

Department of Education
EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS
Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language	D-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes	D-2
Amounts Available for Obligation.....	D-3
Obligations by Object Classification	D-6
Summary of Changes.....	D-7
Authorizing Legislation	D-9
Appropriations History	D-12
Significant Items in FY 2011 Appropriations Reports.....	D-13
Summary of Request.....	D-17
Activities:	
Effective teaching and learning for a complete education	D-19
Effective teaching and learning: literacy.....	D-20
Effective teaching and Learning: science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.....	D-22
Effective teaching and Learning for a well-rounded education	D-24
Effective teaching and learning: literacy consolidations:	
Striving readers.....	D-27
Even start	D-33
Literacy through schools libraries.....	D-41
National Writing Project.....	D-46
Reading is fundamental/Inexpensive book distribution	D-51
Ready-to-learn television	D-55
Effective teaching and learning: science, technology, engineering, and mathematics consolidations:	
Mathematics and science partnerships	D-63
Effective teaching and learning for a well-rounded education consolidations:	
Excellence in economic education	D-68
Teaching American history.....	D-72
Arts in education	D-77
Foreign language assistance	D-84
Academies for American history and civics	D-90
Close Up fellowships.....	D-93
Civic education	D-97
Educational technology State grants	D-104
College pathways and accelerated learning	D-112
High school graduation initiative	D-115
Advanced placement	D-119
Javits gifted and talented education.....	D-124
Assessing achievement.....	D-128
Training and advisory services	D-134
Rural education	D-140
Supplemental education grants	D-150

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

CONTENTS—continued

	<u>Page</u>
Comprehensive centers.....	D-153
Native Hawaiian student education.....	D-161
Alaska Native student education.....	D-165
State tables	D-169

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

For carrying out school improvement activities authorized by section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002; the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003; and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, \$80,989,000, of which \$56,313,000 shall be available to carry out section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002,¹ *Provided, That* \$17,687,000 shall be available to carry out the Supplemental Education Grants program for the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands:² *Provided further, That up to 5 percent of the amount referred to in the previous proviso may be reserved by the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands to administer the Supplemental Education Grants programs and to obtain technical assistance, oversight and consultancy services in the administration of these grants and to reimburse the United States Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for such services.*³

NOTES

A regular 2011 appropriation for this account had not been enacted at the time the budget was prepared; therefore, this account is operating under a continuing resolution (P.L. 111-322, Dec. 22, 2010; 124 Stat 3518) that provides funding through March 4, 2011. The amounts included for fiscal year 2011 in this budget reflect the annualized levels provided by the continuing resolution. In addition, no language is included for programs authorized under the expired Elementary and Secondary Education Act; when new authorizing legislation for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is enacted, a budget request for these programs will be proposed.

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>¹ ...of which, \$56,313,000 shall be available to carry out section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002:</p>	<p>This language specifies the funding level for the Comprehensive Centers program.</p>
<p>² ...<i>Provided</i>, That \$17,687,000 shall be available to carry out the Supplemental Education Grants program for the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands:</p>	<p>This language specifies the funding level for Supplemental Education Grants to the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands.</p>
<p>³ <i>Provided further</i>, That up to 5 percent of the amount referred to in the previous proviso may be reserved by the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands to administer the Supplemental Education Grants programs and to obtain technical assistance, oversight and consultancy services in the administration of these grants and to reimburse the United States Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for such services.</p>	<p>This language allows the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands to reserve up to 5 percent of their Supplemental Education Grants funds for administration and for technical assistance, oversight, and consultancy services for these grants and to reimburse the United States Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for these services.</p>

NOTE

A regular 2011 appropriation for this account had not been enacted at the time the budget was prepared; therefore, this account is operating under a continuing resolution (P.L. 111-322, Dec. 22, 2010; 124 Stat 3518) that provides funding through March 4, 2011. The amounts included for fiscal year 2011 in this budget reflect the annualized levels provided by the continuing resolution. In addition, no language is included for programs authorized under the expired Elementary and Secondary Education Act; when new authorizing legislation for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is enacted, a budget request for these programs will be proposed.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Amounts Available for Obligation (\$000s)

	2010	2011 CR	2012
Discretionary authority:			
Annual appropriation.....	\$5,228,444	0	\$1,664,979
Annualized CR (PL 111-322)	<u>0</u>	<u>\$5,228,444</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, adjusted appropriation.....	5,228,444	5,228,444	1,664,979
Comparative transfer to <u>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity</u> for:			
Homeless children and youth education	-65,427	-65,427	0
Comparative transfer to <u>Innovation and Instructional Teams</u> for:			
Improving teacher quality State grants	-2,947,749	-2,947,749	0
Comparative transfer to <u>Supporting Student Success</u> for:			
21 st Century community learning centers	-1,166,166	-1,166,166	0
Comparative transfer from <u>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity</u> for:			
Striving readers	200,000	250,000	0
Even start	66,454	66,454	0
Literacy through school libraries	19,145	19,145	0
High school graduation initiative	50,000	50,000	0
Comparative transfer from <u>Innovation and Instructional Teams</u> for:			
National writing project	25,646	25,646	0
Reading is fundamental/Inexpensive book distribution	24,803	24,803	0
Ready-to-learn television	27,300	27,300	0
Excellence in economic education	1,447	1,447	0
Teaching American history	118,952	118,952	0
Arts in education	40,000	40,000	0
Academies for American history and civics	\$1,815	\$1,815	0
Close up fellowships	1,942	1,942	0
Advanced placement	45,840	45,840	0
Comparative transfer from <u>Supporting Student Success</u> for:			
Civic education: We the people	21,617	21,617	0
Civic education: Cooperative education exchange	<u>13,383</u>	<u>13,383</u>	<u>0</u>

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

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

	2010	2011 CR	2012
Subtotal, comparable appropriation	\$1,709,899	\$1,757,476	\$1,664,979
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	-1,681,441	-1,681,441	0
Advance from prior year	<u>1,681,441</u>	<u>1,681,441</u>	<u>1,681,441</u>
Comparative transfer to <u>Innovation and Instructional Teams</u> for:			
Improving teacher quality State grants			
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	1,681,441	1,681,441	0
Advance from prior year	<u>-1,681,441</u>	<u>-1,681,441</u>	<u>-1,681,441</u>
Subtotal, comparable budget authority	1,709,899	1,757,476	1,664,979
Unobligated balance, start of year	75,523	64,774	0
Unobligated balance, start of year, Recovery Act	9,168	0	0
Recovery of prior-year obligations.....	295	0	0
Unobligated balance, expiring	-198	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year.....	-64,774	0	0
Comparative Transfers:			
Unobligated balance, start of year to <u>Innovation and Instructional Teams</u> for:			
Improving teacher quality State grants	-35,976	-29,375	0
Unobligated balance, start of year to <u>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity</u> for:			
Homeless children and youth education	-65	-65	0
Unobligated balance, start of year to: <u>Supporting Student Success</u> for:			
21 st century community learning centers....	-14,461	-14,890	-14,890
Unobligated balance, start of year from <u>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity</u> for:			
Striving readers.....	35,148	200,000	0
Even start.....	<u>3,323</u>	<u>4,267</u>	<u>0</u>

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

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

	2010	2011 CR	2012
Unobligated balance, end of year to <u>Innovation and Instructional Teams</u> for:			
Improving teacher quality State grants	\$29,375	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year to <u>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity</u> for:			
Homeless children and youth education	65	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year to: <u>Supporting Student Success</u> for:			
21 st century community learning centers....	14,890	\$14,890	0
Unobligated balance, end of year from <u>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity</u> for:			
Striving readers.....	-200,000	0	0
Even start.....	<u>-4,267</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations	1,555,918	1,997,077	\$1,650,089

NOTE: The Administration is proposing to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. FY 2012 funds for affected programs are proposed for later transmittal and will be requested once the legislation is reauthorized.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Obligations by Object Classification
(\$000s)

	2010	2011 CR	2012
Other contractual services:			
Advisory and assistance services.....	\$5,716	\$27,320	\$84,068
Other services.....	33,891	4,793	0
Peer review.....	1,580	1,750	2,375
Purchases of goods and services.....	<u>570</u>	<u>550</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal.....	41,757	34,413	86,443
Grants, subsidies, and contributions	1,504,993	1,962,664	1,563,646
Grants, Recovery Act.....	9,168	0	0
Interest and dividends.....	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations	1,555,918	1,997,077	1,650,089

NOTE: The Administration is proposing to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. FY 2012 funds for affected programs are proposed for later transmittal and will be requested once the legislation is reauthorized.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Summary of Changes (\$000s)

2011 CR	\$1,757,446
2012	<u>1,664,979</u>
Net change	-92,467

NOTE: The Administration is proposing to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. FY 2012 funds for affected programs are proposed for later transmittal and will be requested once the legislation is reauthorized.

	<u>2011 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
Increases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
Initial funding for the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program to support State and local efforts aimed at implementing a comprehensive literacy strategy that provides high-quality literacy instruction and support to students from pre-kindergarten to grade 12.	0	+\$383,348
Initial funding for the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) program to support State efforts to improve the teaching and learning of STEM subjects.	0	+206,046
Initial funding for the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education to support State and local efforts to develop and expand innovative practices to improve teaching and learning in the arts, health education, physical education, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, environmental education, economics, financial literacy, and other subjects.	0	+246,084
Initial funding for the proposed College Pathways and Accelerated Learning to support programs that prepare students in high-need school districts to enter and succeed in college.	0	+86,000
Increase funding for Assessing Achievement (formerly State Assessments) to support formula and competitive grants to States and other entities to implement college- and career-ready standards and assessments.	\$420,000	<u>+9,268</u>
Subtotal, increases		\$930,746

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Summary of Changes—continued (\$000s)

	<u>2011 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
Decreases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
Eliminate funding for Striving Readers, Even Start, Literacy through School Libraries, National Writing Project, Reading is Fundamental, and Ready-to-Learn Television because these programs are proposed for consolidation into the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program.	\$413,348	-\$413,348
Eliminate funding for Mathematics and Science Partnerships because it would be replaced by the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics program.	180,478	-180,478
Eliminate funding for Excellence in Economic Education, Teaching American History, Arts in Education, Foreign Language Assistance, Academies for American History and Civics, Close Up Fellowships, and Civic Education because these programs are proposed for consolidation into the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education.	226,084	-226,084
Eliminate funding for Educational technology State grants because this program is proposed for consolidation into the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education initiative.	100,000	-100,000
Eliminate funding the High School Graduation Initiative, Advanced Placement, and Javits Gifted and Talented Education because these programs are proposed for consolidation into the proposed College Pathways and Accelerated Learning.	103,303	<u>-103,303</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-1,023,213
Net change		-92,467

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

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

Activity	2011 Authorized	2011 CR	2012 Authorized	2012 Request
Effective teaching and learning for a complete education:				
Effective teaching and learning: literacy (<i>proposed legislation</i>):	---	---	To be determined	\$383,348
Striving readers (<i>ESEA I-E, section 1502</i>)	0 ¹	\$250,000	0 ¹	0
Even start (<i>ESEA I-B-3</i>)	0 ¹	66,454	0 ¹	0
Literacy through school (<i>ESEA I-B-4</i>)	0 ¹	19,145	0 ¹	0
National writing project (<i>ESEA II-C-2</i>)	0 ¹	25,646	0 ¹	0
Reading is fundamental (<i>ESEA V-D, subpart 5</i>)	0 ¹	24,803	0 ¹	0
Ready-to-learn television (<i>ESEA II-D-3</i>)	0 ¹	27,300	0 ¹	0
Effective teaching and learning: science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (<i>proposed legislation</i>):	---	---	To be determined	\$206,046
Mathematics and science partnerships (<i>ESEA II, Part B</i>)	0 ¹	180,478	0 ¹	0
Effective teaching and learning for a well-rounded education (<i>proposed legislation</i>):	---	---	To be determined	\$246,084
Excellence in economic education (<i>ESEA V-D, subpart 13</i>)	0 ¹	1,447	0 ¹	0
Teaching American history (<i>ESEA II-C-4</i>)	0 ¹	118,952	0 ¹	0
Arts in education (<i>ESEA V-D, subpart 15</i>)	0 ¹	40,000	0 ¹	0
Foreign language assistance (<i>ESEA V-D, subpart 9</i>)	0 ¹	26,928	0 ¹	0
Academies for American history and civics (<i>American History and Civics Education Act and ESEA V-D</i>)	0 ¹	1,815	0 ¹	0
Close-up fellowships (<i>ESEA section 1504</i>)	0 ¹	1,942	0 ¹	0
Civic education (<i>ESEA II, Part C-3</i>)	0 ¹	35,000	0 ¹	0

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Authorizing Legislation—continued
(\$000s)

	Activity	2011 Authorized	2011 CR	2012 Authorized	2012 Request
	Educational technology State grants (<i>ESEA II-D-1 and 2</i>)	0 ^{1,2}	100,000	0 ^{1,2}	0
	College pathways and accelerated learning opportunities (<i>proposed legislation</i>):	---	---	To be determined	\$86,000
	High school graduation initiative (<i>ESEA I-H</i>)	0 ¹	50,000	0 ¹	0
	Advanced placement (<i>ESEA I-G</i>)	0 ¹	45,840	0 ¹	0
	Javits gifted and talented education (<i>ESEA V-D, subpart 6</i>)	0 ¹	7,463	0 ¹	0
D-10	Assessing achievement (<i>ESEA VI-A-1</i>)	0	410,732	To be determined ¹	\$420,000
	Training and advisory services (<i>CRA IV</i>)	0	6,989	0	6,989
	Rural education (<i>ESEA VI-B</i>)	0 ^{1,3}	174,882	To be determined ^{1,3}	174,882
	Supplemental education grants (<i>Compact of Free Association Act</i>)	\$19,890 ⁴	17,687	\$20,071 ⁴	17,687
	Comprehensive centers (<i>Educational Technical Assistance Act, Section 203</i>)	0 ⁵	56,313	0 ⁵	56,313
	Native Hawaiian student education (<i>ESEA VII-B and HEA VIII-Z</i>)	0 ^{1,6,7}	34,315	To be determined ^{1,6}	34,315
	Alaska Native student education (<i>ESEA VII-C</i>)	0 ^{1,8}	33,315	To be determined ^{1,8}	33,315
	<u>Unfunded authorizations:</u>				
	Early reading first (<i>ESEA I-B-2</i>)	0 ⁹	0	0 ⁹	0
	Special education teacher training (<i>ESEA, Section 2151(d)</i>)	0 ⁹	0	0 ⁹	0

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Authorizing Legislation—continued
(\$000s)

Activity	2011 Authorized	2011 CR	2012 Authorized	2012 Request
Early childhood educator professional development (ESEA, Section 2151(e))	0 ⁹	0	0 ⁹	0
Teacher mobility (ESEA, Section 2151(f))	0 ⁹	0	0 ⁹	0
State grants for innovative programs (ESEA, V-A)	<u>0⁹</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0⁹</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, definite authorization	\$19,890		\$20,071	
Total, annual appropriation		\$1,757,446		\$1,664,979
Portion of request subject to reauthorization				1,583,990
Portion of request not authorized				80,989

NOTE: The Administration is proposing to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. FY 2012 funds for affected programs are proposed for later transmittal and will be requested once the legislation is reauthorized.

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

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

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

⁴ The Compact of Free Association Act authorizes \$12,230 thousand for the Federated States of Micronesia and \$6,100 thousand for the Republic of the Marshall Islands for fiscal year 2005 and an equivalent amount, as adjusted for inflation (calculated as two thirds of the percentage change in the U.S. Gross Domestic Product Implicit Price Deflator, or 5 percent, whichever is less in any one year) for each of the succeeding fiscal years through 2023. The 2012 authorization is calculated based on inflation estimates as of February 2010.

⁵ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2009. The President's fiscal year 2012 budget proposes authorizing this program through appropriations language.

⁶ The Henry K. Giugni Memorial Archives earmark, which is included in the CR appropriation for Native Hawaiian student education, is authorized through Title VIII, part Z of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, with an indefinite authorization of appropriations.

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

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

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Appropriations History (\$000s)

	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2003	6,784,484	7,347,584	7,788,329	8,001,159
(2003 Advance for 2004)	(1,765,000)	(2,265,000)	(1,765,000)	(1,765,000)
2003 Technical amendment	0	0	0	546
2004	5,042,834	5,797,637	5,731,453	5,800,496
(2004 Advance for 2005)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)
2005	5,940,493	5,661,401	5,730,632	5,619,657
(2005 Advance for 2006)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)
2006	5,332,219	5,393,765	5,457,953	5,255,478
(2006 Advance for 2007)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)
2007	4,973,158	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	5,255,478 ¹
(2007 Advance for 2008)	(1,435,000)			(1,435,000)
2008	4,698,276	5,693,668	5,198,525	5,289,076
(2008 Advance for 2009)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)
Supp. (PL 110-329)	0	0	0	15,000
2009	4,566,323	5,399,609 ²	5,292,422 ²	5,362,016
(2009 Advance for 2010)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,681,441)
Recovery Act Supp. (PL 111-5)	0	1,066,000	1,070,000	720,000
2010	5,182,181	5,244,644	5,197,316 ³	5,228,444
(2010 Advance for 2011)	(1,681,441)	(1,681,441)	(1,681,441)	(1,681,441)
2011	1,890,779	5,221,444 ⁴	5,388,173 ³	5,228,444 ⁵
(2010 Advance for 2011)	(0)	(1,681,441)	(1,681,441)	(1,681,441)
2012	1,664,979			

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

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

³ The level for the Senate allowance reflects Committee action only.

⁴ The level for the House allowance reflects the House-passed full-year continuing resolution.

⁵ The level for the appropriation reflects the continuing resolution (P.L. 111-322) passed December 22, 2010.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Significant Items in FY 2011 Appropriations Reports

Alaska Native Educational Equity

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

Response: The Department will accept applications for projects that include construction of facilities in rural schools if Congress specifically authorizes the use of FY 2011 funds for construction. Applications from eligible entities that propose to serve schools in rural areas will undergo the same peer review process as all other applications.

Arts in Education

Senate: The Committee urges the Department to support the evaluation and national public dissemination of information regarding model programs and professional development projects funded through the Arts in Education section, including dissemination of information regarding the results of projects which received awards in fiscal years 2001 and 2002, and subsequent years. The Committee expects such information to be available and disseminated not later than 30 days after enactment of this act and to include, where available, information regarding program outcomes, training methods, and the self-evaluation results of funded model arts programs and professional development programs.

Response: This spring, the Department will post on the Arts in Education program webpage: (1) a sampling of the final performance reports for the Arts in Education Model Development and Dissemination (AEMDD) grants (from fiscal year 2001 to the present) and the Professional Development for Arts Educators (PDAE) grants (from fiscal year 2003 to the present); (2) GPRA data for the AEMDD grantees; (3) updated project abstracts from the AEMDD 2005 and 2006 grantees that will include project-level data and outcomes; and (3) profiles of promising AEMDD projects. The Department plans to inform the arts community of new information and resources posted on the webpage through periodic updates to members of the Arts Innovation listserv and through the Arts Education Partnership. The Department also is planning to convene an informational meeting to showcase successful AEMDD and PDAE projects during Arts Awareness week this spring.

Comprehensive Centers

Senate: The Committee expects to be notified promptly of the Department's specific plans for the centers competition.

Response: The Department has notified the Committee of the plan to hold a competition for the Comprehensive Centers in 2012.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Significant Items in FY 2011 Appropriations Reports—continued

Enhanced Assessment Grants

Senate: The Committee urges the Department to give priority to applications to improve the quality of assessments for students with disabilities and EL students.

Response: In FY 2011, the Department plans to use FY 2010 funds to support collaborative efforts among States to develop a system of English language proficiency assessments aligned with English language proficiency standards that correspond to a common set of college- and career-ready standards in English language arts and mathematics held in common by multiple States. The Department is using funds from the IDEA General Supervision Enhancement Grants program to support the development of alternate assessments aligned with alternative achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities.

Foreign Language Assistance

Senate: The Committee strongly urges the Secretary to waive the matching requirement for qualifying schools and to increase awareness of this accommodation among the affected school population.

Response: The Department is not planning a competition in 2011. If additional funds, sufficient to hold a new competition, become available, the Department will continue its practice of making eligible applicants aware of the Secretary's authority to waive the matching requirement for qualifying grantees.

Rural Education

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2012 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(in thousands of dollars)					2012 President's Budget Compared to 2011 CR	
Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	2010 Appropriation	2011 CR Annualized	2012 President's Budget	Amount	Percent
Education Improvement Programs						
1. Effective teaching and learning for a complete education:						
(a) Effective teaching and learning: Literacy:						
(1) Effective teaching and learning: Literacy (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	383,348	383,348	---
(2) Striving readers (ESEA I-E, section 1502) ¹	D	200,000	250,000	0	(250,000)	-100.0%
(3) Even start (ESEA I-B-3)	D	66,454	66,454	0	(66,454)	-100.0%
(4) Literacy through school libraries (ESEA I-B-4)	D	19,145	19,145	0	(19,145)	-100.0%
(5) National writing project (ESEA II-C-2)	D	25,646	25,646	0	(25,646)	-100.0%
(6) Reading is fundamental/Inexpensive book distribution (ESEA V-D, subpart 5)	D	24,803	24,803	0	(24,803)	-100.0%
(7) Ready-to-learn television (ESEA II-D-3)	D	27,300	27,300	0	(27,300)	-100.0%
Subtotal		363,348	413,348	383,348	(30,000)	-7.3%
(b) Effective teaching and learning: Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics:						
(1) Effective teaching and learning: Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	206,046	206,046	---
(2) Mathematics and science partnerships (ESEA II, Part B)	D	180,478	180,478	0	(180,478)	-100.0%
Subtotal		180,478	180,478	206,046	25,568	14.2%
(c) Effective teaching and learning for a well-rounded education:						
(1) Effective teaching and learning for a well-rounded education (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	246,084	246,084	---
(2) Excellence in economic education (ESEA V-D, subpart 13)	D	1,447	1,447	0	(1,447)	-100.0%
(3) Teaching American history (ESEA II-C-4)	D	118,952	118,952	0	(118,952)	-100.0%
(4) Arts in education (ESEA V-D, subpart 15)	D	40,000	40,000	0	(40,000)	-100.0%
(5) Foreign language assistance (ESEA V-D, subpart 9)	D	26,928	26,928	0	(26,928)	-100.0%
(6) Academies for American history and civics (American History and Civics Education Act and ESEA-V-D)	D	1,815	1,815	0	(1,815)	-100.0%
(7) Close Up fellowships (ESEA section 1504)	D	1,942	1,942	0	(1,942)	-100.0%
(8) Civic education (ESEA II, Part C-3):						
(a) We the People (section 2344)	D	21,617	21,617	0	(21,617)	-100.0%
(b) Cooperative education exchange (section 2345)	D	13,383	13,383	0	(13,383)	-100.0%
Subtotal		226,084	226,084	246,084	20,000	8.8%
(d) Educational technology State grants (ESEA II-D-1 and 2)	D	100,000	100,000	0	(100,000)	-100.0%
Subtotal, Effective teaching and learning for a complete education		869,910	919,910	835,478	(84,432)	-9.2%
2. College pathways and accelerated learning:						
(a) College pathways and accelerated learning (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	86,000	86,000	---
(b) High school graduation initiative (ESEA I-H)	D	50,000	50,000	0	(50,000)	-100.0%
(c) Advanced placement (ESEA I-G)	D	45,840	45,840	0	(45,840)	-100.0%
(d) Javits gifted and talented education (ESEA V-D, subpart 6)	D	7,463	7,463	0	(7,463)	-100.0%
Subtotal		103,303	103,303	86,000	(17,303)	-16.7%

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

-The FY 2011 level for appropriated funds is an annualized amount provided under the fourth Continuing Resolution (P.L. 111-322).

-Programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for which funds are requested in 2012 or that are shown as consolidated in 2012 are proposed under 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.

-Account totals and programs shown within accounts for fiscal years 2010 and 2011 have been adjusted to be comparable to the fiscal year 2012 request.

