovations for improving early learning outcomes, supporting college access and success, addressing the unique learning needs of students with disabilities and limited English proficiency, or serving schools in rural school districts.

The Administration will work closely with the Congress to enact an ESEA reauthorization proposal and carry out a fundamental restructuring of Federal funding for education. The 2011 request for this program reflects enactment of this proposal. However, if ESEA is not reauthorized prior to the 2011 appropriation, the Administration would still seek \$500 million in fiscal year 2011 for Investing in Innovation.

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

	<u>2011</u>
Amount for new awards	\$470,000
Number of new awards	100-150
Range of awards	\$1,000-50,000
Average award	\$3,200
Evaluation, technical assistance, and dissemination	\$25,000
Peer review of applications	\$5,000

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Department is currently developing performance measures for this program. The measures will focus on the extent to which grantees implement a quality evaluation that will produce strong evidence of the efficacy of the intervention, and the grantees' cost-effectiveness in serving large numbers of students.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Excellent instructional teams

(Proposed legislation)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
Effective teachers and leaders State grants	0	\$2,500,000	+\$2,500,000
Teacher and leader innovation fund	0	950,000	+950,000
Teacher and leader pathways			
Teacher pathways	0	235,000	+235,000
Principals and school leadership teams	<u>0</u>	<u>170,000</u>	<u>+170,000</u>
Subtotal	0	405,000	+405,000
Total	0	3,855,000	+3,855,000

---

### PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Excellent Instructional Teams programs would help States and local educational agencies (LEAs) promote and enhance the education profession and improve teacher and principal effectiveness. Funds could also be used to foster teacher collaboration and the creation of instructional teams and to recruit, prepare, support, and retain effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders, especially in high-need LEAs, schools, fields, and subjects. These programs would also help States and LEAs ensure the equitable distribution of qualified and effective teachers and effective principals.

The proposed Excellent Instructional Teams programs would have three components: the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program, the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund, and the Teacher and Leader Pathways program. These three programs would replace an array of programs in current law, and funded in the fiscal year 2010 appropriation, that focus on teaching and school leadership.

The Administration believes that this consolidated approach will be more effective in supporting State and local efforts to (1) increase the number of teachers who are not only qualified, but also effective; (2) eliminate inequities in the distribution of qualified and effective teachers and effective school leaders between high-poverty and high-minority schools and other schools; (3) reform State and local policies and practices so that teacher and school leader preparation contributes to effectiveness; (4) develop evaluation and compensation systems that recognize and reward teachers and school leaders for taking on additional responsibilities and leadership roles, are based in significant part on the teacher's or school leader's effectiveness in raising student achievement, and ensure that ineffective teachers improve or, if they do not, enter another field, based on fair, transparent procedures; (5) ensure that teachers and school leaders have access to high-quality professional development opportunities that meet their and their students' needs over the course of their careers; (6) promote collaboration among staff, the

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### **Excellent instructional teams**

---

formation of instructional teams, and the use of data to improve practice; and (7) ensure that principals and other school leaders are prepared to lead efforts to turn around persistently low-performing schools.

Safeguards will 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 Teachers and Leaders State Grants**

#### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants would be distributed by formula to States. The Department of the Interior/Bureau of Indian Education and the Outlying Areas would each receive one-half of 1 percent of the total appropriation. States would use at least 90 percent of their formula grants to make subgrants to LEAs.

States could use their State-level funds for a variety of activities, including those designed to ensure the equitable distribution of qualified and effective teachers and effective principals, support the creation of effective teacher career ladders, increase the effectiveness of professional development, and reform teacher and school leader compensation. States accepting funds would be expected to take steps to strengthen teacher and principal evaluation systems within the State. In addition, some State-level funds would be focused on improving the effectiveness of the State's principals.

In order to receive an award, an LEA would be required to conduct an assessment (with the involvement of school staff and other stakeholders) of local needs, and describe in an application to the State how the LEA will use program funds, along with other local, State, and Federal funds, to meet those needs and ensure the equitable distribution of qualified and effective teachers and effective principals within the LEA. LEAs could use program funds to carry out a broad range of activities, including those designed to recruit, prepare, support, and retain qualified and effective teachers and principals, particularly for high-need and low-performing schools.

The Secretary would reserve up to 1.5 percent of funds under this program for national research, technical assistance, outreach, and dissemination activities, such as national activities to strengthen teacher evaluation, improve teacher and principal certification, and scale up the work of nonprofit organizations that support LEAs in strengthening their teacher and principal pipelines and human resource practices.

This would be a forward-funded program. Funds would 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.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Excellent instructional teams

---

#### **FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$2.5 billion for the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program for fiscal year 2011. This program would focus on evaluating and improving teacher and principal effectiveness, based on student outcomes. States and LEAs would have flexibility in how they use formula grant funds, but would be accountable for improving their teacher and principal evaluation systems and ensuring that teachers and principals who are effective at raising student achievement are equitably distributed across schools and LEAs.

Funding for the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program will also help ensure that all children are taught by teachers who have expertise in the subjects they teach and the skills needed to teach effectively. The Department would emphasize collaboration among staff, formation of instructional teams, and helping teachers and principals examine student work and outcome data in order to improve instruction and student achievement.

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

	<u>2011</u>
Range of awards to States	\$11,611 – 274,178
Average State grant	46,154
Amount for Outlying Areas	12,500
Amount for BIE	12,500
National leadership activities	37,500
Evaluation	37,500

#### **Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund**

#### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund would provide support for State and LEA efforts to develop and implement innovative approaches to human capital systems. It would build on the strengths of the Teacher Incentive Fund and support compensation reforms and complementary reforms of teacher and principal development and evaluation, teacher placement, and other practices.

Grantees, selected competitively, would use funds to reform teacher and school leader compensation and career advancement systems, improve the use of evaluation results for retention and compensation decisions, and implement other innovations to strengthen the workforce.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Excellent instructional teams

---

#### **FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$950.0 million for the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund for fiscal year 2011. This program would help support States and LEAs in improving the effectiveness of the education workforce in high-need schools by creating the conditions to identify, recruit, prepare, retain, and advance effective teachers, principals, and school leadership teams in those schools. It would also support activities to improve teacher effectiveness, reduce disparities in the access of students to effective teachers, and turn around persistently low-performing schools.

In fiscal year 2011, continuation costs for the Teacher Incentive Fund would be funded from the appropriation for the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund.

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

	<u>2011</u>
Funding for new awards	\$486,250
Number of new awards	15
Average new award	\$32,417
Peer review of new award applications	\$9,500
Evaluation	\$14,250

---

NOTE: Approximately \$440,000 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund for continuation costs under the Teacher Incentive Fund.

#### Teacher and Leader Pathways

#### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

##### Teacher Pathways

Teacher Pathways would fund competitive grants to LEAs to support the creation or expansion of high-quality pathways, including university- and LEA-based as well as alternative routes, into the teaching profession, in order to increase the number of effective teachers serving in high-need and low-performing schools and high-need fields and subjects.

The Secretary would be allowed to reserve up to 5 percent of funds from this program for a national teacher recruitment campaign to recruit into the teaching profession such individuals as high school and college students, recent college graduates, mid-career professionals, retirees, and veterans, including those recently separated from military service.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Excellent instructional teams

---

#### Principals and School Leadership Teams

The Principals and School Leadership Teams program would fund competitive grants to States and LEAs to support the recruitment, preparation, and retention of effective principals and school leadership teams who are able to turn around low-performing schools. The Secretary would be allowed to reserve up to 5 percent of funds under this program for national activities, including disseminating research providing technical assistance on school leadership.

The Secretary would also be permitted to reserve up to 5 percent of funds under this program to make grants for the recruitment and training of SEA and LEA leaders, including chief academic officers and human resource directors, who are able to lead transformational change in their States and LEAs.

### **FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$405.0 million for the Teacher and Leader Pathways in fiscal year 2011: \$235.0 million for the Teacher Pathways program and \$170.0 million for the Principals and School Leadership Teams program.

The Teacher Pathways program would support investments in the preparation of new teachers and principals. The Nation faces the challenge of hiring thousands of teachers and school leaders in the next few years as a result of increasing enrollments and the retirement of many veteran educators. High-quality pathways to teacher certification and other innovative approaches for recruiting, training, and placing mid-career professionals and recent college graduates whose knowledge and experience can help them become successful teachers in high-need schools are an essential mechanism for preparing new teachers to enter the classroom, supporting them during the first year in the profession, and addressing inequities in the distribution of qualified and effective teachers. The proposed Principals and School Leadership Teams program would support the recruitment, preparation, and retention of effective principals and school leadership teams who are able to turn around low-performing schools.

A growing body of research indicates that the quality of a school's leadership has a substantial effect on student achievement. Good school leaders are able to create cultures focused on learning, with high expectations for all students, as well as recruit and retain highly effective teachers. Moreover, the impact of strong leadership may be greatest in high-need schools, which are found disproportionately in high-need LEAs. Schools that need major course corrections to turn themselves around cannot depend solely on the heroic efforts of individual teachers; while this will help, it will not be enough. Rather, these schools need serious, systematic change, requiring effective leaders. Federal investments in the recruitment, preparation, and retention of effective principals and school leadership teams will also be particularly important given that the Bureau of Labor Statistics expects increased demand for educational administrators through 2016, as the number of school-age children grows and current school leaders retire in greater numbers.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Excellent instructional teams

---

In fiscal year 2011, School Leadership, Teacher Quality Partnership, Teachers for a Competitive Tomorrow, and Transition to Teaching continuation costs would be funded from the appropriation for Teacher and Leader Pathways programs.

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

2011

#### Teacher pathways

Funding for new awards	\$128,685
Number of new awards	20
Average new award	\$6,434
Peer review of new award applications	\$2,350
National teacher recruitment campaign	\$11,750
Evaluation	\$3,525

#### Principals and school leadership teams

Funding for new awards	\$229,650
Number of new awards	15
Average new award	\$7,977
Peer review of new award applications	\$1,700
National leadership activities	\$8,500
Grants to train SEA and LEA managers	\$8,500
Evaluation	\$2,550

NOTE: Approximately \$117,790 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Teacher and Leader Pathways programs for continuation costs under School Leadership (\$29,100 thousand), Teacher Quality Partnerships (\$57,002 thousand), Teachers for a Competitive Tomorrow (\$1,188 thousand), and Transition to Teaching (\$30,500 thousand).

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

#### Performance Measures

The Department will establish goals and performance indicators to assess the impact of the four Excellent Instructional Teams programs.

Under the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program, each State would be required to report annually to the public and the Secretary, through a State Report Card, on key measures concerning teacher and principal effectiveness, the quality of educator support and working conditions, the equitable distribution of qualified and effective teachers and effective principals, and the effectiveness of each teacher and principal preparation program in the State.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Improving teacher quality State grants

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

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
Annual appropriation	\$1,266,308	0	-\$1,266,308
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	<u>1,681,441</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-1,681,441</u>
Total	2,947,749	0	-2,947,749

---

<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

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

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

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

The State awards subgrants to LEAs using a formula that is similar to the one that the Department uses for State allocations, except that, after LEAs receive the amount equivalent to their 2001 allocations from the Eisenhower Professional Development State Grants and Class

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

---

Size Reduction programs, remaining funds are then allocated to LEAs by a formula based 20 percent on LEAs' share of the population aged 5 to 17 and 80 percent on LEAs' share of poor children aged 5 to 17. In addition to using these funds for professional development and class-size reduction, LEAs may use program funds for other activities to improve teacher quality, including teacher and principal recruitment and retention initiatives, signing bonuses and other financial incentives, teacher and principal mentoring, reforming tenure systems, merit pay, teacher testing, and pay differentiation initiatives.

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

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) required all SEAs receiving Title I, Part A funds to develop a plan to have all public school teachers of core academic subjects meet the highly qualified teacher requirements no later than the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

—Highly qualified” means that the teacher: (1) has obtained full State certification as a teacher; (2) holds a minimum of a bachelor's degree; and (3) has demonstrated subject-matter competency in each of the academic subjects in which he or she teaches. LEAs have commonly used their Improving Teacher Quality State Grants funds to help enable teachers to meet this requirement.

In the fiscal year 2009 appropriations act, Congress directed the Department to use \$5 million of that year's appropriation for a grant to the organization New Leaders for New Schools, for a school leadership partnership initiative, and up to \$7.5 million for teacher and principal quality national activities. The Department is using \$3.5 million of the latter funds for a national teacher recruitment campaign and the remaining \$4.0 million to supplement a new grant competition under the School Leadership program. In the fiscal year 2010 appropriations act, Congress directed the Department to use \$5 million to continue the school leadership partnership initiative.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2006.....	\$2,887,439
2007.....	2,887,439
2008.....	2,935,248
2009.....	2,947,749
2010.....	2,947,749

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

---

#### **FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests no funding for the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program for fiscal year 2011. In place of several, sometimes narrowly targeted programs that serve current and prospective teachers and school leaders, the Administration proposes to create broader Excellent Instructional Teams programs through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization.

The Administration believes that this consolidated approach will be more effective in supporting State and local efforts to (1) increase the number of teachers who are not only qualified, but also effective; (2) eliminate inequities in the distribution of qualified and effective teachers and effective school leaders between high-poverty and high-minority schools and other schools; (3) reform State and local policies and practices so that teacher and school leader preparation contributes to effectiveness; (4) develop evaluation and compensation systems that recognize and reward teachers and school leaders for taking on additional responsibilities and leadership roles, are based in significant part on the teacher's or school leader's effectiveness in raising student achievement, and ensure that ineffective teachers improve or, if they do not, enter another field, based on fair, transparent procedures; (5) ensure that teachers and school leaders have access to high-quality professional development opportunities that meet their and their students' needs over the course of their careers; (6) promote collaboration among staff, the formation of instructional teams, and the use of data to improve practice; and (7) ensure that principals and other school leaders are prepared to lead efforts to turn around persistently low-performing schools.

High-quality recruitment, professional development, and induction programs will be important components of the Excellent Instructional Teams initiatives, to ensure that our Nation's high-poverty schools are staffed with effective teachers who are prepared to help all children succeed academically. Funding for the Excellent Instructional Teams programs would also help maintain the momentum for ensuring that all children are taught by teachers who have expertise in the subjects they teach and the skills needed to teach effectively.

The revised State grants portion of the Excellent Instructional Teams programs would focus on evaluating and improving teacher and principal effectiveness, based on student outcomes, and treating teachers like the professionals they are. States and LEAs would have flexibility in how they use formula grant funds, but would be accountable for improving their teacher and principal evaluation systems and ensuring that teachers and principals who are effective at raising student achievement are equitably distributed across schools and LEAs.

In addition to its focus on improving educator effectiveness, the Excellent Instructional Teams programs would help States and school districts ensure that poor and minority children are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers at higher rates than other children. The percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers has increased over the past 5 years. A survey of school districts conducted by the Department found that 94 percent of classes were taught by a highly qualified teacher in 2006-2007, an increase of more than 7 percentage points from 2003-04. However, some schools, especially schools that are high-poverty, continue to struggle to meet the highly qualified teacher requirements. In 2006-07, 94 percent of elementary school classes were taught by a highly qualified teacher in

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

---

high-poverty schools, compared to 97 percent of classes in low-poverty schools. At the secondary-school level, the percentages were 89 percent and 95 percent for high-poverty and low-poverty schools, respectively.

If Congress does not reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act prior to the 2011 appropriation, the Administration believes its requested increase for ESEA programs should be devoted to programs best positioned to reform K-12 education such as the National Teacher Recruitment Campaign and would seek funding of \$50.0 million for this program.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Range of awards to States	\$13,986- 327,107	\$14,024- 331,147	
Average State award	55,600	55,744	0
Amount for Outlying Areas	14,665	14,665	0
Amount for BIE	14,665	14,665	0
Evaluation	14,739	14,739	0

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

#### Performance Measures

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

The Department established measures to assess the performance of the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program. These measures gauge the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in high-poverty schools and by highly qualified teachers in elementary and secondary schools. These data were collected through ESEA's annual State performance reports for the years 2004 through 2006. The Department's ED Facts/Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) began collecting the data in 2007.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

---

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

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

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of core academic elementary classes in high-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	100	90
2007	100	94
2008	100	95
2009	100	
2010	100	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of core academic classes in high-poverty secondary schools taught by highly qualified teachers.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	100	86
2007	100	89
2008	100	90
2009	100	
2010	100	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in elementary schools.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	95	94
2007	100	96
2008	100	97
2009	100	
2010	100	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in secondary schools.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	92	91
2007	100	93
2008	100	94
2009	100	
2010	100	

**Source of data:** U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report and ED Facts/EDEN 2007.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

---

**Assessment of progress:** The program made progress on this objective from 2006 to 2007, and from 2007 to 2008, but did not meet any targets. No targets are shown for 2011 because the Administration is proposing to consolidate this program.

In 2008, the Department developed the following two additional performance measures to reflect progress on ensuring an equitable distribution of teachers: (1) the number of States that reduce the difference between the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in elementary schools in the highest-poverty quartile and the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in elementary schools in the lowest-poverty quartile; and (2) the number of States that reduce the difference between the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in secondary schools in the highest-poverty quartile and the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in secondary schools in the lowest-poverty quartile. From 2006 to 2007, 20 States reduced the gap in elementary schools, and 22 States reduced the difference in secondary schools. These results were previously shown as the change from 2005 to 2006 because the data were reported by school year (e.g., as the change in this measure from school year 2005-2006 to school year 2006-2007). From 2007 to 2008, 27 States reduced the gap in elementary schools and 33 States reduced the gap in secondary schools.

### Efficiency Measure

The efficiency measure for the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program focuses on decreasing the average number of days between the date of a monitoring visit and the date that the Department sends a monitoring report to the State.

<b>Measure:</b> The average number of days it takes the Department of Education to send a monitoring report to States after monitoring.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2006</b>	82	37
<b>2007</b>	81	Data not collected
<b>2008</b>	36	29.4
<b>2009</b>	35	
<b>2010</b>	34	

**Assessment of progress:** The Department did not conduct any monitoring visits in fiscal year 2007 because program staff were working with States on the revised State plans and preparing for the second round of monitoring visits. Beginning in 2008, data reflect the Department's second round of State monitoring. In 2008, the Department met the 36-day target. No targets are shown for 2011 because the Administration is proposing to consolidate this program.

### Other Performance Information

The Department is currently using Improving Teacher Quality State Grants evaluation funds to conduct rigorous impact studies in four major areas: pre-service training, alternative routes to certification, professional development, and teacher retention strategies.

A study of pre-service training, released in early 2009, identified different models of teacher training, including models of alternative certification, and compared the performance of students

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

---

taught by teachers who have received different types of preparation. It found no empirical differences in performance on reading and math assessments of students taught by teachers trained through traditional routes versus teachers who had pursued alternative routes to certification. A second study will look at the effectiveness of teachers who chose to enter teaching through highly selective alternative certification programs; the report is expected in summer 2012.

Two separate studies of teacher professional development activities are identifying and then testing promising approaches to in-service training. The first, which was completed in September 2008, examined the extent to which particular professional development activities change teaching practices in ways that research suggests are effective in improving student achievement in early reading. It found that although there were positive impacts on teachers' knowledge of scientifically based reading instruction, neither of the two professional development activities evaluated led to higher student test scores over a 1-year period, and any additional effect of coaching activities on teaching practices was also insignificant. The second study will examine professional development activities that focus on improving student achievement in mathematics. An interim report on the mathematics study is expected in February 2010, and the final report is expected to be released in fall 2010.

Another evaluation assessed existing induction programs in order to identify promising teacher retention strategies. The first report, released in October 2008, found that retention rates of participants in a comprehensive teacher induction activity were not statistically significantly different from those of teachers in a control group. The second report, released in August 2009, includes information from 10 districts in which teachers were offered 1 year of induction services ("1-year" districts) and 7 districts in which teachers were offered 2 years of induction services ("2-year" districts). The report found no discernable impact of comprehensive induction on teacher retention rates in the school, district, or profession after 2 years for either 1-year or 2-year districts. In addition, the report found that there were no statistically significant impacts on overall student achievement across all grade levels in reading or math during the teachers' second year. The final report is expected to be released in fall 2010.

In addition to the impact studies described above, the Department has used program evaluation funds to assess the progress that States, school districts, and schools have made in implementing the teacher quality and professional development provisions in the ESEA. The report, which was released early in 2009, is based on the second round of data collection from the *National Longitudinal Study of No Child Left Behind* and the *Study of State Implementation of Accountability and Teacher Quality Under No Child Left Behind*. It presents findings from interviews with State education officials in all States and surveys of nationally representative samples of school district officials, principals, and teachers conducted in 2004-05 and 2006-07.

Key findings of the study include:

- By 2006-07, the vast majority of teachers met their States' requirements for being considered highly qualified under the ESEA. In that year, 94 percent of classes were taught by a highly qualified teacher. However, requirements for the demonstration of content-knowledge expertise varied greatly among States, both in the passing scores that new teachers must meet to demonstrate content knowledge on assessments and in the extent to which States give teachers credit for years of prior teaching experience in determining their highly qualified teacher status.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

---

- Teachers in high-poverty and high-minority schools were more likely to report that they were not highly qualified. Moreover, even among teachers who were considered highly qualified, teachers in high-poverty schools had less experience and were less likely to have a degree in the subject they taught.
- The percentage of teachers who were not highly qualified was higher for special education teachers and middle-school teachers.
- In 2006-07, 44 percent of school districts reported facing moderate or major challenges in attracting qualified applicants for teaching positions in mathematics, 53 percent for science, and 55 percent for special education. More than 90 percent of high-minority districts reported difficulty attracting applicants in science and mathematics who met the highly qualified teacher requirements.
- Although nearly all teachers reported taking part in content-focused professional development related to teaching reading or mathematics during the 2005-06 school year and summer, a relatively small proportion participated in such learning opportunities for an extended period of time, despite the ESEA's emphasis on sustained, intensive, classroom-focused professional development. For example, only 13 percent of elementary teachers participated for more than 24 hours in professional development that included in-depth study of topics in reading, and only 6 percent received more than 24 hours of professional development that included in-depth study of topics in mathematics.