¹ FY 2010 level reflects a rescission of \$50,000 thousand under P.L. 111-226.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2012 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(in thousands of dollars)

Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	2010 Appropriation	2011 CR Annualized	2012 President's Budget	2012 President's Budget Compared to 2011 CR	
					Amount	Percent
Education Improvement Programs (continued)						
3. Assessing achievement (ESEA VI-A-1)	D	410,732	410,732	420,000	9,268	2.3%
4. Training and advisory services (CRA IV)	D	6,989	6,989	6,989	0	0.0%
5. Rural education (ESEA VI-B)	D	174,882	174,882	174,882	0	0.0%
6. Supplemental education grants (Compact of Free Association Act)	D	17,687	17,687	17,687	0	0.0%
7. Comprehensive centers (ETAA section 203)	D	56,313	56,313	56,313	0	0.0%
8. Native Hawaiian student education (ESEA VII-B and HEA VIII-Z)	D	34,315	34,315	34,315	0	0.0%
9. Alaska Native student education (ESEA VII-C)	D	33,315	33,315	33,315	0	0.0%
Subtotal		1,707,446	1,757,446	1,664,979	(92,467)	-5.3%
Total, Appropriation ¹	D	1,707,446	1,757,446	1,664,979	(92,467)	-5.3%

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

-The FY 2011 level for appropriated funds is an annualized amount provided under the fourth Continuing Resolution (P.L. 111-322).

-Programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for which funds are requested in 2012 or that are shown as consolidated in 2012 are proposed under 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.

-Account totals and programs shown within accounts for fiscal years 2010 and 2011 have been adjusted to be comparable to the fiscal year 2012 request.

¹ Adjusted for comparability. Excludes \$1,681,441 thousand appropriated in fiscal year 2010 and under the 2011 CR level in this account for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants. That program is in the Innovation and Instructional Teams account in FY 2012; the associated FY 2012 advances are in the Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity account (\$840,721 thousand) and the Special Education account (\$840,720 thousand).

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Summary of Request

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

The fiscal year 2012 appropriation would support the first year of a reauthorized ESEA. The Administration's request for programs in the EIP account (except for three non-ESEA programs) is proposed for later transmittal pending the enactment of the reauthorization. The Administration is requesting a total of approximately \$1.7 billion for programs in this account. This request represents a strengthening and expansion of existing ESEA programs under two broad program authorities: **Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education** and **College Pathways and Accelerated Learning**. The budget also reallocates programs across budget accounts in order to better align the budget presentation with the structure of the ESEA as proposed for reauthorization.

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

- \$383 million for **Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy** to support State and local efforts aimed at implementing and supporting a comprehensive literacy strategy that provides high-quality literacy instruction and support to students from pre-kindergarten through grade 12.
- \$206 million for **Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics** to improve teaching and raise student achievement in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM). The program would support comprehensive efforts to improve STEM education through activities including professional development for STEM teachers; implementation of high-quality curriculum, assessments, and instructional materials; and creation or improvement of systems for linking student data on assessments with instructional supports such as lesson plans and intervention strategies.
- \$246 million for **Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education** to support States and high-need local educational agencies (LEAs) in developing and expanding innovative practices that improve teaching and learning in the arts, health education, physical education, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, environmental education, economics, financial literacy, and other subjects.

The Administration also is proposing a new \$86 million **College Pathways and Accelerated Learning** program to support competitive grants to States and LEAs for expansion of such activities as Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, dual high school/college enrollment, and "early college high schools" in order to prepare more students for high school graduation and success in college.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Summary of Request

The Administration requests \$420 million for **Assessing Achievement** (formerly State Assessments), an increase of \$9.3 million, to assist States and other entities in developing and implementing assessments that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards. Formula funds would support States' implementation of the assessments currently required under Title I of the ESEA while they transition to new college- and career-ready standards and assessments that capture a fuller picture of what students know and are able to do. Funds for competitive grants would also support targeted projects to advance States' and other entities' efforts to implement new assessment requirements of the reauthorized Title I and to develop additional assessments that support the improvement of teaching and learning. The proposed increase for FY 2012 would support a grant competition to assist consortia of States in developing high-quality assessments in areas of common need.

The 2012 request also includes:

- \$7.0 million for **Training and Advisory Services** to support regional equity assistance centers that provide technical assistance to school districts in addressing educational equity related to issues of race, gender, and national origin;
- \$174.9 million for **Rural Education** to provide resources to rural LEAs and schools that often face unique challenges in implementing ESEA;
- \$17.7 million for **Supplemental Education Grants** program to provide support to the Federated States of Micronesia and to the Republic of the Marshall Islands in place of grant programs in which those Freely Associated States no longer participate pursuant to the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003;
- \$56.3 million for **Comprehensive Centers** to provide comprehensive technical assistance to grantees under the Education Technical Assistance Act of 2002;
- \$34.3 million for **Native Hawaiian Student Education** to provide supplemental education programs and services to Native Hawaiian children and adults, in such areas as teacher training, family-based education, gifted and talented education, special education, higher education, and community-based education learning centers; and
- \$33.3 million for **Alaska Native Student Education** to support the development and operation of supplemental education programs and services for Alaska Native children and adults.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Effective teaching and learning for a complete education

(Legislation sought)

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
<i>Effective teaching and learning: literacy</i>	0	\$383,348	+\$383,348
<i>Effective teaching and learning: science, technology, engineering, and mathematics</i>	0	206,046	+206,046
<i>Effective teaching and learning for a well-rounded education</i>	0	246,084	+246,084
Total	0	835,478	+835,478

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The proposed Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education initiative would strengthen instruction and help raise student achievement across the core academic content areas by: (1) supporting the development of instructional systems that are aligned with high-quality kindergarten-through-grade-12 (K-12) college- and career-ready standards; (2) assisting States and local educational agencies (LEAs) in strengthening their preschool-through-grade-12 literacy programs; (3) assisting States and LEAs in strengthening preschool-through-grade-12 science, technology, engineering, and mathematics instruction; and (4) supporting States, LEAs, and nonprofit entities in developing, implementing, evaluating, and replicating evidence-based programs in the arts, health education, physical education, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, environmental education, economics and financial literacy, and other subjects that contribute to a well-rounded education.

The Administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization proposal includes three programs within the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education authority: (1) Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy; (2) Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics; and (3) Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education. In addition, the Department would be authorized to reserve up to 10 percent of the total appropriation to support a range of national activities, including identification of effective programs and best practices, development of high-quality educational and professional-development content, technical assistance, and dissemination. The Department would also be authorized to use funds from the appropriate program to continue grants made prior to reauthorization for programs being consolidated as part of the reauthorization.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education

The Department would also use program funds to strengthen the use of technology across the core academic content areas. In awarding grants under any of these programs, the Department could give priority to applicants that propose to use technology to address student learning challenges and increase student engagement and achievement or teacher effectiveness.

The Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education initiative would address the need to strengthen instruction and raise student achievement across the core academic content areas, especially in high-need LEAs. The Administration believes that this initiative would improve the capacity of States, LEAs, and schools to use their resources to drive improvements in the quality of academic instruction in a comprehensive manner. This approach would replace the patchwork of programs and funding streams in current law with three comprehensive, coherent programs that provide increased flexibility for States and LEAs to design, develop, and implement strategies that best meet the needs of their students. Further, this initiative would spur innovation and facilitate the spread of evidence-based practices.

Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program would provide competitive grants to State educational agencies (SEAs), or SEAs in partnership with appropriate outside entities, to support the development and implementation of comprehensive, evidence-based State and local efforts to provide high-quality literacy programs aligned with college- and career-ready English-language arts standards. These programs would be designed to address the need to strengthen instruction comprehensively and to increase student achievement in high-need LEAs and schools for students from preschool through grade 12, with LEAs able to focus funds on the areas of their greatest need.

In awarding State Literacy grants, the Department would give a priority to SEAs that have adopted and are implementing a set of high-quality college- and career-ready standards for English language arts that are common to a significant number of States. States would be permitted to reserve up to 20 percent of grant funds for State-level activities that support development and implementation of a comprehensive preschool-through-grade-12 State literacy plan. The Department could, at a State's request, permit that State to use up to 20 percent of its grant to make subgrants to eligible applicants for additional activities to provide high-quality literacy instruction. States would be required to use the remainder of their grant funds to make comprehensive literacy subgrants to high-need LEAs and other entities to implement a comprehensive high-quality literacy program, especially for projects in high-need schools. The Department would be permitted to reserve up to 5 percent of the appropriation for competitive State Capacity-Building grants that would support State efforts to strengthen their capacity to improve teaching and student achievement in literacy.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$383 million in fiscal year 2012 for Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy. This request would support the first year of the program, which would address the need to strengthen instruction comprehensively and to increase student achievement in literacy in high-need LEAs and schools. This new program would replace the patchwork of literacy funding streams in current law with a single comprehensive and coherent program that supports the improvement of education in reading, writing, and language arts while providing increased flexibility for States and LEAs to develop and implement strategies that best meet local needs. The Administration believes that this approach would help ensure that States and high-need LEAs have in place a solid infrastructure across the grade levels to support high-need schools in implementing high-quality, developmentally appropriate, and systematic literacy instruction.

Research and assessment data provide strong justification for a continued Federal investment in a large-scale evidence-based literacy program targeted to high-need LEAs and schools. Findings released in October 2009 from the Department's Early Childhood Longitudinal Study indicate that, at kindergarten entry, children from families with incomes below the poverty threshold have significantly lower reading scores than children from families living at or above the poverty threshold. The effects of socioeconomic status persist; on the 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), the most recent NAEP reading assessment, more than half (55 percent) of fourth-grade students in high-poverty schools scored below the basic reading level, compared with only 17 percent in low-poverty schools.¹ About half (47 percent) of eighth-grade students in high-poverty schools scored below the basic reading level, compared with only 13 percent in low-poverty schools. These data also demonstrate that, overall, an alarming number of our Nation's children are not reading at grade level. It is clear that many of the Nation's students, especially those in high-poverty schools, are unable to read at a level that would enable them to graduate from high school at a college- and career-ready literacy level.

While the fiscal year 2010 appropriation for Striving Readers expanded the program to provide support for the improvement of literacy instruction for students from birth through grade 12, it also allocated funding by specific age ranges of students, which may perpetuate a tendency in the field to implement segmented improvements to literacy instruction. The Administration strongly believes that State and local efforts will be more coherent and more likely to drive improvements in student achievement if they have a comprehensive preschool-grade 12 focus that also provides them with the flexibility to best meet the needs of their students.

The new Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program would build on reforms made in previous years and seek to ensure that the elements of a comprehensive high-quality literacy program are embedded in State and local strategies, strengthen performance expectations, and support the identification and testing of innovative methods of teaching reading, writing, and language arts. In addition, the Administration's request includes \$350 million for the Early Learning Challenge Fund (ELCF), which would provide competitive grants to States for the

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education

development of a statewide infrastructure of integrated high-quality early learning supports and services for children from birth through age 5 in order to help improve children's school readiness.

The Department also would use funds allocated for Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy to pay continuation costs for grants made prior to ESEA reauthorization under Striving Readers, Literacy Through School Libraries, and Ready-to-Learn Television.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2012</u>
Amount for grants	\$113,430
Number of grants	5-20
Peer review of new award applications	\$1,000
National activities set-aside	\$38,335
Continuations for antecedent programs	<u>\$230,583</u>
Total, Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy	\$383,348

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$230,583 thousand would be provided in FY 2012 to fund continuation awards for grants made under the following programs prior to enactment of the reauthorization: Striving Readers (\$203,092 thousand), Literacy Through School Libraries (\$191 thousand), and Ready-to-Learn Television (\$27,300 thousand).

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

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) program would provide competitive grants to SEAs, or SEAs in partnership with appropriate outside entities, to support State and local efforts to implement a comprehensive strategy for the provision of high-quality STEM instruction and support to students from preschool through grade 12. Grantees and subgrantees would be required to focus on improving teaching and learning in mathematics or science, or both, and could also carry out activities in technology or engineering designed to increase student achievement, in high-need LEAs and schools.

In awarding State STEM grants, the Department would give priority to States that have adopted and are implementing a set of high-quality K-12 mathematics college- and career-ready standards (and, at the Department's discretion, additional standards, such as science standards) that are common to a significant number of States. The Department could also give

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education

priority to States that have a robust statewide partnership or network that brings together a variety of organizations with STEM expertise, such as museums, institutions of higher education, and community-based organizations. States receiving grants would be permitted to reserve up to 20 percent of grant funds for State-level activities to support a coherent approach to funding and implementing high-quality evidence-based STEM instruction in high-need LEAs and schools. States would be required to use their remaining grant funds to make subgrants to high-need LEAs and other entities to improve STEM instruction at the local level through, for example, online curricula and other technology-based approaches to STEM education. The Department would be permitted to reserve up to 5 percent of funds for competitive State Capacity-Building grants that would support State efforts to strengthen their capacity to improve the teaching and learning of STEM.

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$206 million in fiscal year 2012 for the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM program. This request would support the first year of the program, which would replace the existing Mathematics and Science Partnership program with a more comprehensive, flexible program and address the need to strengthen instruction comprehensively and increase student achievement in STEM subjects in high-need LEAs and schools.

Improving American students' achievement in STEM fields is vital to ensuring the economic well-being of our country and is a priority of the Administration. Projections from the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate that over 80 percent of the fastest-growing occupations (such as those in the healthcare- and computer-related fields) are dependent on knowledge of mathematics, science, technology, or engineering. On the 2009 Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) mathematics assessment, the United States was outperformed by 17 of 33 other countries belonging to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), which represents the world's most advanced countries, and by 12 of 33 other OECD countries on the 2009 PISA science assessment. For the United States to remain competitive in the global economy, build and maintain a highly skilled workforce, and nourish technological innovation, we must improve STEM teaching and learning and ensure access to rigorous courses of study for all students.

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education

Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM would help address these concerns by focusing on teaching and learning of STEM subjects in a manner that is aligned with college- and career-ready standards. This new program would also provide States and LEAs with the flexibility necessary to meet the needs of their students and teachers across STEM subjects while focusing funding on programs that improve student achievement, especially in high-need LEAs. The Department is planning to work closely with the National Science Foundation and other Federal science agencies to implement a coordinated STEM education strategy that optimizes the delivery of services and minimizes duplication and inefficiency. Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM will be a key element of that strategy.

In addition, as components of the Administration's governmentwide effort to support and improve STEM education, the Department would set aside \$80 million from the FY12 appropriation for the new Teacher and Leader Pathways program for projects to prepare effective STEM teachers and include support for STEM projects in the FY 2012 Investing in Innovation competition. The Department would also promote advancements in STEM-related educational technology through the new Advanced Research Projects Agency-Education.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2012</u>
Amount for grants	\$184,041
Number of grants	5-20
Peer review of new award applications	\$400
National activities set-aside	<u>\$20,605</u>
Total, Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM	\$206,046

Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education would provide competitive grants to high-need LEAs, SEAs, and institutions of higher education or nonprofit organizations in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs to support the development and expansion of innovative practices to improve teaching and learning across a well-rounded curriculum that includes the arts, health education, physical education, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, environmental education, economics and financial literacy, and other subjects as identified by the Secretary.

In awarding grants, the Department would be authorized to give priority to applicants that plan to (1) integrate teaching or learning in one or more of the above subjects with reading, English-language arts, or STEM instruction; (2) establish articulation agreements with postsecondary programs for the continuation of instruction in an academic subject; or (3) achieve State-wide

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education

impact in one or more States. The Department could also give priority to proposals that are supported by the strongest available evidence.

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$246 million in fiscal year 2012 for the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program. The request would support the first year of the program, which would replace several, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that seek to improve student achievement in specific subject areas (including programs that support the arts, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, and economics and financial literacy).

The Administration believes that all students should receive high-quality instruction across the academic content areas. However, the existing range of Federal programs that focus on the teaching and learning of specific subjects is too fragmented to provide State and LEA officials with the tools they need to strengthen instruction and increase student achievement in the comprehensive manner required. Nor are the current programs well-structured to enable educators and policymakers to identify and expand the most effective and innovative practices. Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education would address these problems by consolidating existing funding streams into a single comprehensive program that will drive resources to where they are most needed and generate information on what works. This new program would also provide States and LEAs with the flexibility necessary to meet the needs of their students and teachers across a well-rounded curriculum while focusing funding on programs that improve student achievement, especially in high-need LEAs.

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

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2012</u>
Amount for grants	\$122,649
Number of grants	10-25
Peer review of new award applications	\$300
National activities set-aside	\$24,608

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)—continued

	<u>2012</u>
Continuations for antecedent programs	<u>\$98,527</u>
Total, Effective Teaching and Learning for A Well-Rounded Education	\$246,084

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$98,527 thousand would be provided in FY 2012 to fund continuation awards for grants made under the following programs prior to enactment of the reauthorization: Teaching American History (\$62,700 thousand), Arts in Education (\$14,266 thousand), Foreign Language Assistance (\$18,694 thousand), Civic Education (\$1,420 thousand), and Excellence in Economic Education (\$1,447 thousand).

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Striving readers

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$250,000 ²	0	-\$250,000

¹The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

²Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

From the total fiscal year 2011 appropriation, the Department will reserve: (1) one-half of 1 percent for grants to the Department of the Interior/Bureau of Indian Education and one-half of 1 percent for the Outlying Areas; (2) \$10 million for formula grants to States for the establishment or support of a State Literacy Team with expertise in literacy development and education for children from birth through grade 12 to assist the State in developing a comprehensive literacy plan; and (3) up to 5 percent for national activities. The remaining funds will be used to award competitive grants to States.

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

An SEA may reserve up to 5 percent of its allocation for leadership activities, including technical assistance and training, data collection, reporting, and administration. Eligible entities receiving

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Striving readers

subgrants must use Striving Readers funds for services and activities that have the characteristics of effective literacy instruction through professional development, screening and assessment, targeted interventions for students reading below grade level, and other research-based methods of improving classroom instruction and practice.

In fiscal years 2005 through 2009, the Striving Readers program supported competitive grants to improve middle- or high-school students' literacy skills. In conference report language, Congress directed the Department to "make competitive grants to develop, implement, evaluate, and bring to scale reading interventions for middle- or high-school students who are reading significantly below grade level, prioritizing services to those schools and districts with one or more high or middle schools that include a significant number of students reading below grade level." In addition, Congress directed the Department to give competitive preference to schools that agreed to participate in randomized research studies and to balance grants between projects serving middle schools and projects serving high schools.

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

In conducting the second competition in 2009, the Department limited eligibility to SEAs applying on behalf of the SEA and one or more LEAs with governing authority over Title I-eligible schools that serve any of grades 6 through 12. Applicants were required to include at least five schools in their applications. The Notice Inviting Applications included two absolute priorities that all applicants were required to meet. The first required grantees to implement a supplemental literacy intervention (for students with reading skills 2 or more years below grade level) during the second, third, and fourth years of the 4-year project period. The second absolute priority required applicants to evaluate the effectiveness of the supplemental literacy intervention using an experimental research design. In an effort to ensure that each project included a sufficient number of struggling readers necessary for an evaluation to detect an impact, the Department also required applicants to provide State or other assessment data for the 2 most recent school years that demonstrated that each school included in the application had a minimum of 75 struggling readers during each of those years.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Striving readers

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

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

	(\$000s)
2007	31,870
2008	35,371
2009	35,371
2010	200,000 ¹
2011 CR.....	250,000

¹ Reflects a rescission of \$50,000 thousand under P.L. 111-226.

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Striving Readers program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that seek to promote improvement of reading, writing, and language arts instruction for students of various grade spans, the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization, a new broader program, Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy. This program would address the need to comprehensively strengthen instruction and increase student achievement in literacy in high-need LEAs and schools.

Under the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program, the Department would provide competitive grants to States to support the development and implementation of comprehensive State and local efforts to provide high-quality literacy programs aligned with college- and career-ready English language arts standards. These programs would be designed to increase student achievement in high-need LEAs and schools for students from preschool through grade 12, with LEAs able to focus funds on the areas of their greatest need. This approach would replace the patchwork of literacy funding streams in current law with a single comprehensive and coherent program that would provide increased flexibility for States and LEAs to develop and implement strategies that best meet local needs. The Administration believes that this new program would help ensure that States and high-need LEAs have in place a solid infrastructure across the grade levels to support high-need schools in implementing high-quality, developmentally appropriate, and systematic literacy instruction.

The new program would build off congressional action in fiscal year 2010, which changed the Striving Readers program from an adolescent literacy program to a comprehensive literacy development and education program that provides support for the improvement of literacy instruction for children from birth through grade 12. The 2010 appropriations language, however, also allocated funding by specific age ranges of students, which may perpetuate a tendency in the field to implement segmented improvements to literacy instruction. The Administration believes that the Federal Government can better support literacy improvement

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Striving readers

efforts by providing States and LEAs with the flexibility to invest Federal funds based on their needs within the framework of a comprehensive preschool-through-12th-grade literacy plan. In addition, the Department's request includes \$350 million for the Early Learning Challenge Fund (ELCF), which would provide competitive grants to States for the development of a statewide infrastructure of integrated high-quality early learning supports and services for children from birth through age 5.

The fiscal year 2012 request for Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy would include funds to pay 2012 continuation costs for the Striving Readers grants made in previous years.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Amount for competitive grants	\$176,000	\$224,000	0
Continuation	0	\$196,908	0
New	\$176,000	\$27,092	0
Total number of competitive grants			
Continuation	0	11-26 ¹	
New	3-18	1-5	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$2,000	\$1,000	0
Amounts for formula grants			
State Literacy Team grants	\$10,000	\$10,000	0
Bureau of Indian Education	\$1,000	\$1,250	0
Outlying Areas	\$1,000	\$1,250	0
National activities (including evaluation)	\$10,000	\$12,500	0

NOTE: In fiscal year 2012, continuation costs of approximately \$203,092 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program.

¹The Department would award continuation grants to the 5-20 grantees that first received funding from the FY 2010 appropriation, as well as the 8 adolescent literacy grantees that first received funding from the FY 2008 appropriation. The Department would use \$20,908 thousand from the FY 2011 Striving Readers appropriation to support years 3 and 4 of those 4-year projects because the FY 2010 appropriation for this program did not include the authority for the payment of those continuations.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Striving readers

2012 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program. The Department uses the following measures to evaluate the performance of the grants to improve middle- or high-school students' literacy skills.

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

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

Measure: The percentage of adolescent students reading significantly below grade level who demonstrate a gain in their reading achievement at a minimum of one grade level or its equivalent after participating in an intensive literacy intervention over an academic year.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		34.14
2008	36.14	42.59
2009	44.14	44.83
2010	46.14	
2011	48.14	
2012	50.14	

Additional Information: At the end of 2008-09 school year, 44.83 percent of adolescent students participating in the targeted literacy intervention component of the program demonstrated a gain of at least one grade level in reading achievement, exceeding the target for 2009.

Measure: The percentage of students in schools participating in the Striving Readers program who score at or above proficient on the State's assessment in reading/language arts.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	60.45	59.32
2008	61.32	62.40
2009	64.40	60.22
2010	66.40	
2011	68.40	
2012	68.40	

Additional Information: The percentage of students in Striving Readers schools who scored at or above proficient on State reading assessments decreased slightly to 60.22 percent in spring 2009, missing the target.

The fiscal year 2010 appropriation for Striving Readers expanded the program to provide support for the improvement of literacy instruction for students from birth through grade 12. The Department is currently developing performance measures for the revised program. The

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Striving readers

measures will focus on the extent to which grantees improve student English language arts achievement.

Other Performance Information

All 16 current Striving Readers grantees are conducting rigorous experimental evaluations of their supplemental literacy interventions for struggling readers. The eight 2006 grantees are also conducting experimental or quasi-experimental evaluations of their whole-school literacy-throughout-the-curriculum models for all students. The Department released the year-3 evaluation reports for the 2006 grantees, which provided preliminary results from 3 years of implementation, including impact findings, in fall 2010. The key research questions that the impact studies address are: (1) do the specific supplemental literacy interventions employed by the grantees significantly improve reading proficiency among struggling readers after 1, 2, or 3 years of intervention? (2) do the school-level literacy-throughout-the-curriculum models improve outcomes for all students? Three of the eight evaluations found that one year of the targeted intervention had statistically significant positive impacts on achievement for either middle or high school students. One of the three evaluations examining interventions that could serve struggling readers for up to 3 years found a positive impact of 3 years of the intervention, but not 1 or 2 years of the intervention, on student outcomes. None of the five evaluations that examined the effectiveness of the whole-school models found a statistically significant impact on student reading achievement. As the evaluations continue and more years of data are collected, the Department will have more reliable information on the impacts of the interventions and whole-school models. The evaluation reports are available at: <http://www.ed.gov/programs/strivingreaders/performance.html>.

In addition, the Department plans to release annual updates to the cross-site summary tables as well as 16 profiles of the individual projects through fiscal year 2014. The cross-site summary tables include descriptions of the interventions, the evaluations designs, and findings on the fidelity of implementation and the impacts of the interventions on student outcomes. Currently, the cross-site tables include findings for the 2006 grantees; the findings for the 2009 cohort of grantees will be included when they become available in 2012. The project profiles and cross-site summary tables are available at: <http://www.ed.gov/programs/strivingreaders/performance.html>.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Even start

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$66,454 ²	0	-\$66,454

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

² Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

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

Six percent of the annual appropriation is set aside at the national level for programs serving migrant children, the Outlying Areas, and Indian tribes and tribal organizations if the

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Even start

appropriation for the program exceeds \$200 million. When the appropriation is \$200 million or less, the set-aside is 5 percent. The Department is also required to fund a grant for an Even Start project in a women's prison. Up to 3 percent is reserved at the Federal level for evaluation and technical assistance. In addition, in years in which the appropriation exceeds the amount appropriated for the preceding fiscal year, the Department is required to reserve \$2 million, or 50 percent of the excess, whichever is less, for the National Institute for Literacy (NIFL) to carry out scientifically based research on family literacy. When the appropriation is the same as or less than the preceding year's appropriation, the Department may reserve only sufficient funds for NIFL to continue multi-year research projects. The statute also authorizes \$1 million for competitive grants to States for Even Start statewide family literacy initiatives in years when the appropriation increases over the previous year.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$82,283
2008	66,454
2009	66,454
2010	66,454
2011 CR	66,454

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Even Start program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that seek to promote improvement of reading, writing, and language arts instruction for students of various grade spans, the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization, a new broader program, Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy. This program would address the need to comprehensively strengthen instruction and increase student achievement in literacy in high-need LEAs and schools.

Under the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program, the Department would provide competitive grants to States to support the development and implementation of comprehensive State and local efforts to provide high-quality literacy programs aligned with college- and career-ready English-language arts standards. These programs would be designed to increase student achievement in high-need LEAs and schools for students from preschool through grade 12, with LEAs able to focus funds on the areas of their greatest need. This approach would replace the patchwork of literacy funding streams in current law with a single comprehensive and coherent program that would provide increased flexibility for States and LEAs to develop and implement strategies that best meet local needs. The Administration believes that this new program would help ensure that States and high-need LEAs have in place a solid infrastructure across the grade levels to support high-need schools in implementing high-quality,

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Even start

developmentally appropriate, and systematic literacy instruction (which may include programs that support family literacy).

Other programs included in the fiscal year 2012 request can also support family literacy activities. The request includes \$635 million for Adult Education State grants, which assist adult parents in obtaining the necessary educational skills to become full partners in the educational development of their children. In addition, the request includes \$350 million to launch the Early Learning Challenge Fund (ELCF), which would provide competitive grants to States for the development of a statewide infrastructure of integrated high-quality early learning supports and services for children from birth through age 5.

Further, the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal supports family literacy in a number of ways. It would significantly increase State and local spending on parent and family engagement activities, ensuring that every district receiving Title I funds is developing and implementing a family engagement plan focused on raising student achievement and developing promising new strategies (which may include family literacy) to engage parents and families. The reauthorization proposal would also double the local Title I set-aside for parent and family engagement, from 1 to 2 percent, for a total of some \$290 million in fiscal year 2012. Additionally, States would be allowed to use 1 percent of their College- and Career-Ready Students (CCRS) allocations, totaling about \$145 million, for State-led competitions that would support local, family involvement programs. This Family Engagement and Responsibility Fund would help expand district-level, evidence-based parental involvement activities.

The Supporting Student Success programs – Promise Neighborhoods, Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students, and 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) – would also encourage and support parent and family engagement, including family literacy, in a number of ways. Funds from each of these programs could be used to support and promote innovative activities that encourage the active and meaningful engagement and involvement of families in their children's education, which may include family literacy. Additionally, the Promise Neighborhoods program would create a continuum of cradle- to-career solutions, with high-quality schools at the center, in distressed communities. Projects would not only work to comprehensively address student needs, including through the implementation of ambitious, rigorous, and comprehensive education reforms and effective community services, they would also support strong systems of family and community support. Under the new Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program, eligible local entities would assess families' experiences and attitudes on the conditions for learning in their child's school, which could include conditions related to school safety, school environment, and school engagement. This school-level information would be publicly available, ensuring that families have access to important information about their children's schools. Further, the 21st CCLC program would work to improve student achievement by supporting programs that implement in-school and out-of-school strategies that provide students and, where appropriate, teachers and family members with additional time and supports. The Administration's reauthorization proposal for the 21st CCLC program would broaden the existing menu of programs and strategies to include full-service community schools, which coordinate and provide access to comprehensive and integrated services at the school site in order to meet comprehensive needs of students, families, and members of the community.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Even start

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

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Amount distributed to States	\$61,138	\$61,138	0
Average State award	\$1,176	\$1,176	0
Range of State awards	\$306 - \$7,307	\$306 - \$6,728	0
Evaluation and technical assistance	\$1,993	\$1,993	0
Set-aside for migrant children, the Outlying Areas, and Indian tribes			
Amount for grants	\$3,323	\$3,323	0
Number of State-awarded projects	388	388	0
Indian tribes continuation projects	4	4	0
Migrant continuation projects	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>
Total projects	396	396	0
Number of children served	21,550	21,550	0
Number of adults served	15,360	15,360	0

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Even start

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

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

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

Measure: The percentage of Even Start adults who achieve significant learning gains on measures of reading/English language acquisition, as measured by the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS) and the Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE).		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	70.9	73.1
2008	71.2	69.9
2009	73.0	75.3
2010	73.6	
2011	74.0	

Additional Information: In 2009, 75.3 percent of Even Start adults achieved significant learning gains on measures of reading/English language acquisition, as measured by the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS) and the Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE), exceeding the target. No targets are shown for 2012 because the Administration is proposing to consolidate this program.

Measure: The percentage of Even Start adults with a high school completion goal who earn a high school diploma.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	60.8	68.5
2008	60.8	75.0
2009	70.0	67.2
2010	72.0	
2011	72.0	

Additional Information: In 2009, 67.2 percent of Even Start adults with a high school completion goal earned a high school diploma, a decrease from 2008 and missing the target.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Even start

No targets are shown for 2012 because the Administration is proposing to consolidate this program.

Measure: The percentage of Even Start adults with General Equivalency Diploma (GED) attainment goal who earn a GED.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	45.3	48.9
2008	48.0	58.2
2009	45.0	63.9
2010	47.5	
2011	49.0	

Additional Information: In 2009, 63.9 percent of Even Start adults with a high school completion goal earned a GED, exceeding the target of 45.0 percent. No targets are shown for 2012 because the Administration is proposing to consolidate this program.

Measure: The percentage of Even Start children who are entering kindergarten achieving significant gains on receptive language, as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT – III).		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	84	75
2008	85	77
2009	80	83
2010	82	
2011	82	

Additional Information: The Department defines significant gains as a gain of 4 points or more on the PPVT-III. In 2009, 83 percent of Even Start children entering kindergarten achieved significant gains on receptive language, exceeding the target. No targets are shown for 2012 because the Administration is proposing to consolidate this program.

Measure: The number of letters preschool-aged Even Start children can identify, as measured by the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	16.0	16.2
2008	17.0	17.9
2009	17.0	18.4
2010	17.0	
2011	17.0	

Additional Information: On average, Even Start children could identify 18.4 letters in 2009, an increase from 2008 and exceeding the target. No targets are shown for 2012 because the Administration is proposing to consolidate this program.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Even start

Measure: The percentage of preschool-aged children participating in Even Start programs who demonstrate age-appropriate oral language skills, as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT – III).		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		66
2008	67	69
2009	68	69
2010	69	
2011	69	

Additional Information: The purpose of this measure is to determine the percentage of preschool-aged Even Start participants who enter kindergarten with sufficient language skills. In 2009, 69 percent of preschool-aged children demonstrated age-appropriate oral language skills, the same percentage as in 2008, which exceeded the target. No targets are shown for 2012 because the Administration is proposing to consolidate this program.

Other Performance Information

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

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

In order to learn more about the effectiveness of instructional services, the Institute of Education Sciences used Even Start evaluation funds to conduct the *Even Start Classroom Literacy Interventions and Outcomes (CLIO)* study. The study tested whether two research-based, literacy-focused preschool and parenting education curricula were more effective than existing Even Start instructional services, and the extent to which research-based parenting education curricula that focus on child literacy add value to the CLIO preschool curricula. The final report,

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Even start

released in September 2008, found that the CLIO combined curricula had statistically significant positive impacts on support for print knowledge and literacy resources in the classroom, the amount of parenting education time spent on child literacy, parent interactive reading skill and parent responsiveness to their child, and child social competence. The combined curricula did not, however, demonstrate statistically significant impacts in numerous other areas, including parent English reading skills, and several child outcome measures including expressive language, receptive vocabulary, phonological awareness, print knowledge, and grammar. It is important to note, however, that this evaluation was not designed to answer questions about the Even Start program's performance but, rather, to study the impact of two specific curricula implemented in the Even Start context as compared to the impact of regular Even Start services.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Literacy through schools libraries

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

FY 2012 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$19,145 ²	0	-\$19,145

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

² Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

An LEA receiving assistance under the program is required to report annually on: (1) how it used program funds; and (2) the extent to which the LEA has increased the availability of, and access to, up-to-date school library media resources in its schools. In addition, the Department is required to conduct biennial evaluations of the program. The Department also requires

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Literacy through school libraries

grantees to report data for the performance measures established under the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA).

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$19,485
2008	19,145
2009	19,145
2010	19,145
2011 CR	19,145

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Literacy Through School Libraries program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that seek to promote improvement of reading, writing, and language arts instruction for students of various grade spans, the Administration has proposed to create, through the ESEA reauthorization, a new broader program, Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy. This program would address the need to comprehensively strengthen instruction and increase student achievement in literacy in high-need LEAs and schools.

Under the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program, the Department would provide competitive grants to States to support the development and implementation of comprehensive State and local efforts to provide high-quality literacy programs aligned with college- and career-ready English-language arts standards. These programs would be designed to increase student achievement in high-need LEAs and schools for students from preschool through grade 12, with LEAs able to focus funds on the areas of their greatest need. This approach would replace the patchwork of literacy funding streams in current law with a single comprehensive and coherent program that would provide increased flexibility for States and LEAs to develop and implement strategies that best meet local needs. The Administration believes that this new program would help ensure that States and high-need LEAs have in place a solid infrastructure across the grade levels to support high-need schools in implementing high-quality, developmentally appropriate, and systematic literacy instruction (which may include programs that support school libraries).

While the Administration recognizes the importance of libraries and the need for students to know how to use their services, a broader program that replaces the literacy funding streams in current law with a single comprehensive, coherent, and flexible program that supports the improvement of education in reading, writing, and language arts will be more likely to drive improvements in student achievement. Activities to expand school or classroom library services would be authorized under the program, and LEAs whose plans call (as part of a program for increasing achievement in literacy) for increasing their library collections, opening their facilities for longer hours, or providing professional development to school librarians would be able to use program funds for those activities.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Literacy through school libraries

The fiscal year 2012 request for the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program would include funds to pay 2012 continuation costs to complete the Literacy through School Libraries evaluation.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Amount for local awards	\$18,571	\$18,571	0
Number of new awards	50	45-55	0
Number of students served	133,863	133,863	0
Amount for peer review of applications	\$191	\$191	0
Amount for evaluation	\$191	\$191	0
Amount for the DOI Bureau of Indian Education	\$96	\$96	0
Amount for the Outlying Areas	\$96	\$96	0

NOTE: FY 2012 continuation costs of approximately \$191 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program in order to complete the evaluation begun in 2010.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

The Department established new performance measures for the Literacy through School Libraries program in 2008. The new measures are: (1) the percentage of students in schools served by the program who are proficient in reading; (2) the number of books and media resources purchased per student, pre- and post-grant, compared to the national average; and (3) the difference in the number of purchases of school library materials (books and media resources) between schools participating in the program and the national average. Grantees reported baseline data for these new measures in 2009. For the 2008 cohort, 62 percent of students in schools served by the program were proficient in reading. Grantees purchased one book or media resource per student pre-grant and five books or media resources per student post-grant, compared to the national average of one book or media resource purchased per student. Therefore, the difference in the number of purchases of school library materials (books and media resources) between schools participating in the Literacy Through School Libraries

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Literacy through school libraries

program (post-grant) and the national average was four books and media resources per student. Data for the 2009 cohort will be available in early 2011.

Other Performance Information

In 2009, the Department completed an evaluation of the program to determine: (1) how districts allocate grant funds and target them to schools with the greatest need for improved library resources; (2) how funds are used (e.g., to buy books, improve technology, increase library hours, or provide professional development for library and reading staff); (3) the effects of the program on staff collaboration and coordination; and (4) how reading achievement scores vary in schools that received grants compared to schools that did not. The study addressed these questions by examining data from grantee performance reports, a school library survey of grantees and matched comparison schools, and annual school-level student test score data. The study is posted at: <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/opepd/ppss/reports.html#libraries>.

Key findings of the study include:

- School districts reported selecting participating schools based on various kinds of disadvantages at those schools. For example, 36 percent chose schools based on a lack of library resources, 22 percent based on poverty level, and 20 percent based on those identified for school improvement under Title I of the ESEA. However, 53 percent of districts distributed grant funds to all of the schools in the district. (Districts could use more than one method to select schools for participation.)
- School libraries tended to allocate the greatest amount of their funds to materials such as books and subscriptions and the next most to computer hardware. Districts that received grants spent 57 percent of the grant money on school library resources, including books and subscriptions, in the 2005-06 school year. Districts spent 20 percent of funds on the acquisition of advanced technology and 8 percent on operating the library during nonschool hours. After receiving the grants, grantees roughly tripled the amounts they spent on books and subscriptions and on computer hardware. By contrast, nongrantees showed little change in these categories. Among the grantees, some of the greatest changes were among small schools, rural schools, and schools with \$12 or less in pre-grant library expenditures per student.
- Grantees showed significant increases in the number of days that the library was open in the summer and in the number of visits to the library per week.
- Before receiving the grants, grantees provided significantly fewer non-school hours of access than nongrantees, but they eliminated this difference after receiving the grants.
- Grantees acquired substantially more books in the 2005-06 grant year than did nongrantees (with means of 1,611 and 784 books, respectively), although nongrantees still had more books in their library collections at the end of the year than did grantees (11,892 for nongrantees and 9,451 for grantees).

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Literacy through school libraries

- About twice as many classroom teachers, paraprofessionals, and reading specialists in grantee schools received professional development related to school libraries compared with nongrantee staff members (for example, a mean of 9.5 to 4.7 classroom teachers, respectively) in 2005-06. However, the mean number of both grantee and nongrantee staff members receiving professional development decreased in 2005-06 compared to 2003-04, especially for classroom teachers (from 14.1 to 9.5 for grantees and from 11.1 to 4.7 for nongrantees).
- No definitive statement can be made as to whether the Literacy Through School Libraries program was associated with changes in student test scores. The program feature that most clearly was associated with improved test results was an increase in the number of books per student that were purchased by the library. However, because the evaluation did not implement a true experimental design, the findings cannot support causal inferences that attribute observed differences in student reading achievement to participation in the program.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

National Writing Project

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$25,646 ²	0	-\$25,646

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

² Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The National Writing Project (NWP) program earmarks funds for the NWP, a nationwide nonprofit educational organization that promotes and supports teacher training programs to improve the teaching of writing. The statute requires that the NWP enter into contracts with institutions of higher education or other nonprofit educational providers that establish, operate, and provide the non-Federal share of the cost of teacher training programs in effective approaches and processes for the teaching of writing. Federal funds support 50 percent of the costs of these programs, and recipients must contribute an equal amount. The Federal share may not exceed \$100,000 for any one contractor, or \$200,000 for a statewide program administered by any one contractor in at least five sites throughout the State. The teacher training programs may be conducted during the school year and during the summer months, and may be used to train teachers across all disciplines who teach grades kindergarten through college. A national advisory board provides advice and reviews NWP programs and activities.

The NWP network includes over 200 local sites that serve all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. NWP sites provide customized services for teachers in their area but adhere to a national program model that includes common practices and principles.

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$21,533
2008	23,581
2009	24,291
2010	25,646
2011 CR.....	25,646

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

National writing project

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the National Writing Project program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that seek to promote improvement of reading, writing, and language arts instruction for students of various grade spans, the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization, a new broader program, Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy. This program would address the need to comprehensively strengthen instruction and increase student achievement in literacy in high-need local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools.

Under the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program, the Department would provide competitive grants to States to support the development and implementation of comprehensive State and local efforts to provide high-quality literacy programs aligned with college- and career-ready English-language arts standards. These programs would be designed to increase student achievement in high-need LEAs and schools for students from preschool through grade 12, with LEAs able to focus funds on the areas of their greatest need. This approach would replace the patchwork of literacy funding streams in current law with a single comprehensive and coherent program that would provide increased flexibility for States and LEAs to develop and implement strategies that best meet local needs. The Administration believes that this new program would help ensure that States and high-need LEAs have in place a solid infrastructure across the grade levels to support high-need schools in implementing high-quality, developmentally appropriate, and systematic literacy instruction.

From the amount requested for the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy programs, the Department would reserve funds to support a range of national activities, including research, developing high-quality educational and professional-development content, technical assistance, dissemination, and identifying and disseminating information on effective programs and best practices. The NWP program authority provides earmarked assistance to a specific entity, and the Administration believes that competing funds rather than earmarking them will lead to higher-quality programs and improved student outcomes. Organizations such as the NWP would be eligible to compete for such national activities funding available under this program to create high-quality, educational content for children. Furthermore, NWP has a long history of success raising revenue through partnering with nonprofit groups on core activities and seeking grants from foundations and is well positioned to continue its activities without further Federal support from earmarks.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Number of project sites	208	208	0
Number of States (including D.C., Puerto Rico, & the Virgin Islands)	53	53	0

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

National writing project

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

The Department has one annual performance measure designed to provide information on the quality of NWP professional development programs. This measure is the percentage of sites that surpass all NWP quality review criteria in the areas of (a) overall adherence to the NWP model and (b) structural support and strategic effectiveness.

Goal: To improve the teaching of writing in the Nation's schools.

Objective: To improve the quality of National Writing Project sites.

Measure: The percentage of sites that surpass all NWP quality review criteria in the areas of (1) overall adherence to the NWP model and (2) structural support and strategic effectiveness..		
Year	Target	Actual
2008		95.8
2009		96.5
2010	85	98.5
2011	85	

Additional information: Data for this measure are collected by NWP, through the NWP site peer review. The peer review process used to collect data for this measure was designed, developed, and implemented by the NWP. Three types of NWP professional development programs offered at each site (summer institute, in-service programs, and continuity programs) are considered in this review, as well as each site's overall adherence to the NWP professional development model. The NWP reported in its annual performance report that 98.5 percent of sites surpassed all NWP review criteria in the areas of overall adherence to the NWP model and structural support and strategic effectiveness. No targets are shown for 2012 because the program is proposed for consolidation.

The Department identified two additional measures for the program but was unable to obtain data from the grantee and has dropped the measures. These measures were: (1) The percentage of NWP summer institute training syllabi deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals and (2) The percentage of NWP summer institute training session participants who improve the quality of writing assignments given, as demonstrated through an independent review of lesson plans by a panel of experts or individuals.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

National writing project

Efficiency Measures

The Department adopted two efficiency measures for the program: (1) The average annual total cost per contact hour for educators participating in NWP training and professional development and (2) The average annual Federal cost per contact hour for educators participating in NWP training and professional development.

NWP reported that the average annual total cost per educator contact hour was \$20.31 in 2008-09 and the average annual Federal cost per educator contact hour was \$5.68. NWP calculates contact hours at the site level, on a "per program" basis, by identifying the total number of participants in each NWP program multiplied by the average number of hours per participant for that program. Contact hour calculations are averaged across all NWP sites to obtain a national average for a single year period.

Other Performance Information

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

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

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

While both the survey and AED study suggest that the NWP support programs may have positive effects on teacher effectiveness and student outcomes, neither approach is sufficiently rigorous to yield information on the effectiveness of NWP-supported interventions on student learning in NWP classrooms relative to that in comparable non-NWP classrooms. For example, in the AED study, data showed a significant increase in the writing skills of students in the NWP

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

National writing project

teachers' classrooms, but the study failed to compare these gains to comparable control groups or carefully matched comparison groups.

The Department encouraged the NWP to conduct a far more rigorous, independent national program evaluation, and in November 2006, the NWP contracted with SRI International, located in Menlo Park, CA, to conduct a 4-year evaluation. The national evaluation began in fiscal year 2007. The study sample consists of 39 schools in 14 local sites. A preliminary report, which provides descriptive data from the first year of implementation, is available on the web at <http://policyweb.sri.com/cep/publications/WPD-Year3Report-Final-May2010.pdf>. Later reports will provide information on the impact of program activities on teacher practices and student writing. NWP has reported that student writing samples will be scored during the summer of 2011, following the conclusion of all data collection. The final report, which will include a complete analysis of student outcomes, should be available in the spring of 2012.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Reading is fundamental/Inexpensive book distribution

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$24,803 ²	0	-\$24,803

¹The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

²Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$25,043
2008	24,606
2009	24,803
2010	24,803
2011 CR.....	24,803

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Reading is Fundamental program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that seek to promote improvement of reading, writing, and language arts instruction for students

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Reading is fundamental/Inexpensive book distribution

of various grade spans, the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization, a new broader program, Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy. This program would address the need to comprehensively strengthen instruction and increase student achievement in literacy in high-need local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools.

Under the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program, the Department would provide competitive grants to States to support the development and implementation of comprehensive State and local efforts to provide high-quality literacy programs aligned with college- and career-ready English-language arts standards. These programs would be designed to increase student achievement in high-need LEAs and schools for students from preschool through grade 12, with LEAs able to focus funds on the areas of their greatest need. This approach would replace the patchwork of literacy funding streams in current law with a single comprehensive and coherent program that would provide increased flexibility for States and LEAs to develop and implement strategies that best meet local needs. The Administration believes that this new program would help ensure that States and high-need LEAs have in place a solid infrastructure across the grade levels to support high-need schools in implementing high-quality, developmentally appropriate, and systematic literacy instruction.

The Administration's reauthorization proposal recognizes the importance of children's access to books, but is based on the premise that a broader program that replaces the patchwork of literacy funding streams in current law with a single comprehensive, coherent, and flexible program that supports the improvement of education in reading, writing, and language arts will be more likely to drive improvements in student achievement. Subgrantees would be able to partner with nonprofit organizations, such as RIF, to further the implementation of an LEA's comprehensive literacy plan. In addition, the current RIF 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.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Book funds			
Federal share	\$19,606	\$19,606	0
Local match	<u>\$5,977</u>	<u>\$5,977</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	\$25,583	\$25,583	0
Books distributed	14,445,000	14,445,000	0
Children served	4,132,000	4,132,000	0
Number of sites	16,000	16,000	0
Average Federal share per child (for books and services, whole dollars)	\$4.75	\$4.75	0
Federal cost per book (whole dollars)	\$1.38	\$1.38	0
Books per child	3.5	3.5	0

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Reading is fundamental/Inexpensive book distribution

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)—continued

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Technical assistance	\$2,224	\$2,224	0
Support services and management	\$2,973	\$2,973	0

NOTE: Figures for 2010 and 2011 are estimates based on activity supported during fiscal year 2009 primarily with fiscal year 2008 funds, which is the most recent year for which information is available.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

Goal: To motivate low-income children to read.