In general, the findings of this study indicate that States and school districts are working to implement and comply with the statutory teacher qualification requirements. In addition, States have set standards for highly qualified teachers under the ESEA and have been updating their relevant data systems. Both States and districts are working to develop strategies designed to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers, particularly in traditionally disadvantaged schools and high-need fields and subjects such as mathematics, science, and special education. However, the report notes several issues that warrant attention. First, variations among State policies regarding the content knowledge required to meet the highly qualified teacher requirements raise questions about whether some States have set high enough standards to ensure that teachers have a solid understanding of the subjects they teach. Second, the variation in the distribution of highly qualified teachers across types of teachers and schools highlights enduring inequities in student access to highly qualified teachers. Finally, the low percentage of teachers participating in content-focused professional development over an extended period of time suggests that more can be done to deepen teachers' content knowledge.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Ready to teach

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 8)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$10,700	0	-\$10,700

---

<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 Teach program supports two types of competitive grants to nonprofit telecommunications entities: (a) grants to carry out a national telecommunications-based program to improve teaching in core curriculum areas, and (b) digital educational programming grants that enable eligible entities to develop, produce, and distribute educational and instructional video programming. National telecommunications-based program grants are generally 5-year awards. Digital educational programming grants must last 3 years, be matched by applicants, and must be based on challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards in reading or mathematics.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2006.....	\$10,890
2007.....	10,890
2008.....	10,700
2009.....	10,700
2010.....	10,700

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funds for the Ready to Teach program. In place of this program and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs, the Administration proposes to create broader Excellent Instructional Teams programs through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization.

Innovative uses of technology, including those that target professional development for teachers, will be a focus of the Administration's reauthorization proposal. The Administration believes that this consolidated approach will be more effective in supporting State and local efforts to (1) increase the number of teachers who are not only qualified, but also effective; (2) eliminate inequities in the distribution of qualified and effective teachers and effective school leaders between high-poverty and high-minority schools and other schools; (3) reform State and

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Ready to teach

---

local policies and practices so that teacher and school leader preparation contributes to effectiveness; (4) develop evaluation and compensation systems that recognize and reward teachers and school leaders for taking on additional responsibilities and leadership roles, are based in significant part on the teacher's or school leader's effectiveness in raising student achievement, and ensure that ineffective teachers improve or, if they do not, enter another field, based on fair, transparent procedures; (5) ensure that teachers and school leaders have access to high-quality professional development opportunities that meet their and their students' needs over the course of their careers; (6) promote collaboration among staff, the formation of instructional teams, and the use of data to improve practice; and (7) ensure that principals and other school leaders are prepared to lead efforts to turn around persistently low-performing schools.

High-quality recruitment, professional development, and induction programs will be important components of the Excellent Instructional Teams initiatives, to ensure that our Nation's high-poverty schools are staffed with effective teachers who are prepared to help all children succeed academically. Funding for the Excellent Instructional Teams programs would also help ensure that all children are taught by teachers who have expertise in the subjects they teach and the skills needed to teach effectively.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Funding for new awards	0	\$10,693	0
Number of new awards	0	2	0
Funding for continuation awards	\$10,700 <sup>1</sup>	0	0
Number of continuation awards	2	0	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	7	0

---

<sup>1</sup> In FY 2009, because continuation costs exceeded the total amount appropriated by approximately \$564 thousand, the Department prorated grantee continuation awards.

### 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 assess 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.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Ready to teach

---

**Goal: To improve student achievement by developing high-quality, standards based digital classroom content and professional development for teachers.**

**Objective:** *To improve the quality of digital professional development and classroom content developed through the Ready to Teach program.*

**Measure:** The percentage of Ready to Teach products deemed to be of high quality.

Year	Targets	Actual
2008		100
2009	100	100
2010	100	

**Measure:** The percentage of Digital Educational Programming products deemed to be of high quality.

Year	Targets	Actual
2008		75
2009	100	67
2010	100	

**Assessment of progress:** Expert panel members were asked to review a sample of grantee products, and provide a quality rating using criteria developed by the Department. The five basic criteria for determining the quality of Ready to Teach products are: 1) content; 2) technology; 3) design 4) dissemination and implementation; and 5) target audience. Expert panel members rate products based on a 7-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 product to achieve an overall rating of “high quality,” a total score of 75 or higher must be assigned. The sample of items reviewed in any given year tends to be small because experts can only review completed products.

In 2009, 100 percent of Ready to Teach products (4 of 4) were deemed by expert panel members to be of “high quality,” and 67 percent of Digital Educational Programming products (2 of 3) were considered “high quality.” The Digital Educational Programming result represents a decrease of 10 percentage points from 2008, when 75 percent (3 of 4) products were deemed to be “of high quality.” The Department attributes this decrease primarily to the fact that only 3 products were available for review, compared to 4 in the previous year. The item deemed not to be “of high quality” in both years also happens to be from a single grantee, and the Department is currently working with this grantee to ensure that expert panel member recommendations regarding ways to improve the product are implemented. No targets are shown for 2011 because the Administration is proposing to consolidate this program.

### Other Performance Information

The Department has not conducted any evaluations of the Ready to Teach program. Most current grantees under the program have agreed to conduct relatively rigorous evaluations, using experimental or quasi-experimental designs; however, most grantees are running into serious barriers in trying to implement such evaluations. For example, most current grantees receive Federal support to develop new products and services. Because this is the case, grantees are faced with the technical challenge of developing new products and services while simultaneously trying to test the efficacy of such products and services as they relate to teacher

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Ready to teach

---

classroom practice and student learning outcomes. It is still too soon to determine the extent to which they have succeeded in implementing such evaluations.

Previous grantees also conducted a number of evaluations of activities supported under this program, several of which suggest that specific program activities may have at least a moderate effect on teacher classroom practice. For example, in 2002, the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) contracted with an independent evaluator to determine the impact of online courses and professional development offered through the PBS TeacherLine program on teacher practice and student performance. As part of this evaluation, a small quasi-experimental pilot study was conducted in Florida's Miami-Dade County public schools to assess the effect of TeacherLine participation on aggregated student standardized test scores on the math portion of the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). Using demographic background and baseline student academic performance data, schools in the treatment group (which included schools with at least 10 percent TeacherLine participation) were matched with non-participating schools. Treatment and comparison groups consisted primarily of urban, low-performing schools with very high (95 percent) minority enrollments. Preliminary findings show that TeacherLine-participating schools scored higher, on average, than non-participating schools on the outcome measures employed. However, this analysis used a relatively small sample size (involving 21 schools, 7 of which were in the treatment group), and only looked at student outcomes – making no attempt to control for potentially significant differences in actual classroom practice – limiting the overall reliability of the findings.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Teacher incentive fund

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

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$400,000	0	-\$400,000

---

<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 goals of the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) are to improve student achievement by increasing teacher and principal effectiveness; reform teacher and principal compensation systems so that teachers and principals are rewarded for gains in student achievement; increase the number of effective teachers teaching low-income, minority, and disadvantaged students in hard-to-staff subjects; and create sustainable performance-based compensation systems. These compensation systems also provide educators with additional compensation for taking on additional responsibilities and leadership roles.

The program provides grants to encourage school districts and States to develop and implement innovative strategies for providing financial incentives for teachers and principals who raise student achievement and close the achievement gap in some of our Nation's highest-need schools. Under the appropriations language authorizing the program, local educational agencies (LEAs), including charter schools that are LEAs; States; or partnerships of: (1) an LEA, a State, or both, and (2) at least one nonprofit organization, are eligible for competitive grants to develop and implement performance-based compensation systems for public school teachers and principals in high-need areas. Also under the statutory language, these compensation systems must take into consideration gains in student achievement as well as other factors, including classroom observations conducted multiple times during the year. Further, the Department requires applicants for TIF grants to demonstrate a significant investment in, and a commitment to ensuring the fiscal and programmatic sustainability of their project.

The appropriations language also permits the Department to use up to 5 percent of TIF funds for technical assistance, training, peer review of applications, program outreach, and evaluation activities.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) provided an additional \$200 million in fiscal year 2009 for new TIF awards. With the Recovery Act funds, and in response to lessons learned from the first two rounds of TIF grants and from other efforts around the country to improve educator effectiveness, the Department plans to place a priority on the support of projects that will develop and implement a performance-based compensation system that (1) rewards, at differentiated levels, teachers and principals who demonstrate their

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teacher incentive fund

---

effectiveness by improving student achievement; (2) uses student growth as a significant factor in calculating differentiated levels of compensation provided to teachers and principals; (3) is designed to assist high-need schools to (a) retain effective teachers in teaching positions in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas, such as mathematics, science, special education, and English language acquisition, and (b) fill vacancies with teachers of those subjects or specialty areas who are effective or likely to be effective; and (4) is sustainable and aligned with a coherent strategy for strengthening the educator workforce in an LEA participating in the project.

The Recovery Act also requires the Department, through the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), to conduct a rigorous national evaluation, using a randomized controlled methodology if feasible, to assess the impact of performance-based teacher and principal compensation systems on teacher and principal recruitment and retention in high-need schools and subjects. The Recovery Act, in addition to providing the 5 percent reservation for an evaluation, allows the Secretary to reserve up to 1 percent for management and oversight of the activities supported with those funds. The Recovery Act funds are available for obligation by the Department through September 30, 2010.

The Department expects to use approximately \$137 million of the Recovery Act appropriation for about 60 new awards, \$51 million for continuation awards, and up to \$12 million for the mandated national evaluation, peer review of new award applications, and management and oversight. These awards will be made by September 30, 2010.

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

	(\$000s)
2006.....	\$99,000
2007.....	200
2008.....	97,270
2009.....	97,270
Recovery Act .....	200,000
2010.....	400,000

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for the Teacher Incentive Fund for fiscal year 2011. In place of several, sometimes narrowly targeted programs that serve current and prospective teachers and school leaders, the Department proposes to create broader Excellent Instructional Teams programs through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization.

The Administration believes that this consolidated approach will be more effective in supporting State and local efforts to (1) increase the number of teachers who are not only qualified, but also effective; (2) eliminate inequities in the distribution of qualified and effective teachers and effective school leaders between high-poverty and high-minority schools and other schools; (3) reform State and local policies and practices so that teacher and school leader preparation contributes to effectiveness; (4) develop evaluation and compensation systems that recognize and reward teachers and school leaders for taking on additional responsibilities and leadership roles, are based in significant part on the teacher's or school leader's effectiveness in raising

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teacher incentive fund

---

student achievement, and ensure that ineffective teachers improve or, if they do not, enter another field, based on fair, transparent procedures; (5) ensure that teachers and school leaders have access to high-quality professional development opportunities that meet their and their students' needs over the course of their careers; (6) promote collaboration among staff, the formation of instructional teams, and the use of data to improve practice; and (7) ensure that principals and other school leaders are prepared to lead efforts to turn around persistently low-performing schools.

Building on the initiatives undertaken and advances made through the TIF, the Excellent Instructional Teams initiatives, particularly the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund, would provide support for State and school district efforts to develop and implement innovative approaches to human capital systems. The new programs would include a focus on the recruitment, retention, and reward of teachers, including special education teachers, and principals who raise student achievement and close the achievement gap in high-need schools. Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund grantees would use funds to reform teacher and school leader compensation and career development systems, improve the use of evaluation results for retention and compensation decisions, and implement human resource reforms and other innovations to strengthen the workforce.

Education research has demonstrated clearly that one of the most powerful actions we can take to improve student achievement, especially in high-need subjects and schools, is to increase the concentration of effective teachers and leaders. In addition, this research has also demonstrated the difficulty of determining based on front-end credentials (for example, traditional versus alternative certification) which teachers will be most effective in the classroom. Therefore, efforts to improve teacher effectiveness have increasingly focused on recruiting, developing, and retaining teachers who demonstrate their effectiveness through their impact on student learning.

The Excellent Instructional Teams initiatives will encourage and support State educational agencies (SEAs) and LEAs in advancing comprehensive strategies for strengthening the educator workforce and driving improvements in teacher effectiveness. As States and LEAs seek to increase educator effectiveness by aligning their approaches to recruitment and placement, preparation and certification, induction and development, and retention and advancement of effective teachers and leaders, compensation systems that reward teacher contribution can reinforce these efforts. For example, compensation reform can be an important tool in efforts to attract effective teachers and leaders and build strong instructional teams in high-need schools, to create robust career advancement systems for teachers and other school leaders, and to create more effective professional development systems. Because of the interconnectedness across each of these areas, it is important to think of them in a coherent, integrated way, with emphasis consistently placed on approaches that measure, support, and reward teachers and school leaders based on their effectiveness in delivering improved student outcomes and that support educators' efforts to improve throughout the course of their careers.

Under the Administration's reauthorization proposal, TIF continuation grant costs would be funded from the appropriation for the new Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teacher incentive fund

---

If Congress does not reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act prior to the 2011 appropriation, the Administration believes its requested increase for ESEA programs should be devoted to programs best positioned to reform K-12 education, such as the Teacher Incentive Fund, and would seek funding of \$800 million for this program, \$400 million more than the fiscal year 2010 appropriation, for continuation grant costs and approximately 100 new awards.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Amount for continuation awards	\$92,406	\$80,000	0
Number of continuation awards	34	33	0
Amount for new awards	0	\$300,000	0
Number of new awards	0	60-80	0
Technical assistance, training, outreach, and evaluation	\$4,864	\$19,000	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$1,000	0

---

NOTES: Continuation costs of approximately \$440,000 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund.

The Department expects to use approximately \$137,000 thousand of the Recovery Act appropriation for about 60 new awards, \$51,000 thousand for continuation awards, and up to \$12,000 thousand for the mandated national evaluation, peer review of new award applications, and management and oversight.

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

The Department has established two performance measures for TIF: (1) changes in LEA personnel deployment practices, as measured by changes over time in the percentage of teachers and principals in high-need schools who have a record of effectiveness; and (2) changes in teacher and principal compensation systems in participating LEAs, as measured by the percentage of a district's personnel budget that is used for performance-related payments to effective teachers and principals (as measured by student achievement gains). The Department collects these data from grantee annual performance reports.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teacher incentive fund

---

Many grantees have submitted their baseline data for these measures. However, after reviewing these data, Department staff determined that grantees are not collecting and reporting the data uniformly, especially for the first performance measure, where, for example, there is a wide variation in how grantees are defining and measuring “effectiveness.” The Department, therefore, will not be reporting on these data until grantees are able to provide more uniform data. TIF program staff plan to develop standard definitions of teacher effectiveness for the purposes of this measure so that data will be collected and reported more accurately and consistently.

The preliminary baseline percentage for the second performance measure is that 0.33 percent of districts’ personnel budgets were used for performance-related payments to effective teachers and principals (as measured by student achievement gains). This percentage will likely change once the discussions between TIF and grantee staff take place. In addition, this percentage incorporates data from only the first cohort of grants (grants awarded in the fall of 2006) and does not include all of those grants.

### Other performance information

The Center for Educator Compensation Reform (CECR), created and funded through a Department contract, collects and publishes profiles of current TIF grantees, which highlight their innovative and effective activities. For example:

- Twenty-seven schools in 7 public school districts (with approximately 1,217 eligible teachers) have partnered with the University of Texas (UT) System’s TIF program. The UT System is implementing the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) model, which provides differentiated compensation for teachers based on their performance in the classroom and their students’ academic growth, and career advancement opportunities for teachers as they take on additional responsibilities and participate in professional development activities. For example, teachers in the program can become “mentor” and “master” teachers, which give them additional compensation and responsibilities. Mentor teachers teach half-time and mentor other teachers half-time, and master teachers model teaching strategies and provide in-school professional development to the “career” teachers at their school. The UT System is also supplementing the TAP model with an additional incentive, in the form of a recruitment bonus, to attract effective teachers and principals to the participating schools. CECR reports that nearly 16,000 students, most of whom are Black or Hispanic, have benefited from this program.
- Memphis City Schools’ (MCS) Effective Practice Incentive Community (EPIC) was designed by New Leaders for New Schools (NLNS) to identify and provide incentives to school leaders and practitioners who have implemented effective practices that help drive student achievement gains and are willing to share those practices with educators across the country. This program recognizes and rewards highly effective teachers based on a value-added model, and provides incentives for those educators to participate in the recording of their effective practices, either through case studies, practice profiles, or video documentation. Effective education practices are not only identified and documented, providing those teachers with great reflective tools, but also shared, through a website run by NLNS, with other MCS educators and educators at all schools participating in EPIC grants (including schools in Denver, CO and Prince

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teacher incentive fund

---

George's County, MD that receive TIF funds). CECR notes that the MCS EPIC program has affected approximately 10,000 students, most of whom receive free and reduced-price lunch.

- The Edward W. Brooke Charter School, a charter school for students in kindergarten through grade 8 in Boston, Massachusetts, is using its grant to offer teachers and principals annual bonuses tied to student performance during the previous academic school year. The compensation plan also offers differentiated base salaries for teachers who have proven expertise in high-need subject areas, such as mathematics and science. In addition, the school is using TIF funds as a retention tool by awarding incentives only to teachers who commit to returning to the school the following year.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Advanced credentialing

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

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$10,649	0	-\$10,649

---

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

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Advanced Credentialing program authorizes competitive grants to State educational agencies (SEAs), local educational agencies (LEAs), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) working with an LEA or SEA, the National Council on Teacher Quality working with an LEA or SEA, or another certification or credentialing organization working with an LEA or SEA. The program supports activities to encourage and support teachers seeking advanced certification or advanced credentialing.

The current authority for this program supports two activities: 1) the development of teacher standards linked to increased student achievement, and 2) outreach, recruitment, subsidies, and support programs related to teacher certification or credentialing by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), the National Council on Teacher Quality (which initiated the creation of the credential offered by the American Board for the Certification of Teacher Excellence), or other nationally recognized certification or credentialing organizations. Through this program and its antecedent, the Eisenhower Professional Development Federal Activities program, the Department invested \$176 million between fiscal years 1991 and 2008 in the development and implementation of the NBPTS certification and used \$33 million for a 5-year grant for the development of teacher credentials to the American Board for the Certification of Teacher Excellence (ABCTE) that ended in 2008.

In the 2009 appropriation, Congress earmarked \$10.649 million for the NBPTS and provided that \$1 million was to be used for the development of a National Board certification for principals of elementary and secondary schools. The 2010 appropriation provides the same amount of funding for the NBPTS but does not provide authority to use these funds for the development of the principal credential.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Advanced credentialing

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$16,695
2007 .....	16,695
2008 .....	9,649
2009 .....	10,649
2010 .....	10,649

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for Advanced Credentialing for fiscal year 2011. In place of this program and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted programs, the Administration proposes to create broader Excellent Instructional Teams programs through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization.

The Administration believes that this consolidated approach will be more effective in supporting State and local efforts to (1) increase the number of teachers who are not only qualified, but also effective; (2) eliminate inequities in the distribution of qualified and effective teachers and effective school leaders between high-poverty and high-minority schools and other schools; (3) reform State and local policies and practices so that teacher and school leader preparation contributes to effectiveness; (4) develop evaluation and compensation systems that recognize and reward teachers and school leaders for taking on additional responsibilities and leadership roles, are based in significant part on the teacher's or school leader's effectiveness in raising student achievement, and ensure that ineffective teachers improve or, if they do not, enter another field, based on fair, transparent procedures; (5) ensure that teachers and school leaders have access to high-quality professional development opportunities that meet their and their students' needs over the course of their careers; (6) promote collaboration among staff, the formation of instructional teams, and the use of data to improve practice; and (7) ensure that principals and other school leaders are prepared to lead efforts to turn around persistently low-performing schools.

The Excellent Instructional Teams initiatives, particularly the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund, would enable States and districts to reform their compensation, hiring, licensure, and tenure systems and would also provide support for national activities to strengthen teaching and leadership. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and other nonprofit organizations that are eligible for funding under the Advanced Credentialing program would be encouraged to partner with States and districts to compete for funding under the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund for which \$950 million is requested, and may also be eligible to compete in competitions carried out under the National Leadership Activities set-aside within the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Advanced credentialing

---

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Administration (includes grantee personnel costs, benefits, travel, and indirect costs)	\$942	\$942	0
Candidate support services and evaluation activities	1,125	1,125	0
Candidate subsidies	7,582	8,582	0
School leadership credential development	<u>1,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	10,649	10,649	0

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Through Advanced Credentialing and its antecedent program, the Eisenhower Professional Development Federal Activities program, the Department awarded grants to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) and the National Council on Teacher Quality (later transferred to the American Board for the Certification of Teacher Excellence (ABCTE)) to support the development and implementation of advanced certifications or credentials for teachers who have demonstrated mastery in the teaching of their academic discipline. Data from the National Center for Education Statistics' Schools and Staffing Survey from the 2003-4 school year indicate that 10 percent of beginning teachers leave the profession after 1 year and another 10 percent leave after their second year. By their fifth year, more than a third of teachers have left the profession. Advanced certifications or credentials may be one way for States and districts to identify and retain effective teachers.