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

Measure: The number of low-income children who receive books and reading services through the Reading is Fundamental program.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2007	3,769,244	4,141,351
2008	3,700,000	4,098,701
2009	3,750,000	
2010	4,200,000	
2011	4,250,000	

Additional information: The measure gauges the extent to which the program provides books and reading services to low-income children. RIF estimates this number by multiplying the number of children served by the percentage of children who are eligible for free- and reduced-lunch as reported by local projects. The Department established the 2011 target using 2007 and 2008 data. It is important to note that these data represent the total number of children served with Federal funds; 77 percent of children served in 2008-09 with 2008 funds were eligible for free- and reduced-price lunch. The number of participants decreased from 2007 to 2008 due to the withdrawal of renewing programs that were no longer eligible to receive the funds. The funds from the withdrawal of these programs were used to increase the average amount per book that RIF provided to high-need programs as the cost of books has increased.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Reading is fundamental/Inexpensive book distribution

No target is shown for 2012 because the Administration is proposing to consolidate this program.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Ready-to-learn television

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$27,300 ²	0	-\$27,300

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

² Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Ready-to-learn television

Grantees are required to consult with the Secretaries of Education and Health and Human Services on strategies to maximize the use of quality educational programming for preschool and elementary school children. Grantees must also coordinate activities with other Federal programs that have major training components related to early childhood development.

The Department awarded three new 5-year grants in September 2010:

- Window to the World (WTTW), which will receive \$6.5 million per year, will partner with Wildbrain Entertainment develop Project UMIGO (“yoU Make It GO”), which will be designed to help children age 2 through 8 learn mathematics. Project UMIGO will use multiple platforms (including the World Wide Web, cell phones, handheld gaming devices, television, DVDs, and books), media-based mathematics curriculum to offer child-initiated and creative play opportunities (e.g., digital paint, glue, and blocks) that support mathematics learning, as well as related support materials and digital resources for parents, caregivers, and teachers. The goal is to ensure that children learn the basic principles of mathematics and well as to think creatively, invent, and work collaboratively.
- The Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), in partnership with the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS), will receive approximately \$14.6 million per year to develop a transmedia collection (video content, interactive games, mobile apps, and white board applications) designed to raise achievement in children ages 2 to 8 in high-needs communities. Project content will be aligned with rigorous mathematics and literacy academic standards and a progress tracking system will provide feedback on student progress to parents and teachers.
- The Hispanic Information and Telecommunications Network (HITN), which will receive \$6 million per year, will partner with Callaway Arts & Entertainment to form the Learning Apps media Partnership (Project LAMP), which will develop transmedia learning applications that promote essential literacy and mathematics skills in 3 to 8 year olds. Each property (project) will include multiple platforms, including books, websites, mobile phone applications, handheld games, television, DCDs, and audio CDs, and will include training materials for families, caregivers, and educators.

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$24,255
2008	23,831
2009	25,416
2010	27,300
2011 CR	27,300

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Ready-to-learn television

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Ready-to-Learn Television program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that seek to promote improvement of reading, writing, and language arts instruction for students of various grade spans, the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization, two new broader programs, Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy and Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM). These programs would address the need to comprehensively strengthen instruction and increase student achievement in literacy and STEM subjects in high-need local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools.

Under the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program, the Department would provide competitive grants to States to support the development and implementation of comprehensive State and local efforts to provide high-quality literacy programs aligned with college- and career-ready English-language arts standards. Similarly, under the Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM program, the Department would provide competitive grants to States to support the development and implementation of high-quality STEM programs. These programs would be designed to increase student achievement in high-need LEAs and schools for students from preschool through grade 12, and LEAs would have the flexibility to focus funds on the areas of their greatest need. This approach would replace the current patchwork of literacy and STEM programs and funding streams in current law with two comprehensive and coherent programs that would provide increased flexibility for States and LEAs to develop and implement strategies that best meet local needs. The Administration believes that this coherent yet flexible approach would help ensure that States and high-need LEAs have in place a solid infrastructure across the grade levels to support high-need schools in implementing high-quality, developmentally appropriate, and systematic literacy and STEM instruction.

From the amount requested for the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education programs, the Department would reserve funds to support a range of national activities, including research; developing high-quality educational and professional-development content; technical assistance; and identifying and disseminating information on effective programs and best practices. Public telecommunications entities—such as the Public Broadcasting Service, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and other eligible entities—would be able to compete for such national activities funding available under this program to create high-quality, educational content for children.

The fiscal year 2012 request for the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program would include funds to pay 2012 continuation costs for Ready-to-Learn Television grants made in 2010.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Ready-to-learn television

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Number of new awards	3	0	0
Number of continuation awards	0	3	0
New award funding	\$27,251	0	0
Continuation award funding		\$27,300	0
Evaluation (review of grant products)	4	0	0
Peer review of new award applications	<u>45</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	27,300	27,300	0

Note: Continuation costs of approximately \$27,300 thousand for projects awarded in fiscal year 2010 will be provided under the fiscal year 2012 request for Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Over the last few years, the Department has supported various strategies to obtain more timely and accurate information on the extent to which activities supported through the RTL program may improve learning outcomes for children. The Department developed new GPRA goals and measures to provide information on the impact and quality of RTL programming and outreach. The Department also used the fiscal year 2005 competition (for 5-year awards) to dramatically re-design the management and implementation of core program activities. Instead of a single, large award to one grantee, the Department made three smaller awards to different grantees (two programming grantees and one outreach grantee) that focused more strategically on specific core program activities. To ensure that the effects of programming-related activities are more carefully measured, both programming grantees are conducting rigorous evaluations that use experimental or quasi-experimental designs. Grantee evaluators must also meet periodically with an outside advisory panel of expert evaluators.

For the 2010 competition, the Department established two invitational priorities: (1) Developing educational content in reading or mathematics that is designed to increase the literacy or numeracy skills of low-income children ages 2 to 8 years, delivering the content through coordinated use of multiple media platforms, and developing effective outreach strategies and (2) providing for the development and dissemination of products and results through open educational resources and making the products freely available through various media platforms. In addition, applicants could earn up to 20 competitive preference priority points for projects proposing an evaluation plan that was based on rigorous scientifically based research methods to assess effectiveness. The Department made three awards, which are described above, and will develop targets for the performance measures during the first year of the grant. The 2010 grantees will produce new materials and strategies, and while the work builds on prior

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Ready-to-learn television

work, it is sufficiently changed that the Department will need to establish new baselines for the performance measures.

Given that it is unlikely that the grantees will develop products during the first year of the grant (2011), the new baselines will be set in 2012 or later. (The final year for assessing the performance of 2005 grantees was 2010.)

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

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

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

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

Measure: The percentage of Ready to Learn children's television programming deemed to be of high quality.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2008		50
2009	75	75
2010	100	86

Measure: The percentage of Ready to Learn targeted outreach products and services deemed to be of high quality.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2008		72
2009	82	50
2010	92	67

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Ready-to-learn television

In 2008, 50 percent of RTL programs (2 of 4) for which episodes were reviewed were considered by expert panel members to be of “high quality,” and 72 percent of RTL outreach products and services (8 of 11), were considered to be of “high quality.” Likewise, in 2009, 75 percent of RTL programs (three of four) for which episodes were reviewed, and 50 percent of RTL outreach products (four of eight), were considered to be of “high quality.” The Department had concerns with one television program (*Martha Speaks*) for which panel members assigned a score below 4.0 for the second year in a row. Concerns included whether the pedagogy for the series addressed the literacy needs of the target population, whether the programming was engaging for the children of the target age, whether the programming took advantage of emerging technologies to create new opportunities for learning, and whether the programming fit into the literacy scaffolding of the RTL program. The outreach review panel thought the site was engaging and used a variety of strategies for developing vocabulary, but there were concerns about whether the website was appealing enough to motivate children to seek out the site given available alternatives and whether it was as suitable for the intended target audience as it could have been. In the 2010 review, the *Martha Speaks* program received a panel score of 4.1 out of 5, showing major improvement. Across all projects reviewed in 2010, 86 percent of the programming (six out of seven programs) and 67 percent of the outreach products and services (four out of six) were deemed to be of high quality.

Shortly after the panel review, the Department scheduled a meeting with the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS), and the show’s producers to discuss plans for improving the series and for addressing the issues identified by expert panel members. In addition, the Department instituted bi-weekly calls to discuss project activities. Changes to the project included the addition of live action music videos that included diverse groups of children in both urban and rural settings and the addition of print on screen to both animation and live action. The Department is continuing to monitor project implementation.

Likewise, the Department has concerns regarding the overall quality of RTL outreach products and services, and is working to ensure grantees implement the expert panel recommendations.

Efficiency Measures

The Department developed a single efficiency measure for the RTL program: dollars leveraged from non-Federal sources over 5 years (the length of each grant award) per Federal dollar dedicated to core non-outreach program activities. Because high quality children’s television programs are so expensive to develop, produce, and distribute, Federal support for new programming through the RTL programs is typically used by grantees to attract additional revenue from the private sector. Program quality is directly affected by the extent to which grantees succeed in using Federal dollars to leverage additional funds from alternate sources. This measure will be used to compare the relative success of RTL grantees in leveraging non-Federal investments for the development and production of new children’s television programs. Because grantees typically are not expected to establish annual leveraging targets, and there is no set schedule for obtaining matching funds, the only truly meaningful unit of analysis for purposes of comparing grantee performance is the entire 5-year award period. During the 5-year period comprising fiscal years 2005 through 2009, the Department provided two grantees with \$98.55 million in funding. These two grantees together contributed a total of \$66.15 million in non-Federal funding to programming activities, or \$0.67 non-Federal dollars for every Federal

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Ready-to-learn television

dollar; the individual grantee amounts were \$0.29 and \$1.03. The Department will use the \$0.67 figure as the baseline against which to measure future efficiency.

Other Performance Information

Both 2005 RTL programming grantees are currently implementing multiple formative studies that should improve many aspects of their projects, and summative evaluations that are designed to provide evidence on the extent to which children's television programming contributes to gains in early literacy. Final results are expected in fiscal year 2011, after the no-cost extension year available to current grantees.

Evaluations of Programming Content

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

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

- Whether daily viewing of *Word World* episodes in preschool classrooms over a 6-week period results in gains in knowledge of print conventions, letter recognition, phonemic awareness, episode-specific vocabulary, and/or episode-specific word recognition (as measured by comparison of a pre- to post-assessment).
- Whether educational effects of *Word World* are moderated by children's family income level, gender, initial verbal language skills (as assessed by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-4 (PPVT-IV)), and region of the country.
- Whether educational effects are mediated by children's interest and attention while viewing (as determined from both teacher viewing logs and from the *Word World* Content Test section on children's knowledge about show characters).

Results of this study to date suggest that regular viewing of *Word World* may improve preschool children's learning of specific literacy skills. Significant results were found in the overall sample for: the learning of vocabulary words that occurred in the *Word World* episodes viewed (a 5.6 percent gain was found between pre- and post-test for children in the experimental condition group, compared to a 2.4 percent gain for children in the control group), and in the

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Ready-to-learn television

recognition of printed words that occurred in the episodes viewed (a 3.9 percent gain was found for children in the experimental condition group, compared to a 1.1 percent gain for children in the control group). Significant results were also found for particular subgroups. Specifically, significant gains in phonemic awareness were found for: pre-k children from homes where parents' level of education was high school or less; pre-k children who scored in the lower third on the baseline verbal vocabulary assessment (the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test); and pre-K children from lower income homes where English is spoken as a second language.

Evaluations Supporting Outreach

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

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Mathematics and science partnerships

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$180,478 ²	0	-\$180,478

¹The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

²Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Mathematics and Science Partnerships (MSP) program supports State and local efforts to improve students' academic achievement in mathematics and science by improving elementary and secondary school mathematics and science teacher education and professional development. Authorized teacher education and professional development activities include summer workshops or institutes that train teachers to use curricula based on scientific research and aligned with challenging State academic content standards; innovative distance-learning programs; and programs that bring teachers together with working scientists, mathematicians, and engineers to expand teachers' subject-matter knowledge and research. Grantees may also use program funds to develop more rigorous mathematics and science curricula that are aligned with challenging State and local academic content standards and recruit individuals with mathematics, science, and engineering majors into the teaching profession through the use of signing and performance incentives, stipends, and scholarships.

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

The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of a fiscal year's appropriation to conduct program evaluation activities.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Mathematics and science partnerships

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

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$182,160
2008	178,978
2009	178,978
2010	180,478
2011 CR	180,478

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Department is not requesting funding for the Mathematics and Science Partnerships program for FY 2012. In place of this program, the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization, a new program, Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM). This program would provide competitive grants to SEAs (or SEAs in partnership with appropriate outside entities) to support State and local efforts aimed at implementing and supporting a comprehensive strategy for the provision of high-quality STEM instruction and support to students from prekindergarten through grade 12. Grantees and subgrantees would be required to focus on mathematics or science, or both, and could also carry out activities in technology or engineering. In awarding State STEM grants, the Department would give a priority to SEAs that have adopted and are implementing a set of K-12 college- and career-ready standards in, at minimum, mathematics. States would be permitted to reserve up to 20 percent of their grant for State-level activities to support the development and implementation of a coherent approach to funding and implementing high-quality evidence-based STEM instruction in high-need schools. States would be required to use their remaining grant funds to make subgrants to high-need LEAs and eligible partnerships to improve STEM instruction at the local level, including, for example, through online curriculum and technology-based approaches.

In addition, as components of the Administration's governmentwide effort to support and improve STEM education, the Department would set aside \$80 million from the FY12 appropriation for the new Teacher and Leader Pathways program for projects to prepare effective STEM teachers and include support for STEM projects in the FY 2012 Investing in Innovation competition. The Department would also promote advancements in STEM-related educational technology through the new Advanced Research Projects Agency-Education.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Mathematics and science partnerships

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Total budget authority	\$180,478	\$180,478	0
Amount distributed to States	\$179,576	\$179,576	0
Average State award	\$3,207	\$3,207	0
Range of State awards	\$898–\$21,268	\$898–\$20,717	0
Evaluation	\$902	\$902	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.

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

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

Measure: The percentage of Mathematics and Science Partnerships teachers who significantly increase their content knowledge, as reflected on project-level pre- and post-assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		78
2008	79	70
2009	80	70
2010	81	
2011	82	

Additional Information: 2007 data are used as the baseline for the targets. In 2007, grantees measured content knowledge with locally developed assessments. Since 2008, more stringent national assessments have been used; the Department will adjust the targets to reflect these more stringent assessments. 2010 data will be available in the summer of 2011. No targets are shown for 2012 because the program is proposed for consolidation.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Mathematics and science partnerships

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

Measure: The percentage of students in classrooms of Mathematics and Science Partnerships teachers who score at the proficient level or above in State assessments of mathematics or science.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		44
2008	45	46
2009	46	58
2010	47	
2011	48	

Additional Information: 2007 data are used as the baseline for the targets. 2010 data will be available in the summer of 2011. No targets are shown for 2012 because the program is proposed for consolidation.

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

Measure: The percentage of Mathematics and Science Partnerships projects that report using an experimental or quasi-experimental design for their evaluations.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		37
2008	38	37
2009	39	51
2010	40	
2011	41	

Measure: The percentage of Mathematics and Science Partnerships projects that use an experimental or quasi-experimental design for their evaluations, and, in addition, whose evaluations are conducted successfully and yield scientifically valid results.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		12
2008	13	11
2009	14	11
2010	15	
2011	16	

Additional Information: 2007 data are used as the baseline for the targets. The Department's contractor collects information related to evaluation from annual performance reports and rates the evaluations using a rubric developed for the Department in 2007. 2010 data will be available in the summer of 2011. No targets are shown for 2012 because the program is proposed for consolidation.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Mathematics and science partnerships

Efficiency Measure

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2007	100	100
2008	100	96
2009	100	100
2010	100	
2011	100	

Additional Information: In order to help ensure accuracy, the Department requires State program coordinators to review the data before submitting them to the Department. 2010 data will be available in the summer of 2011. No targets are shown for 2012 because the program is proposed for consolidation.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Excellence in economic education

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$1,447 ²	0	-\$1,447

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

² Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

The authorizing legislation requires the grantee to dedicate 25 percent of its grant to national activities that develop and support effective relationships with State and local economic education organizations, promote and support research on effective teaching of economics, and disseminate materials that foster economic literacy. The remaining 75 percent must be used to award subgrants to State educational agencies (SEAs), local educational agencies (LEAs), or State or local economic, personal finance, or entrepreneurial education organizations to support teacher training; economics curriculum development; evaluation of the impact of economics education on students; research on economics education; the creation of school-based student activities to promote consumer, economic, and personal finance education; and the replication of best practices in the effective teaching of economics and financial literacy education. Subgrant recipients must secure a 50 percent match from non-Federal sources, which may be provided in cash or in-kind contributions. Program funds must be used to supplement, not supplant, other Federal, State, and local funds spent for economics and financial literacy.

In 2010, the Council for Economic Education (formerly the National Council on Economic Education) received a 5-year grant to implement this program. The Council previously received a 5-year grant to implement the program in 2005.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Excellence in economic education

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$1,473
2008	1,447
2009	1,447
2010	1,447
2011 CR	1,447

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funding for the Excellence in Economic Education program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs focused on student achievement in specific subject areas, the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization, a broader program, Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education. This new program would address the need to strengthen instruction and increase student achievement, especially in high-need LEAs, across the subjects that contribute to a well-rounded education, such as arts, health education, physical education, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, environmental education, economics and financial literacy, and other subjects that may be identified by the Secretary.

Under the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program, the Department would provide competitive awards to States, high-need LEAs, and other entities to carry out such activities as development, implementation, and evaluation of successful programs; dissemination of evidence-based practices; and scaling up of effective programs. This approach would replace the patchwork of programs and funding streams in current law with a single comprehensive and coherent program that would provide States and LEAs with the flexibility to determine how best to meet the needs of their students and teachers across a well-rounded curriculum (which may include activities that support the improvement of student achievement or teacher effectiveness in economics and financial literacy), and allow the Department to focus funding on programs that improve student achievement, especially in high-need LEAs. Eligible entities that are interested in developing, implementing, or expanding high-quality, innovative practices, strategies, or programs for economics and financial literacy education would be able to apply for funding.

The Department believes that efforts to enable more students to become financially literate should be a priority, and would likely make that a focus of competitions under the new program. The Department may also support other financial literacy efforts in fiscal year 2012 by building on the Financial Education for College Access and Success initiative, which received FIE funding in fiscal year 2010 to support the development and use of personal finance instructional materials that improve students' financial decisions regarding higher education. Expansions of this program could include funding new grants to support the development of additional instructional materials or the adoption and evaluation of materials developed through the fiscal year 2010 grant at additional sites.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Excellence in economic education

The Department has also joined with the Department of the Treasury to promote a new initiative, the National Financial Capability Challenge, that will encourage educators and schools to incorporate financial education into their curricula and to reward innovation and effective teaching. Additionally, the Department is also implementing Congress' amendments to the TRIO and GEAR UP programs (in the Higher Education Opportunity Act) that require (in the case of most TRIO programs) or permit (in the case of GEAR UP) grantees to provide financial and economic literacy services to participating students. Examples of these services include financial planning for postsecondary education and financial literacy counseling for students and their parents.

Under the Administration's reauthorization proposal, Excellence in Economic Education continuation grant costs would be funded from the fiscal year 2012 appropriation for the new Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Funding for subgrants	\$1,085	\$1,085	0
Funding for direct grantee activities	\$362	\$362	0

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$1,447 thousand for Excellence in Economic Education grants would be provided from the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program in fiscal year 2012.

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 2012 and future years and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

In 2008, the Department approved new performance measures for this program that will draw data from comprehensive assessments of student performance across projects, grade levels, and geographic regions. 2009 was the first year of reporting using the new performance measures. 2010 data will be available in the fall of 2011.

Goal: To promote economic and financial literacy among all students in kindergarten through grade 12.

Objective: *To increase students' knowledge of, and achievement in, economics to enable the students to become more productive and informed citizens.*

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Excellence in economic education

Measure: The percentage of students participating in projects funded through the Excellence in Economic Education program who score proficient on standardized tests of economics and/or personal finance.		
Year	Target	Actual
2009	70	58
2010	70	
2011	70	
2012	70	

Additional Information: Sub-grantees were required to use one of the following standardized test instruments: *Basic Economics Test*, *Test of Economic Knowledge*, *Test of Economic Literacy*, *Test of Understanding of College Economics*, or one of the three *Financial Fitness for Life* tests. In 2009, the tests were administered to approximately 6,040 middle and high school students no more than two days after completing sub-grantee economics and personal finance instructional activities. The definition of “proficient” for this performance measure is a score of 70 percent correct or better on tests used.

Measure: The percentage of teachers participating in projects funded by the Excellence in Economic Education program who show a significant increase in their pre-post scores on a standardized measure of economic content knowledge.		
Year	Target	Actual
2009	70	82
2010	70	
2011	70	
2012	70	

Additional Information: Sub-grantees were required to use one of the following standardized test instruments: *Basic Economics Test*, *Test of Economic Knowledge*, *Test of Economic Literacy*, *Test of Understanding of College Economics*, or one of the three *Financial Fitness for Life* tests. The tests were administered to teachers prior to and after participation in sub-grantee training programs. In 2009, 894 of 1,206 participating teachers completed both the pre-test and post-test assessments.

Findings indicate that teachers scored an average of 65 percent correct on pre-tests and an average of 81 percent correct on post-tests.

Measure: The percentage of students participating in entrepreneurial projects funded by the Excellence in Economic Education program who show a significant increase in their pre-post scores on a standardized measure.		
Year	Target	Actual
2009	70	
2010	70	
2011	70	
2012	70	

Additional Information: 2009 data for this measure will be available in the spring of 2011.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Teaching American history

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$118,952 ²	0	-\$118,952

¹The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

² Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Teaching American History (TAH) program provides competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to promote the teaching of traditional American history in elementary and secondary schools as a separate academic subject. Grants are used to improve the quality of history instruction by supporting professional development for teachers of American history, including elementary school teachers who teach history as a part of the general curriculum. In order to receive a grant, an LEA must agree to carry out the proposed activities in partnership with one or more of the following: an institution of higher education, a nonprofit history or humanities organization, a library, or a museum.

Beginning in fiscal year (FY) 2008, the Department has awarded new TAH grants as 3-year grants, with 2-year continuation awards available to grantees demonstrating effective performance during the first 3 years.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$119,790
2008	117,904
2009	118,952
2010	118,952
2011 CR	118,952

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Teaching American history

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funding for the TAH program for FY 2012. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs focused on student achievement in specific subject areas, the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization, a broader program, Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education. This new program would address the need to strengthen instruction and increase student achievement, especially in high-need LEAs, across the subjects that contribute to a well-rounded education, such as arts, health education, physical education, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, environmental education, economics and financial literacy, and other subjects that may be identified by the Secretary.

Under the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program, the Department would provide competitive awards to States, high-need LEAs, and other entities to carry out such activities as development, implementation, and evaluation of successful programs; dissemination of evidence-based practices; and scaling up of effective programs. This approach would replace the patchwork of programs and funding streams in current law with a single comprehensive and coherent program that would provide States and LEAs with the flexibility to determine how best to meet the needs of their students and teachers across a well-rounded curriculum (which may include activities that support the improvement of student achievement or teacher effectiveness in history), and allow the Department to focus funding on programs that improve student achievement, especially in high-need LEAs. Eligible entities that are interested in developing, implementing, or expanding high-quality, innovative practices, strategies, or programs for history education would be able to apply for funding.