The Department hopes that all State longitudinal data systems will eventually include data on teachers who have attempted or achieved NBPTS or ABCTE certification that would allow us to develop meaningful performance measures for advanced credentialing programs.

Congress directed the Department to award a contract to the National Research Council to conduct this study in order to assess the impact of the NBPTS credential and to provide a framework for evaluating other advanced teaching credentials or certifications. On June 11, 2008, the National Research Council's Committee on Evaluation of Teacher Certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards issued its final report on its evaluation of the advanced teaching credential offered by the NBPTS ([http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=12224](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12224)).

The report included the following findings and recommendations:

- Teachers who earn NBPTS certification are more effective at improving their students' achievement than teachers who do not have NBPTS certification.
- High standards were employed in the initial design and development of NBPTS assessments. However, some documentation on the subsequent development, administration, and scoring of assessments was not easily accessible. The National Research Council Committee recommended that NBPTS take several steps to improve

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Advanced credentialing

---

the reliability of its assessments and to regularly evaluate its assessments to continuously improve them.

- There were disparities in applicants' participation across States, across the types of schools where Board-certified teachers work, and across teachers from different racial and ethnic backgrounds. To address this, the National Research Council Committee recommended that NBPTS implement and maintain a database of information on NBPTS applicants and their career paths.
- Existing research neither supports nor refutes hypotheses about the effects of the certification process on teachers' practice. The National Research Council Committee recommended further research on this topic and on the effect of the certification on teacher retention.
- The current research base is inadequate to support an evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of the NBPTS credential.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Transition to teaching

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title II, Part C, Subpart 1, Chapter B)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$43,707	0	-\$43,707

---

<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 Transition to Teaching program helps high-need schools and local educational agencies (LEAs) recruit and employ qualified licensed or certified teachers by encouraging the development and expansion of alternative routes to certification. The program provides 5-year grants to recruit, train, certify, and place talented individuals into teaching positions and to support them during their first years in the classroom. In particular, the program focuses on encouraging two groups of nontraditional teaching candidates to become classroom teachers: (1) mid-career professionals with substantial career experience, including highly qualified paraprofessionals, and (2) recent college graduates.

Under the program, the Secretary makes competitive grants to State educational agencies (SEAs), high-need LEAs, for-profit or nonprofit organizations (in partnership with SEAs or high-need LEAs) that have a proven record of effectively recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers, institutions of higher education (in partnership with SEAs or high-need LEAs), regional consortia of SEAs, or consortia of high-need LEAs. Grantees must develop and implement comprehensive approaches to training, placing, and supporting teacher candidates they have recruited, including ensuring that the program meets relevant State certification or licensing requirements if it provides an alternative route to teacher certification.

Grantees are expected to ensure that program participants are placed in high-need schools in high-need LEAs and must give priority to schools that are located in areas with the highest percentages of students from families with incomes below the poverty line. A "high-need school" is defined as a school in which at least 30 percent of the students are from low-income families or that is located in an area with a high percentage of out-of-field teachers, is within the top 25 percent of schools statewide with unfilled teacher positions, is located in an area with a high teacher turnover rate, or is located in an area with a high percentage of teachers who are not licensed or certified. A "high-need LEA" is defined as an LEA for which at least 20 percent or 10,000 of the children served are from families with incomes below the poverty line, and that has a high percentage of teachers teaching out of field or with emergency credentials.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Transition to teaching

---

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

	(\$000s)
2006.....	\$44,484
2007.....	44,484
2008.....	43,707
2009.....	43,707
2010.....	43,707

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for Transition to Teaching for fiscal year 2011. In place of several, sometimes narrowly targeted programs that serve current and prospective teachers and school leaders, the Administration proposes to create broader Excellent Instructional Teams programs through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization.

The Excellent Instructional Teams programs will help States and LEAs to create or expand teacher preparation programs that meet their needs, and allow the Department to focus funding on projects that prepare effective teachers, especially those who will teach in high-need schools and subjects. The Administration believes that this consolidated approach will be more effective in supporting State and local efforts to (1) increase the number of teachers who are not only qualified, but also effective; (2) eliminate inequities in the distribution of qualified and effective teachers and effective school leaders between high-poverty and high-minority schools and other schools; (3) reform State and local policies and practices so that teacher and school leader preparation contributes to effectiveness; (4) develop evaluation and compensation systems that recognize and reward teachers and school leaders for taking on additional responsibilities and leadership roles, are based in significant part on the teacher's or school leader's effectiveness in raising student achievement, and ensure that ineffective teachers improve or, if they do not, enter another field, based on fair, transparent procedures; (5) ensure that teachers and school leaders have access to high-quality professional development opportunities that meet their and their students' needs over the course of their careers; (6) promote collaboration among staff, the formation of instructional teams, and the use of data to improve practice; and (7) ensure that principals and other school leaders are prepared to lead efforts to turn around persistently low-performing schools.

Preparation of new teachers – including nontraditional candidates prepared through high-quality alternative routes to certification or licensure – will be a key component of the Excellent Instructional Teams initiatives. This emphasis is appropriate, given that, as a result of increasing enrollments and the retirement of many veteran educators, the Nation faces the challenge of hiring thousands of teachers and school leaders in the next few years.

The new Excellent Instructional Teams programs will build on Transition to Teaching's record of support for alternative-route programs. States and LEAs that receive funding under the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program would be able to use program funds to establish and expand high-quality pathways to certification or licensure. In addition, the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund would provide support for States and LEAs to reform their certification or licensure policies and practices. The Teacher Pathways program would provide

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Transition to teaching

---

competitive grants to support the creation or expansion of high-quality pathways, including traditional and alternative routes, into the teaching profession, and support a national teacher recruitment campaign that would help recruit into the teaching profession such individuals as high-school and college students, recent college graduates, mid-career professionals, retirees, and veterans, including those recently separated from military service, and direct these individuals into high-quality preparation programs. The types of activities supported by the Transition to Teaching program could also be funded through Race to the Top and the Investing in Innovation Fund.

Under our reauthorization proposal, Transition to Teaching continuation grant costs would be funded from the appropriation for the new Teacher and Leader Pathways programs.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Funding for new awards	\$7,082	0	0
Number of new awards	20	0	0
Average new award	\$354	0	0
Funding for continuation awards	\$36,300	\$43,488	0
Number of continuation awards	104	93	0
Average continuation award	\$349	\$468	0
Evaluation	\$219	\$219	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$106	0	0
Number of participants	36,040 <sup>1</sup>	10,805	0

---

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$30,500 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Teacher and Leader Pathways programs.

<sup>1</sup> The number of participants in 2009 includes 25,235 individuals in projects from the 2002 cohort that have received no-cost extensions, 6,066 individuals in the 2004 cohort, 2,942 individuals in the 2006 cohort, and 1,797 in the 2007 cohort. The number of participants is expected to decrease significantly in 2010, as shown in the table above, as projects in the 2002 cohort end.

### 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.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Transition to teaching

---

The Transition to Teaching authorization has required that each grantee submit an interim evaluation report at the end of the third year of the 5-year grant period and a final evaluation report at the end of the grant. This evaluation must describe the extent to which the grantee has met program goals relating to teacher recruitment and retention.

The Department has established the following goal and performance indicators to assess the impact of the Transition to Teaching program:

**Goal: To increase the number of mid-career professionals, qualified paraprofessionals, and recent college graduates who become highly qualified teachers in high-need schools in high-need LEAs and teach for at least 3 years.**

*Objective: Recruit, prepare, and retain highly qualified teachers in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Transition to Teaching participants who become teachers of record in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.								
Year	Target				Actual			
	2002 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort
2006	55	40			74	81		
2007	75	75			75	83	81	
2008	75	83	60		76	83	74	65
2009		85	79	60		76	66	67
2010		85	83	79				
2011			85	83				

**Assessment of Progress:** In 2006, 74 percent of participants in the 2002 cohort were teachers of record in high-need schools in high-need LEAs, exceeding the target of 55 percent. By 2006, 81 percent of participants in the 2004 cohort were teachers of record in high-need schools in high-need LEAs, exceeding the target of 40 percent.

Based on the most recently received data and the adoption of a standardized definition for “teacher of record” in 2005, the Department set higher targets for 2007 for the 2002 cohort and for 2007-09 for the 2004 cohort. In 2007, 75 percent of participants in the 2002 cohort were teachers of record in high-need schools in high-need LEAs, meeting the target, and 83 percent of participants in the 2004 cohort were teachers of record in high-need schools in high-need LEAs, exceeding the target of 75 percent. Eighty-one (81) percent of the 2006 cohort participants were teachers of record in high-need schools in high-need LEAs in 2007.

In 2008, 76 percent of participants in the 2002 cohort were teachers of record in high-need schools in high-need LEAs, exceeding the target of 75 percent. Eighty-three (83) percent of participants in the 2004 cohort were teachers of record in high-need schools in high-need LEAs, meeting the target. Seventy-four (74) percent of participants in the 2006 cohort were teachers of record in high-need schools in high-need LEAs, decreasing from the previous year but still

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Transition to teaching

exceeding the target. Sixty-five (65) percent of participants in the 2007 cohort were teachers of record in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.

In 2009, 76 percent of participants in the 2004 cohort were teachers of record in high-need schools in high-need LEAs, falling short of the target. Sixty-six (66) percent of participants in the 2006 cohort were teachers of record in high-need schools in high-need LEAs, decreasing from the previous year and less than the target. Sixty-seven (67) percent of participants in the 2007 cohort were teachers of record in high-need schools in high-need LEAs, increasing from the previous year and exceeding the target.

Because the Department does not expect participants to become “teachers of record” in the first year of the program, baseline data are not provided for the first year of each cohort. Data for this measure for FY 2010 will be available in December 2010.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Transition to Teaching participants receiving certification or licensure within 3 years.								
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>				<b>Actual</b>			
	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2004 Cohort</b>	<b>2006 Cohort</b>	<b>2007 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2004 Cohort</b>	<b>2006 Cohort</b>	<b>2007 Cohort</b>
<b>2006</b>	40	15			48	36		
<b>2007</b>	65	40			50	42	6	
<b>2008</b>	65	48	15		53	44	19	9
<b>2009</b>		50	40	15		47	31	23
<b>2010</b>		50	48	40				
<b>2011</b>			50	48				

**Assessment of progress:** In 2006, 48 percent of participants in the 2002 cohort received certification or licensure within 3 years, exceeding the target of 40 percent. Thirty-six (36) percent of participants in the 2004 cohort received certification or licensure within 3 years in 2006, exceeding the target of 15 percent. In 2007, 50 percent of participants in the 2002 cohort had received certification or licensure within 3 years, below the target of 65 percent. Forty-two (42) percent of participants in the 2004 cohort had received certification or licensure within 3 years in 2007, exceeding the target of 40 percent. Six (6) percent of the 2006 cohort participants had received certification or licensure within 3 years in 2007.

In 2008, 53 percent of participants in the 2002 cohort had received certification or licensure within 3 years, below the target of 65 percent; 44 percent of participants in the 2004 cohort had received certification or licensure within 3 years, below the target of 48 percent; and 19 percent of participants in the 2006 cohort had received certification/licensure within 3 years, exceeding the target of 15 percent. Also in 2008, 9 percent of participants in the 2007 cohort had received certification/licensure within 3 years.

In 2009, 47 percent of participants in the 2002 cohort had received certification or licensure within 3 years, increasing from the previous year but falling short of the target of 50 percent. Thirty-one (31) percent of participants in the 2004 cohort had received certification or licensure within 3 years, also increasing from the previous year but less than the target. Twenty-three

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Transition to teaching

---

(23) percent of participants in the 2007 cohort had received certification or licensure within three years, exceeding the target.

Data for FY 2010 for this measure will be available in December 2010.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Transition to Teaching teachers of record who teach in high-need schools in high-need LEAs for 3 years.						
Year	Target			Actual		
	2002 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2006				73		
2007	74			75	80	
2008	75			70	76	
2009		77			66	
2010		77				
2011						

**Assessment of progress:** This measure is the number of teachers of record who are still teaching after 3 years divided by the total number who began teaching 3 years earlier. Since it usually takes at least a year for a participant to find a teaching position, the baseline year for each cohort is 4 years after the start of the grant. The Department has set targets at the baseline plus 1 percent annually for all cohorts. In 2006, the baseline year, 73 percent of teachers of record in the 2002 cohort of grantees had taught in high-need schools in high-need LEAs for 3 years. In 2007, performance increased to 75 percent, exceeding the target of 74 percent. In 2008, the baseline year for the 2004 cohort, 76 percent of teachers of record in the cohort had taught in high-need schools in high-need LEAs for 3 years. The Department has used these data to set targets for 2009 and 2010. In 2009, 66 percent of teachers of record in the 2004 cohort of grantees had taught in high-need schools in high-need LEAs for 3 years, falling short of the target.

The Department will use 2010 data to establish a baseline for the 2006 cohort.

### Efficiency Measures

The Department developed two efficiency measures for the Transition to Teaching program:  
 (1) cost per participant who teaches in a high-need school in a high-need LEA for 3 years; and  
 (2) cost per participant receiving certification/licensure.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Transition to teaching

<b>Measure:</b> The cost per participant who teaches in a high-need school in a high-need LEA for 3 years.								
Year	Target				Actual			
	2002 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort
2006	\$40,000				\$26,465			
2007	\$35,000				\$17,705	\$31,240		
2008	\$30,000	\$21,240			\$14,154	\$19,524		
2009		\$16,240				\$15,287	\$33,317	
2010		\$16,240	\$23,317					
2011			\$18,317					

<b>Measure:</b> The cost per participant receiving certification or licensure.								
Year	Target				Actual			
	2002 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort
2006	\$11,500	\$14,000			\$11,190	\$13,163		
2007	\$11,500	\$12,000			\$10,959	\$13,943		
2008	\$11,500	\$11,500			\$10,848	\$14,333	\$28,505	
2009		\$11,500	\$23,505			\$13,013	\$19,733	\$42,392
2010		\$11,500	\$18,505	\$37,392				
2011			\$18,505	\$32,392				

**Assessment of progress:** In 2006, the first year in which this measure was used, data collected for participants in the 2002 cohort of grantees showed that the cost per retained participant was \$26,465 and the cost per certified participant was \$11,190. The denominator for these measures is the cumulative amount of money expended for each cohort. In 2007, the cost per retained participant fell to \$17,705 and the cost per certified participant was \$10,959 for those in the 2002 cohort, both measures showing progress within the cohort from the previous year. In 2008, the cost per retained participant in the 2002 cohort fell to \$14,154 and the cost per certified participant in that group fell to \$10,848.

For participants in the 2004 cohort of grantees, the cost per certified or licensed participant was \$13,163 in 2006. In 2007, the cost per certified participant rose to \$13,943, and the cost per retained participant was \$31,240 for the same cohort. In 2008, the cost per retained participant fell to \$19,524 and the cost per certified participant rose to \$14,333. In 2009, the cost per certified participant fell to \$13,013 and the cost per retained participant fell to \$15,287.

For participants in the 2006 cohort of grantees, the cost per certified or licensed participant was \$28,505 in 2008. In 2009, the cost per certified or licensed participant fell to \$19,733, and the cost per retained participant was \$33,317.

In 2009, the cost per certified or licensed participant in the 2007 cohort was \$42,392.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Transition to teaching

---

#### Other Performance Information

In 2006, the Department released *Transition to Teaching Program Evaluation: An Interim Report on the FY 2002 Grantees*, a report prepared for the Department by the American Institutes for Research. Using data collected from November 2004 to February 2006, this report examined the types of activities grantees implemented, the content and outcomes of the activities, and the characteristics and qualifications of participants in the program. The report noted that 74 percent of participants who entered the Transition to Teaching project in 2002 were reported to still be teaching in 2004. In addition, the report found that 20 percent of program participants stated that they would likely not be teaching if they had not been involved in a Transition to Teaching project.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Teacher quality partnership

(Higher Education Act of 1965, Title II, Part A)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$43,000	0	-\$43,000

---

<sup>1</sup> The program is authorized for FY 2011; however, the program is proposed for consolidation under new legislation to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) program seeks to improve student achievement and the quality of teachers working in high-need schools and early childhood education (ECE) programs by improving the preparation of teachers and enhancing professional development activities for teachers; holding teacher preparation programs accountable for preparing effective teachers; and recruiting highly qualified individuals, including minorities and individuals from other occupations, into the teaching force. Projects may also include a component to train school leaders in high-need or rural local educational agencies (LEAs) and a component to partner with a public broadcast television station or another entity that develops digital education content, to improve the quality of teacher preparation programs. The program is intended to help create a variety of effective pathways into teaching, strengthen State educational agencies and LEA human capital systems, and support our Nation's teaching force in effectively improving student outcomes.

Only partnerships may apply for funding under this program. Partnerships must include a high-need LEA; a high-need school or high-need ECE program (or a consortium of high-need schools or ECE programs served by the partner high-need LEA); a partner institution of higher education (IHE); a school, department, or program of education within the partner IHE; and a school or department of arts and sciences within the partner IHE. A partnership may also include, among others, the Governor of the State, the State educational agency, the State board of education, the State agency for higher education, or a business.

Further, in order to maximize resources and reduce redundancy, applicants will be required to explain how they plan to coordinate activities under the TQP program with other federally funded programs aimed at improving teacher effectiveness (e.g., Teacher Quality State Grants under Title II of the ESEA and the Teacher Incentive Fund).

The following three types of Partnership grants are eligible to be funded through the program: Pre-Baccalaureate Preparation of Teachers program — Grants are provided to implement a wide-range of reforms in teacher preparation programs and, as applicable, preparation programs for early childhood educators. These reforms may include, among other things, implementing curriculum changes that improve, evaluate, and assess how well prospective teachers develop teaching skills; using teaching and learning research so that teachers

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teacher quality partnership

---

implement research-based instructional practices and use data to improve classroom instruction; developing a high-quality and sustained pre-service clinical education program that includes high-quality mentoring or coaching; creating a high-quality induction program for new teachers; implementing initiatives that increase compensation for qualified early childhood educators who attain 2-year and 4-year degrees; developing and implementing high-quality professional development for teachers in the partner high-need LEAs; developing effective mechanisms, which may include alternative routes to State certification, to recruit qualified individuals into the teaching profession; and strengthening literacy teaching skills of prospective and new elementary and secondary school teachers.

Teaching Residency program — Grants are provided to develop and implement teacher residency programs that are based on models of successful teaching residencies and that serve as a mechanism to prepare teachers for success in high-need schools and academic subjects. Grant funds must be used to support programs that provide, among other things, rigorous graduate-level course work to earn a master's degree while undertaking a guided teaching apprenticeship; learning opportunities alongside a trained and experienced mentor teacher; and clear criteria for selecting mentor teachers based on measures of teacher effectiveness. Programs must place graduates in targeted schools as a cohort in order to facilitate professional collaboration and provide a 1-year living stipend or salary to members of the cohort, which must be repaid by any recipient who fails to teach full time at least 3 years in a high-need school and teach a high-need subject or area.

Partnerships may apply for funding under the Pre-Baccalaureate Preparation of Teachers program, the Teaching Residency program, or both. Partnerships may also seek separate funding under the School Leadership program described below. In addition, grant funds are available to develop digital education content to carry out the activities in partnership grants for Pre-baccalaureate Preparation of Teachers programs and partnership grants for Teaching Residency programs. No partnership may receive funds to implement a School Leadership program or to develop digital education content that has not been awarded funding under either the Pre-Baccalaureate Preparation of Teachers program or the Teaching Residency program. Partnerships are eligible to receive grants to support residency programs for up to 5 years and must provide matching funds in cash or in kind from non-Federal sources equal to at least 100 percent of the grant amount.

School Leadership program — Grants are provided to develop and implement effective school leadership programs to prepare individuals for careers as superintendents, principals, early childhood education program directors, or other school leaders. Such programs must promote strong leadership skills and techniques so that school leaders are able to:

- Create a school climate conducive to professional development for teachers;
- Understand the teaching and assessment skills needed to support successful classroom instruction;
- Use data to evaluate teacher instruction and drive teacher and student learning;
- Manage resources and time to improve academic achievement;
- Engage and involve parents and other community stakeholders; and
- Understand how students learn and develop in order to increase academic achievement.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teacher quality partnership

---

Grant funds must also be used to develop a yearlong clinical education program, a mentoring and induction program, and programs to recruit qualified individuals to become school leaders.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) provided \$100 million for the TQP program. These funds are available for obligation for 2 fiscal years. The Department expects to award these grants in early 2010.

In 2008, the program was reauthorized as part of the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA) and the name of the program was changed from the Teacher Quality Enhancement program to the Teacher Quality Partnership program. In addition, the program was extensively redesigned. In reauthorization, the State and Recruitment programs were eliminated and the Partnership program was restructured as discussed above. HEOA allows program funds to be used to implement an evaluation plan. In 2010, the Department will award a contract for an evaluation of teacher residency programs supported through grants awarded in 2009 and 2010.

The HEOA also allows for the State teacher quality accountability reporting system, established by title II, sections 205-207 of the Higher Education Act, to be funded out of the program's appropriation. Previously, the system had been funded out of the Department's salaries and expenses account or through the GPR Data/HEA Program Evaluation program. The State teacher quality accountability reporting system gathers data from all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam and the Virgin Islands on such topics as the completion rates for traditional and alternative route teacher preparation programs, and State teacher assessments and certifications. These data are reported to Congress and the Nation through the Secretary's annual report on teacher quality, and they provide critical information on both the progress toward the Nation's goal of a highly qualified teacher in every classroom, and the areas where further improvements are needed.