The fiscal year 2012 request for the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program would include funds to pay 2012 TAH continuation grant costs.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Total budget authority	\$118,952	\$118,952	0
Amount for new awards	\$116,126	\$70,021	0
Number of new awards	124	70–80	0
Amount for continuation awards	0	\$46,331	0
Number of continuation awards	0	50	0
Number of teachers served	20,000	18,500	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$461	\$450	0

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Teaching American history

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)—continued

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
National activities including evaluation	\$2,365	\$2,150	0

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$62,700 thousand for TAH grants initiated with FY 2009 funds would be provided from the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program in FY 2012.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested for FY 2012 and future years and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department recently established the measures described below as new performance and efficiency measures for the TAH program. The FY 2009 data provided below are from FY 2008 grantees that elected to submit performance reports using these new measures; of the 120 FY 2008 grantees, 65 (54 percent) elected to do so. Beginning with the FY 2009 grantees, all TAH grantees will use the new measures. FY 2010 data will be available in the spring of 2011. The Department will use FY 2010 data as the baseline for establishing targets for future years.

Performance Measures

Goal: To improve student achievement by providing high-quality professional development to kindergarten-through-grade-12 (K-12) teachers of American history.

Objective: *Demonstrate the effectiveness of professional development activities for K-12 teachers of American history through increased achievement on assessments of American history content knowledge.*

Measure: The average percentage change in the scores (on a pre-post assessment of American history) of participants who complete at least 75 percent of the professional development hours offered by the project.		
Year	Target	Actual
2009		16.1%

Additional Information: Each project's assessment is aligned with the content of the project, and at least 50 percent of its questions come from a validated test of American history.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Teaching American history

Measure: The percentage of TAH participants who complete 75 percent or more of the total hours of professional development offered.		
--	--	--

Year	Target	Actual
2009		62%

Efficiency Measures

Objective: *Improve the operational efficiency of the program.*

Measure: The cost per TAH participant who completes 75 percent or more of the total hours of professional development offered.		
---	--	--

Year	Target	Actual
2009		\$7,331

Measure: The cost per teacher hour of professional development attended.		
---	--	--

Year	Target	Actual
2009		\$0.14

Additional Information: Results for this measure are calculated by dividing the funds spent in a given year by the grand total of professional development hours attended by participants in that year.

Other Performance Information

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

The evaluation also found, however, that TAH grants were not reaching those teachers most in need of services. Approximately 74 percent of participating teachers had more than 5 years of teaching experience, and many were already certified in history or a history-related field. Further analysis showed that a majority of TAH participants had 14 or more years of teaching experience and held advanced degrees in history. These findings, combined with the fact that many teachers voluntarily participated in time-intensive TAH projects, suggest that TAH projects likely reach those teachers most interested in American history, not those most in need of additional professional development.

In 2007, the Department initiated an additional 4-year evaluation of the program. This evaluation is addressing questions related to the association between teacher participation in funded activities and content knowledge and between teacher participation and student

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Teaching American history

achievement, grantee practices associated with gains in teacher content knowledge and gains in student achievement, and technical quality and rigor of grantee evaluations. Results from the evaluation are expected in the summer of 2011.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Arts in education

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$40,000 ²	0	-\$40,000

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

² Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Arts in education

visual arts educators. In addition, the fiscal year 2008 appropriation included funding for a National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) survey on arts education in public elementary and secondary schools. NCES collected principal and teacher survey data nationwide during school year 2009-2010 using the Fast Response Survey System (FRSS) and is in the process of analyzing these data. The Department expects to report results from the FRSS this summer.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2007	\$35,277
2008	37,533
2009	38,166
2010	40,000
2011 CR	40,000

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Arts in Education program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs focused on student achievement in specific subject areas, the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization, a broader program, Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education. This new program would address the need to strengthen instruction and increase student achievement, especially in high-need LEAs, across the subjects that contribute to a well-rounded education, such as arts, health education, physical education, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, environmental education, economics and financial literacy, and other subjects that may be identified by the Secretary.

Under the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program, the Department would provide competitive awards to SEAs, high-need LEAs, and other entities to carry out such activities as development, implementation, and evaluation of successful programs; dissemination of evidence-based practices; and scaling up of effective programs. This approach would replace the patchwork of programs and funding streams in current law with a single comprehensive and coherent program that would allow States and LEAs to identify how to best meet the needs of their students and teachers across a well-rounded curriculum (which may include activities that support the improvement of student achievement or teacher effectiveness in the arts), and allow the Department to focus funding on programs that improve student achievement, especially in high-need LEAs. Eligible entities that are interested in developing, implementing, or expanding high-quality, innovative practices, strategies, or programs for arts education (including VSA Arts, the Kennedy Center and other eligible entities under the current Arts in Education program) would be eligible to apply for funding.

The fiscal year 2012 request for Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education would include funds to pay 2012 continuation costs for Arts in Education grants made in previous years.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Arts in education

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
VSA Arts			
Total funds available	\$9,060	\$9,060	0
Participating Programs:			
State-initiated and National programs	3,709	3,709	0
District/local sites	3,098	3,098	0
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts			
Total funds available	\$6,838	\$6,838	0
Participants:			
Theater for Young Audiences	48,195	40,000	0
Theater for Young Audiences On-tour	114,617	135,000	0
Arts Management Fellows, Interns and Seminar Participants	2,600	n/a	0
Professional Development for Teachers	920	1,100	0
Performance Plus	32,234	34,000	0
National Symphony Orchestra Education	57,870	58,000	0
NSO American Residencies	9,319	15,000	0
Model School Initiatives	15,532	15,700	0
Any Given Child	70,527	85,000	0
Student Participation:			
Career Development for Aspiring Performers	606	657	0
Audiences	2,585	2,420	0
American College Theater Festival:			
Students	31,500	32,000	0
Teachers	6,525	6,550	0
Audience	627,550	627,550	0
Partners in Education:			
Teachers Served	32,000	36,000	0
National Demonstration and Leadership Activities <i>Model Arts Program</i>			
Total funds available	\$14,616	\$14,616	0
Amount for new awards	\$8,955	\$919	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$5,122	\$13,347	0

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Arts in education

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) – continued

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Number of new awards	34	2	0
Number of continuation awards	20	52	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$189	0 ¹	0
Interagency transfer to NEA Arts Education Partnership	\$350	\$350	0
<i>Professional Development for Arts Educators</i>			
Total funds available	\$9,000	\$9,000	0
Amount for new awards	0	\$7,065	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$8,522	\$1,560	0
Amount for supplemental awards	\$278	0	0
Number of new awards	0	28	0
Number of continuation awards	29	5	0
Number of supplemental awards	29	0	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$175	0
Interagency transfer to NEA	\$200	\$200	0
<i>Evaluation</i>	\$486	\$486	0

NOTE: FY 2012 continuation costs of approximately \$14,266 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program.

¹ The Department plans to fund new applications in FY 2011 from the FY 2010 slate.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data, and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2012 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Arts in education

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

Measure: The total number of students who participate in standards-based arts education sponsored by the JFK Center for the Performing Arts and VSA Arts.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	757,830	786,263
2008	772,405	1,356,225
2009	786,979	1,436,836
2010	801,553	1,481,053
2011	816,127	
2012	830,701	

Measure: The number of low-income students who participate in standards-based arts education sponsored by the JFK Center for the Performing Arts.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	51,645	26,814
2008	52,658	34,973
2009	53,671	47,112
2010	54,684	49,117
2011	55,697	
2012	56,710	

Measure: The number of students with disabilities who participate in standards-based arts education sponsored by VSA Arts.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	125,510	126,363
2008	127,971	190,161
2009	130,432	187,540
2010	132,893	139,882
2011	135,354	
2012	137,815	

Measure: The percentage of teachers participating in the JFK Center for the Performing Arts program who receive professional development that is sustained and intensive.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	17.4	17.1
2008	18.4	19.0
2009	19.4	12.1
2010	20.4	19.7
2011	21.4	
2012	22.4	

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Arts in education

Measure: The percentage of teachers participating in VSA Arts programs who receive professional development that is sustained and intensive.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	18.5	17.0
2008	19.5	18.0
2009	20.5	17.0
2010	21.5	34.0
2011	22.5	
2012	23.5	

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

Data collected in 2005 represented a baseline of 728,683 for the total number of students who participate in standards-based arts education sponsored by the Kennedy Center and VSA Arts. The Department established targets for subsequent years based on an annual 2 percentage point increase from the 2005 baseline. Since 2005, the combined participation figure for the Kennedy Center and VSA Arts has increased steadily, and in 2008 it exceeded the target by more than 500,000 students. The 1-year jump in 2008 was, according to reports from the two grantees, largely attributable to changes in data collection. In 2010, the combined participation continued to increase by about 3 percent over the 2009 figure to 1,481,053 students, which exceeded the target by nearly 680,000 students. The Department may consider revising its performance targets to better align with the grantees' new data collection methods and recent performance.

Data collected in 2006 represent the baseline for the four remaining measures in this series. The number of low-income students is based on students who are eligible to receive free and reduced-priced meals, as reported by school-level personnel, while the number of students with disabilities is based on local-level counts of students in both self-contained and inclusive classrooms. (In 12 States, however, some counts were based on IDEA child-count averages for inclusive settings only.) Targets for the number of low-income students and students with disabilities who participate in standards-based arts education sponsored by the Kennedy Center and VSA Arts, respectively, increase annually by 2 percentage points from the 2006 baseline. In 2010, the Kennedy Center did not meet its performance target of 54,684 students, but did show an increase of more than 2,000 low-income students over the previous year. VSA Arts has shown a sizable increase in the number of students with disabilities who participate in standards-based arts education between 2006 and 2009. In 2010, however, VSA Arts reported a decrease of more than 47,650 students from 2009, but still exceeded the performance target.

The Department also has established targets for the percentage of teachers participating in Kennedy Center and VSA Arts programs who receive sustained and intensive professional development based on an annual 1 percentage point increase from the 2006 baseline. In 2010, the Kennedy Center reported a teacher participation rate of 19.7 percent, an increase of more than 7 percentage points over the previous year, but did not meet the Department's performance target. VSA Arts reported a teacher participation rate of 34 percent, a doubling over the previous year and exceeding the performance target by more than 12 percentage points.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Arts in education

Measure: The percentage of teachers participating in the Professional Development for Arts Educators program who receive professional development that is sustained and intensive.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		87
2007	88	100
2008	89	92
2009	90	93
2010	91	99
2011	92	
2012	93	

Additional Information: This measure focuses on the Professional Development for Arts Educators program and examines the percentage of teachers who receive instruction that occurs regularly over the course of the school year (including summer) and requires committed participation in order to make a difference in teaching and student learning. Data collected in 2006 represent the baseline for this indicator and are the basis for targets for subsequent years. In 2010, the percentage of teachers who received sustained and intensive professional development increased from 93 to 99 percent and exceeded the performance target of 91 percent. The Department continues to work with grantees to ensure that definitions for “sustained and intensive” are used consistently across projects.

Measure: The percentage of students participating in Arts Models programs who demonstrate proficiency in mathematics compared to those in control or comparison groups.		
Year	Control	Treatment
2008	60.4	80.4
2009	60.0	67.0
Change	-0.4	-13.4

Measure: The percentage of students participating in Arts Models programs who demonstrate proficiency in reading compared to those in control or comparison groups.		
Year	Control	Treatment
2008	61.4	76.1
2009	41.0	63.0
Change	-10.4	-13.1

Additional Information: The Department developed two measures that focus on the Model Arts program and its impact on student achievement, specifically the percentage of Model Arts students who demonstrate proficient levels of achievement on State assessments in mathematics and in reading, compared to control or comparison groups. For the school year 2008-2009, the students in the treatment groups performed better than those in the control groups on both reading and mathematics measures. Both the treatment and control groups showed declines in performance between school years 2007-2008 and 2008-2009. The Department expects to have 2010 performance data this spring.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Foreign language assistance

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$26,9281 ²	0	-\$26,928

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2009. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

² Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Foreign language assistance

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$23,780
2008	25,655
2009	26,328
2010	26,928
2011 CR	26,928

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Foreign Language Assistance program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs focused on student achievement in specific subject areas, the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization, a broader program, Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education. This new program would address the need to strengthen instruction and increase student achievement, especially in high-need LEAs, across the subjects that contribute to a well-rounded education, such as arts, health education, physical education, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, environmental education, economics and financial literacy, and other subjects that may be identified by the Secretary.

Under the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program, the Department would provide competitive awards to SEAs, high-need LEAs, and other eligible entities to carry out such activities as development, implementation, and evaluation of successful programs; dissemination of evidence-based practices; and scaling up of effective programs. This approach would replace the patchwork of programs and funding streams in current law with a single comprehensive and coherent program that would provide States and LEAs with the flexibility to determine how to best meet the needs of their students and teachers across a well-rounded curriculum (which may include activities that support the improvement of student achievement or teacher effectiveness in foreign language education), and allow the Department to focus funding on programs that improve student achievement, especially in high-need LEAs.

The fiscal year 2012 request for Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education would include funds to pay 2012 continuation costs for FLAP grants made in previous years.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
<u>SEA Grants</u>			
Number of new grants	2	0	0
Funding for new grants	\$346	0	0
Number of continuing grants	3	5	0
Funding for continuing grants	\$481	\$900	0

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Foreign language assistance

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)—continued

LEA Grants

Number of new grants	31	0	0
Funding for new grants	\$6,415	0	0
Number of continuing grants	36	67	0
Funding for continuing grants	\$9,925	\$14,590	0

LEA-IHE Partnership Grants

Number of new grants	22	0	0
Funding for new grants	\$5,815	0	0
Number of continuing grants	20	42	0
Funding for continuing grants	\$3,914	\$11,438	0

Peer review of new award applications	\$32	0	0
---------------------------------------	------	---	---

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$18,694 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years, and those requested in FY 2012 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

This program has been among the programs that receive help from the Department's Data Quality Initiative (DQI), which provides contractor assistance to increase the capacity of Department staff and grantees to obtain better outcome information from grant programs. The contractor has worked with the Department to strengthen outcome measures, identify and address data deficiencies, and improve processes and reporting instruments so that the Department can collect uniformly high-quality data from grantees. Through this work, the Department established five new performance measures for FLAP LEA grantees and two new performance measures for SEA grantees. LEAs awarded grants prior to fiscal year 2008 began reporting on four of these measures in 2008. LEAs that received grant awards in fiscal year 2008 and beyond must report on all five LEA measures, or at least those that are appropriate for their projects. SEAs that received grant awards in fiscal year 2008 and beyond report on both SEA measures.

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Foreign language assistance

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

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

Measure: The number of students participating in foreign language instruction in the targeted non-critical language(s) in the schools served by FLAP LEA grants.		
Year	Target	Actual
2008		27,841
2009		24,950
2010		
2011		
2012		

Measure: The average number of minutes per week of foreign language instruction in the targeted non-critical language(s) in the schools served by FLAP LEA grants.		
Year	Target	Actual
2008		510
2009		329
2010		
2011		
2012		

Additional information: The data reported for 2008 include data from grantees receiving awards in 2006 and 2007 while the data reported for 2009 include data only from the grantees receiving awards in 2007. Of the 49 3-year grants awarded in 2007, 23 serve students in non-critical languages. The Department provided detailed guidance and reporting assistance to grantees prior to the 2009 reporting year, which (along with the reduction in the number of grantees reporting, from 34 to 23) could account for some of the changes in the data from 2008 to 2009 and is also the reason for not setting targets until after the 2010 reporting year. The significant change in average minutes per week of foreign language instruction could be a reflection of a difference in the types of projects funded from the 2006 cohort and included in the 2008 data. For example, a foreign language partial-immersion or total-immersion project could realistically spend between 750 and 1,500 minutes per week on foreign language instruction, while a traditional project, in which high school students spend one period a day in a foreign language class, might spend between 225 and 300 minutes. The Department is reviewing the grantee-established targets, and once those have been verified, will aggregate them and set program-level targets.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Foreign language assistance

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

Measure: The number of students participating in foreign language instruction in the targeted critical language(s) in the schools served by FLAP LEA grants.		
Year	Target	Actual
2008		28,831
2009		12,459
2010		
2011		
2012		

Measure: The average number of minutes per week of foreign language instruction in the targeted critical language(s) in the schools served by FLAP LEA grants.		
Year	Target	Actual
2008		179
2009		209
2010		
2011		
2012		

Additional information: The data reported for 2008 include data from grantees receiving awards in 2006 and 2007 while the data reported for 2009 include data only from the grantees receiving awards in 2007. The decrease in the student count is likely a reflection of the number of grantees reporting changing from 74 in 2008 to 30 in 2009. Of the 49 3-year grants awarded in 2007, 30 serve students in critical languages. Some projects serve students in both critical and non-critical languages. The Department provided detailed guidance and reporting assistance to grantees prior to the 2009 reporting year, which could account for some of the change in the data from 2008 to 2009 and is also the reason for not setting targets until after the 2010 reporting year. The Department is reviewing the grantee-established targets, and once those have been verified, will aggregate them and set program-level targets.

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

The measure is the number of students in FLAP projects who meet ambitious project objectives for foreign language proficiency. The eight grantees that received 5-year LEA-IHE Partnership grants in 2008 began reporting on this measure in 2010; however, of the eight grantees, one designed a program to improve assessments in Chinese and, thus, does not serve students directly; another grantee was in a planning year; two grantees were not scheduled to assess their students until 2010; and the remaining four grantees have struggled to report data on this measure in a form that the Department can use. The Department will continue to work with the DQI contractor and the current grantees to generate accurate data reporting for this measure.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Foreign language assistance

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

Objective: *To improve foreign language teaching.*

Measure: The number of teachers receiving training through FLAP SEA projects.		
Year	Target	Actual
2009		244
2010	48	43
2011	59	
2012	111	

Measure: The number of schools that use the assessments, standards, or curriculum developed by FLAP SEA projects.		
Year	Target	Actual
2009		64
2010	23	35
2011	37	
2012	54	

Additional information: The Department collected data for these measures for the first time in 2009 from the four grantees that received awards in 2006. In 2010, two of the three grantees that received grant awards in 2009 were able to report on the teacher training measure in year one of their projects; the third grantee was unable to offer training in year one as planned, which resulted in the cohort not meeting its target. All three 2009 grantees reported on the assessments, standards, or curriculum measure. The two grantees that received awards in 2010 will also report in 2011 for the first time. The Department set targets for the SEA grantees based on the targets established by the grantees.

Other Performance Information

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

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Academies for American history and civics

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$1,815 ²	0	-\$1,815

¹The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

² Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

In fiscal year 2011, the Department expects to make new 3-year grants for Presidential Academies, with funding for the full 3 years provided from the 2011 appropriation.

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$1,980
2008	1,945
2009	1,945
2010	1,815
2011 CR.....	1,815

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Academies for American history and civics

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funding for the Academies for American History and Civics program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs focused on student achievement in specific subject areas, the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization, a broader program, Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education. This new program would address the need to strengthen instruction and increase student achievement, especially in high-need local educational agencies (LEAs), across the subjects that contribute to a well-rounded education, such as arts, health education, physical education, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, environmental education, economics and financial literacy, and other subjects that may be identified by the Secretary.

Under the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program, the Department would provide competitive awards to States, high-need LEAs, and other entities to carry out such activities as development, implementation, and evaluation of successful programs; dissemination of evidence-based practices; and scaling up of effective programs. This approach would replace the patchwork of programs and funding streams in current law with a single comprehensive and coherent program that would provide States and LEAs with the flexibility to determine how best to meet the needs of their students and teachers across a well-rounded curriculum (which may include activities that support the improvement of student achievement or teacher effectiveness in history or in civics and government), and allow the Department to focus funding on programs that improve student achievement, especially in high-need LEAs. Eligible entities that are interested in developing, implementing, or expanding high-quality, innovative practices, strategies, or programs for history education or for civics and government education would be able to apply for funding.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Total budget authority	\$1,815	\$1,815	0
Amount for Presidential Academies	\$1,015	\$1,795	0
Number of new awards	0	1-2	0
Number of continuation awards	2	0	0
Amount for Congressional Academies	\$800	0	0
Number of continuation awards	1	0	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$20	0

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Academies for American history and civics

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

The performance measure for this program is the average percentage gain on an assessment after participation in an academy, as measured through pre- and post-assessments. Data are collected through grantee annual performance reports. In addition, each grantee must conduct an evaluation to track its progress toward specific objectives and performance measures that assess its impact on teaching, learning, and other outcomes for project participants.

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

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

Measure: The average percentage point gain on a teacher assessment after participation in a Presidential Academy.		
Year	Target	Actual
2008		26
2009	27	22
2010	28	10
2011	29	

Measure: The average percentage point gain on a student assessment after participation in a Congressional Academy.		
Year	Target	Actual
2008		19
2009	20	-3
2010	21	10
2011	22	

Additional information: 2008 data are used as the baseline for the targets. Because the Academies deliver a variety of instructional content, grantees create and administer their own assessments to measure participant gains. As the measures are calculated, an improvement from, for instance, 50 to 61 correct answers would be counted as a 22 percent improvement. The Congressional Academy grantee reported that the questions on the 2009 student assessment were too broad and didn't accurately test the content studied in the academy. No targets are shown for 2012 because the program is proposed for consolidation.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Close Up fellowships

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$1,942 ²	0	-\$1,942

¹The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

² Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Close Up Fellowships program provides a noncompetitive grant to the Close Up Foundation, which administers programs for increasing civic responsibility and understanding of the Federal Government among middle school and secondary school students. Through the grant, the Close Up Foundation provides three types of fellowships: (1) fellowships for middle and secondary school students from low-income families (Program for Middle and Secondary School Students); (2) professional development fellowships for teachers of fellowship recipient students (Program for Middle and Secondary School Teachers); and (3) fellowships for middle and secondary school recent immigrant students (Program for New Americans). The fellowships enable recipients to come to Washington, D.C., to participate in the Foundation's Close Up Washington civic education programs, in which they study the operations of, and meet with leaders from, the three branches of the Federal Government.

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$1,454
2008	1,942
2009	1,942
2010	1,942
2011 CR	1,942

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funding for the Close Up Fellowships program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs focused on student achievement in specific subject areas, the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization, a broader program,

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Close Up fellowships

Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education. This new program would address the need to strengthen instruction and increase student achievement, especially in high-need local educational agencies (LEAs), across the subjects that contribute to a well-rounded education, such as arts, health education, physical education, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, environmental education, economics and financial literacy, and other subjects that may be identified by the Secretary.

Under the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program, the Department would provide competitive awards to States, high-need LEAs, and other entities to carry out such activities as development, implementation, and evaluation of successful programs; dissemination of evidence-based practices; and scaling up of effective programs. This approach would replace the patchwork of programs and funding streams in current law with a single comprehensive and coherent program that would provide States and LEAs with the flexibility to determine how best to meet the needs of their students and teachers across the curriculum (which may include activities that support the improvement of student achievement or teacher effectiveness in civics and government), and allow the Department to focus funding on programs that improve student achievement, especially in high-need LEAs. Eligible entities that are interested in developing, implementing, or expanding high-quality, innovative practices, strategies, or programs in civics and government education would be able to apply for funding.