A variety of other programs administered by the Department also make competitive awards that support training and professional development activities that are designed to enhance teacher classroom effectiveness. These programs include the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program, authorized under Title V, Part D of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), and the Personnel Preparation program, authorized under Part D of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2006.....	\$59,895 <sup>1</sup>
2007.....	59,895 <sup>1</sup>
2008.....	33,662 <sup>1</sup>
2009.....	50,000 <sup>2</sup>
Recovery Act .....	100,000
2010 .....	43,000

---

<sup>1</sup> Funds were provided under the antecedent Teacher Quality Enhancement program.

<sup>2</sup> Of this amount, the fiscal year 2009 Appropriations Act set aside \$6,556 thousand for non-competing continuation awards under the antecedent Teacher Quality Enhancement program.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teacher quality partnership

---

#### **FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests no funding for the Teacher Quality Partnership program for fiscal year 2011. In place of this program and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted programs, the Administration proposes to create broader Excellent Instructional Teams programs through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization.

The Administration believes that this consolidated approach will be more effective in supporting State and local efforts to (1) increase the number of teachers who are not only qualified, but also effective; (2) eliminate inequities in the distribution of qualified and effective teachers and effective school leaders between high-poverty and high-minority schools and other schools; (3) reform State and local policies and practices so that teacher and school leader preparation contributes to effectiveness; (4) develop evaluation and compensation systems that recognize and reward teachers and school leaders for taking on additional responsibilities and leadership roles, are based in significant part on the teacher's or school leader's effectiveness in raising student achievement, and ensure that ineffective teachers improve or, if they do not, enter another field, based on fair, transparent procedures; (5) ensure that teachers and school leaders have access to high-quality professional development opportunities that meet their and their students' needs over the course of their careers; (6) promote collaboration among staff, the formation of instructional teams, and the use of data to improve practice; and (7) ensure that principals and other school leaders are prepared to lead efforts to turn around persistently low-performing schools.

The Excellent Instructional Teams initiatives, particularly Teacher and Leader Pathways, would allow States and districts to create or fund teacher and leader preparation programs that meet their needs by giving them the authority to spend funds on a variety of activities, including creating or funding efforts to recruit, train, and support teachers of a variety of ages and backgrounds, to teach in high-need schools or high-need subjects. Partnerships of high-need districts, States, and institutions of higher education that are eligible for funding under the Teacher Quality Partnership program would be encouraged to compete for funding under the Teacher and Leader Pathways program, for which \$405 million is requested.

In September 2009, the Department awarded \$43 million for 28 grants under the Teacher Quality Partnership program, with 12 grants supporting teacher residency programs, 9 supporting programs to improve teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate level, and 7 grants supporting both teacher residency and undergraduate teacher preparation projects. Under the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal, the fiscal year 2011 continuation costs for these grants would be funded from the appropriation for the new Teacher and Leader Pathways programs. In addition, in early 2010, the Department will award an additional \$100 million in grants using Recovery Act funds appropriated for the Teacher Quality Partnership program. These grant awards will be fully funded with Recovery Act funds and will not have continuation costs for future years.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teacher quality partnership

---

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
<u>Teacher quality enhancement</u>			
Number of continuation awards	9	0	0
Average continuation award	\$728	0	0
Amount of continuation awards	\$6,556	0	0
<u>Teacher quality partnerships</u>			
Number of new awards	28	0	0
Average new award	\$1,519	0	0
Total new award funding	\$42,552	0	0
Number of continuation awards	0	28	0
Average continuation award	0	\$2,037 <sup>1</sup>	0
Total continuation award funding	0	\$40,310 <sup>1</sup>	0
<u>Teacher quality partnerships (Recovery Act)</u>			
Number of new awards	11	0	0
Average new award	\$9,076	0	0
Total Recovery Act funding	\$100,000		
Peer review of new award applications	\$286	0	0
Evaluation	\$326	\$2,325	0
Title II Accountability Reports	\$280	\$365	0

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$57,002 thousand in FY 2011 would be provided from the appropriation for the Teacher and Leader Pathways programs.

<sup>1</sup> Continuation costs for these grants in 2010 are \$57,033 thousand, which exceeds the amount available, so the awards will be reduced accordingly.

#### **PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

##### **Performance Measures**

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, and performance measures.

In 2008, the program was reauthorized as part of the Higher Education Opportunity Act and the program was revised extensively. The Department concluded that the performance measures that had been developed for the antecedent program were no longer appropriate. As a result, the Department developed new measures for the program.

**Goal: To increase the quality of teachers in high-need schools and early childhood education programs**

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teacher quality partnership

---

**Objective:** *To increase the number of new teachers graduating from high-quality teacher preparation programs.*

**Measure:** The percentage of program completers (1) who attain initial certification/licensure by passing all necessary licensure/certification assessments and attain a bachelor's degree (pre-baccalaureate program) within 6 years or a master's degree (residency program) within 2 years or (2) who attain highly competent early childhood educator status with a bachelor's degree within 6 years or an associate's degree within 3 years.

Because this performance measure will not provide data for a number of years, the Department also created the following measure that would provide data in a shorter time-frame: The percentage of program participants who did not graduate in the previous reporting period and who persisted in the postsecondary program in the current reporting period.

**Objective:** *To improve the subject matter competency of new teachers.*

**Measure:** The percentage of grantees that report improved scores for initial State certification or licensure of teachers.

**Objective:** *To increase the retention rate of new teachers in high-need school districts.*

**Measure:** The percentage of beginning teachers who are retained in teaching in the partner high-need local educational agency (LEA) or early childhood education (ECE) program 3 years after initial employment.

Because this performance measure would not provide data for a number of years, the Department also created the following measure that would provide data in a shorter time-frame: The percentage of beginning teachers who are retained in teaching in the partner high-need LEA or ECE program 1 year after initial employment.

Data for the performance measures will come from the revised annual performance report. It is expected that initial data for these measures will not be available until fiscal year 2013 at the earliest.

### Efficiency Measure

The Department also developed an efficiency measure for this program. The measure is the cost of a successful outcome, where successful outcome is defined as retention in the partner high-need LEA or ECE program 3 years after initial employment. This measure ties in with the program's new performance indicators. Data for the efficiency measure will come from the revised annual performance report and will not be available until fiscal year 2013 at the earliest. These data will assist in program management and in improving program oversight and could be used to focus technical assistance efforts where they can be most effective.

### Other Performance Information

Using \$2 million in funds appropriated for the Teacher Quality Partnership program, the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) will award a contract in 2010 for an evaluation of projects awarded

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teacher quality partnership

---

under the teacher residency authority. The evaluation will provide both impact and implementation information to address the following research questions:

- What is the impact on student achievement of teachers who choose to participate in the Teacher Residency Program (i.e., How does their performance in the classroom compare to other novice and experienced teachers in the targeted schools)?
- What is the retention rate of the Residency program teachers in the targeted school compared to their novice colleagues who didn't go through the residency program?
- What are the characteristics of the teacher preparation program (e.g., length of overall program, nature of required coursework and apprenticeship activities, characteristics of their assigned mentor teacher, criteria for selecting program participants, etc.)?
- What are the characteristics of the teacher applicants and participants in the teacher residency program?

The evaluation would follow approximately 200 program participants as they complete the teacher residency program and for 2 years following their graduation to look at teacher classroom performance and retention rates. Based on the characteristics of the projects supported by grants awarded during the 2009 competition, NCEE would select approximately 10 programs to look at the performance in the classroom and whether graduates of teacher residency programs remain in the teaching profession. IES has not yet issued a request for proposals and statement of work for this contract, so some aspects of the proposed design and methodology for this evaluation may change.



## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teachers for a competitive tomorrow

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2006.....	0 <sup>1</sup>
2007.....	0 <sup>1</sup>
2008.....	\$1,966
2009.....	2,184
2010.....	2,184

---

<sup>1</sup> This program was not authorized prior to fiscal year 2008.

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for the Teachers for a Competitive Tomorrow program for fiscal year 2011. In place of this program and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted programs, the Administration proposes to create broader Excellent Instructional Teams programs through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization.

The Administration believes that this consolidated approach will be more effective in supporting State and local efforts to (1) increase the number of teachers who are not only qualified, but also effective; (2) eliminate inequities in the distribution of qualified and effective teachers and effective school leaders between high-poverty and high-minority schools and other schools; (3) reform State and local policies and practices so that teacher and school leader preparation contributes to effectiveness; (4) develop evaluation and compensation systems that recognize and reward teachers and school leaders for taking on additional responsibilities and leadership roles, are based in significant part on the teacher's or school leader's effectiveness in raising student achievement, and ensure that ineffective teachers improve or, if they do not, enter another field, based on fair, transparent procedures; (5) ensure that teachers and school leaders have access to high-quality professional development opportunities that meet their and their students' needs over the course of their careers; (6) promote collaboration among staff, the formation of instructional teams, and the use of data to improve practice; and (7) ensure that principals and other school leaders are prepared to lead efforts to turn around persistently low-performing schools.

The Excellent Instructional Teams initiatives, particularly Teacher and Leader Pathways, would allow States and districts to create or fund teacher and leader preparation programs that meet their needs by giving them the authority to spend funds on a variety of activities, including creating or funding efforts to recruit, train, and support teachers of a variety of ages and backgrounds, to teach in high-need schools or high-need subjects. Institutions of higher education that are eligible for funding under the Teachers for a Competitive Tomorrow program would be encouraged to partner with States and districts to compete for funding under the Teacher and Leader Pathways program, for which \$405 million is requested. In addition, the proposed Investing in Innovation program would dedicate \$150 million towards STEM projects and include a cross-cutting emphasis on technology.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teachers for a competitive tomorrow

---

Under the reauthorization proposal, the FY 2011 continuation costs for existing grants under the Teachers for a Competitive Tomorrow program would be funded from the appropriation for the new Teacher and Leader Pathways programs.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
<u>Baccalaureate Program</u>			
Number of continuation awards	5	5	0
Average continuation award	\$218	\$218	0
Total continuation award funding	\$1,092	\$1,092	0
Total award funding	\$1,092	\$1,092	0
Total number of awards	5	5	0
 <u>Master's Program</u>			
Number of new awards	0	1	0
Average new award	0	\$1,081	0
Total new award funding	0	\$1,081	0
Number of continuation awards	2	0	0
Average continuation award	\$500	0	0
Total continuation award funding	\$1,001	0	0
Total award funding	\$1,001	\$1,081	0
Total number of awards	2	1	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$11	0
Total program funding	\$2,093 <sup>1</sup>	\$2,184	0
Total number of awards	7	6	0

---

NOTE: Continuation costs of \$1,188 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Teacher and Leader Pathways programs.

<sup>1</sup> Excludes \$91 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**

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

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### **Teachers for a competitive tomorrow**

---

resources provided in previous years and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Three performance measures have been established for this program. The first measure is the percentage of program participants earning a Bachelor's or a Master's degree and certification or licensure in a science, technology, engineering or mathematics (STEM) or critical foreign language (CFL) area. The second performance measure is the percentage of program participants who become a teacher of record in a high-need school. The final performance measure is the percentage of program participants who remain teaching in the STEM or CFL area in a high-need school for 3 or more years. The Department will have published data for the new measures by the spring of 2010.

### **Efficiency Measures**

The efficiency measure for this program is the cost of a successful outcome, where success is defined as a program participant who remains in teaching in the STEM or CFL area in a high need school for 3 or more years. This is a new measure linked to the program's other performance measures.

The data used to calculate the efficiency measure will come from the program's annual performance report. The Department expects to have the data necessary to calculate this measure in the spring of 2010.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Teach for America

(Higher Education Act of 1965, Title VIII, Part F)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$18,000	0	-\$18,000

---

<sup>1</sup> The program is authorized in FY 2011; however, the program is proposed for consolidation under new legislation to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Higher Education Opportunity Act, authorizes the Secretary to award a 5-year grant to Teach for America, Inc. (TFA), a nonprofit organization that recruits outstanding recent college graduates who commit to teach for 2 years in underserved communities in the United States. The purpose of the program is to enable TFA to implement and expand its program for recruiting, selecting, training, and supporting new teachers. With these funds, the grantee is required to: (1) provide highly qualified teachers to serve in high-need local educational agencies in urban and rural communities; (2) pay the costs of recruiting, selecting, training, and supporting new teachers; and (3) serve a substantial number and percentage of underserved students.

In order to satisfy these requirements, grant funds may be used for the following activities: (1) recruiting and selecting teachers through TFA's highly selective national process; (2) providing pre-service training to such teachers through a rigorous summer institute that includes hands-on teaching experience and significant exposure to education coursework and theory; (3) finding placements for these teachers in schools and positions designated by high-need local educational agencies as high-need placements serving underserved students; and (4) providing ongoing professional development activities for these teachers during their first 2 years in the classroom, including regular classroom observations and feedback, and ongoing training and support. The grantee may use up to 5 percent of these grant funds to support non-programmatic activities that are not related directly to the recruitment, selection, training, and support of teachers.

The grantee is required to submit an annual report to the Department that must include data on indicators related to the number and quality of the teachers placed in local educational agencies using grant funds, such as: (1) the background of the teachers selected to participate; (2) the training these teachers received through the grant; (3) where these teachers were placed by TFA; (4) the professional development these teachers received; and (5) the retention of these teachers. The annual report must also include an external evaluation of the satisfaction of local educational agencies and principals with teachers placed in their districts and schools through this grant.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teach for America

---

The grantee is also required to enter into a contract with an independent auditor to conduct a comprehensive review of the grantee's accounting, financial reporting, and internal control systems. This review must assess whether that grantee's accounting, financial reporting, and internal control systems are designed to: (1) provide information that is complete, accurate, and reliable; (2) reasonably detect and prevent material misstatements, as well as fraud, waste, and abuse; and (3) provide information to demonstrate the grantee's compliance with related Federal requirements, as applicable. The independent auditor must complete this review within 90 days of the grantee's first receipt of funding under this program authority and submit a report to the members of the Congressional authorizing committee and the Department, within 120 days of grantee's first receipt of funding, that contains the auditor's findings and any recommendations as appropriate, with respect to the grantee's accounting, financial reporting, and internal control systems.

In addition, the Department is required to use a portion of funds appropriated for this program for a study that examines the achievement levels of the students taught by the teachers assisted through this grant. The study must compare, within schools with a participating teacher, the achievement gains made by students taught by teachers who were assisted through this grant with the achievement gains made by students taught by teachers who were not assisted through this grant. The Department is required to conduct such a study not less than once every 3 years, and each such study must include multiple placement sites and multiple schools within placement sites. The study must meet the peer review standards of the education research community and must include reviewers who are practicing researchers and have expertise in assessment systems, accountability, psychometric measurement and statistics, and instruction.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2006.....	0
2007.....	0 <sup>1</sup>
2008.....	0 <sup>2</sup>
2009.....	0 <sup>3</sup>
2010.....	\$18,000

---

<sup>1</sup> \$4,930 thousand awarded as an unsolicited grant under the Fund for the Improvement of Education.

<sup>2</sup> \$11,790 thousand awarded as an unsolicited grant under the Fund for the Improvement of Education.

<sup>3</sup> \$14,894 thousand awarded as an unsolicited grant under the Fund for the Improvement of Education.

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for the TFA program for fiscal year 2011. In place of this program and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted programs, the Administration proposes to create broader Excellent Instructional Teams programs through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization.

The Administration believes that this consolidated approach will be more effective in supporting State and local efforts to (1) increase the number of teachers who are not only qualified, but

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teach for America

---

also effective; (2) eliminate inequities in the distribution of qualified and effective teachers and effective school leaders between high-poverty and high-minority schools and other schools; (3) reform State and local policies and practices so that teacher and school leader preparation contributes to effectiveness; (4) develop evaluation and compensation systems that recognize and reward teachers and school leaders for taking on additional responsibilities and leadership roles, are based in significant part on the teacher's or school leader's effectiveness in raising student achievement, and ensure that ineffective teachers improve or, if they do not, enter another field, based on fair, transparent procedures; (5) ensure that teachers and school leaders have access to high-quality professional development opportunities that meet their and their students' needs over the course of their careers; (6) promote collaboration among staff, the formation of instructional teams, and the use of data to improve practice; and (7) ensure that principals and other school leaders are prepared to lead efforts to turn around persistently low-performing schools.

The Excellent Instructional Teams initiatives, particularly Teacher and Leader Pathways, would allow States and districts to create or fund teacher and leader preparation programs that meet their needs by giving them the authority to spend funds on a variety of activities, including creating or funding efforts to recruit, train, and support teachers of a variety of ages and backgrounds, to teach in high-need schools or high-need subjects. Teach for America, in partnership with States and districts, could compete for funding under the Teacher and Leader Pathways program, for which \$405 million is requested. In addition, Teach for America could compete for funding under the Investing in Innovation program and could partner with States in their applications for funds under the Race to the Top program. States may also use funds awarded under the Effective Teachers and Leaders State grants program to support Teach for America projects.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
TFA corps members recruited and trained	0	4,200 <sup>1</sup>	0

<sup>1</sup> Estimate based on the 4,100 TFA corps members recruited, selected, and trained in 2009 with support that included \$14,894 thousand from an unsolicited grant awarded under the Fund for the Improvement of Education.

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

By expanding the pool of qualified candidates for teaching positions in schools serving students from low-income communities, TFA seeks to redress educational inequities and ensure that disadvantaged students have teachers committed to helping them succeed at high levels. In the past several years, various studies have been published that examined whether TFA has achieved this goal by placing teachers who are as effective as teachers hired through other mechanisms, as measured by student achievement on academic assessments. The majority of non-TFA teachers are prepared through traditional programs within colleges of education, which include more coursework on pedagogical approaches to improve student learning and require

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teach for America

---

supervised practical experience teaching in a classroom setting. The key research question is whether the TFA approach of selecting college seniors and recent graduates with exceptional academic credentials, who then undergo intensive training in a summer institute, can produce teachers who are as effective as teachers who complete traditional programs.

Although numerous studies of TFA have been conducted in the last decade, this section only includes studies that addressed whether TFA teachers are as effective as other teachers. This discussion is further limited to studies that employed rigorous research designs (randomized controlled trials or analyses of longitudinal data that employed fixed-effects models to control for differences in the characteristics of the students in classrooms to which teachers are assigned). Generally, studies have found that TFA teachers in mathematics courses were either slightly more effective (Decker, Mayer, and Glazerman, 2004; Kane, Rockoff, and Staiger, 2006; Xu, Hannaway, and Taylor 2007) or as effective as non-TFA teachers (Boyd, Grossman, Lankford, Loeb and Wyckoff, 2006). Most of these studies found no difference between TFA teachers and non-TFA teachers in English/language arts courses (Decker, Mayer, and Glazerman, 2004; Kane, Rockoff, and Staiger, 2006). One study found that comparable test score gains were slightly lower for students taught by TFA teachers than non-TFA teachers on English/language arts assessments (Boyd, Grossman, Lankford, Loeb and Wyckoff, 2006), and one study found small test score gains for TFA teachers relative to non-TFA teachers across all subjects, including English/language arts (Xu, Hannaway, and Taylor 2007). The Xu, Hannaway, and Taylor study found that the effect of having a TFA teacher was stronger than that of years of teacher experience or full certification in the subject area.

The Department is currently conducting an evaluation of the impact of teachers selected through two highly selective alternative certification programs, TFA and The New Teacher Project, on the achievement of students in secondary school mathematics courses. The study randomly assigned students to either a teacher who entered through a highly selective route to alternative certification or another teacher who teaches the same math course at the same school. The sample of teachers who entered through highly selective alternative routes is equally divided between teachers selected through the Teach for America and The New Teacher Project programs. The study involves approximately 112 schools in up to 20 school districts, with a focus on 300 secondary school math teachers and their approximately 18,000 students and involves roughly equal samples of middle school and high school teachers. The research questions examined by this study include:

- What is the impact on student math achievement of secondary school math teachers who entered teaching through two highly selective alternative routes relative to other math teachers in the same schools?
- What is the impact on student math achievement of secondary school math teachers who entered teaching through Teach for America relative to other math teachers in the same schools?

This study will be completed by 2012. More information is available on the Institute of Education Sciences website at: [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq\\_alternative.asp](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_alternative.asp).

With the significant increase of \$250 million for State longitudinal data systems provided under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, many more States will develop longitudinal data

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teach for America

---

systems that allow State and local educational agencies to link data on students, teachers, and schools. The availability of longitudinal information on the pathways through which teachers enter the profession and on their academic background would enable policymakers and researchers to more accurately track the effects of Federal, State, and local investments in programs and approaches, such as Teach for America, to improve teacher quality.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### School leadership

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

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$29,220	0	-\$29,220

---

<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 School Leadership program provides competitive grants to assist high-need local educational agencies (LEAs) in recruiting, training, and retaining principals and assistant principals. A high-need LEA is defined as one that: (1) serves at least 10,000 children from low-income families or serves a community in which at least 20 percent of the children are from low-income families, and (2) has a high percentage of teachers teaching either outside of their area of certification or with emergency, provisional, or temporary certification.

Entities eligible for grants include high-need LEAs, nonprofit organizations, and institutions of higher education. Grantees may use their funds to recruit and retain individuals to serve as principals in high-need LEAs by: (1) providing financial incentives to aspiring new principals, (2) providing stipends to principals who mentor new principals, (3) carrying out professional development programs in instructional leadership and management, and (4) providing incentives that are appropriate for teachers or individuals from other fields who want to become principals and that are effective in retaining new principals.