In addition, the Close Up Fellowships 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.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Total budget authority	\$1,942	\$1,942	0
Program for middle and secondary school students			
Total Federal share	\$1,300	\$1,300	0
Total participants	13,038	13,038	0
Total number of Close Up fellowships	1,973	1,973	
Program for middle and secondary school teachers			
Total Federal share	\$582	\$582	0
Total participants	1,664	1,664	0
Total number of Close Up fellowships	291	291	0

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Close Up fellowships

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)—continued

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Program for new Americans			
Total Federal share	\$60	\$60	0
Total participants	588	588	0
Total number of Close Up fellowships	129	129	0

NOTE: Data for the 2010 program output measures reflect the program reporting period July 1, 2009 - June 30, 2010. Data for the 2011 program output measures are projections for the program reporting period July 1, 2010 - June 30, 2011.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

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

Performance Measures

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

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

Measure: The ratio of Federal to non-Federal funding that is allocated for teachers and economically disadvantaged students through the Close-Up Fellowships program.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	0.59	0.53
2008	0.56	0.56
2009	0.53	0.56
2010	0.50	0.60
2011	0.47	

Additional Information: The Department calculates this measure as the total Federal appropriation divided by the total amount of non-Federal funds raised and used for fellowships. The performance targets are based on the grantee's past performance in obtaining non-Federal contributions. No targets are shown for 2012 because the program is proposed for consolidation.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Close Up fellowships

Other Performance Information

Recent surveys conducted by the Close Up Foundation provide some evidence of greater student knowledge of government and civic engagement after participation in the Program for Middle and Secondary School Students, though the results have not been verified by the Department or otherwise subjected to external analysis. Ninety-three percent of student respondents to the 2009-2010 survey reported that the program increased their understanding of the Federal Government, and 94 percent of student respondents agreed that the program helped them better understand the role of a citizen in a democracy. In addition, 96 percent of teacher respondents agreed that participation in the program helped their students understand current issues facing the United States.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Civic education

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0^{1,2}

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
We the People	\$21,617 ³	0	-\$21,617
Cooperative Education Exchange	<u>13,383³</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-13,383</u>
Total	35,000	0	-35,000

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

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

³ Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

We the People

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

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Civic education

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

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

Cooperative Education Exchange

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

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

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

We the People

	(\$000s)
2007	\$17,039
2008	20,056
2009	20,076
2010	21,617
2011 CR	21,617

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Civic education

Cooperative Education Exchange

(\$000s)

2007	\$12,072
2008	11,861
2009	13,383
2010	13,383
2011 CR	13,383

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Civic Education program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs focused on student achievement in specific subject areas, the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization, a broader program, Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education. This new program would address the need to strengthen instruction and increase student achievement, especially in high-need local educational agencies (LEAs), across the subjects that contribute to a well-rounded education, such as arts, health education, physical education, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, environmental education, economics and financial literacy, and other subjects that may be identified by the Secretary.

Under the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program, the Department would provide competitive awards to State educational agencies (SEAs), high-need LEAs, and other eligible entities to carry out such activities as development, implementation, and evaluation of successful programs; dissemination of evidence-based practices; and scaling up of effective programs. This approach would replace the patchwork of programs and funding streams in current law with a single comprehensive and coherent program that would provide States and LEAs with the flexibility to determine how to best meet the needs of their students and teachers across a well-rounded curriculum (which may include activities that support the improvement of student achievement or teacher effectiveness in civic and economic education), and allow the Department to focus funding on programs that improve student achievement, especially in high-need LEAs.

Entities that are interested in developing, implementing, or expanding high-quality, innovative practices, strategies, or programs for civics and government education, which could include the Center for Civic Education and the National Council on Economic Education, would be eligible to apply for funding under the new Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program .

The fiscal year 2012 request for Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education includes funds to pay 2012 continuation costs for the Cooperative Education Exchange program made in previous years.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Civic education

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
We the People:			
Statutory earmark to Center for Civic Education	\$21,617	\$21,617	0
Cooperative Education Exchange Program:			
Statutory earmarks to:			
Center for Civic Education	\$5,019	\$5,019	0
National Council on Economic Education	<u>5,019</u>	<u>5,019</u>	<u>0</u>
Earmark total	10,038	10,038	0
Number of competitive awards:			
New awards	1	1	0
Continuation awards	1	2	0
Competitive award funding:			
New awards	\$2,681	\$2,178	0
Continuation awards	653	1,157	0
Peer review of applications for new awards	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>
Competitive awards, total	3,345	3,345	0
Total funds, Cooperative Education Exchange	\$13,383	\$13,383	0

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$1,420 thousand for competitive awards under the Cooperative Education Exchange grants would be provided from the appropriation for the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Civic education

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

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

Measure: The percentage of teachers participating in training or professional development activities provided as part of the “We the People” program that have demonstrated improved quality of instruction through an evaluation.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	94	97
2008	97	97
2009	98	92
2010	98	
2011	98	

Additional information: Data for this measure are self-reported by the Center for Civic Education based on a 12-question survey it developed on the extent to which participating teachers report that professional development improved the quality of classroom instruction. The survey is administered after participating teachers return to their respective classrooms and the resulting response rates have been below the level considered by the National Center for Education Statistics to be necessary to ensure that possible nonresponse bias is minimized. For this reason, the Department has ongoing concerns about the reliability of the data for performance monitoring and improvement purposes. No targets are shown for FY 2012 because the program is proposed for consolidation.

Other Performance Information

We the People

Evaluation

In 2006–2007, the Center for Civic Education commissioned the RMC Research Corporation to conduct a quasi-experimental study to examine the effects of the *We the People* program on students’ political knowledge, civic skills, and civic attitudes. The study design, as described in the report (<http://www.civiced.org/pdfs/research/wtpEvaluation121207.pdf>) matched 822 students in classrooms using the *We the People* curriculum with 735 students with similar demographic characteristics in high school government classes whose teachers did not use the curriculum. Although the evaluation found that participating students made significantly greater gains than comparison students in their understanding of core values and principles of democracy, constitutional limits on governmental institutions, and rights and responsibilities of citizenship as well as improvements in the *We the People* participants’ ability to analyze issues, to debate, to persuade, and to achieve group consensus, flaws in the evaluation design undermine its ability to support a causal inference about the impact of the *We the People* program.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Civic education

The report indicates that staff from the Center for Civic Education and State and district program coordinators selected “teachers in each [S]tate with high quality programs” to participate in the study, which fails to ensure that the teachers in the study are representative of all teachers participating in the *We the People* program or teachers overall. This potential selection bias was further complicated by a small sample size of only 24 teachers using the *We the People* program and 18 comparison teachers and by differences in a number of observable characteristics among teachers in the *We the People* and comparison groups. Since this evaluation did not randomly select participating teachers to use the *We the People* curricula, we cannot reject the hypothesis that more motivated or qualified teachers, who would be expected to produce better student outcomes regardless of the curricula used, opt to participate in the *We the People* program. To the extent that the Center for Civic Education and the State and district program coordinators selected the best teachers from among this pool of teachers, the potential for selection bias was exacerbated.

The student sample was also flawed. Over 90 percent of the students in the study were White and performed at the A or B level in their coursework, which is not representative of the student population nationwide. The students in the *We the People* and comparison groups differed in pre-test civics scores, self-reported grades, and membership in extracurricular activities. Since these students differed in observable respects, they may also have differed on a number of important unobservable characteristics (e.g., family background, IQ, or motivation) that the researchers cannot control for in data analyses. The improvements in student knowledge were measured using a test that was developed by a team of scholars in collaboration with the Center for Civic Education and the research firm MPR Associates. The credibility of the study’s findings about the impact of the *We the People* program on student knowledge of civics is brought into question by the fact that the study relied on an assessment developed by a key stakeholder to measure the impact of the program.

Audit

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

Based on the results of its audit, the Office of the Inspector General concluded that there is no assurance that costs charged to the *We the People* and Cooperative Civic Education and Economic Education Exchange Program grants, and costs not reviewed as part of our audit, were allowable and documented in accordance with Federal requirements. The Office of the Inspector General also found that the Center for Civic Education did not distribute the number of free textbooks for which it charged the *We the People* grant and did not properly execute and monitor certain contracts supported with grant funds. The Office of the Inspector General recommended that the Department designate the Center for Civic Education as a “high-risk grantee,” determine the quantity of additional textbooks that the Center for Civic Education should be required to distribute under the *We the People* grant, and either request that the

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Civic education

Center for Civic Education return funds to the Department or adjust active grants for improper charges and unsupported costs charged to the grants, as appropriate.

The Center for Civic Education appealed the audit findings. In response to the Inspector General's audit findings, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer examined the documentation and information provided subsequently by the Center for Civic Education and determined that "high-risk grantee" status was not warranted for the fiscal year 2010 *We the People* grant award. The Department awarded the fiscal year 2010 grant subject to special conditions and a corrective action plan, which included requirements that the Center for Civic Education provide documentation that it is satisfying specific recommendations in the audit report and report at specified intervals on obligations, expenditures, and textbook printing and distribution. The Office of the Chief Financial Officer expects to issue an audit determination letter in fiscal year 2011 that will discuss the Department's response to the Inspector General's audit findings.

Cooperative Education Exchange

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Educational technology State grants

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0^{1,2}

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$100,000 ³	0	-\$100,000

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

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

³ Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

Each SEA must distribute at least 95 percent of its allocation to LEAs. Under the authorizing statute, the SEA uses 50 percent of the amount available to make competitive grants to high-need LEAs or to partnerships that include at least one high-need LEA and at least one other entity with expertise in integrating technology effectively into curricula. In making competitive awards, an SEA must give priority to applications from LEAs that receive formula allocations too

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Educational technology State grants

small to carry out the purposes of the program effectively. The SEAs distribute the remaining 50 percent to LEAs through a formula based on each LEA's share of funds under ESEA Title I, Part A. An SEA may also reserve up to 5 percent of its allocation for administration and other State-level activities.

Beginning in the fiscal year 2006 appropriations act, Congress has annually included language allowing States to award up to 100 percent of funds competitively.

The Department may reserve up to 2 percent of the amount appropriated for the program for national coordination and technical assistance activities. The Department has used these funds to conduct a required study on the conditions and practices under which educational technology: (1) is effective in improving student achievement; and (2) increases the ability of teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction.

In addition, under the program's national activities authority, the Department is responsible for developing a national long-range technology plan. In 2010, the Administration released its National Educational Technology Plan (NETP), *Transforming American Education: Learning Powered by Technology*, which is a 5-year action plan for using technology to improve student learning, accelerate and scale up the adoption of effective practices, and use data and information for continuous improvement. The NETP describes a model of learning that leverages technology and includes goals and recommendations in five key areas—learning, assessment, teaching, infrastructure, and productivity.

In the fiscal year 2010 appropriations act, the Congress included language permitting the Department to use a portion of the Educational Technology State Grants national activities funding to establish the National Center for Research in Advanced Information and Digital Technologies, which is authorized under the Higher Education Opportunity Act. The Center, operated by a nonprofit corporation, will develop and maintain a comprehensive research program on the use of advanced information and digital technologies to improve all levels of learning and education.

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2007	\$272,250
2008	267,494
2009	269,872
Recovery Act.....	650,000
2010	100,000
2011 CR.....	100,000

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Educational technology State grants

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not seeking funding for the Educational Technology State Grants program for fiscal year 2012. Instead of continuing a separate funding stream for education technology, the Administration is proposing, through the ESEA reauthorization, to infuse technology across ESEA programs in order to improve teaching and learning and build State and local capacity to support the effective integration of technology into curricula and instruction. The Administration believes that technology is integral in improving educational quality for students, and that technology can be a powerful tool in a wide variety of strategies to improve student learning and better support teachers. However, the existing approach to Federal funding for technology authorized by ESEA, the Educational Technology State Grants program, is not the most effective approach to infusing technology across the program areas and enabling educators and policymakers to identify the most effective practices to replicate.

As an example of how the reauthorization proposal would support the integrated use of technology, the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education initiative would address the need to strengthen instruction and increase student achievement, especially in high-need LEAs, through three programs focused on literacy; science, technology, engineering, and math; and ensuring a well-rounded education. Under these new authorities, the Department would support States and districts in identifying how to best meet the needs of their students and teachers across the content areas, including through innovative uses of technology in classroom instruction or professional development. SEAs also would be eligible for funds, under the initiative's national activities authority, to help strengthen the use of technology in the core academic subjects, including through the development and implementation of technology-enabled curriculum, assessments, professional development, and supporting tools and resources. The initiative would support States, districts, and schools in their efforts to use technology to transform teaching and learning in order to better meet the needs of their students and to ensure that students are College- and Career-Ready.

The Administration's \$300 million request for a reauthorized Investing in Innovation Fund would support the use of technology to drive improvements in educational quality. Other programs that would encourage the integrated use of technology include Expanding Educational Options, College Pathways and Accelerated Learning, Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants, Teacher and Leader Pathways, Assessing Achievement, and English Learner Education. Under the Administration's proposal for Title I, Part A, College- and Career-Ready students, States and districts would be able to set aside a sizable percentage of funding for capacity-building activities, including for technology.

In December 2010, the Department released its Notice of Supplemental Priorities for Discretionary Grant Programs. These priorities include technology as one of 16 priorities that may be applied to competitive grants. In fiscal year 2011, the Department is proposing to apply this priority to the Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy program, encouraging States to use technology to support and enhance their comprehensive literacy plans.

In addition, the Administration is requesting \$90 million for the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Education (ARPA-ED), a new initiative modeled after similar research programs in the

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Educational technology State grants

Department of Defense and Department of Energy and charged with the improvement of early childhood through postsecondary education. ARPA-ED would pursue breakthrough developments in education technology, including learning systems, support systems for educators, and tools that improve educational outcomes. The Wireless Innovation (WIN) Fund would provide mandatory funds from the sale of spectrum bands by the Federal Communications Commission, and the Department is requesting additional discretionary funds under the Fund for the Improvement of Education.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
Amount for State grants	\$96,775	\$96,775	0
Range of awards	\$484-\$11,478	\$484-\$10,650	0
Amount for BIE	\$735	\$735	0
Amount for Outlying Areas	\$490	\$490	0
National activities set-aside	\$2,000	\$2,000	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 primary goal of the Educational Technology State Grants program is to improve the academic achievement of students, particularly students who attend high-poverty or low-performing schools, through the use of technology in schools. The Department has established several performance measures to assess the extent to which LEAs receiving substantial amounts of program funds are able to demonstrate that: (1) students and teachers in high-poverty schools have access to the Internet; (2) they have fully and effectively integrated technology into curriculum; (3) teachers have met State technology standards; and (4) students have met their State's technology literacy standards by the eighth grade. The Department is collecting data for these measures through *EDFacts*, grantee performance reports, and the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) surveys.

The first performance measure examines the difference in Internet access between classrooms in high- and low-poverty schools. The 2009 data, collected at the school level through the

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Educational technology State grants

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), showed a one-tenth of 1 percent difference in Internet access between high- and low-poverty schools. For this measure, low-poverty schools are defined as schools with less than 35 percent of their students eligible for free or reduced-price lunches, while high-poverty schools are defined as schools with 75 percent or more of their students eligible. The second performance measure examines technology integration, and in 2009 States reported that 61 percent of those LEAs that were assessed were determined by the State to have effectively and fully integrated technology into their curriculum. For the third performance measure, in 2009 States reported that 80 percent of full-time teachers who were assessed were determined to have met the State's technology standards. The fourth measure examines student technology literacy, and in 2009 States reported that 66 percent of students who were assessed were determined to be technologically literate. The quality of data for the second, third, and fourth measures should be viewed with some caution because only a portion of States reported data and of those that reported, some may not have reported data for all LEAs. States also may differ in their definitions and approaches to collecting data for these measures. The Department plans to assess the quality of these data and the feasibility of establishing annual performance targets this spring. Also, the Department continues to work with States to enhance their capacity to report more complete data in future years.

In 2009, the Department completed a comprehensive State-level monitoring report that examined: (1) the distribution of awards between formula and competitive grants, and (2) how States address areas assessed through the Department's GPRA measures, specifically technology literacy, technology integration, and professional development. The report found that in fiscal year 2008, approximately 12 States distributed 100 percent of their Educational Technology formula funds competitively and focused their grant strategies on strengthening professional development and developing technology-rich classrooms or 21st century learning environments. The remaining States continued to distribute 50 percent of funds by formula and 50 percent through a competitive process.

In terms of how States are addressing the Department's GRPA measures, the report noted that States differ widely in how they define technology literacy, with 46 percent of the States using a unique State-specific definition, 34 percent using the State Educational Technology Directors Association's definition, and 20 percent providing no specific definition to their LEAs. The report also found that technology integration is evident in subgrants in all 50 States, but only 29 of those States explicitly identify technology integration as an area of focus in their competitive subgrant competition. In the area of professional development, the report found that 36 States spent more than the minimum requirement of 25 percent on professional development and that a majority of States and districts were focusing their professional development on the integration of technology into the curriculum or on how to use data and formative assessment to support individualized student learning.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Educational technology State grants

Efficiency Measure

Measure: The percentage of monitoring reports that the Department sends within 45 days after a monitoring visit (both on-site and virtual).		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		0
2008	50	0
2009	75	not applicable
2010	100	not applicable
2011	100	

Additional information: The Department has taken steps to initiate a new monitoring protocol that integrates information from five formula grant programs administered by the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education into a comprehensive monitoring report. Since the Department began to implement this new monitoring protocol in fiscal year 2007, staff administering the Educational Technology State grant program have made some improvement in the average amount of time it takes to issue a monitoring report, from 258 days in fiscal year 2006 to 56 days in fiscal year 2007 but then up to 90 days in 2008, which was more than double the efficiency goal of 45 days. In fiscal years 2009 and 2010, the program office did not conduct any new monitoring visits and instead focused on completing monitoring reports and analyzing State responses to corrective actions from previous years. The program office also continued to conduct ongoing desk monitoring, identify potential risk factors, and provide targeted technical assistance to grantees.

Other Performance Information

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

In 2007, the Department released a 2-volume report from the study, *National Educational Technology Trends Study: State Strategies and Practices*, which documented State educational technology policies and programs, including the role of the Educational Technology State Grants program in State efforts. The study examined survey and case study data to document State priorities for educational technology, perceptions of State and district administrators on technology-related needs, and challenges experienced by States in the administration of the Educational Technology State Grants program during its first 2 years of operation. The report noted that, by 2004, 42 States had student technology standards, with 18 States having “stand-alone” standards, 16 States having technology standards embedded within other academic

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Educational technology State grants

content standards, and the remaining 8 States having both stand-alone technology standards and embedded standards.

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

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

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Educational technology State grants

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

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

College pathways and accelerated learning (Legislation sought)

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
0	\$86,000	+\$86,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program would support efforts to increase high school graduation rates and preparation for college matriculation and success by providing college-level and other accelerated courses and instruction in middle and high schools with concentrations of students from low-income families and in high schools with low graduation rates. Grants would support strategies that could include expanding the availability of Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) courses, dual-enrollment programs that allow students to take college-level courses (including courses in career and technical education) and earn college credit while in high school, and “early college high schools” that allow students to earn a high school degree and an associate’s degree or 2 years of college credit simultaneously. Grants would also support projects that re-engage out-of-school youth or students who are not on track to graduate, and the program would also fund accelerated learning opportunities for students across the performance spectrum, including those who exceed proficiency standards, in high-poverty elementary schools.

States and local educational agencies (LEAs) would be eligible to apply for competitive grants individually, in consortia, or in partnership with other entities. In order to receive a grant, applicants would be required to demonstrate how they will use evidence to design, implement, and continuously improve proposed project activities.

The Department would be authorized to reserve up to 5 percent of the amount available for grants to carry out national activities, including research on promising accelerated learning models. In addition, the Department could reserve funds to make grants to States and to transfer funds to the Department of the Interior’s Bureau of Indian Education to pay for the cost of advanced test fees for students from low-income families.

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$86 million in fiscal year 2012 for the proposed College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program, which would be created through the Administration’s Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization proposal. The request would support the first year of the program, which would replace, with a more comprehensive and

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

College pathways and accelerated learning

flexible program, several, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that seek to prevent students from dropping out of school or offer accelerated learning opportunities.

Although students who drop out, or are at risk of dropping out, are often thought of as low achievers who need a watered-down curriculum to keep them in school, educators find that often the opposite is the case. Efforts to introduce AP, IB, and other accelerated curricula in schools with concentrations of at-risk students recently have shown strong success, as demonstrated by the increasing numbers of students from low-income families taking and passing AP tests. Further, research shows that students who participate in an accelerated high school curriculum have a higher probability of success in higher education. According to the Department's 2000 follow-up of the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS: 88/2000), 96 percent of students in the lowest socio-economic status quintile who participated in AP courses enrolled in postsecondary education programs, compared to 39 percent of those who did not participate. Clifford Adelman's 2006 study *The Toolbox Revisited* confirms the significance of those data. Adelman found that participation in a challenging curriculum, including programs such as AP and IB, is a key factor associated with a student's completion of a bachelor's degree and has a stronger correlation with degree completion than high school test scores, class rank, or GPA. The same study concluded that the impact of a challenging curriculum on rates of completion of a bachelor's degree is even higher for African-American and Hispanic students than it is for White students. By promoting accelerated learning opportunities in high-poverty schools, the College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program would thus address the needs of students at risk of dropping out, not just those who are already high achievers.

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

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

The College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program would also allow considerable local flexibility by supporting other efforts to prevent students from dropping out and to re-engage out-of-school youth, including early warning systems and comprehensive prevention and reentry plans. Early warning systems would seek to identify effectively those students at risk of not

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

College pathways and accelerated learning

graduating on time and would provide schools and LEAs with the information necessary to target interventions of the type and level necessary to support students' on-time graduation.

The Department also would use funds allocated for College Pathways and Accelerated Learning to pay continuation costs for grants made prior to ESEA reauthorization under the High School Graduation Initiative, Advanced Placement, and Javits Gifted and Talented Education programs. In the first year of the program, all program funds would be used to pay these continuation costs and to support grants to pay for advanced test fee costs for students from low-income families.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2012</u>
Budget Authority	\$86,000
Amount for grants	0
Continuation awards for antecedent programs	\$65,900
Grants for advanced course test fee costs	\$20,100

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$65,900 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for College Pathways and Accelerated Learning in fiscal year 2012 to fund continuation awards for grants made under the High School Graduation Initiative (\$50,000 thousand), Advanced Placement Incentive (\$10,800 thousand), Javits Gifted and Talented Education (\$5,100 thousand) programs.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

High school graduation initiative

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$50,000 ²	0	-\$50,000

¹The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

² Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The High School Graduation Initiative awards discretionary grants to State educational agencies and local educational agencies to support the implementation of effective, sustainable, and coordinated dropout prevention and re-entry programs in high schools with annual dropout rates that exceed their State average annual dropout rate. Funds may also be used to support activities at middle schools that feed into high schools that have dropout rates that exceed the State average annual rate. Grants are awarded for up to 60 months and may be used for such activities as: the early and continued identification of students at risk of not graduating, providing at-risk students with services designed to keep them in school, identifying and encouraging youth who have left school without graduating to reenter and graduate, implementing other comprehensive dropout prevention approaches, and implementing transition programs that help students successfully transition from middle school to high school.

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

	(\$000s)
2007	0
2008	0
2009	0
2010	\$50,000
2011 CR	50,000

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funding for the High School Graduation Initiative for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other narrowly targeted programs that seek to improve student achievement in high schools or provide an accelerated curriculum, the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

High school graduation initiative

reauthorization, a broader program, College Pathways and Accelerated Learning. This program would support efforts to increase high school graduation rates and preparation for college matriculation and success by providing college-level and other accelerated courses and instruction to students in high-poverty middle and high schools and in high schools with low graduation rates. The program would also support projects that re-engage out-of-school youth or students who are not on track to graduate.

Students at risk of dropping out would be a critical target population for the new program. Educators find that giving such students the opportunity to enroll and succeed in demanding courses can be a successful approach to dropout prevention, as many students lose interest in and subsequently leave school because they are unchallenged by the standard curriculum. Further, research shows that students who participate in an accelerated high school curriculum, particularly African-American and Hispanic students, have a high probability of success in higher education. According to the Department's 2000 follow-up of the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS: 88/2000), 96 percent of students in the lowest socio-economic status quintile who participated in AP courses enrolled in postsecondary education programs, compared to 39 percent of those who did not participate.

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

The fiscal year 2012 request for the College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program would include funds to pay 2012 High School Graduation Initiative continuation grant costs.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Total budget authority	\$50,000	\$50,000	0
Amount for new awards	\$46,717	0	0
Number of new awards	29	0	0
Amount for continuation awards	0	\$48,918	0
Number of continuation awards	0	29	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$439	0	0

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

High school graduation initiative

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)—continued

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
National activities, including technical assistance and dissemination	\$2,844	\$1,082	0

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$50,000 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for College Pathways and Accelerated Learning in fiscal year 2012.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made towards achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested for FY 2012 and future years and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department recently established new performance measures for this program. The fiscal year 2010 grantees will be the first grantees to collect and report data to the Department that address the new measures. Baseline data will be available in the fall of 2011. The new performance measures are:

- For each high school served by the project, the school's graduation rate, as defined in the State's approved accountability plan for Part A of Title I of the ESEA, as well as the graduation rates for the following subgroups:
 - Major racial and ethnic groups;
 - Students with disabilities;
 - Students with limited English proficiency; and
 - Economically disadvantaged students.
- The number and percentage of students enrolled in grades 9 through 12 in participating schools or programs who, during the most recent school year, earned at least one quarter of the credits necessary to graduate from high school with a regular diploma.
- The number and percentage of participating students who had not attended school for 60 or more instructional days immediately prior to their participation in the project, and the average daily attendance of such students while participating in the project.
- The number and percentage of students served by the project during the most recent school year who were 2 or more years behind their expected age and credit

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

High school graduation initiative

accumulation in high school, and the number and percentage of such students who earned one half or more of the credits they need to graduate with a regular diploma.