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

	(\$000s)
2006.....	\$14,731
2007.....	14,731
2008.....	14,474
2009.....	19,220
2010.....	29,220

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for School Leadership for fiscal year 2011. In place of several, sometimes narrowly targeted programs that serve current and prospective teachers and school leaders, the Administration proposes to create broader Excellent Instructional

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### School leadership

---

Teams programs through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization. Recognizing the importance of leadership in educational improvement, these programs would significantly increase support for strengthening school leadership and increasing the number of effective principals leading high-need and low-performing schools.

The Administration believes that this consolidated approach will be more effective in supporting State and local efforts to (1) increase the number of teachers who are not only qualified, but also effective; (2) eliminate inequities in the distribution of qualified and effective teachers and effective school leaders between high-poverty and high-minority schools and other schools; (3) reform State and local policies and practices so that teacher and school leader preparation contributes to effectiveness; (4) develop evaluation and compensation systems that recognize and reward teachers and school leaders for taking on additional responsibilities and leadership roles, are based in significant part on the teacher's or school leader's effectiveness in raising student achievement, and ensure that ineffective teachers improve or, if they do not, enter another field, based on fair, transparent procedures; (5) ensure that teachers and school leaders have access to high-quality professional development opportunities that meet their and their students' needs over the course of their careers; (6) promote collaboration among staff, the formation of instructional teams, and the use of data to improve practice; and (7) ensure that principals and other school leaders are prepared to lead efforts to turn around persistently low-performing schools.

Training for current and prospective school leaders will be a key component of the Excellent Instructional Teams initiatives because of the importance of school leadership in education reform and innovation, and particularly in turning around low-performing schools. Each State would use a portion of its Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grant for activities to improve the quality of the State's school leadership, particularly in high-need and low-performing schools. In addition, the Department would make competitive Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund grants for innovative strategies by States and LEAs to raise the quality of teaching and school leadership, including by empowering principals in high-need schools with greater authority to select effective instructional teams for their schools.

Finally, the proposed Teacher and Leader Pathways program would also support the recruitment, preparation, and retention of effective principals and school leadership teams with the skills to turn around low-performing schools. Competitive grants made under this program would help prepare principals and school leadership teams to significantly improve student achievement in low-performing schools, and help recruit and train LEA and State educational agency (SEA) managers who are able to lead transformational change in their States and LEAs.

Under the Administration's reauthorization proposal, School Leadership continuation grant costs of approximately \$29.1 million would be funded from the appropriation for the new Teacher and Leader Pathways programs.

If Congress does not reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act prior to the 2011 appropriation, the Administration believes its requested increase for ESEA programs should be devoted to programs best positioned to reform K-12 education such as the School Leadership program and would seek funding of \$79.2 million for this program, \$50.0 million more than the fiscal year 2010 appropriation, for continuation grant costs and approximately 25 new awards.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### School leadership

---

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Funding for new awards	\$3,909	\$11,842 <sup>1</sup>	0
Number of new awards	7	20	0
Average new award	\$558	\$592	0
Funding for continuation awards	\$15,215	\$21,085	0
Number of continuation awards	22	29	0
Average continuation award	\$692	\$727	0
Technical assistance	0	0	0
Evaluation	\$96	\$146	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$147	0

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$29,100 thousand in fiscal year 2011 would be provided from the appropriation for the Teacher and Leader Pathways programs.

<sup>1</sup> Funding for new awards in 2010 includes \$4,000 thousand earmarked in the Department's FY 2009 appropriation act (under the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program) for teacher and principal quality national activities.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

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

The Department has established the following goal with two objectives and corresponding performance indicators to measure the impact of the School Leadership program:

**Goal: To increase the number of new, certified principals and assistant principals and to improve the skills of current practicing principals and assistant principals, all serving in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.**

**Objective:** *To recruit, prepare, and support teachers and individuals from other fields to become principals, including assistant principals, in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.*

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### School leadership

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of participants who become certified as principals and assistant principals.				
Year	Target		Actual	
	Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 2	Cohort 3
2006	30		43	
2007	50		65	
2008	60			
2009				
2010				
2011				

**Assessment of progress:** These measures track participants who are enrolled in projects designed to train and certify new principals and assistant principals. Grantees report data through annual performance reports. (—Cohorts 2 and 3” refer to the participants in the projects initiated in FY 2005 and FY 2008, respectively.) In 2006, 43 percent of Cohort 2 participants had become certified, exceeding the target of 30 percent and, in 2007, 65 percent of these participants had become certified, exceeding the target of 50 percent. The Department will use 2008 data, which will be available in Spring 2010, to set a baseline and targets for the third cohort of grantees.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of program completers earning certification as a principal or assistant principal who are employed in those positions in high-need schools in high-need local educational agencies (LEAs).				
Year	Target		Actual	
	Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 2	Cohort 3
2006	40		68	
2007	50		54	
2008	60			
2009				
2010				
2011				

**Assessment of progress:** In 2006, 68 percent of those certified in Cohort 2 had achieved similar employment, exceeding the target of 40 percent, and in 2007, 54 percent of these certified participants became so employed, decreasing from the previous year but still exceeding the target of 50 percent.

**Objective:** *To provide professional development, coaching, mentoring, and other support activities to current practicing principals and assistant principals in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.*

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### School leadership

---

**Measure:** The percentage of participating principals and assistant principals who complete structured professional development.

Year	Target		Actual	
	Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 2	Cohort 3
2006	60		99	
2007	75		99	
2008	75			
2009				
2010				
2011				

**Assessment of progress:** This measure tracks participants who are, at the time of their participation, already serving as principals or assistant principals and who complete professional development in the area of school leadership. It, therefore, tracks performance for the in-service element of the program, unlike the other measures, which track performance of the program in preparing new administrators and placing them in high-need schools. Grantees report data through annual performance reports, and the program office verifies and analyzes these data against the core indicators for the program. In 2006, 99 percent of principals and assistant principals in the second cohort of grantees who participated in structured professional development had completed the training programs, exceeding the target of 60 percent. In 2007, 99 percent of principals and assistant principals in the second cohort of grantees who participated in structured professional development had completed the training programs, exceeding the target of 75 percent. Final performance data for the second cohort, including 2008 data, will be available in 2010. The Department will use 2008 data, which will be available in Spring 2010, to establish a baseline and targets for the third cohort of grantees. Because virtually all participants appear to meet the goal, the Department may also retire this measure.

The Department established the following two, new performance measures as part of the 2008 grant competition for assessing the effectiveness of the School Leadership program:

(1) the percentage of participants who become certified principals or assistant principals and who are then placed and retained in schools in high-need LEAs, and (2) the percentage of principals or assistant principals who participate in professional development activities, show an increase in their pre-post scores on a standardized measure of principal skills, and are retained in their positions in schools in high-need LEAs for at least 2 years. Grantees, starting with the cohort first funded in FY 2008, will be expected to provide data on each component of these measures.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Expanding Educational Options

(Proposed legislation)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
0	\$490,000	+\$490,000

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The purpose of the proposed Expanding Educational Options program would be to increase the supply of high-quality public educational options available to students, especially students attending low-performing schools, by creating and expanding effective charter and other autonomous schools and by supporting the implementation of comprehensive systems of public school choice. All grantees would also be required to fund or operate parent information and outreach programs to make families and students aware of these options.

The Administration's reauthorization proposal for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) will include two separate grant competitions within the Expanding Educational Options program: Supporting Effective Charter Schools Grants and Promoting Public School Choice Grants. The Department would reserve up to 5 percent of the appropriation for national research, data collection, technical assistance to grantees, and dissemination activities. The Secretary would also be authorized to use program funds to continue grants made prior to reauthorization for programs being consolidated as part of the reauthorization.

The Department would, under the Supporting Effective Charter Schools competition, make competitive grants to State educational agencies (SEAs), charter school authorizers, charter management organizations (CMOs), local educational agencies (LEAs), and other nonprofit organizations to start or expand effective charter and other autonomous schools. Autonomous schools would be defined as charter and other public schools that have autonomy over key areas of their operations, including staffing, budget, time, and program, and are subject to higher levels of accountability than other public schools. The Department would work to ensure that funding is focused on the creation of high-quality schools by selecting applicants based on their record of success in supporting, overseeing, or operating (depending on the type of grantee) effective charter and other autonomous schools, including their record of closing (or terminating funding for, depending on the type of grantee) ineffective charter and other autonomous schools, as appropriate, and their commitment to start schools that would expand options for students attending low-performing schools. In addition, the Department would give priority to applicants proposing to create or expand charter schools. Grantees would use funds to: (1) open or expand one or more charter or other autonomous schools; (2) develop and implement strategies and activities to provide parents, students, and the community with information about how to identify, evaluate, and access high-quality educational options; and (3) share information on promising practices and successful school models. The Department may also make competitive grants to SEAs, LEAs, financial institutions, and other entities for the

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Expanding educational options

---

purposes of (a) improving access of charter schools to facilities and (b) improving access of charter schools to facilities funding and finance.

The Department would also administer a second competition, Promoting Public School Choice, to make grant awards on a competitive basis to LEAs, and to SEAs in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs. Grantees would use funds to develop and implement programs of public school choice that increase the range of high-quality educational options available to students, including options that bring together students of diverse backgrounds. Grantees would be required to provide options for students in low-performing schools, and encouraged to provide more comprehensive systems of choice. Grantees would use funds to: (1) create and implement a comprehensive school choice plan, which may include creating or expanding inter- and intra-district choice programs; magnet school programs; online learning programs; or academic pathways, and (2) develop and implement strategies and activities to provide parents, students, and the community with information about how to identify, evaluate, and access high-quality educational options.

### **FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST**

For fiscal year 2011, the Administration requests \$490 million for the proposed Expanding Educational Options program. The new program would expand on existing programs that support school improvement by focusing on improving educational outcomes for students and providing real, high-quality school choice to students and parents by funding effective charter and other effective autonomous schools; providing resources to States and districts in implementing comprehensive systems of choice that improve public school options for students; and supporting the development and implementation of parent information and outreach programs.

The Administration recognizes the importance of and need for continued support of efforts to increase the availability of high-quality educational options within the public school system and to provide all families with such options and the information they need to select them. The Expanding Educational Options program would strengthen and expand the purposes of the Department's current school choice activities, while focusing funding on those showing results.

Within the \$490 million requested for the first year of this program, the Department would reserve the following:

- \$287.0 million for Supporting Effective Charter Schools Grants, which would provide support for SEAs, charter school authorizers, CMOs, LEAs and nonprofit organizations to start or expand effective charter schools and other effective autonomous schools;
- \$25.7 million for Promoting Public School Choice Grants, which would support State and district efforts to develop and implement comprehensive school choice programs;
- \$16.5 million for national activities, which would support research, data collection, technical assistance to grantees, and dissemination activities; and

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Expanding educational options

---

- \$160.7 million for continuation awards for projects originally funded under the following programs: Charter Schools (including State Facilities Incentive Grants and Credit Enhancement), Voluntary Public School Choice, and Smaller Learning Communities.

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

	<u>2011</u>
<u>Supporting Effective Charter Schools Grants</u>	
Amount for grants	\$286,543
Peer review of new award applications	\$500
National activities	\$11,000
Continuation costs for antecedent programs	\$101,957
<u>Promoting Public School Choice Grants</u>	
Amount for grants	\$25,621
Peer review of new award applications	\$100
National activities	\$5,500
Continuation costs for antecedent programs	\$58,779

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$101,957 thousand in fiscal year 2011 would be provided under Supporting Effective Charter School Grants to fund continuation awards (through their scheduled completion) for grants made under the following programs prior to enactment of the reauthorization: Charter Schools (\$52,925 thousand), State Charter School Facilities Incentive Grants (\$14,782 thousand), and Smaller Learning Communities (\$34,250 thousand).

Continuation costs of approximately \$58,779 thousand in fiscal year 2011 would be provided under Promoting Public School Choice Grants to fund continuation awards (through their scheduled completion) for grants made under the following programs prior to enactment of the reauthorization: Voluntary Public School Choice (\$24,529 thousand) and Smaller Learning Communities (\$34,250 thousand).

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Program performance would be assessed through annual grantee reporting on indicators established by the Secretary, such as student achievement, attendance, graduation rates, and the number of students enrolled in high-quality educational options.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Charter schools grants

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

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$256,031 <sup>2</sup>	0	-\$256,031

---

<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> From the amount appropriated for charter schools in FY 2010, the appropriations language permits the Secretary to use up to \$23,082 thousand for Charter Schools Facilities Incentive Grants and Credit Enhancement for Charter Schools Facilities and up to \$50,000 thousand to make awards to charter management organizations and other nonprofit entities for replication and expansion of successful charter school models.

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Charter Schools program (CSP) supports the planning, development, and initial implementation of charter schools, which provide enhanced parental choice and, in exchange for stricter accountability, are exempt from many statutory and regulatory requirements.

State educational agencies (SEAs) that have the authority under State law to approve charter schools are eligible to compete for grants. If an eligible SEA does not participate in the grant competition, charter schools from the State may apply directly to the Secretary. Grantees receive up to 3 years of assistance, of which they may use not more than 18 months for planning and program design and not more than 2 years for the initial implementation of a charter school.

In awarding grants, the Department must give preference to States that have multiple chartering agencies (or an appeals process for prospective charter schools that initially fail to be approved by a single agency), that ensure the accountability of public charter schools for reaching clear and measurable objectives, and that give public charter schools a high degree of autonomy over their budgets and expenditures. Further, States may reserve up to 10 percent of their grant for dissemination sub-grants to spread information (about how to create and sustain high-quality accountable schools) from high-quality charter schools with a demonstrated history of success to other public schools, including other charter schools.

Under the authorizing statute, the Secretary must use the amount appropriated above \$200 million, but not exceeding \$300 million, to make competitive 5-year grants for the State Facilities program. States eligible for these grants are those with per-pupil aid programs to assist charter schools with their school facility costs. Federal funds are used to match State-funded programs that make payments to provide charter schools with facilities financing. States pay an increasing share of the cost of the program. Of funds appropriated in excess of \$300 million, 50 percent must be used for the State Charter School Facilities Incentive Grant program and 50 percent for the other authorized activities. In fiscal year 2010, the

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Charter schools grants

---

appropriations act revised these allocation rules to permit the Secretary to use up to \$23.082 million for the State Facilities and Credit Enhancement for Charter Schools Facilities programs and up to \$50 million to make multiple awards to charter management organizations and other nonprofit entities for the replication and expansion of successful charter school models. This language also directed the Department to submit a report detailing the Department's planned uses of the fiscal year 2010 appropriation for the Charter Schools Program (CSP). The 2010 appropriations language also allows the Secretary to reserve \$10 million to fund technical assistance, evaluation, research, and dissemination of information on charter schools and model programs.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2006.....	\$214,782
2007.....	214,783
2008.....	211,031
2009.....	216,031
2010.....	256,031

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Charter Schools Program (CSP) for fiscal year 2011. While supporting the creation and expansion of charter schools will remain a priority, the Administration proposes to create a larger, more expansive program, Expanding Educational Options, that addresses the need to increase the supply of high-quality educational options available to students attending low-performing schools by creating and expanding effective charter schools and other effective autonomous schools and by providing additional high-quality educational options for students.

Reducing the number of small, narrowly targeted programs is an important priority for the Administration, as the proliferation of these fragmented funding streams has resulted in inefficiencies at the Federal, State and local level, with grantees dealing with numerous small grant competitions with different applications and requirements, rather than focusing on improving outcomes for students, and the Department focusing on running separate grant competitions and monitoring compliance under many different programs, rather than focusing on providing strong support and directing funding to proven or promising practices.

This new program would replace current Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) programs that support choice-based models of school reform as well as family outreach. The Expanding Educational Options program would include two separate grant competitions: (1) Supporting Effective Charter Schools Grants and (2) Promoting Public School Choice Grants. Under the Supporting Effective Charter Schools Grants competition, State educational agencies, charter school authorizers, charter support organizations, charter management organizations, and other nonprofit organizations in partnership with LEAs would be eligible to apply for competitive grants to start or expand effective charter schools and other effective autonomous schools. The Department would work to ensure the creation of quality schools by selecting applicants based on their record of success in supporting, overseeing, or operating

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Charter schools grants

---

(depending on the type of grantee) effective charter and other autonomous schools, including their record of closing ineffective charter and other autonomous schools, as appropriate, and their commitment to starting schools that would expand options for students attending low-performing schools. In addition, the Department would give priority to applicants proposing to create or expand charter schools. Funds could also be available for competitive grants for charter schools facilities programs. Under the Promoting Public School Choice Grants competition, LEAs, individually or in a consortium, and SEAs in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs, would be eligible to apply for competitive grants to develop and implement a comprehensive choice program that increases the range of high-quality educational options available to students and improves the academic achievement of students attending low-performing schools. Grant activities could include creating or expanding inter- and intra-district choice programs, magnet schools, academic pathways, and online learning programs. Under both grant programs, grantees would be required to develop and implement strategies to inform parents and students about the availability and accessibility of high-quality educational options.

The fiscal year 2011 request for the Expanding Educational Options program would include funds to pay continuation costs for Charter School grants made in previous years.

The Administration will work closely with the Congress to enact a ESEA reauthorization proposal and carry out a fundamental restructuring of Federal funding for education. The 2011 request for this program reflects enactment of this proposal. However, if ESEA is not reauthorized prior to the 2011 appropriation, the Administration would still seek \$310 million in fiscal year 2011 for the Charter Schools program, an increase of \$54 million.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
<u>Charter Schools Grants</u>			
Amount for new awards	\$85,274	\$127,237	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$103,043	\$45,562	0
Number of schools supported	1,200	1,400-1,600	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$150	\$150	0
<u>Charter Management Organization Grants</u>			
Amount for new awards	0	\$49,850	0
Amount for continuation awards	0	0	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$150	0
<u>Facilities Incentive Grants</u>			
Amount for new awards	\$12,706	0	0
Amount for continuation awards	0	\$14,782	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$25	0	0

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Charter schools grants

---

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
National activities, including evaluation	\$6,533	\$10,000	0

NOTES: Continuation costs of \$67,707 thousand in FY 2011, including \$52,925 thousand for Charter Schools Grants and \$14,782 thousand for Facilities Incentive Grants programs, would be provided from the appropriation for the Expanding Educational Options program.

The amounts shown on this table do not include \$8,300 thousand in FYs 2009 and 2010 for the Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program, which are shown in the program output measures for that activity.

#### **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 support the creation of a large number of high-quality charter schools.**

***Objective:** To encourage the development of a large number of high-quality charter schools that are free from State or local rules that inhibit flexible operation, are held accountable for enabling students to reach challenging State performance standards, and are open to all students.*

<b>Measure:</b> The number of States that have charter school legislation (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico).		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	44	41
2007	44	41
2008	44	41
2009	44	41
2010	44	
2011	44	

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Charter schools grants

<b>Measure:</b> The number of charter schools in operation around the Nation.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	3,600	3,997
2007	3,900	4,155
2008	4,290	4,376
2009	4,720	
2010	5,191	
2011	5,710	

**Assessment of progress:** The number of States that have charter school legislation has plateaued in recent years. The remaining States without charter school laws are mainly rural (e.g., South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia). Meanwhile, the number of charter schools opening each of the past 3 years has continued to increase steadily. Data are supplied annually by State educational agencies and are verified by Department staff.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of fourth-grade charter school students who are achieving at or above proficient on State assessments in reading.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		64.1
2008	69.2	69.1
2009	74.4	
2010	79.5	
2011	84.6	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of fourth-grade students in charter schools who are achieving at or above proficient on State assessments in mathematics.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		61.5
2008	67	68.1
2009	72.5	
2010	78	
2011	83.5	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of eighth-grade charter school students who are achieving at or above proficient on State assessments in reading.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		64.6
2008	69.7	67.8
2009	74.7	
2010	79.8	
2011	84.8	

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Charter schools grants

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of eighth-grade students in charter schools who are achieving at or above proficient on State assessments in mathematics		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		51.1
2008	58.1	56.6
2009	65.1	
2010	72.1	
2011	79.1	

**Assessment of progress:** The program made progress on these measures in 2008, with sizeable increases in the percentage of fourth- and eighth-grade students who achieved at or above proficient on State assessments in reading and mathematics between school years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008. In 2008, fourth-grade charter school students were within one-tenth of 1 percent from the performance target in reading and exceeded the performance target in mathematics. At the eighth grade level, the percentage of students who were achieving at or above proficiency on State assessments increased by more than 3 percent in reading and by more than 5 percent in mathematics between 2007 and 2008, but did not meet the established performance targets, which are based on the ESEA, Title I statutory goal of ensuring that all students are proficient in reading and mathematics by 2014. Analysis of these data showed that there is notable variation in performance among the schools funded. The 2009 data, reflecting the 2008-2009 school year, are expected to be available in the spring of 2010.

### Efficiency Measures

The Department also has implemented an efficiency measure to assess the State Charter School Facilities Incentive Grant program by examining the ratio of funds leveraged by States to funds awarded by the Department. The leveraging ratio is the total funds available (the Federal grant and the State match) divided by the Federal grant for a specific year. This program was first funded in fiscal year 2004 and awarded 5-year grants to four States.

<b>Measure:</b> The ratio of funds leveraged by States for charter facilities to funds awarded by the Department under the State Charter School Facilities Incentive Grant Program.				
Year	Cohort 1		Cohort 2	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
2006	2.7	5.3		
2007	3.1	5.8		
2008	7.0	44.8		
2010			4.0	
2011			5.0	

**Assessment of progress:** Between 2006 and 2008, the program far exceeded its performance targets, as shown in the chart below. In 2008, the fifth year of the grant, the leveraging ratio increased to 44.8, exceeding the Department's performance target more than four-fold. The Department reconfirmed the data provided by the four State grantees and determined that the figures were accurate and that the high ratio was due to one grantee

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Charter schools grants

---

achieving an exceptionally high leveraging ratio of 50.5. The targets, beginning in 2010, reflect a new performance cycle for the second cohort of grants and may need to be adjusted once baseline data are received. The Department expects to have baseline data available by the summer of 2010.

The Department has also developed a second outcome-based efficiency measure to capture the cost efficiency, across States, of the Federal investment in supporting charter school start-ups. The measure is defined as the Federal cost per student of launching a successful school (defined as a school in operation for 3 or more years). Data for school year 2006-2007 show an average cost of \$866 per student and in school year 2007-2008 an average cost of \$768 per student. Efficiency data, collected through annual grantee performance reports, will assist the Department in determining what constitutes a reasonable cost per student based on different program types and grade levels.

### Other Performance Information

In fiscal year 2003, the Department launched its first impact evaluation of the federally supported Charter Schools Program. The study is addressing the following research issues: the impact of charter school strategies on student achievement, school success, and satisfaction; the impact on parent satisfaction; school factors or characteristics independent of, or associated with, charters, that affect student outcomes (e.g., school or class size, proportion of certified teachers); and the extent to which the degree of autonomy or the policy environment in which the schools operate influences their effectiveness. Approximately 40-50 charter middle schools are participating in this random assignment study. The researchers are following two treatment groups of students and a control group for two consecutive grade levels and also will survey students, parents, and principals. The analysis will then examine how the policy conditions contribute to student achievement. The Department expects the final evaluation report to be available this spring.

A number of studies of charter schools' effectiveness have shown mixed results, but together suggest that charter schools with more experience provide added value when compared to conventional public schools, and that charter schools serving at-risk students can be effective in improving academic achievement. For example, *Achievement in Charter Schools and Regular Public Schools in the United States: Understanding the Differences*, a national study released in 2004 by Harvard University, showed that students in charter schools outperformed their peers in traditional public schools on State reading and math assessments. Students in charter schools were 5.2 percent more likely to be proficient in reading and 3.2 percent more likely to be proficient in math than students in matched public schools. The study also found that the longer a charter school had been in operation, the better students in that charter school performed in comparison to students in traditional public schools.

A 2009 study, *Multiple Choice: Charter School Performance in 16 States*, by researchers at Stanford University's Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO), examined longitudinal student-level data from a sample of 2,403 charter schools across 15 States and the District of Columbia to determine whether students who attend charter schools performed better academically than if they had attended a traditional public school. The researchers found that students in more than 80 percent of the 2,403 charter schools in their sample performed either

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Charter schools grants

---

the same or worse than students in traditional public schools on mathematics tests. More specifically, 17 percent of charter schools in the sample demonstrated significant growth in mathematics compared to traditional public schools in the sample. Forty-six percent of charter schools produced math gains that were indistinguishable from the average growth among traditional public schools. The remaining 37 percent of charter schools in the sample posted gains that were significantly below what those students would have seen if enrolled in a traditional public school instead. The researchers also performed a State-by-State analysis of charter school results and found that the effectiveness of charter schools varies widely by State and depends greatly on each State's charter school law and policies, including whether a State has imposed caps and allowed for multiple authorizers. Further, the national analysis showed that, in general, charter schools have different effects on students of different family backgrounds. For students from low-income families or English language learners, charter schools had a larger, more positive effect academically compared to similar students in traditional public schools. The researchers also found that students perform better in charter schools over time, with first-year charter students on average experiencing some decline in learning, but in the second and third years these same students experience positive academic gains.

Several studies have used more a rigorous experimental research design to compare the performance of students who were admitted by lottery into oversubscribed charter schools and those who were not admitted and instead attended traditional public schools. Hoxby and Murarka (2007), as part of the New York City (NYC) Charter School Evaluation Project, found a positive achievement effect for students attending the city's charter schools. In reading, NYC charter school students in grades 3 through 8 on average scored 1.6 scale-score points or 0.04 standard deviations above what would have been expected had they remained in traditional public schools. In math, NYC charter school students in grades 3 through 8 on average scored 3.8 scale score points or 0.09 standard deviations above what would have been expected had they remained in traditional public schools. These improvements were in addition to typical developmental gains that these students would have been expected to make in the traditional public school, had they not been awarded a seat through the lottery. The evaluation also included demographic information and found that students applying to New York City's charter schools were more likely to be African American (64 percent versus 32 percent) and eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (93 percent versus 74 percent) than students in the traditional public schools in the district. The researchers also examined charter school policies in relation to achievement and found that effects on achievement were correlated with the length of the school year.

In light of the changing charter school landscape and recent research findings, the Department has initiated a new evaluation of the Charter Schools Program. This comprehensive 5-year evaluation will examine the conditions and characteristics of charter schools; document the contributions and impact of the Federal role in creating and supporting high-quality charter schools; examine the academic achievement of charter school students; and assess factors and conditions at the State, local, and school levels that lead to successful charter schools. The Department expects the first evaluation product to be available in the fall of 2010.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Credit enhancement for charter school facilities

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

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$8,300 <sup>2</sup>	0	-\$8,300

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2004. 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> The FY 2010 appropriation does not provide a separate appropriation for this program; instead, from the amount provided for charter schools, the appropriations language permits the Secretary to use up to \$23,082 thousand for Charter School Facilities Incentive grants and Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities. The Department anticipates using \$8,300 thousand for the Credit Enhancement program.

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program provides assistance to help charter schools meet their facility needs. Under this program, funds are provided on a competitive basis to public and nonprofit entities, and consortia of such entities, to leverage other funds and help charter schools obtain school facilities through such means as purchase, lease, and donation. Grantees may also leverage grant funds to help charter schools construct and renovate school facilities. The grant period runs until the Federal funds and earnings on those funds have been expended for the grant purposes or until financing facilitated by the grant has been retired, whichever is later.

To help leverage funds for charter school facilities, grant recipients may, among other things: guarantee and insure debt to finance charter school facilities; guarantee and insure leases for personal and real property; and facilitate charter schools' facilities financing by identifying potential lending sources, encouraging private lending, and other similar activities. These are all forms of credit enhancement intended to reduce risk to the lender, thereby creating access to credit for charter schools or lowering the interest rate and cost of borrowing to the charter school.

Some of the grantees have been community development financial institutions (CDFIs), which typically specialize in project finance and economic development in low-income communities. The remaining grantees have been nonprofit organizations, State public finance authorities, and one local public finance authority.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Credit enhancement for charter school facilities

---

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

	(\$000s)
2006.....	\$36,611
2007.....	36,611
2008.....	8,300 <sup>1</sup>
2009.....	8,300 <sup>1</sup>
2010.....	8,300 <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Department used \$8,300 thousand from the FY 2008 and FY 2009 appropriations and intends to use the same amount from the FY 2010 appropriation for charter schools for Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities.

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not seeking separate funding for the Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program for fiscal year 2011. In place of this program and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs focusing on improving educational options, the Administration proposes to create a broader program, Expanding Educational Options, that would support choice-based models of school reform (including effective charter schools, other effective, autonomous, accountable schools, and public school choice programs) as well as parent education and family involvement activities. The new program would replace most of the current Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs that support these activities.

The Administration believes that the best approach to promoting educational options is to increase the supply of and demand for alternatives to under-performing schools and options that create learning environments that provide high-quality, innovative approaches for delivering elementary and secondary education and give parents the information they need. The new program would improve the supply of quality educational options, especially for students in under-performing schools, through support for the creation and expansion of effective charter schools and other effective, autonomous and accountable schools and support for increased inter- and intra-district choice programs. The program would also foster demand by increasing awareness among students and parents about such options and about the quality of educational opportunities.

The new program would provide a streamlined approach that consists of two competitions. One would support SEAs, LEAs, charter authorizers, charter support organizations, charter management organizations, and nonprofit organizations in creating or expanding effective charter schools or other effective, autonomous schools and in reaching out to parents and students. Funds could also be available for competitive grants for charter schools facilities programs. The other competition would support the efforts of LEAs, consortia of LEAs, and SEAs in consortia with LEAs to create and expand public school choice programs and give families what they need to access those programs.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Credit enhancement for charter school facilities

---

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Amount of new awards	\$8,263	\$8,300	0
New awards	1	1	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$37	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
Estimated amount of charter school facilities funds leveraged over the life of the grants	\$89,400 <sup>2</sup>	\$89,400 <sup>2</sup>	0
Estimated number of charter schools served over the life of the grants	29	29	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The Department plans to fund the next highest-scoring applicant from the FY 2009 slate.

<sup>2</sup> The amount leveraged is the dollar amount raised (versus the amount contributed to the financing from the grant) as a direct result of the guarantee, bond insurance, or other credit-enhancing instrument. If the grantee received a non-Department of Education grant (including a New Markets Tax Credit allocation) and is using it to provide additional financing for a school served by the Federal grant, funds leveraged from these other funds may also be counted as funds leveraged by the Federal grant.

#### 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 increase the number of charter school facilities acquired, constructed, or renovated.

**Objective:** Increase funds available for the acquisition, renovation, or construction of charter school facilities.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Credit enhancement for charter school facilities

<b>Measure:</b> The amount of funding Credit Enhancement program grantees leverage for the acquisition, construction, or renovation of charter school facilities (in millions of dollars).		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	100	168
2007	120	343
2008	140	520
2009	200	
2010	200	
2011	200	

**Objective:** Increase the number of charter schools facilities acquired, constructed, or renovated.

<b>Measure:</b> The number of charter schools served through the Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities Program.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	25	46
2007	40	64
2008	50	82
2009	60	
2010	60	
2011	60	

**Assessment of progress:** Data for the program show a continuing trend of increasing amounts leveraged and an increasing number of charter schools served. For FY 2006, new and continuing grantees leveraged \$168 million for 46 schools. In FY 2008, this amount had increased to \$520 million and 82 schools. The program has exceeded its targets for both measures in each of the last 3 years. Targets have not been subsequently increased, and remain steady after FY 2009, as the Department expects grantees across all cohorts to complete a more consistent number of credit enhancements in the coming years. Data for 2009 will be available in spring 2010. Targets for FY 2011 are included because, while this program does not make multi-year awards (and, thus, will have no continuations in FY 2011), the grant activities are implemented over a number of years and existing grantees will continue to report on these measures.

#### Other Performance Information

The Department has tracked the level of defaults on loans facilitated. As of 2009, only 16 cents of every \$100 of grant funds had been lost to default over the life of the program. When leveraged funds are taken into account, this comes to 3 cents for every \$100 of the total amount supported through the program.

The Department completed an evaluation of the program in 2008. The evaluation addressed three primary research questions: (1) Is the program achieving its legislative purpose?; (2) Does the program provide for improved access to capital markets for facilities and for better rates and terms on financing than would be otherwise available to charter schools?; and (3) Do certain models of credit enhancement provide for more favorable outcomes than others?

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### **Credit enhancement for charter school facilities**

---

The study found that the program is achieving its purpose and improving the borrowing capabilities of charter schools. Representatives of grantees, commercial lenders, investment banks, and rating agencies agreed that, without the program, assisted schools would not have received facilities loans at any price. Unsuccessful applicants generally were not able to support their proposed lending levels, providing evidence that the program does provide improved access. Entities that used their program funds to credit-enhance a loan made by a lender or a bond purchased by an investor supported higher lending volumes and a greater number of schools than those making direct loans, indicating that the grantees tend to be more effective when acting as a third-party credit-enhancing agent rather than as a direct lender. (However, this finding is not conclusive, since it was based on a small number of grantees.) Additional findings include that entities that had experience making direct loans to charter schools before becoming grantees were able to provide a significantly higher volume of loans after receiving program awards, and that charter schools assisted through the program were generally located in census tracts with a lower median household income than the relevant county as a whole and had a higher proportion of minority students than traditional public schools or even other charter schools.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Voluntary public school choice

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

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$25,819	0	-\$25,819

---

<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 Voluntary Public School Choice program supports efforts to establish intra-district and inter-district public school choice programs. The Department makes competitive awards to State educational agencies (SEAs), local educational agencies (LEAs), or partnerships that include SEAs, LEAs, and other public, for-profit or nonprofit entities. In making awards, the Department gives priority to applications that provide the widest variety of choices to students in participating schools; propose partnerships to implement an inter-district approach to providing students with greater public school choice; and plan to address the needs of secondary school students, particularly those students attending low-performing schools, by assisting in their transition to higher-performing schools.

Grantees may use their funds to: (1) plan a public school choice program; (2) make tuition transfer payments to the public schools that students choose to attend; (3) increase the capacity of high-demand public schools to serve greater numbers of students (except that program funds cannot be used for school construction); (4) carry out public information campaigns to inform parents and students about public school choice opportunities; and (5) pay other costs reasonably necessary to implement a public school choice program. Student participation in programs must be voluntary. If more students choose to participate in a program than the program can accommodate, the grantee must select students to participate by lottery. Grantees may use up to 5 percent of their allocations for administrative expenses.

By statute, the Department may reserve up to 5 percent of the amount appropriated for evaluation activities, dissemination of information, and technical assistance.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Voluntary public school choice

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2006.....	\$26,278
2007.....	26,278
2008.....	25,819
2009.....	25,819
2010.....	25,819

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not seeking separate funding for the Voluntary Public School Choice (VPSC) for fiscal year 2011. While supporting districts in implementing programs that give students and parents more educational options is an important goal, traditionally low funding levels and a limited set of authorized activities have prevented this program from having a large-scale impact. Reducing the number of small, narrowly targeted programs is an important priority for the Administration, as the proliferation of these fragmented funding streams has resulted in inefficiencies at the Federal, State and local level, with grantees dealing with numerous small grant competitions with different applications and requirements, rather than focusing on improving outcomes for students, and the Department focusing on running separate grant competitions and monitoring compliance under many different programs, rather than focusing on providing strong support and directing funding to proven or promising practices. In place of this program and several other programs that seek to expand educational options for students and families, the Administration proposes to create a broader, more expansive program, Expanding Educational Options, that addresses the need to increase the supply of high-quality educational options available to students attending low-performing schools by creating and expanding effective charter schools and other effective autonomous schools and by expanding public school choice programs.

This new program would replace current Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) programs that support choice-based models of school reform as well as family outreach. The Expanding Educational Options program would include two separate grant competitions: (1) Supporting Effective Charter Schools Grants and (2) Promoting Public School Choice Grants. Under the Supporting Effective Charter Schools Grants competition, State educational agencies, charter school authorizers, charter support organizations, charter management organizations, and other nonprofit organizations in partnership with LEAs would be eligible to apply for competitive grants to start or expand effective charter and other autonomous schools. Under the Promoting Public School Choice Grants competition, LEAs, individually or in a consortium, and SEAs in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs would be eligible to apply for competitive grants to develop and implement a comprehensive choice program that increases the range of high-quality educational options available to students and improves the academic achievement of students attending low-performing schools. Grant activities could include creating or expanding inter- and intra-district choice programs, magnet schools, academic pathways, and online learning programs. Under both grant programs, grantees would be required to develop and implement strategies to inform parents and students about the availability and accessibility of high-quality educational options.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Voluntary public school choice

---

The fiscal year 2011 request for Innovative and Competitive School Options would include funds to pay continuation costs for Voluntary Public School Choice grants made in previous years.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Amount for awards	\$24,529	\$24,529	0
Number of continuation awards	14	14	0
National activities/evaluation	\$1,290	\$1,290	0

NOTE: FY 2011 continuation costs of approximately \$24,500 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Expanding Educational Options program.

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

#### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data, and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of 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 assist States and local school districts in creating, expanding, and implementing a public school choice program.**

*Objective: The Voluntary Public School Choice Program increases options for public school choice.*

<b>Measure:</b> The number of students who have the option of attending participating Voluntary Public School Choice schools selected by their parents.				
Year	Cohort 1		Cohort 2	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
2006	846,523	896,194		
2007	843,384	739,068		
2008				1,182,617
2009			1,241,748	1,416,835
2010			1,300,879	
2011			1,360,010	

**Assessment of progress:** Data for the first cohort of grantees were collected from the Department's evaluation of the VPSC program and reflect the number of students who were eligible to participate in school choice through the funded projects. These data show an upward

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Voluntary public school choice

---

trend in the number of students eligible to participate in school choice until 2007, when there was a notable decline. In 2007 (representing school year 2006-2007), the Department returned to using grantees' annual performance reports (rather than data from the National Evaluation of the Voluntary Public School Choice Program) as its primary data source. For this measure, only 9 of the 13 original grantees reported data in 2007 compared to 11 grantees that reported data in previous years through the National Evaluation. The smaller number of grantees reporting data in 2007 may explain the decline in the number of eligible students between 2006 and 2007.

In 2008, the Department established initial performance targets for the second cohort of grantees using baseline data of 1,545,834 students and based on the expectation that the number of eligible students would be similar to that of the first cohort of grantees. However, reanalysis of the baseline data from the second cohort showed a lower number of eligible students in the new cohort and, as a result, the Department recently revised its targets to better align with the second cohort's initial performance and with the program's goal of increasing the number of eligible students by 5 percent annually. Performance data for 2008 and 2009 (reflecting school years 2007-2008 and 2008-2009) show a significant increase of nearly 20 percent in the number of students eligible to participate in school choice. The Department expects to have additional data available in the fall of 2010.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students participating at Voluntary Public School Choice sites who exercise school choice by changing schools.				
Year	Cohort 1		Cohort 2	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
2006	2.0	4.1		
2007	2.5	4.1		
2008				5.7
2009			7.1	5.4
2010			8.6	
2011			10.0	

**Assessment of progress:** Data for the first cohort were collected from the Department's evaluation of the program. Data reported previously showed, for 2004, a 1 percent participation rate and for 2005, a 1.9 percent participation rate (which reflects the percentage of participating students who transfer to a different school); however, based on data reported recently through the evaluation the revised percentages are 1.5 percent for 2004 and 2.9 percent for 2005. For 2006 and 2007, the rate grew to 4.1 percent, which exceeded the 2.0 and 2.5 percent targets that were based on the previous (since corrected) baseline data. In 2007, the Department returned to using grantees' annual performance reports (rather than data from the National Evaluation of the Voluntary Public School Choice Program) as its primary data source. For this measure, only 8 of the 13 grantees reported data in 2007 compared to 11 grantees that reported data in previous years through the National Evaluation.

In 2008, the Department established initial performance targets for the second cohort of grantees based on the expectation that the baseline numbers would be similar to those of the first cohort. Analysis of the baseline data from the second cohort showed a much larger percentage of eligible students changing schools over the previous cohort's baseline year and, as a result, the Department recently revised its targets to better align with the second cohort's

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Voluntary public school choice

---

initial performance and with the program's goal of doubling the percentage of students changing schools by the end of the 5-year grant period. Performance data for 2009 show a slight decrease in the percentage of eligible students changing schools, which resulted in the program not meeting its performance target for 2009. Performance data for 2010 will be obtained from annual grantee progress reports and are expected to be available in the fall of 2010.

<b>Measure:</b> Percent of students who score proficient or above on Reading/language arts assessments.		
Year	Cohort 2	
	Target	Actual
<b>2008</b>		62.1
<b>2009</b>	68.4	69.3
<b>2010</b>	74.7	
<b>2011</b>	81.1	

<b>Measure:</b> Percent of students who score proficient or above on mathematics assessments.		
Year	Cohort 2	
	Target	Actual
<b>2008</b>		64.5
<b>2009</b>	70.4	72.6
<b>2010</b>	76.3	
<b>2011</b>	82.3	

**Assessment of progress:** Beginning with the 2007 cohort, the Department has begun to collect achievement data for VPSC-participating students. These data, collected through annual grantee reports, show a notable increase in the percentage of students who met or exceeded their State's annual progress standards in reading/language arts and mathematics. The 2009 data, reflecting the 2008-09 school year, show that grantees' performance, in both subject areas, exceeded the established targets, which are based on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), Title I statutory goal of ensuring that all students are proficient in reading/ and mathematics by 2014.

### Other Performance Information

The Department, in 2008, released the final report of the national evaluation on the implementation of the VPSC program. The VPSC evaluation examined choice initiatives across 13 programs in the first grant cohort over a 5-year period. Specifically, the evaluation addressed: (1) the characteristics of the VPSC program sites; (2) how, and the extent to which, the VPSC projects promoted educational equity and excellence; and (3) the effects of the VPSC projects on the academic achievement of participating students. The evaluation found that the total number of students identified as eligible for choice and the total number of enrolling students in the VPSC program increased during the early years of the program, but then declined during the program's fifth year. Ten of the VPSC grantee sites provided eligibility and enrollment data for 4 consecutive years (school year (SY) 2003-04 to SY 2006-07). Across these 10 sites, enrollment of first-time enrollees increased from an average of 696 students per site to 2,459 students per site from SY 2003-04 to SY 2005-06, but then declined to 2,167

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### **Voluntary public school choice**

---

students per site in SY 2006-07. The enrollment decline in the final year of the program may reflect a saturation point for sites, given that a large portion of enrollees from earlier years remained enrolled in those schools and, thereby, limited the number of available seats during the final year of the grant.

The evaluation's findings on student achievement were modest. The evaluation compared trend data from six cohorts of VPSC enrollees and six cohorts of matched non-VPSC enrollees across four of the 13 program sites. When these two groups were compared, students enrolled in the VPSC initiatives demonstrated slightly higher achievement in reading and mathematics compared to those students not enrolled. These findings, however, may have been influenced by several factors, including the procedure for matching the comparison group, the length of time covered by the trends (such that more data points came before the start of the VPSC program than after), and, lastly, the fact that these data represent only 4 of the 13 VPSC sites and, therefore, a small proportion of the enrolling students. The final VPSC evaluation report is available on the Department's website ([www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/choice/vpscp1/report.pdf](http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/choice/vpscp1/report.pdf)).