- For each school served by the project that includes an eighth grade:
 - Average daily attendance; and
 - The number and percentage of students enrolled in the eighth grade who enrolled in ninth grade at the start of the next school year.

Other Performance Information

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

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Advanced placement

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$45,840 ²	0	-\$45,840

¹The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

²Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Advanced placement

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$37,026
2008	43,540
2009	43,540
2010	45,840
2011 CR	45,840

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funding for the Advanced Placement Incentive program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and two other narrowly targeted programs that seek to improve student achievement in high schools or provide an accelerated curriculum, the Administration has proposed to create, through the ESEA reauthorization, a broader program, College Pathways and Accelerated Learning. This program would support efforts to increase preparation for college matriculation and success through the introduction of AP and IB courses in high-poverty middle and high schools as well as other accelerated curriculum options (such as dual high school/college enrollment and early college high schools) in those schools. It would also provide grants to States for payment of advanced course test fees for students from low-income families.

Under the Administration's reauthorization proposal, Advanced Placement Incentive continuation grant costs would be funded from the appropriation for the new College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program. The fiscal year 2012 request for that program also includes \$20.1 million to pay for advanced course test fees for student from low-income students in school year 2011-2012.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Total budget authority	\$45,840	\$45,840	0
Test fee program	\$18,615	\$20,004	0
Amount for new awards	\$17,970	\$20,004	0
Number of new awards	41	41	0
Award supplements	\$645	0	0
Incentive program	\$27,225	\$25,378	0
Amount for new awards	0	\$10,837	0
Number of new awards	0	17	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$27,225	\$14,541	0
Number of continuation awards	41	21	0

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Advanced placement

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)—continued

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$458	0

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$10,800 thousand and test fee costs of approximately \$20,100 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for College Pathways and Accelerated Learning in fiscal year 2012.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, indicators, and performance data and targets, and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2012 and future years and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

Measure: The number of Advanced Placement tests taken by low-income public school students nationally.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	230,352	286,028
2008	328,932	325,567
2009	378,272	399,809
2010	435,013	483,624
2011	500,265	
2012	600,318	

Additional Information: Data for this measure are obtained from the College Board and capture the effects of efforts to increase low-income students' participation in AP programs.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Advanced placement

Measure: The number of Advanced Placement tests taken by minority (Hispanic, Black, Native American) public school students nationally.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	376,000	413,847
2008	421,000	473,666
2009	544,716	538,249
2010	626,423	616,992
2011	675,520	
2012	721,562	

Additional Information: Data for this measure are obtained from the College Board and capture the effects of efforts to increase minority students' participation in AP programs.

Measure: The percentage of Advanced Placement tests passed (tests receiving scores of 3-5) by low-income public school students nationally.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	38.6	35.6
2008	39.2	34.5
2009	39.8	37.0
2010	40.2	35.6
2011	40.4	

Additional Information: This measure calculates the number of AP exams passed by low-income public school students in relation to the total number of AP exams taken by those students. Data for this measure are obtained from the College Board and capture the effects of efforts to increase low-income public school students' success on AP exams. The Department will develop a target for this measure for 2012.

Measure: The number of Advanced Placement tests passed (tests receiving scores of 3-5) by low-income public school students nationally.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	99,000	97,142
2008	128,941	106,586
2009	150,552	147,654
2010	174,875	172,005
2011	203,108	

Additional Information: Data for this measure are obtained from the College Board and capture the effects of efforts to increase low-income students' success on AP exams. The Department will develop a target for this measure for 2012.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Advanced placement

Measure: The ratio of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate tests taken in public high schools served by Advanced Placement Incentive grants to the number of seniors enrolled at those schools.						
Year	Target			Actual		
	2006 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2009 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2009 Cohort
2007	0.55			0.53		
2008	0.66			0.60	0.65	
2009	0.79	0.78		0.62	0.79	0.97
2010		0.93	1.03		0.93	1.24
2011		1.10	1.09			

Additional Information: This measure is the number of AP and IB tests taken in high schools served by Advanced Placement Incentive grants divided by the total number of seniors enrolled at those schools. This measure, referred to as the “Challenge Index,” was developed by the *Washington Post* in order to assess the performance of high schools. The Department did not award new Advanced Placement Incentive grants in 2007. The Department will develop targets for this measure for 2012.

Efficiency Measure

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

Additional Information: The Department’s efficiency measure for the Advanced Placement Test Fee program is the cost per passage of an Advanced Placement test by a low-income public school student. Results for 2007 were calculated by dividing the total expenditures for the Test Fee program from June 1, 2006, to May 30, 2007, by the total number of tests passed by low-income public school students benefitting from the Test Fee program. Beginning in 2008, the results for this measure are calculated by dividing the total amount States report spending on AP test fees by the total number of tests passed by low-income students. 2009 data will be available in the spring of 2011. The Department will develop a target for this measure for 2012.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Javits gifted and talented education

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$7,463 ²	0	-\$7,463

¹The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

²Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

Grants from this program are awarded under two priorities. Under the first priority, 5-year research and development grants are awarded to develop and improve model programs for identifying and serving students who are traditionally underrepresented in gifted and talented education (including students from low-income families, English learners, and students with disabilities); at least half of the applications approved for funding in a given year must address this priority. Under the second priority, 3-year capacity-building grants are awarded to SEAs and LEAs to improve services for gifted and talented students.

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Javits gifted and talented

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$7,596
2008	7,463
2009	7,463
2010	7,463
2011 CR	7,463

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funding for the Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Student Education program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other narrowly targeted programs that seek to improve student achievement in high schools or provide an accelerated curriculum (including to gifted and talented students), the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization, a broader program, College Pathways and Accelerated Learning. This program would support efforts to increase preparation for college matriculation and success by providing college-level and other accelerated courses and instruction in high-poverty middle and high schools. Gifted and talented students would be an important target population for this program because they are likely to need an advanced or accelerated curriculum in order to progress academically consistent with their abilities. Further, the program would support accelerated achievement projects targeting students who are traditionally underrepresented in gifted and talented education.

In addition, activities to strengthen the education of gifted and talented students could be funded through the Effective Teachers and Leaders program in the proposed ESEA reauthorization, which would provide funds for professional development for teachers and school leaders, particularly in high-need or low-performing schools. Further, gifted and talented students would also benefit from the new assessment and accountability system, proposed as part of the reauthorization of ESEA Title I, which would measure and encourage growth beyond proficiency.

Under the Administration's reauthorization proposal, Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Student Education continuation grant costs would be funded from the appropriation for the new College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Javits gifted and talented

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Total budget authority	\$7,463	\$7,463	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$5,492	\$5,301	0
Number of continuation awards	15	15	0
Average continuation award	\$366	\$353	0
Research and development center	\$1,971	\$2,162	0

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$5,100 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for College Pathways and Accelerated Learning in fiscal year 2012.

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 for fiscal year 2012 and future years and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department collects data for the measures listed below every 2 years by convening an expert panel of scientists and practitioners to review information from a sample of annual performance reports and self-evaluations prepared by grantees. Baselines for these measures were set in 2005 and 2006.

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

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Javits gifted and talented

Measure: The percentage of Javits Gifted and Talented Education project designs for effective professional development focusing on gifted and talented education with average reviewer ratings for quality of high or above.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	92	100
2008		
2009	93	60
2010		
2011	95	

Additional Information: In 2009, panel reviewers applied a more stringent rubric than in previous years, which resulted in a significant decrease in the percentage of project designs receiving a high quality rating.

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Assessing Achievement

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$410,732 ²	\$420,000	+\$9,268

¹ This program is currently titled State Assessments. The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2012.

² Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Assessing achievement

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

Section 6112 of the ESEA authorizes Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments, a competitive grant program under which the Department makes awards to support efforts by States, or consortia of States, to: (1) improve the quality, validity, and reliability of State academic assessments; (2) measure student academic achievement through the use of multiple measures from multiple sources; (3) chart student progress over time; and (4) use comprehensive instruments such as performance- and technology-based assessments. To date, the Department has made 46 awards under the program.

In each year beginning with fiscal year 2005, the Congress has first provided \$400 million for the State Assessment grants, with any remaining funds going to Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments. The Department has used the Enhanced Assessment Instruments funds to support projects to increase the accessibility and validity of assessments for students with disabilities or limited English proficiency; develop English language proficiency assessments; use technology to improve State assessments; and provide intensive, high-quality professional development for using assessment data to improve instruction. In FY 2011, the Department expects to fund collaborative efforts among States to develop a system of English language proficiency assessments aligned with English language proficiency standards that correspond to a common set of college- and career-ready standards in English language arts and mathematics held in common by multiple States. Priority will be give to collaborative efforts across multiple States. These English language proficiency assessments would complement the English language arts and mathematics assessments that are being developed under the Race to the Top Assessment program and the alternate assessments aligned with alternative achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities being developed under the IDEA General Supervension Enhancement Grants program.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$407,563
2008	408,732
2009	410,732
2010	410,732
2011CR	410,732

FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2012, the Department requests \$420 million for Assessing Achievement (currently State Assessments), \$9.3 million more than the 2011 annualized CR level. The request would support one of the major reforms embedded in the Administration's proposal for reauthorization

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Assessing achievement

of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the implementation of college- and career-ready (CCR) standards in order to ensure that all students graduate from high school with the knowledge and skills they need to be successful in college and the workplace. Under the reauthorization proposal for this program, the Department would continue to award \$400 million to States through the same formula as in current statute, and the remaining \$20 million requested for fiscal year 2012 would be awarded on a competitive basis to consortia of States or consortia of States and other entities.

Existing State assessments generally fail to capture the full spectrum of what students know and can do. They focus on concepts that are easy to measure; rely mainly on multiple-choice items with fill-in-the-blank bubble answers; and provide time-sensitive data and results months later, when their instructional usefulness is largely past. Educators need high-quality assessment systems that more broadly and validly measure student achievement and ask students to demonstrate what they know and can do. They need assessment systems that appropriately assess all students, including students with disabilities and English Learners, and that assess a range of content areas to support a well-rounded curriculum.

States have begun collaborating to develop common assessments aligned with rigorous college- and career-ready standards in English-language arts and mathematics. Under the Administration's reauthorization proposal, States would be required to adopt college- and career-ready standards and to administer assessments aligned with those standards. The resources provided through the reauthorized Assessing Achievement program would support not only transition to and implementation of those assessments, but also the improvement of other assessments and the reporting of assessment data. These resources would increase the number of States implementing assessment systems that measure whether students are on track to being college- and career-ready by the time they graduate from high school, and they also will help States align their standards and high school graduation requirements with college and career expectations.

Under the reauthorization proposal, fiscal years 2012 through 2014 formula grant funds would flow to all States to support compliance with the current ESEA requirements for reading/language arts, mathematics, and science assessments. Once States have finished implementing the current ESEA assessment requirements, States could use their formula funds to support the transition to English-language arts and mathematics assessments that are held in common by a number of States, measure student attainment against college- and career-ready standards, and can be used to measure student growth and to inform determinations of individual teacher and principal effectiveness for purposes of evaluation. States could also use formula funds to administer their current assessments, develop and implement assessments that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards in other subjects, including science, engineering, and technology, develop or improve assessments of English language proficiency, develop or improve native language assessments, expand the range of accommodations available to English Learners and students with disabilities, incorporate the principles of universal design for learning in assessments measuring attainment of college- and career-ready standards, or carry out other activities.

Starting with fiscal year 2015, funds would flow only to States that (1) have adopted college- and career-ready standards that are common to a significant number of States; and (2) are

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Assessing achievement

implementing, or have committed to implementing, assessments in English-language arts and in mathematics in grades 3-8 and at least once in high school that are aligned with those standards.

The reauthorization proposal would also establish a program to award competitive grants to consortia of States, or partnerships of States and other organizations, for research on, or development, evaluation, and improvement of, assessments that are aligned with college- and career-ready content and achievement standards that are held in common by a significant number of States. The proposed increase for fiscal year 2012 would support a grant competition to assist consortia of States in developing high-quality assessments in areas of common need, in particular in strategic areas that may need additional resources for full development. Such areas might include developing or improving assessments in subjects other than English-language arts and mathematics, developing formative or diagnostic assessments, or improving the reliability and validity of assessments for English learners and students with disabilities. The Department would set aside approximately \$20 million of the request for this competition.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Grants for State Assessments			
Amount for State Grants	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000
Estimated number of awards	52	52	52
Range of awards	\$256-\$32,709	\$256-\$32,709	\$256-\$32,709
Average award	\$7,615	\$7,615	\$7,615
BIE and Outlying Areas	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments			
Amount for new awards	\$10,657	\$10,657	\$19,925
Number of new awards	2-3	2-3	2-4
Range of new awards	\$2,500-\$5,000	\$2,500-\$5,000	\$2,500-\$5,000
Peer review of new award applications	\$75	\$75	\$75

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2012 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Assessing achievement

Currently, 26 States have reading or language arts, mathematics, and science assessments that have received full approval from the Department. Thirteen States have received approval of their reading or language arts assessments and mathematics assessments, but have not yet received approval for science. In addition, 2 States that had previously received approval of their reading or language arts assessments and mathematics assessments have recently made changes to their assessment systems and have had to re-submit evidence that their assessments still comply with the Title I requirements. Eleven States have never received approval from the Department; of those, six States have entered into compliance agreements with the Department because it will take them 1 to 2 additional years to come into compliance, and the remaining five were placed in mandatory oversight status. In 2011, the Department will review the progress of the States that have been under mandatory oversight status to determine if they have come into compliance. In addition, the Department placed conditions on the fiscal year 2010 Title I, Part A grant awards for 29 States whose required assessments had not yet received Departmental approval.

In addition, under the regulations pertaining to State assessment systems under Title I issued on April 9, 2007, States have the option of developing alternate assessments based on modified standards for students with disabilities that meet certain criteria. One of the criteria is that there must be objective evidence demonstrating that a student's disability has precluded the student from achieving grade-level proficiency. To date, 13 States have submitted evidence to the Department to demonstrate that their alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards meet the requirements established under the regulations. Of those, four States have received approval of their alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, and the remaining nine States are in the process of submitting additional evidence regarding compliance with the regulatory requirements.

In the fall of 2009, the Department conducted a pilot review of grantee products to obtain baseline data for the performance measures for the Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments program. These measures assess the extent to which funded projects produce significant research regarding assessments, in particular regarding accommodations and alternate assessments for students with disabilities, and whether grantees disseminate information on the advances in assessment that result from their grants. To date, the Department has reviewed final products from six of the eight grantees that received fiscal year 2005 funding. (The other two grantees had received an extension of their grant periods and were still conducting grant activities at the time of the pilot review. The Department will review final products from these two grantees in the winter of 2010). Baseline data on these measures will be reported in fiscal year 2011. The products from the fiscal year 2006 and 2007 cohorts will be reviewed during the summer of 2011.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Assessing achievement

Efficiency Measures

The Department has adopted an efficiency measure that tracks the average number of days per peer review session it takes the Department to issue an initial standards and assessment decision letter to a State after receiving a submission.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	90	56.00
2008	90	78.23
2009	90	100.9
2010	90	183.4
2011	To be determined	
2012	To be determined	

Additional information: The Department began formal peer reviews of State standards and assessment systems in 2005. These reviews determine whether a State has met each of the requirements specified in the authorizing statute. At this time every State has submitted evidence for review multiple times.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Training and advisory services

(Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IV)

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$6,989 ¹	\$6,989	0

¹ Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Training and advisory services

The fiscal year 2009 appropriation included \$2.5 million for one-time grants for local educational agencies (LEAs) facing challenges in creating student assignment plans that comply with the 2007 Supreme Court decision declaring unconstitutional plans based on race. The Department made 11 awards to school districts seeking technical assistance to develop and implement student assignment plans that avoid the re-segregation of schools and facilitate student diversity while maintaining compliance with the Supreme Court decision.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2007	\$7,113
2008	6,989
2009	9,489
2010	6,989
2011 CR	6,989

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2012, the Administration requests \$7.0 million for the Training and Advisory Services program, the same as the fiscal year 2011 CR level. The fiscal year 2012 funds would support the second year of 3-year grants to 10 regional EACs.

The Department expects to hold a competition in fiscal year 2011 for EACs that support the goal of equal access to a high-quality education for all students. The competition will give priority to applicants that address the following priorities: effective teachers and leaders; improving school climate; and promoting science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). The requested funds for fiscal year 2012 would provide continued support to the EACs for such activities as instructing school officials on how to prevent sexual harassment and combat biases that can lead to hate crimes and bullying, helping educators select appropriate educational programs to meet the needs of English Learners, increasing participation by minorities and females in advanced mathematics and science courses, and working with LEAs to ensure that systemic reform and educational restructuring plans consider the needs of all students.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Training and advisory services

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Amount for continuation awards	\$6,969	0	\$6,966
Number of continuation awards	10	0	10
Amount for new awards	0	\$6,900	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$69	0
Number of new awards	0	10	0
Data collection	\$20	\$20	\$23

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2012 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department gathers data to inform the program's performance measures through customer surveys administered by the Library of Congress's Federal Research Division. About 48 percent of the targeted customer group responded to the 2006 survey. With assistance from the Department's Data Quality Initiative contractor, the Department made revisions to the survey and took steps to increase the response rate, and in 2007 and 2008 the rate increased to almost 76 percent. The response rate dropped slightly to 71 percent (135 out of 205 in the targeted customer group responded) in 2009 and was 69 percent (193 out of the 279 targeted customer group) in 2010. Years 2006 and 2009 mark the first year of a 3-year grant cycle, which may explain why the centers identified fewer clients in those years. Further analysis of the response rates in 2010 by position and type of organization revealed that principals had the lowest response rate (35 percent) and accounted for 20 percent of the clients. The Department will consider additional ways to reach principals next year.

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

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Training and advisory services

Measure: The percentage of customers of Equity Assistance Centers who develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices in eliminating, reducing, or preventing harassment, conflict, and school violence.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	67	50
2008	68	56
2009	69	52
2010	70	36
2011	71	
2012	72	

Additional information: Targets are based on the 2006 baseline data. Responses from the past 4 years may more accurately reflect the needs of the target audience (than in previous years), since the response rate increased significantly from 2006 to 2007 and beyond. The response rate in 2010 was 69 percent. Further analysis of the response rate revealed that principals had the lowest response rate, 35 percent, which accounted for 20 percent of the clients. Follow-up plans for next year will include considerations for reaching principals. The drop in positive responses for this measure in 2010 could be explained by fewer customers seeking this type of assistance. Also, the percentages for individual EACs ranged from 14 percent to 56 percent. The Department will look at the EACs with the lowest percentages to determine what kind of technical assistance may be warranted.

Measure: The percentage of customers of Equity Assistance Centers who develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices, or both, in ensuring that students of different race, sex, and national origin have equitable opportunity for high-quality instruction.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	72	82
2008	73	89
2009	74	85
2010	75	77
2011	76	
2012	77	

Additional information: While results have improved for this measure since 2006, the recent decline has not been fully explored. However, the percentages for individual EACs ranged from 55 percent to 100 percent. The Department will attempt further analyses of the data to try and determine if there are specific centers or other reasons that could explain the drop.

Measure: The percentage of customers who report that the products and services they received from the Equity Assistance Centers are of high quality.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		92
2008	90	95
2009	90	95
2010	90	90
2011	90	
2012	90	

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Training and advisory services

Additional information: This measure was first implemented in 2007. Customers have responded very positively on the quality of the products and services they have received, and 90 percent of the respondents gave the products and services a “very high” or “high” rating of quality in 2010.

Measure: The percentage of customers who report that the products and services they received from the Equity Assistance Centers are of high usefulness to their policies and practices.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	86	88
2008	87	94
2009	88	92
2010	89	85
2011	90	
2012	90	

Additional information: Respondents have responded positively to this measure for 5 years in a row, and the program has generally exceeded its targets. In 2010, 85 percent of the respondents gave the products and services a “very high” or “high” rating of usefulness. The percentages for individual EACs receiving a rating of “high” or “very high” ranged from 73 percent to 94 percent. Further analyses of the centers receiving the highest and the lowest ratings may provide information to guide the Department’s technical assistance efforts.

Efficiency Measures

The Department has implemented a measure of administrative efficiency to assess the Training and Advisory Services program and other technical assistance programs. The measure is the percentage of grant funds that each EAC carries over for each year of operations. The Department established a second efficiency measure for the program: the number of working days following a monitoring visit it takes the Department to send a monitoring report to grantees.

Measure: The percentage of Equity Assistance Center grant funds carried over in each year of the project.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	10	<1
2008	10	<1
2009	10	4
2010	10	2
2011	10	
2012	10	

Additional information: The EACs carried over less than 1 percent of their grant funds on average for 2006, 2007, and 2008, 4 percent in 2009, and 2 percent in 2010, exceeding the target of 10 percent or less carryover.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Training and advisory services

Measure: The number of working days it takes the Department to send a monitoring report to grantees after monitoring visits.		
Year	Target	Actual
2010	45	73
2011	45	
2012	45	

Additional information: The Department conducted two monitoring visits for the EACs in September 2009. The 45-day target for sending the monitoring reports to the grantees fell within fiscal year 2010; however, the target was not met for either monitoring visit. As of the end of fiscal year 2010, the Department had completed and sent one of the two reports. The program office plans to dedicate staff time to focus on issuing the monitoring reports by the 45-day target.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined^{1,2}

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$174,882 ³	\$174,882	0

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2012.

² Currently, the amount appropriated to carry out Title VI, Part B is to be distributed equally between Subparts 1 and 2.

³ Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

SMALL, RURAL SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (Subpart 1)

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

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

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

Eligible LEAs also may (under the "REAP-Flex" authority) consolidate funds they receive from these sources to carry out effective activities under any of the authorized programs.

RURAL AND LOW-INCOME SCHOOL PROGRAM (Subpart 2)

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

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

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$168,918
2008	171,854
2009	173,382
2010	174,882
2011 CR	174,882

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is requesting \$174.9 million for REAP, the same amount as the 2011 annualized CR level. The request would support the program's first year of operation under a reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The request would provide an average LEA award of approximately \$20,000 under the SRSA and an average LEA subgrant of approximately \$52,000 under RLIS.

REAP is authorized by the ESEA and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2012 under reauthorized legislation. The Administration's reauthorization proposal would update the criteria by which a district is designated as rural to align with the most recent criteria developed by OMB and the Census Bureau, extend REAP-Flex authority to RLIS subgrantees, and authorize national support for technical assistance, research, and other activities, including demonstration grants to help rural districts overcome the unique challenges they face, without decreasing funding for the formula programs. In fiscal year 2012, all funds would be used for SRSA and RLIS formula grants.

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

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), in school year 2007-08, 56 percent of all operating school districts and 31 percent of the Nation's public schools are located in rural areas, with 23 percent of all public school students enrolled at these schools. The small size of many rural schools and districts creates a different set of challenges from those of urban schools and districts. For example, rural schools and districts generally cannot derive the benefits of economies of scale and, thus, face greater per-pupil costs in providing staff or transportation services. According to the report *Status of Education in Rural America*, released by the NCES in July 2007, adjusted for geographic cost differences, operating expenditures per student in 2003-04 were higher in rural districts than in city and suburban districts.