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Parental information and resource centers

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 16)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$39,254	0	-\$39,254

---

<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 Parental Information and Resource Centers (PIRC) program awards grants to provide training, information, and support to State educational agencies (SEAs), local educational agencies (LEAs), and other organizations that carry out parent education and family involvement programs.

Funds for this program may be used to: (1) assist parents in participating effectively in their children's education and helping their children meet State and local standards; (2) help parents obtain information about the range of programs, services, and resources available nationally and locally for parents and school personnel who work with parents; (3) help parents use the technology applied in their children's education; (4) plan, implement, and fund activities for parents that coordinate the education of their children with other programs that serve their children and families; (5) provide support for State or local educational personnel if their participation will contribute to the grant's activities; and (6) coordinate and integrate early childhood programs with school-age programs.

In addition, grantees must use a minimum of 30 percent of their funds to establish, expand, or operate Parents as Teachers, Home Instruction for Preschool Youngsters, or other early childhood parent education programs. They must also use at least 50 percent of their funds to serve areas with high concentrations of low-income families.

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

	(\$000s)
2006.....	\$39,600
2007.....	39,600
2008.....	38,908
2009.....	39,254
2010.....	39,254

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Parental information and resource centers

---

#### **FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests no funding for the Parental Information Resource Centers (PIRCs) program for fiscal year 2011. While making sure that families are informed of and involved in the educational opportunities available in their community will remain a priority, the historically low funding levels and unfocused set of authorized activities have prevented this program from having a sufficiently large-scale impact. Reducing the number of small, narrowly targeted programs is an important priority for the Administration, as the proliferation of these fragmented funding streams has resulted in inefficiencies at the Federal, State and local level, with grantees dealing with numerous small grant competitions with different applications and requirements, rather than focusing on improving outcomes for students, and the Department focusing on running separate grant competitions and monitoring compliance under many different programs, rather than focusing on providing strong support and directing funding to proven or promising practices. In place of PIRCs and several other programs that seek to expand educational options for families and students, the Department will, throughout its Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization proposal, support activities that are designed to provide information to parents and engage parents in their children's education.

The Expanding Educational Options program, proposed as part of the ESEA reauthorization, would help provide families and students with information about their schools and educational options, and also support the creation of new, high-quality alternative options through which parents and students can act on that information. Expanding Educational Options would include two programs to improve public school options for students, both of which would require better information to parents. Under the Supporting Effective Charter Schools program, State educational agencies, charter school authorizers, charter support organizations, charter management organizations, and other nonprofit organizations in partnership with LEAs would be eligible to apply for competitive grants to expand or plan and open an effective charter school or other autonomous school. Under the second program, Promoting Public School Choice, LEAs, individually or in a consortium, and SEAs in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs would be eligible to apply for competitive grants for activities to increase the range of high-quality educational options available to students, especially for those attending the lowest-performing schools. These options would include inter- and intra-district choice programs, —academic pathways,” and online learning programs. Under both programs, grantees would be required to provide parents with information about the availability and accessibility of high-quality educational options.

Additionally, as noted above, ensuring that families are provided with better and clearer data on the schools in their communities and are engaged in their children's education is a priority throughout the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal. States receiving funding under Supporting Successful Students would be required to implement a State-wide school climate measurement system that would survey parents about their children's schools. This new program would also fund family engagement strategies. To receive funds under the College-and-Career-Ready Students program, LEAs would be required to collect school performance and parent survey data, and States would have to publish school report cards in a manner that is accessible and understandable; LEAs would also have a set-aside under this program to focus on local needs and capacity-building, including to promote family engagement. To receive funds under the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program, States and

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Parental information and resource centers

---

LEAs would be required to collect and report data on the qualifications, effectiveness, and retention of teachers and make these data accessible to parents.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Funding for continuation awards	\$38,106	\$37,291	0
Number of continuation awards	62	62	0
Average continuation award	\$615	\$601	0
Technical assistance and evaluation	\$1,148	\$1,963	0

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

#### Performance Measures

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

One measure of the performance of the PIRC program is the number of parents in the target population who receive information about their State accountability systems and about their rights and opportunities for supplemental educational services (SES) and public school choice under ESEA Title I. Grantees have reported data for this measure under several different categories, including: (1) information disseminated through direct contact with the target parents (workshops, online conferences, email and telephone consultations, and home visits); (2) information disseminated in contexts or settings where it is of use to a wider audience (education organization newsletters, brochures, and conference displays); and (3) wide-scale general dissemination activities (billboard campaigns and public service radio, television, and newspaper advertisements).

<b>Measure:</b> The number of parents of children in the PIRC program's target population (those attending schools not making adequate yearly progress) who receive information on their State accountability systems through direct PIRC services.		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2007</b>	72,306	99,933
<b>2008</b>	126,614	222,434
<b>2009</b>		
<b>2010</b>		

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Parental information and resource centers

**Measure:** The number of parents of children in the PIRC program's target population (those attending schools not making adequate yearly progress) who receive information on their State accountability systems through indirect PIRC services.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	6,039,093	1,771,322
2008	8,440,014	21,938,732
2009		
2010		

**Measure:** The number of parents of children in the PIRC program's target population (those attending schools not making adequate yearly progress) who receive information on their rights and opportunities for supplemental services through direct PIRC services.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	73,135	94,288
2008	109,179	198,859
2009		
2010		

**Measure:** The number of parents of children in the PIRC program's target population (those attending schools not making adequate yearly progress) who receive information on their rights and opportunities for supplemental services through indirect PIRC services.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	5,746,226	2,373,798
2008	8,543,624	9,802,891
2009		
2010		

**Measure:** The number of parents of children in the PIRC program's target population (those attending schools not making adequate yearly progress) who receive information on their public school choice options through direct PIRC services.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	68,442	97,122
2008	104,052	195,712
2009		
2010		

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Parental information and resource centers

---

<b>Measure:</b> The number of parents of children in the PIRC program's target population (those attending schools not making adequate yearly progress) who receive information on their public school choice options through indirect PIRC services.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	6,713,975	1,392,628
2008	8,407,417	9,820,742
2009		
2010		

**Assessment of progress:** Targets shown are the sums of targets set by individual grantees for their own projects and reported in their annual progress reports at the conclusion of the year. Also, the data are reported by the PIRCs and are not verified by the Department, and some parents may have been counted more than once in each of these estimates.

For reporting on outcomes from the first year of the grant cycle (2006-2007), PIRCs were instructed to complete their data collection in June 2007. This meant that grantees were able to report only 9 months of implementation data. During the first year of the grant, 53 PIRCS reported reaching 99,933 parents regarding State accountability systems directly, and 55 PIRCs reported reaching 1,771,322 parents indirectly on that issue. Fifty-one PIRCs reported providing direct services about SES to 94,288 parents, and 52 PIRCs provided indirect services about SES to 2,373,798 parents. On school choice, 49 PIRCs reported providing direct services to 97,122 parents, and 52 PIRCs provided indirect services to 1,392,628 parents. Over 58 percent of parents receiving PIRCs services were from low-income families, and over 24 percent were limited English proficient.

For the second year of the grant cycle (2007-2008), PIRCs reported providing direct services to 222,434 parents regarding State accountability systems, 198,859 parents about SES, and 195,712 parents about school choice.

Data for the third year of the grants, 2008-2009, are expected in the fall of 2010. The Administration is not requesting funding for the program in fiscal year 2011, so no target for that year is shown.

In addition, the Department has established two additional indicators to assess the performance of the PIRC program: (1) the percentage of customers (parents, educators in State and local educational agencies, and other audiences) reporting that PIRC services are of high quality and (2) the percentage of customers reporting that PIRC services are highly useful to them. The Department has submitted a data collection instrument for OMB clearance, and will gather information for these measures through annual performance reports and a customer satisfaction survey for the first time in 2010.

#### Program Efficiency Measures

The Department is implementing a common measure of administrative efficiency for the PIRCs and other technical assistance programs. The measure is the percentage of grant funds carried over in each year of the project, which is an indicator of grantee efficiency in project implementation. Data for this efficiency measure were first collected for the cohort of grantees

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### **Parental information and resource centers**

---

funded in FY 2006. In FY 2006, a total of \$37,323,873 was awarded to new PIRC grantees. Of that amount, \$13,002,766, about 35 percent, was carried over to the following year.

The Department is currently working to establish and implement at least one additional efficiency measure. The two measures currently under consideration are: (1) cost per successful outcome, based on activities that are common to all or most PIRC projects; and (2) amount of non-Federal dollars leveraged, based on matching funds reported. The Department is evaluating the quality of the data that would be used for either of these measures.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Smaller learning communities

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

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$88,000	0	-\$88,000

---

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

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

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

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

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Smaller learning communities

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2006.....	\$93,531
2007.....	93,531
2008.....	80,108
2009.....	88,000
2010.....	88,000

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funding for the Smaller Learning Communities (SLC) program for fiscal year 2011. In place of several narrowly targeted programs focused on expanding educational options for students and families, the Administration proposes to create a broader Expanding Educational Options (EEO) program through ESEA reauthorization. The EEO program would have two components: Supporting Effective Charter Schools, which will fund the creation of innovative, high-quality charter and other autonomous schools, and Promoting Public School Choice, which will fund the implementation of comprehensive systems of choice through inter- and intra-district choice programs, magnet schools, academic pathways, and online learning programs. These new programs would replace current ESEA programs that support choice-based and other models of school reform that create options based on student preferences or needs as well as parent information and involvement activities.

State educational agencies (SEAs), charter school authorizers, charter management organizations, LEAs, and other nonprofit organizations could use Supporting Effective Charter Schools funds to create smaller learning communities when in line with communities' needs. LEAs, applying individually or in consortium, and SEAs applying in consortium with LEAs could also create smaller learning communities with Promoting Public School Choice grants, which would support comprehensive strategies for increasing the range of educational options available to students and increasing student achievement, especially in the lowest-performing schools.

In addition, LEAs receiving assistance from the School Turnaround (currently School Improvement Grants) program, which would focus on (among other things) increasing the graduation rate in low-performing high schools, could implement turnaround strategies that create smaller learning communities in large high schools. Graduation Promise grants, included in the budget reconciliation bill pending in Congress, could also be used to support smaller learning communities.

The Administration's budget proposal would provide funds to continue SLC grants through their conclusion, from the appropriation for the new Expanding Educational Options program.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Smaller learning communities

---

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Number of new implementation grants	16 <sup>1</sup>	15 <sup>1,2</sup>	0
New implementation grants	\$37,395	\$32,675	0
Average implementation grant	\$2,335	\$2,178	0
Number of continuation awards	50 <sup>3</sup>	37 <sup>3</sup>	0
Continuation awards	\$46,600	\$50,925	0
Number of schools served	156	111	0
Peer review	0	\$750	0
National activities	\$4,005	\$3,650	0

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$68,500 thousand in fiscal year 2011 would be provided from the appropriation for the Expanding Educational Options program to support grantees selected in FY 2008.

<sup>1</sup>The Department provides 3 years of funding for each grant from a single year's appropriation. Projects successfully implemented may then receive additional funds in years 4 and 5.

<sup>2</sup>The data provided for new grants in FY 2010 are estimates.

<sup>3</sup>FY 2009 funds would support 2-year continuation awards to grantees selected in FY 2007. FY 2010 funds would support 2-year continuation awards to grantees selected in FY 2008.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

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

The Department collects data for four outcome measures for this program. The Department tracks the data for each cohort of grantees in order to make more meaningful comparisons of the impact of the Department's priorities, guidance, and technical assistance from one cohort of grantees to another. Each cohort (from 2004 on) reports 5 years of data for the 5 years of the grant. Each cohort is measured against the same targets. Targets for years 2 through 5 of each grant were reset in 2008, based on the performance of the prior cohorts. The data reported below are for the 2005 cohort. 2010 will be their final year of reporting.

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

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

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Smaller learning communities

**Measure:** The percentage of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Communities grants scoring at or above proficient on State mathematics assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2006		45.5
2007	62	48.1
2008	64	49.9
2009	66	
2010	68	

**Measure:** The percentage of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Communities grants scoring at or above proficient on State reading assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2006		43.4
2007	62	48.4
2008	64	49.8
2009	66	
2010	68	

**Measure:** The percentage of graduates in schools receiving Smaller Learning Communities grants who enroll in postsecondary education, apprenticeships, or advanced training for the semester following graduation.

Year	Target	Actual
2006		80.3
2007	84	75.5
2008	85	76.1
2009	86	
2010	88	

**Measure:** The percentage of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Communities grants who graduate from high school.

Year	Target	Actual
2006		80.4
2007	88	78.2
2008	89	78.3
2009	90	
2010	91	

**Assessment of progress:** The data for performance measures are provided by grantees in their annual performance reports. The Department does not verify these data, although the Department is providing its grantees with assistance in improving the quality of the data provided in the reports. The Department collects data by cohorts of grantees, which may explain significant increases or decreases in the actual data. Since these are 5-year grants, there will be 5 years of data for each cohort. 2009 data will be available in March 2010.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Smaller learning communities

---

#### Efficiency Measures

The Department has two efficiency measures for the Smaller Learning Communities program: the cost per student (in dollars) demonstrating proficiency or advanced skills in mathematics and reading.

<b>Measure:</b> The cost per student (in dollars) demonstrating proficiency or advanced skills in mathematics.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2006</b>	\$475	\$546
<b>2007</b>	465	474
<b>2008</b>	455	476
<b>2009</b>	445	
<b>2010</b>	445	

<b>Measure:</b> The cost per student (in dollars) demonstrating proficiency or advanced skills in reading.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2006</b>	\$425	\$559
<b>2007</b>	415	471
<b>2008</b>	405	476
<b>2009</b>	395	
<b>2010</b>	395	

**Assessment of progress:** The Department calculates the cost by dividing the amount of program funds granted in a given year by the number of students served by the SLC program who score proficient or above on State reading and mathematics assessments. The cost per student (in dollars) demonstrating proficiency or advanced skills in reading and mathematics rose from 2007 to 2008 and failed to meet target levels. 2009 data will be available in March 2010.

#### Other Performance Information

MDRC has conducted rigorous quasi-experimental evaluations of two reform models frequently used by Smaller Learning Communities grantees, the Talent Development model and First Things First. In the Talent Development study, MDRC studied Philadelphia schools (including schools not receiving SLC grants) that had combined smaller learning communities' reforms with strategies to improve curriculum and instruction. For first-time ninth graders, the Talent Development model produced substantial gains in attendance, academic course credits earned, and promotion rates during the ninth-grade year. The students were 8 percent more likely to graduate on time. The First Things First study showed significantly increased rates of student attendance and graduation, reduced dropout rates, and improved student performance on State reading and math assessments in five Houston high schools supported by a 2000 Smaller Learning Communities grant.

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

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### **Smaller learning communities**

---

assess the impact of two supplemental reading interventions for struggling ninth-grade students that were implemented within participating freshman academies. The evaluation examined: whether the interventions in the freshman academies improve reading proficiency, the effects on students' attendance and coursetaking, students' achievement in subsequent grades, and the characteristics of students who benefit most from participation in the interventions. The first interim report on findings from this evaluation was released in 2008. Overall, it showed a positive correlation between interventions and students' reading performance. The second-year results will be released in the spring of 2010.

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

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### **Magnet schools assistance**

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

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$100,000	\$110,000	+\$10,000

---

<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 Magnet Schools Assistance program (MSAP) provides grants to eligible local educational agencies (LEAs) to establish and operate magnet schools that are operated under a court-ordered or federally approved voluntary desegregation plan. Magnet programs aim to eliminate, reduce, or prevent minority group isolation in elementary and secondary schools while strengthening students' knowledge of academic subjects and their grasp of marketable vocational skills. The special curriculum of a magnet school can attract substantial numbers of students from different social, economic, ethnic, and racial backgrounds and provide greater opportunities for voluntary and court-ordered desegregation efforts to succeed.

Grantees receive 3-year awards that cannot exceed \$4 million per year. Funds may be used for planning and promotional activities, salaries of teachers and other instructional personnel, and the acquisition of books, materials, and equipment. LEAs that receive assistance must use the funds for activities intended to improve academic achievement. Expenditures for planning are limited to no more than 50 percent of a grant in the first year and 15 percent in the second and third years. By statute, the Department gives priority to applications for programs that, among other things, develop new magnet schools and use methods other than academic examinations (such as a lottery) to admit students. In addition, for amounts appropriated above \$75 million in any fiscal year, applicants that did not receive a MSAP grant the previous fiscal year receive priority for funds.

The Secretary may use up to 2 percent of the appropriation for evaluation, technical assistance, and dissemination of information on successful magnet school programs.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2006.....	\$106,693
2007.....	106,693
2008.....	104,829
2009.....	104,829
2010.....	100,000

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Magnet schools assistance

---

#### **FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$110.0 million for the Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP) for fiscal year 2011, an increase of \$10 million over the 2010 level. The fiscal year 2011 appropriation would support the first year of a reauthorized MSAP and would support new grant awards.

This program, in combination with the proposed new Expanding Educational Options program, will continue to be a vehicle for fostering education reform and innovation by increasing choice among, and accountability in, public schools. The Administration's reauthorization proposal will continue and strengthen our commitment to improving high-quality educational options for students and increasing diversity by placing a greater emphasis on funding magnet school programs or models that have a record of effectiveness in raising student achievement and reducing racial group isolation. The Administration's request would provide approximately \$107.9 million for continuation grants and approximately \$2.1 million for program evaluation and dissemination activities.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Amount of awards	\$103,002	\$97,654	\$107,904
Number of new awards	0	36-40	2-4
Number of continuation awards	41	0	40-44
Range of awards	\$350-\$4,000	\$350-\$4,000	\$350-\$4,000
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$250	0
Evaluation and dissemination	\$1,827	\$2,096	\$2,096

#### **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: Students have access to high-quality education in desegregated magnet schools.**

**Objective:** *Federally funded magnet schools will eliminate, reduce, or prevent minority group isolation in targeted elementary and secondary schools with substantial proportions of minority group students.*

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Magnet schools assistance

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of magnet schools whose student applicant pool reduces, prevents, or eliminates minority group isolation.						
Year	FY 2004 Cohort		FY 2007 Cohort		FY 2010 Cohort	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
2006	60.5	58.3				
2007	65.5	49.8				
2008			70.4			
2009			75.3			
2010			80.3			
2011					85.2	

**Assessment of Progress:** Implementation data show a decline between 2005 and 2007, in the percentage of magnet schools whose student applicant pool reflects a racial and ethnic composition that, in relation to the total enrollment of the school, reduces, prevents, or eliminates minority group isolation. (Minority group isolation refers to a condition in which minority students, including American Indian or Alaskan Natives, Asian or Pacific Islanders, Hispanics, and Blacks (not of Hispanic origin), constitute more than 50 percent of the enrollment of a school.) The Department expects to have additional performance data available this spring.

**Objective** Magnet school students meet their State's academic achievement standards.

<b>Measure:</b> Percentage of magnet schools whose students from major racial and ethnic groups meet or exceed their State's annual progress standards in reading.						
Year	FY 2004 Cohort		FY 2007 Cohort		FY 2010 Cohort	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
2006	69.2	62.0				
2007	73.1	63.7				
2008			76.9			
2009			80.7			
2010			84.6			
2011					88.4	

<b>Measure:</b> Percentage of magnet schools whose students from major racial and ethnic groups meet or exceed their State's annual progress standards in mathematics.						
Year	FY 2004 Cohort		FY 2007 Cohort		FY 2010 Cohort	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
2006	69.5	61.5				
2007	73.3	60.8				
2008			77.1			
2009			80.9			
2010			84.7			
2011					88.5	

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Magnet schools assistance

---

**Assessment of Progress:** These data, collected through annual grantee reports, show a small increase in the percentage of schools whose minority students met or exceeded their State's annual progress standards in reading and a small decrease in the percentage of schools whose minority students met or exceeded their State's annual progress standards in mathematics. The 2007 data, reflecting the 2006-07 school year, show that grantees' performance, in both subject areas, did not meet the established targets, which are based on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), Title I statutory goal of ensuring that all students are proficient in reading and mathematics by 2014. With data from only one cohort, it is not yet clear why these results were achieved. One possibility is that 2006 may have been a year in which States raised their targets, and magnet schools may not have been able to meet the higher targets. The Department is examining factors that may have influenced these results, such as whether or not programs were implemented fully or for a long enough time period to achieve intended effects, as well as the rigor of the magnet school curriculum and whether teacher training was sufficient. The Department expects to have additional performance data available this spring.

The remaining performance measures focus on sustainability by examining the percentage of magnet schools in operation 3 years after Federal funding ends and the percentage of magnet schools that meet State adequate yearly progress standards at least 3 years after Federal funding ends. Sustainability data for 2008 and 2009 will be obtained from annual grantee progress reports and are expected to be available this spring.

### Efficiency Measures

The Department has implemented an efficiency measure to assess the Federal cost per student in a magnet school. Initial data for the fiscal year 2004 cohort show an average cost of \$769 per student; across projects, these costs have varied significantly from \$164 to \$5,126. The range of costs may have been influenced by numerous factors, such as variations in implementation strategies, types and numbers of programs, grade levels served, whether the program is new or modified, and, lastly, whether the program serves all students or only a subset of students in a school. Further analysis of these efficiency data, collected through annual grantee performance reports, will assist the Department in determining what constitutes a reasonable cost per student based on different program types and grade levels.

### Other Performance Information

An evaluation of the MSAP program, conducted by the American Institutes for Research, examined the extent to which the fiscal year 1998 cohort of grantees reduced minority group isolation and met their achievement objectives. The final report, released in 2004, indicated that MSAP schools adopted innovative practices and worked to align their programs with State and district systemic reforms, but made only modest progress in reducing minority group isolation and improving student achievement. MSAP-supported grants succeeded in preventing, eliminating, or reducing minority group isolation in 57 percent of the desegregation-targeted schools. Determining whether MSAP schools reached achievement goals was difficult because of the limited availability of achievement data. In the final year of the grant cycle, approximately 51 percent of the schools met one-half or more of their achievement targets for language arts and 39 percent met one-half or more for mathematics.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### **Magnet schools assistance**

---

In 2008, following a year-long feasibility study, the Department initiated a new national evaluation of magnet schools focused on a single category of schools that receive funding through the MSAP program: elementary schools that convert to become whole-school magnets. The study will examine the relationship of magnet conversion to resident (those who live within the attendance zone) and non-resident (those who live outside the attendance zone, but choose to attend the magnet school) student outcomes independently. The evaluation will use a comparative interrupted time series quasi-experimental design, involving fiscal year 2004 and/or 2007 grantees, to examine the relationship between magnet school conversion, student achievement, and other outcomes, including minority group isolation in schools. Each magnet school will be matched with two similar traditional public elementary schools that will serve as comparison schools. Further, the evaluation will examine how factors related to student achievement vary according to the characteristics of the magnet schools and of the regular public schools in the same districts. The data collection, which began in early 2008, relies heavily on analysis of existing student records data, including demographic information, residence indicators, and academic test scores collected at various time points. Further, the evaluation will collect one round of principal and magnet school coordinators surveys. The evaluation is scheduled to conclude in the fall of 2011.

The Department also has initiated a descriptive study of the 2004 and 2007 MSAP grantee districts and schools. The report will examine the extent to which MSAP-funded grantee districts and schools are similar to other districts and schools across the country. The data included in the report are from the year prior to the award and are used only to characterize the districts and schools that were selected to receive MSAP funding. The Department expects to release the descriptive report later this winter.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Fund for the improvement of education: programs of national significance (Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 1)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$125,461 <sup>2</sup>	\$25,000	-\$100,461

---

<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.

<sup>2</sup> Adjusted for comparability. Does not include \$10,000 thousand for Promise neighborhoods that is in the Supporting Student Success account.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE) provides authority for the Secretary to support nationally significant programs to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education at the State and local levels and help all students meet challenging State academic content standards and student achievement standards. The types of programs that may be supported include:

- Activities to promote systemic education reform at the State and local levels, including scientifically based research, development, and evaluation designed to improve student academic achievement at the State and local levels and strategies for effective parent and community involvement;
- Programs at the State and local levels that are designed to yield significant results, including programs to explore approaches to public school choice and school-based decisionmaking;
- Recognition programs, including financial awards to States, local educational agencies, and schools that have made the greatest progress in improving the academic achievement of economically disadvantaged students and students from major racial and ethnic minority groups and in closing the academic achievement gap for those groups of students farthest away from the proficient level on the academic assessments administered by the State;
- Scientifically based studies and evaluations of education reform strategies and innovations, and the dissemination of information on the effectiveness of those strategies and innovations;
- Identification and recognition of exemplary schools and programs;
- Activities to support Scholar-Athlete Games programs;
- Programs to promote voter participation in American elections; and
- Demonstrations of the effectiveness of programs under which school districts or schools contract with private management organizations to reform a school or schools.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Fund for the improvement of education: programs of national significance

---

The Secretary may carry out activities under this authority directly or through grants and contracts to State or local educational agencies; institutions of higher education; and other public and private agencies, organizations, and institutions. Awards may be based on announced competitions or may support unsolicited proposals.

All funded programs must be designed so that their effectiveness is readily ascertainable and is assessed using rigorous research and evaluations. Each application for funds must establish clear objectives, which are based on research, for the proposed program and describe the activities the applicant will carry out in order to meet the stated objectives. The Department must use a peer review process to review applications for awards. Recipients of awards must evaluate the effectiveness of their programs and report such information as may be required to determine program effectiveness, and the Department must make the evaluations publicly available. The Secretary may require matching funds for activities under this program.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2006.....	\$11,668
2007.....	16,051
2008.....	121,934 <sup>1</sup>
2009.....	115,965 <sup>2</sup>
2010.....	125,461 <sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$98,816 thousand for Congressional earmarks.

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$88,015 thousand for Congressional earmarks.

<sup>3</sup> Includes \$88,791 thousand for Congressional earmarks.

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is requesting \$25 million for FIE Programs of National Significance in 2011, a decrease of \$100.5 million from 2010. The reduction eliminates funding for one-time special purpose earmarks that do not advance the purposes of the authorizing legislation.

The requested level of funding would allow the Department to support the following activities in 2011:

- The Department would use \$5 million to support the *Data Quality Initiative*, which began in 2006 and is designed to improve the quality, analysis, and reporting of Department of Education elementary and secondary program data. To date, 32 grant programs have received technical assistance under the initiative. Technical assistance activities have included workshops and written guidance for grantees on what information to collect and report to the Department in order to meet GPRA reporting requirements and assistance to program offices with the analysis of the data submitted by grantees. In 2008, the initiative was expanded to also include an objective assessment of program performance data collection, analysis, and reporting for four programs within the Office of Special Education Programs. In 2009, the Department further expanded the initiative to include

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Fund for the improvement of education: programs of national significance

---

—~~the~~ audits” of seven grant programs to examine program performance data quality and how the data are used in program management, as well as to examine the quality and usefulness of grantee local evaluations. Additional programs may be included in the audits in 2010. The goal of the audits is to provide guidance to improve data quality and ensure that program decisions are based on sound information.

In 2011, the initiative would be expanded to include a systematic review of all elementary and secondary education program performance measures, data collections, and analysis and reporting procedures. This activity would help the Department comply with OMB Circular A-11, which requires Federal agencies to establish procedures to ensure the accuracy of all performance measurement data contained in their annual performance plans and reports and which encourages agencies to verify performance data at least every 2 years. The Department plans to spend up to \$5 million in FY 2011.

- The Department would use \$20 million (including funding for peer review) to support activities in response to emerging issues. These could include special studies, conferences, and grant awards.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Earmarks	\$88,015 <sup>1</sup>	\$88,791	0
Full Services Community Schools Program grants	5,368	10,000	0 <sup>2</sup>
Data Quality Initiative	1,522	3,000	\$5,000
Education Facilities Clearinghouse	700	1,000	0
Reach Out and Read	4,964 <sup>3</sup>	TBD	0
Teach for America	14,894 <sup>3</sup>	0 <sup>4</sup>	0
National History Day	499 <sup>3</sup>	TBD	0
Gulf Coast Schools	0	12,000	0
Other activities	0	10,000	19,750
Peer review of new award applications	3	670	250
Total	115,965	125,461 <sup>5</sup>	25,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$333 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).

<sup>2</sup> Continuation costs will be covered under the request for 21st Century Community Learning Centers.

<sup>3</sup> Does not include funding for peer review of the applications, which is included in the amount shown for peer review.

<sup>4</sup> Funds for Teach for America were provided as a separate program in 2010.

<sup>5</sup> Adjusted for comparability. Does not include \$10,000 thousand for Promise neighborhoods that is in the Supporting Student Success account.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

**Fund for the improvement of education: programs of national significance**

---

### **PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

The *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* contains specific accountability provisions for FIE grantees. Each application for funds must include clear objectives for the project that are based on scientifically based research and must describe the activities to be carried out to meet those objectives. In addition, recipients must evaluate the effectiveness of their funded programs and submit evaluations to the Secretary. The Department has not yet established performance measures for the program.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Exchanges with historic and whaling and trading partners

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 12)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$8,754	0	-\$8,754

---

<sup>1</sup>The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is authorized in FY 2010 through appropriations language. The Administration is not proposing appropriations language nor seeking reauthorizing legislation for FY 2011.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program, also known as the Education through Cultural and Historic Organizations (ECHO) program, supports culturally based educational activities, internships, apprenticeship programs, and exchanges for Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians, children and families of Massachusetts, and any federally recognized Indian tribe in Mississippi. The statute designates funds for certain entities in Massachusetts, Alaska, Mississippi, and Hawaii as follows: \$2 million each for: (1) the New Bedford Whaling Museum, in partnership with the New Bedford Oceanarium, in Massachusetts, (2) the Inupiat Heritage Center in Alaska, and (3) the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians; and not less than \$1 million each (for the New Trade Winds Project) to: (1) the Alaska Native Heritage Center, (2) the Bishop Museum in Hawaii, and (3) the Peabody-Essex Museum in Massachusetts. In addition, the authorizing statute requires that not less than \$1 million be used for each of the same three entities (the Alaska Native Heritage Center, the Bishop Museum, and the Peabody-Essex Museum) for internship and apprenticeship programs. In the event that funding levels are less than the statutory levels, the Department prorates the amount provided to each eligible entity.

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

	(\$000s)
2006.....	\$8,910
2007.....	8,910
2008.....	8,754
2009.....	8,754
2010.....	8,754

### 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for the Exchanges with Historic and Whaling and Trading Partners program. The Administration believes that funds for the program should be

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Exchanges with historic whaling and trading partners

---

redirected to other, higher-priority activities that can have an impact on education reform and improvement nationally. In addition, the program 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.

Entities in Alaska, Hawaii, Massachusetts, and Mississippi that wish to continue the activities supported under this program may do so with other Federal and non-Federal funds. Alaska Native entities and the Mississippi Band of Choctaws are eligible to receive grants under the Department's Indian Education programs. Native Hawaiian and Alaska Native organizations may, respectively, apply for funding from the Education for Native Hawaiians and Alaska Native Education Equity programs. Museums in the four States may apply for grants from the Institute of Museum and Library Sciences or other Federal agencies. In addition, many local and national private foundations provide support for cultural activities and museums.

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

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Awards	\$8,754	\$8,754	0
Number of grants	6	6	0

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

#### Performance Measures

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

In 2008, the Department undertook a comprehensive revision of this program's performance measures and developed a set of more outcome-oriented measures. Beginning in 2009, grantees are collecting data on: (1) the percentage of interns and apprentices participating in ECHO-funded internship or apprenticeship programs who rate their internship or apprenticeship positively; (2) the percentage of teachers of school groups participating in ECHO-funded programs who rate the student program positively; (3) the percentage of members of the general public attending ECHO-funded exhibits, displays, education programs, or cultural exchanges who rate their experience positively; and (4) the average number of visits that registered users make to the ECHO grantees' website during the program year. Baseline data for these new measures will be available in spring 2010.

Before developing these new measures, the Department collected data for a set of measures that were intended to measure the capability of grantees to produce and disseminate education programs, including internships, and enhance or create new capabilities among partner institutions. The five measures tracked: (1) the number of partnership exchanges among

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Exchanges with historic whaling and trading partners

---

partner museums; (2) the number of new partner capabilities among partner museums; (3) the number of participants involved in educational and cultural activities supported by grant funds; (4) the number of schools, community groups, and family programs involved in educational and

cultural enrichment activities; and, (5) the number of participants in a culturally based youth internship program involving career awareness, leadership, and job skills development. A “partner” was defined as the entity that a grantee had chosen to work with or another grantee receiving funds through the program. “Exchanges” were defined as a project or program that comes out of a partnership. The Department defined new “partner capabilities” as the skills, activities, or projects that result from partnerships and that go beyond the scope of the program.

The number of partnership exchanges among partner museums in the program increased from 75 to 88 between 2005 and 2006. Individual participants involved in educational and cultural enrichment activities operated through the program increased from approximately 1.5 million to 2.2 million. The number of schools, community groups, and family programs also increased between 2005 and 2006, from 1,316 to 1,421. Data for 2007 were incomplete and not comparable with those for the earlier years.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Troops-to-teachers

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title II, Part C, Subpart 1, Chapter A)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$14,389	0	-\$14,389

---

<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 transfer to the Department of Defense in FY 2011 under new legislation.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Department of Defense (DOD) established Troops-to-Teachers in 1994 to help improve education by recruiting, preparing, and supporting members of the military service as teachers in high-poverty public schools. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act, authorizes the Department of Education to continue funding for this effort.

Under this program, the Secretary of Education transfers funds to DOD for the Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES) to provide assistance, including stipends of up to \$5,000, to eligible members of the armed forces so that they can obtain certification or licensure as elementary school teachers, secondary school teachers, or vocational/technical teachers and become highly qualified teachers by demonstrating competency in each of the subjects they teach. In addition, the program helps these individuals find employment in high-need local educational agencies (LEAs), which are those that: (1) serve not fewer than 10,000 children from low-income families, (2) serve communities in which at least 20 percent of the children are from low-income families, or (3) serve communities in which at least 10 percent (but less than 20 percent) of children are from low-income families and assign all teachers funded by the program to high-need schools.

In lieu of the \$5,000 stipends, DANTES may pay \$10,000 bonuses to participants who agree to teach for at least 3 years in high-need schools located within high-need LEAs. A "high-need school" is defined as a school in which at least 50 percent of the students are from low-income families or the school has a large percentage of students who qualify for assistance under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

A member of the armed forces wishing to receive the program's assistance for placement as an elementary or secondary school teacher must have a baccalaureate or advanced degree, and his or her last period of service in the armed forces must have been honorable. (Separate requirements apply to those who wish to become vocational or technical teachers.) In selecting members of the armed forces to participate in the program, DANTES must give priority to those members who have educational or military experience in science, mathematics, special

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Troops-to-teachers

---

education, or vocational/technical subjects, and who agree to seek employment as teachers in subject areas compatible with their backgrounds.

DANTES' mission is to support DOD's off-duty voluntary education programs and conduct special projects and development activities in support of DOD's education-related functions. In addition to providing information and referral assistance to military personnel interested in becoming public school teachers through the Troops-to-Teachers program, DANTES provides educational opportunities to service members and their families, as well as other DOD personnel; helps military personnel achieve their professional and personal education goals; and supports DOD's recruitment, retention, and transition efforts.

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

	(\$000s)
2006.....	\$14,645
2007.....	14,645
2008.....	14,389
2009.....	14,389
2010.....	14,389

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funds for Troops-to-Teachers under the ESEA program authority because, in fiscal year 2011, funds for program activities will come directly from the Department of Defense (DOD) appropriation. The move to the DOD will ensure continued close oversight of Troops-to-Teachers program outcomes and simplify and streamline program management. The Department of Education will continue to work closely with the DOD in the transition. The Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES) will continue to provide stipends, bonuses, and assistance to help members of the armed services to become qualified and effective teachers.

In addition to the continuation of program activities by the DOD, the Excellent Instructional Teams programs, proposed as part of the ESEA reauthorization, would build on the Troops-to-Teachers program's record of success in recruiting and retaining teachers in high-need fields, subjects, and LEAs. Activities to promote the adoption of alternative routes to teacher and school leader certification (including alternative routes that reach out to nontraditional candidates, such as current and former service members) would be a prominent component of these initiatives. States and LEAs that receive funding under the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program would be able to use program funds to establish and expand alternative routes to certification or licensure. In addition, the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund would provide support for States and LEAs to reform their certification or licensure policies and practices. Finally, the Teacher Pathways program would provide competitive grants to support the creation or expansion of pathways, including alternative routes, into the teaching profession, and support a national teacher recruitment campaign that would help recruit into teaching such individuals as high-school and college students, recent college graduates, mid-career professionals, retirees, and veterans, including those recently separated from military service.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Troops-to-teachers

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Number of program participants	2,321	2,321	0
Number of participants hired	1,762	1,762	0

---

Note: Outputs are based on data reported for 2008. Program —participants” are those individuals who have applied to the Troops-to-Teachers program and signed an agreement with DANTEs to participate in the program. —Participants hired” are those Troops participants who have received program stipends or bonuses for training and certification activities and are hired by eligible local educational agencies.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

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

The Department has required annual progress reports providing performance data on the program from DANTEs. Required information has included: (1) the number of program participants, (2) the number of schools in which participants are employed, (3) grade levels and academic subjects that the participants teach, and (4) retention rates for program participants.

The FY 2006 report revealed a 19 percent 1-year decrease in the number of program registrants (from 3,261 in FY 2005 to 2,656 in FY 2006) and a 6 percent decrease in the number of participants hired during the 2005-06 school year (from 1,147 hired in school year 2004-05 to 1,075 hired in school year 2005-06). The report attributed these declines largely to an increased demand for active and reserve military forces to serve overseas. Of the 3,935 participants teaching, 87 percent were working in high-need schools and/or teaching critical-need subjects such as math, science, or special education. The report also noted that, of the 4,355 participants who began teaching since 2002, 90 percent were still employed as teachers (or had accepted leadership positions in public education) in FY 2006. DANTEs’s FY 2007 report stated that 2,675 individuals became participants in FY 2007, but revised data submitted to the Department suggested this number might be slightly lower (2,525). The FY 2008 report noted that 2,567 individuals became participants, but the most recent data submitted to the Department show fewer participants for that year as well (2,321).

The Department has established the following goal and three performance indicators to measure the impact of the Troops-to-Teachers program:

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Troops-to-teachers

---

**Goal:** To increase the number of military personnel or qualified participants in a reserve component who become highly qualified teachers in high-need LEAs.

**Objective:** To provide schools in high-need LEAs with highly qualified teachers who are former military or reserve component personnel.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of participants who become teachers of record in high-need LEAs.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	75	83
2007	75	82
2008	85	76
2009	86	
2010	87	

**Assessment of progress:** In 2006, 83 percent of the program's participants became teachers of record in high-need LEAs, exceeding the target of 75 percent. In 2007, 82 percent of the program's participants became teachers of record in high-need LEAs, again exceeding the target. (The percentage of participants who became teachers of record in 2007 was recalculated in 2009 based on revised, higher-quality data received from DANTEs. It was previously reported as 84 percent.)

In 2008, the number of program participants who became teachers of record in high-need LEAs fell to 76 percent, missing the target. The Department may recalibrate the targets for this measure for currently funded participants now that more accurate baseline data are available. The Department is not requesting funding for the program in fiscal year 2011, so no target for that year is shown.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of participants who become mathematics, science, or special education teachers.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	49	37
2007	51	35
2008	53	33
2009	54	
2010	54	

**Assessment of progress:** In 2006, 37 percent of the program's participants became math, science, or special education teachers, falling short of the target level. In 2007, 35 percent of the participants became math, science, or special education teachers, a small decrease from the previous year. (The percentages of participants who became math, science or special education teachers in 2006 and 2007 were recalculated in 2009 based on revised, higher-quality data received from DANTEs. The 2006 actual was previously reported as 47 percent, and the 2007 actual was reported as 48 percent.) In 2008, 33 percent of participants became math, science, or special education teachers, missing the target for that year. The Department may recalibrate the targets for this measure for currently funded participants now that more

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Troops-to-teachers

---

accurate baseline data are available. The Department is not requesting funding for the program in fiscal year 2011, so no target for that year is shown.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Troops-to-Teachers participants who remain in teaching for 3 or more years after placement in a teaching position in a high-need LEA.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	80	80
2007	80	78
2008	85	74
2009	85	
2010	86	

**Assessment of progress:** In 2006, the third year of retention for participants who started teaching in the 2002-03 school year, 80 percent of participants were still teaching in a high-need LEA at least 3 years after placement, meeting the target. (The 2006 percentage of participants who remained in teaching for 3 or more years was recalculated in 2009 based on revised, higher-quality data received from DANTEs. The 2006 actual was previously reported as 84 percent.) This measure decreased to 78 percent in 2007, and 74 percent in 2008, missing the targets for both years. The Department may recalibrate the targets for this measure for currently funded participants now that more accurate baseline data are available. The Department is not requesting funding for the program in fiscal year 2011, so no target for that year is shown.

### Efficiency Measures

The Department developed the following efficiency measure for the Troops-to-Teachers program: recruitment cost per teacher of record. Recruitment cost is defined as all overhead costs for the national headquarters and State offices. —Teacher of record” is defined as a Troops-to-Teachers participant who is hired by an eligible school district. DANTEs also collects and analyzes the data on a State-by-State basis and uses the data to improve program operations. In FY 2006, the first year in which this measure was used, the recruitment cost per teacher of record was \$2,632. In FY 2007, the recruitment cost per teacher of record rose to \$3,127. (The 2006 and 2007 recruitment cost per teacher of record was recalculated in 2009 based on revised, higher-quality data received from DANTEs. The 2006 actual was previously reported as \$4,208 and the 2007 actual was previously reported as \$5,274.) In FY 2008, the recruitment cost per teacher of record increased again, to \$3,654.

### Other Performance Information

A March 2006 report on the Troops-to-Teachers program by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) found that, through June 30, 2005, 90 percent of funded participants teaching in high-need districts were retained for a second year and over 75 percent taught for a third year. GAO also found that over 80 percent of program’s participants are male and over 25 percent are African American – contributing significantly to the diversity of the population of new teachers at large, which is 26 percent male and 9 percent African American.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### **Troops-to-teachers**

---

This trend has continued. According to statistical data received from the Department of Defense's Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES), as of the end of 2008, nearly 82 percent of the program's participants have been male and over 26 percent have been African American.

In addition, in 2005, the National Center for Education Information released *Profile of Troops to Teachers*, a national survey of program participants that updates its 1998 evaluation of the program. Highlights of the report include: program participants have taught math, science, and special education in significantly higher proportions than all teachers; 55 percent of program participants have taught in highly populated communities, where the demand for teachers is greatest; and 78 percent of participants intended to remain in the field of education for the next 5 years.