According to the NCES report, schools in rural communities have a number of unique opportunities and challenges. Some positive phenomena that exist in rural communities include strong parental engagement in certain areas, higher teacher satisfaction, and better overall academic achievement. For example, in 2003, 74 percent of students in rural areas had a

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

parent who attended a school event or served as a volunteer, as compared to 65 percent in cities. Teachers in rural schools reported higher satisfaction, on most indicators of satisfaction, and fewer problems in their school than their counterparts in city or town schools. Data from 2009 show that a greater percentage of rural students in 8th grade scored at or above the *Proficient* level on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in reading and mathematics assessments than their peers in cities and towns.

Some challenges that affect the educational outcomes of rural school children include poverty, less access to advanced courses, and low expectations. In school year 2003-04, nearly half of students in rural remote areas attended schools with moderate or high poverty levels. This is greater than the percentage for all other locales except large and mid-size cities. During the 2002-03 school year, just 69 percent of rural high school students attended schools that offered Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate courses, compared to 93 percent of city and 96 percent of suburban high school students. College enrollment among rural individuals 18- to 24-years old was the lowest of all locales in 2004, at 27 percent, compared to a national average of 34 percent.

In addition, because of size and location, many small, rural districts have faced difficulty in meeting the ESEA requirement that students receive instruction in the core academic subjects from teachers who are fully certified by the State, have demonstrated competency in the subjects they teach, and are effective at improving student academic outcomes. These districts also face challenges recruiting and retaining effective teachers. Rural teachers are frequently called upon to teach multiple subjects, which, in turn, requires teachers to obtain multiple certifications in order to meet the statutory definition of “highly qualified.” A 2003 national survey conducted by the Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL) found that 57 percent of secondary school teachers in rural schools with 250 or fewer students teach multiple subjects. Another national study, conducted in 2005 by Edvantia, the successor to AEL, found the “highly qualified” requirements, geographic and social isolation, and lower pay to be the greatest challenges to rural district recruitment and retention of teachers. REAP funds can help rural LEAs meet the challenge of recruiting and retaining a staff of highly qualified and effective teachers. The Administration’s proposal for reauthorization of the ESEA would make it easier for teachers to teach multiple subjects because it would define teacher quality not based exclusively on paper credentials, but on how well a teacher performs in the classroom, and would thus help rural schools keep effective teachers in the classrooms in which they’re needed most.

The Administration’s reauthorization proposal is designed to support the unique needs of rural communities. It would provide greater local flexibility in designing interventions in schools that are not meeting their performance targets, so that rural communities can decide what works best for their schools. The proposal would eliminate Federal mandates to provide supplemental educational services and public school choice – interventions that may not make sense for many rural communities.

Rural districts frequently receive allocations under State formula grant programs that are too small to allow the LEA to address effectively the purposes for which the funds are appropriated. For example, among districts currently eligible for SRSA in fiscal year 2010, the fiscal year 2009 median sum of allocations under three Federal formula grant programs (Improving Teacher

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

Quality State Grants, Educational Technology State Grants, and Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants) was \$17,124. Recognizing that rural districts frequently receive small allocations from Federal formula grants, the REAP-Flex authority gives SRSA-eligible LEAs the flexibility to make more effective use of their small Federal formula allocations. An eligible LEA may use its formula allocations under the covered programs to carry out authorized activities or for activities authorized under Part A of Title I, Title III (English Language Acquisition) or Part B of Title IV (21st Century Community Learning Centers). Fifty percent of eligible districts notified their respective State of their intention to take advantage of this authority in school year 2008-09. Yet, even when the eligible LEAs consolidate their allocations under these programs, they typically do not have enough money to provide effective educator professional development, strengthen school safety, or address the other statutory objectives in a meaningful manner. REAP funds help to make up the difference and assist rural LEAs in financing and implementing approaches to meeting ESEA requirements and addressing the other challenges they face.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Small, rural school achievement			
Total funding	\$87,441	\$87,441	\$87,441
Estimated number of LEAs receiving grants	4,123	4,123	4,304
Average LEA grant	\$21	\$21	\$20
Average award per student (whole \$)	\$82	\$82	\$78
Range of awards to LEAs	0-\$60	0-\$60	0-\$60
Rural and low-income schools			
Total funding	\$87,441	\$87,441	\$87,441
Amount for State grants	\$86,567	\$86,567	\$86,567
Amount for BIE	\$437	\$437	\$437
Amount for outlying areas	\$437	\$437	\$437
Number of States receiving grants	40	40	41
Number of LEAs receiving subgrants	1,558	1,558	1,662
Average State grant	\$2,093	\$2,093	\$2,111
Average LEA subgrant	\$56	\$56	\$52
Average award per student (whole \$)	\$28	\$28	\$26

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)—continued

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Range of awards to States	\$30-\$6,626	\$30-\$6,626	\$40-\$8,129
Estimated range of subgrants to LEAs	\$1-\$650	\$1-\$650	\$1-\$452

NOTE: FY 2012 data may change as a result of the introduction of new locale codes, as provided for in the ESEA reauthorization proposal.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data, and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2012 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

Measure: The percentage of SRSA-participating LEAs that make adequate yearly progress after 3 years.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	96	92
2008	96	85
2009	97	95
2010	97	
2011	98	
2012	98	

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

Measure: The percentage of RLIS-participating LEAs that make adequate yearly progress after 3 years.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	70	58
2008	76	51
2009	82	49
2010	88	
2011	94	
2012	96	

Additional information: When LEAs reported baseline data for 2005, the Department found that 95 percent of LEAs participating in SRSA and 58 percent of LEAs participating in RLIS made AYP. With the baseline data in place, the Department established performance targets to reflect a yearly increase of 1 percentage point every 2 years over the baseline in the number of SRSA LEAs that make AYP, in order to reach 100 percent by the year 2014. Similarly, the Department also adjusted the performance targets for the RLIS program to reflect an annual increase of 6 percentage points over the baseline in the number of LEAs that make AYP. After a decrease in 2008, SRSA grantees with 3 or more years in the program showed a significant increase in 2009. RLIS grantees with 3 or more years in the program dropped to 49 percent meeting AYP in 2009. SRSA has consistently had a greater proportion of grantees making AYP than RLIS, perhaps reflecting the fact that RLIS districts are larger and, thus, may have more subgroups that are counted in AYP determinations. (Note that, as shown in the tables that follow, the gap in proficiency rates for SRSA compared to RLIS districts is not as wide.) Data for 2010 are expected in October 2011.

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

Measure: The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in reading/language arts in each year through the 2013-2014 academic year.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		70
2008	74	74
2009	78	75
2010	82	
2011	86	
2012	90	

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

Measure: The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in mathematics in each year through the 2013-2014 academic year.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		66
2008	71	71
2009	76	71
2010	81	
2011	86	
2012	91	

Measure: The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in reading/language arts in each year through the 2013-2014 academic year.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		69
2008	74	64
2009	79	68
2010	84	
2011	88	
2012	92	

Measure: The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in mathematics in each year through the 2013-2014 academic year.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		64
2008	70	62
2009	75	67
2010	80	
2011	85	
2012	90	

Additional information: The Department established baselines for student proficiency in both programs using data from the 2006-07 school year. Among SRSA districts, the percentage of students who scored proficient or better on their State assessments increased slightly in reading and stayed constant in mathematics from 2008 to 2009, but both did not meet the targets. RLIS districts showed an increase in the percentage of students who score proficient or better on both reading and mathematics assessments, but remained below the targets for both measures. The performance targets for these measures reflect the ESEA goal that 100 percent of students enrolled in districts participating in both the SRSA and RLIS programs will be proficient by 2014. Data for fiscal year 2010 are expected in October 2011.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

Objective: *Eligible rural school districts will use the REAP flexibility authority.*

Measure: The percentage of eligible school districts using the REAP flexibility authority.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	65	56
2008	65	51
2009	65	50
2010	65	
2011	65	
2012	65	

Additional information: While this measure was developed to capture the percentage of eligible districts actually using the flexibility authority, the best available information is on the number of districts reporting to the State their intent to use this authority. (Since there is little reason to believe that LEAs would provide this notification and not use the authority, reported intent serves as a reasonable proxy.) In fiscal year 2009, 50 percent of eligible districts reported their intent to use the flexibility authority. Data for 2010 are expected in October 2011.

Program Efficiency Measure

Measure: The percentage of SRSA program grants awarded by August 30 of each fiscal year.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	80	100
2008	80	100
2009	80	100
2010	80	100
2011	80	
2012	80	

Additional information: Due to difficulty in processing over 4,000 SRSA grants to LEAs in a timely manner in the early years of the program, the Department established a measure to track the efficiency of this task. The Department has had great success since creating the measure, not only exceeding its target of awarding 80 percent of SRSA awards by August 30, but awarding 100 percent each year. Data for 2011 are expected in October 2011.

Other Performance Information

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

The Department released an evaluation report of the RLIS program in June 2010. The purpose of this study was to examine implementation at the State and district levels. Specifically, the Department obtained information on State RLIS priorities and monitoring, State progress toward achieving RLIS goals, characteristics of RLIS districts, uses of RLIS funds, and student achievement and AYP trends in participating districts. The report indicates that the coordinators saw RLIS as a supplemental program, rather than as a stand-alone program, and that they believed that their subgrantee LEAs use their funds to support efforts to make AYP. All nine States in the sample require RLIS districts to engage in a comprehensive planning process and to address gaps identified through local needs assessments, and seven of the States implement RLIS through an integrated planning process that requires LEAs to show how they plan to use funding from Federal programs. Survey respondents indicated that funds were primarily used to purchase technology, support professional development, and otherwise support Title I, Part A activities. From the 2002–03 school year to the 2007–08 school year, the rate of academic improvement in mathematics and reading for districts that received RLIS funding was significantly greater than for non-RLIS rural districts; however, the evaluation did not examine causality, and achievement gains cannot be attributed to the RLIS program. The report also found that, on average, RLIS districts had more students than other rural LEAs but fewer students than all LEAs nationally, that student-to-teacher ratios in RLIS LEAs were higher than in other rural LEAs but similar to the national average, and that per-pupil expenditures were substantially lower in RLIS LEAs than in other rural LEAs and the national average.

Section 6224(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act requires the Department to prepare a biennial report to Congress on the RLIS program. The report must describe the methods SEAs have used to award grants and provide technical assistance, how LEAs and schools have used RLIS funds, and the progress made toward meeting the goals and objectives outlined in the SEA applications. In 2010, the Department submitted to Congress its biennial report for school years 2004-05 and 2005-06 and its report for school years 2006-07 and 2007-08. The latter report includes the finding that of the 39 States receiving fiscal year 2007 funds, all but 4 awarded funds to eligible LEAs by formula based on each eligible LEA's share of students in average daily attendance. One State used a modified formula that targeted a greater share of program funds to LEAs with poverty rates greater than 40 percent and three States awarded funds on a competitive basis. These reports had findings that were consistent with the evaluation report, in that technology, professional development, and Title I, Part A activities were the most frequently reported uses of funds. Finally, it is difficult to link LEA progress toward goals to activities specifically supported with RLIS funds, but the reports do include examples provided by the States of LEA progress toward program goals.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Supplemental education grants

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): \$20,071¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$17,687 ²	\$17,687	0

¹ The Act authorizes \$12,230 thousand for the Federated States of Micronesia and \$6,100 thousand for the Republic of the Marshall Islands for fiscal year 2005 and an equivalent amount, as adjusted for inflation (calculated as two thirds of the percentage change in the U.S. Gross Domestic Product Implicit Price Deflator, or 5 percent, whichever is less in any 1 year), for each of the succeeding fiscal years through 2023. The 2012 authorization is calculated based on inflation estimates as of February 2010.

² Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Supplemental education grants

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

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

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$18,001
2008	17,687
2009	17,687
2010	17,687
2011 CR	17,687

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$17.7 million, the same as the fiscal year 2011 annualized CR level, to maintain funding for Supplemental Education Grants to the RMI and FSM. The request would ensure the continuation of services for residents of the RMI and the FSM. Over 40 percent of the funding in fiscal years 2005 and 2006 was used to support early childhood education. The RMI and FSM have also used Supplemental Education Grants for education improvement programs, vocational and skills training, and professional development.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Grant to Federated States of Micronesia	\$11,801	\$11,801	\$11,801
Grant to Republic of the Marshall Islands	5,886	5,886	5,886

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Supplemental education grants

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Comprehensive centers

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$56,313 ²	\$56,313	0

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2009. The Department proposes to continue funding this program in FY 2012 through appropriations language.

² Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

In order to provide assistance to LEAs and schools in the most efficient and sustainable manner, the Department established a system of technical assistance that includes regional and content centers that, rather than providing services directly to LEAs and schools, focuses on building the capacity of State educational agencies (SEAs) to meet the needs of the LEAs and schools in the State. The 16 *regional centers* work with the SEAs within their geographic regions to help the SEAs implement school and district improvement measures and objectives. In addition, instead of requiring each regional center to have in-depth knowledge of all aspects of school improvement – from instruction to teacher quality to assessment design – the Department has funded five *content centers*, with one center specializing in each of the following five content areas: assessment and accountability; instruction; teacher quality; innovation and improvement; and high schools. Each content center brings together resources and expertise to provide analyses, information, and materials in its focus area for use by the regional centers and SEAs.

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

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Comprehensive centers

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

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

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$56,257
2008	57,113
2009	57,113
2010	56,313
2011 CR.....	56,313

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2012, the Administration requests \$56.3 million, the same as the fiscal year 2011 annualized CR level, to support the first year of funding for the second cohort of comprehensive centers funded under the ETAA.

The Department provided the first year of funding to the existing cohort of ETAA Comprehensive Center grantees in 2005. The 16 regional centers have focused entirely on assisting SEAs in the implementation of ESEA requirements and helping the SEAs to increase their own capacity to assist districts and schools in meeting their student achievement goals. The five content centers have identified and analyzed key research and provided in-depth knowledge and information to the regional centers and the States in each of their content areas.

Since fiscal year 2009, the 16 existing regional centers have focused more of their work on long-term, multi-year projects. Some examples of this work include helping SEAs to:

- Analyze approaches for establishing and implementing statewide systems of support and to develop and implement the most appropriate practices and policies based on their needs and existing institutional structures and capacity;
- Investigate and analyze options for designing teacher evaluation systems that take into account multiple measures of success;

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Comprehensive centers

- Implement the School Improvement Grants (SIG) program, from the development of applications for subgrantees to the development of a system of subgrantee accountability; and
- Investigate, design, and implement models of “tiered intervention” for struggling students at all grade levels.

The content centers continue to supply research-based products and services for the regional centers and the States they serve. As the content centers have in their first years of operation created a significant set of products and services, their work has evolved to include increasing emphasis on assisting the regional centers in using existing products to support SEAs. The content centers have increased their professional development efforts, offering “webinars,” online professional learning communities, and in-person assistance to both SEA staffs and regional staffs, with the latter aimed at helping the regional centers provide more coordinated assistance to SEAs.

In fiscal year 2010, the Department extended the project period and awarded a sixth year of funding to the current cohort of grantees. The Department negotiated new cooperative agreements with each center to include newly defined priorities. The major goal of the regional centers continues to be helping States build their capacity to support districts and schools in meeting their student achievement goals. The major goal of the content centers continues to be to supply much of the research-based information, products, guidance, analyses, and knowledge that regional centers will use when working with States. Under the new cooperative agreements, the regional centers will work with States to address priority issues, such as: (1) improving school readiness and success, (2) implementing internationally benchmarked college- and career-ready elementary and secondary school academic standards with aligned assessments and instructional materials, (3) turning around persistently lowest-achieving schools, (4) improving postsecondary success, (5) improving achievement and high school graduation rates in rural and high-need schools, (6) promoting science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM), (7) meeting the needs of diverse learners, (8) improving the achievement of English learners, (9) recruiting, hiring, and retaining effective teachers and leaders, and (10) enabling data-based and evidence-based decision-making.

In early fiscal year 2011, as the first stage in the process of recompeting the Comprehensive Centers grants, the Department began the process of establishing regional advisory committees, as required by the ETAA, to provide advice on the educational needs of the regions to be served by the centers. Because of the time needed to establish the committees and for the committees to conduct assessments of the regions, the Department will extend the project period of the current grantees for a seventh year in 2011. The Department has begun planning for a new competition, now scheduled for fiscal year 2012. The Department will use the results of findings from the regional advisory committees, the current national evaluation, grantee monitoring, and other outreach to States and other stakeholders to inform the development of the notice inviting applications. The fiscal year 2012 appropriation would provide the first year of funding for the new grants.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Comprehensive centers

The Department has not yet determined the structure of the fiscal year 2012 competition. Planning is being coordinated within the Department to ensure alignment of the Comprehensive Centers' competition with the re-competition of the Regional Education Laboratories and other technical assistance investments. Currently, the Department envisions that the new centers will help States increase their capacity to support their districts and schools, providing technical assistance in at least the following areas:

- Supporting effective implementation of college- and career-ready standards and assessments through a focus on improving teaching and learning to enable students to graduate from high school with the necessary skills and coursework to succeed in college and careers;
- Preparing, recruiting, hiring, developing, identifying, and retaining effective teachers and principals, and ensuring the equitable distribution of effective educators;
- Support for practices to improve students' readiness for success in school;
- Turning around persistently lowest-achieving schools, and refining statewide systems of support for underperforming districts and schools;
- Supporting the accessibility and use of data for instructional improvements in the classroom; and
- Strategies and infrastructure to build State capacity to implement and sustain reforms at scale, and to provide effective support, particularly to high-need schools and districts.

The Department also intends to fund an evaluation of the new centers, beginning in fiscal year 2012.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Comprehensive centers			
Number of centers	21	21	21
Center awards	\$56,313	\$55,088	\$55,813
Average award	\$2,682	\$2,623	\$2,658
Evaluation	0	0	\$500
Support for Regional Advisory Committees and Peer Review	0	\$1,225	0

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Comprehensive centers

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 2012 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

In response to deficiencies identified in the antecedent comprehensive centers, the Department placed strong emphasis on creating a performance-based framework for the current centers that includes, among other things, annual performance measures. These measures were created as part of a Departmentwide effort to bring consistency to the assessment of performance across technical assistance programs through the creation of common performance measures. The measures are designed to analyze the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the services provided by the centers, the extent to which each of the centers meets the objectives of its respective plan, and whether their services meet the educational needs of the SEAs, LEAs, and schools.

As part of the Department's national evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers, initiated in 2006, the contractor led panel reviews and conducted surveys annually beginning in 2007. An analysis of the results of those reviews and surveys has informed the performance measures for the current centers.

Goal: To improve student achievement in low-performing schools under the ESEA.

Objective: *Improve the quality of technical assistance.*

Measure: The percentage of all Comprehensive Centers' products and services that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products and services.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		34
2008	40	39
2009	46	45
2010	52	
2011	59	
2012	66	

Additional information: Independent review panels have reviewed the substantive content of sample products and services provided by the centers and made an assessment of their technical quality based on the following dimensions: demonstrated use of the appropriate documented knowledge base; fidelity of application of the knowledge base to the products and services provided; and clear and effective delivery. The Department has distributed and

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Comprehensive centers

discussed with each individual center the panelists' comments about its projects in order to help centers consider areas for improvement.

Measure: The percentage of all Comprehensive Centers' products and services that are deemed to be of high relevance to educational policy or practice by target audiences.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		74
2008	75	83
2009	76	85
2010	77	
2011	78	
2012	79	

Additional information: As part of the national evaluation, an independent firm collects survey data from a random sample of SEA and intermediate education agency staff who have participated in regional centers' projects and also from regional center staff who have participated in content centers' projects. Projects are defined as a group of closely related activities or deliverables designed to achieve specific outcomes for a specific audience. The evaluators sent surveys to 1,364 project participants, and the response rate was 76 percent. Data for 2009 represent work conducted by the centers during their fourth year of operation.

Objective: *Technical assistance products and services will be used to improve results for children in the target areas.*

Measure: The percentage of all Comprehensive Centers' products and services that are deemed to be of high usefulness to educational policy or practice by target audiences.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		48
2008	52	64
2009	56	71
2010	60	
2011	65	
2012	70	

Additional information: As part of the national evaluation, an independent firm collects survey data from a random sample of SEA and intermediate education agency staff who have participated in regional centers' projects and from regional center staff who have participated in content centers' projects. Projects are defined as a group of closely related activities or deliverables designed to achieve specific outcomes for a specific audience. The evaluators sent surveys to 1,364 project participants, and the response rate was 76 percent. Data for 2009 represent work conducted by the centers during their fourth year of operation.

Efficiency Measures

The Department is implementing a common measure of administrative efficiency to assess the Comprehensive Centers program and other technical assistance programs. The measure is the percentage of grant funds that the centers carry over for each year of operations. Data for the measure are available each year in early September, after Department staff have reviewed data

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Comprehensive centers

for the previous 12-month budget cycle, and are presented in the table below. The Department also established a second efficiency measure for the program: the number of working days following a monitoring visit that it takes the Department to send a monitoring report to grantees. The program office implemented this new measure in 2009 and established a baseline of 81 working days, with a goal of reducing that number to 45 working days.

Objective: *Improve the operational efficiency of the program.*

Measure: The percentage of Comprehensive Center grant funds carried over in each year of the project.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		15
2008	20	6
2009	10	4
2010	10	2
2011	10	
2012	10	

Additional information: The centers had 40 percent carryover in 2006, the baseline year, which was likely the result of having received their initial grant awards several months into the beginning of the first award year. Since then, grantees have reduced the amount of funds they carry over each year substantially below the target percentage.

Measure: The number of working days following a monitoring visit that it takes the Department to send a monitoring report to grantees.		
Year	Target	Actual
2009		81
2010	45	78
2011	45	
2012	45	

Additional information: The Department conducted two monitoring visits in September 2009 and one in July 2010, all of which had report deadlines in fiscal year 2010, based on the 45-day target. To date, 1 of the 3 reports has still not been sent to the grantee; thus, the final number of working days for 2010 will exceed the 78 days currently reported. The Department is addressing this problem by increasing staff attention to these reports.

Other Performance Information

In addition to providing data for the performance measures, the national evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers will assess: (1) the extent to which the centers have met the objectives of their respective technical assistance plans and the educational needs of SEAs, and (2) whether the centers' assistance has expanded SEAs' capacity to provide technical assistance to help LEAs and schools meet their statutory requirements. The evaluation will also examine the centers' responses to changing SEA technical assistance needs, SEAs' reliance on the centers compared to other technical assistance sources, the overall costs for SEAs in

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Comprehensive centers

providing ESEA-related technical assistance, and the estimated dollar value of the centers' products and services to SEAs.

In July 2010, the first interim report from the national evaluation provided an analysis of data obtained through surveys of comprehensive center clients and expert reviews of comprehensive center projects, covering the 2006-07 program year, the second year of center operations. In this first round of project ratings, the content centers had higher mean ratings of technical quality for their sampled projects than did the regional centers, while the regional centers had higher mean ratings of relevance than did the content centers. There was no statistically significant relationship between ratings of quality and ratings of relevance or usefulness, which suggests that achieving high technical quality (judged on the basis of expert peer reviews) was unrelated to the delivery of assistance thought by clients to be highly relevant or useful. There was a high correlation between ratings of relevance and usefulness. In addition, projects that centers had identified as "major" projects were rated higher on measures of relevance and usefulness.

The final report, covering the 2007-08 and 2008-09 program years, is expected in June 2011. This report will include 10 SEA case studies that will more fully capture the complexity of the technical assistance work. A goal of the case studies is to identify lessons learned through the experiences of the Comprehensive Centers and to provide examples of expanded State capacity to meet SEA requirements. The Department hopes to learn about the factors associated with variation in capacity-building across the centers. A new national evaluation, as mandated by statute, will be initiated in 2012.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Native Hawaiian student education

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined^{1, 2, 3}

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$34,315 ⁴	\$34,315	0

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2012.

² The Henry K. Giugni Memorial Archives earmark is authorized through title VIII, part Z of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, with an indefinite authorization of appropriations.

³ Of the amount available to carry out Sections 7204 and 7205 of ESEA, \$500 thousand is to be reserved for a direct grant to the Native Hawaiian Education Council to carry out Section 7204.

⁴ Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Native Hawaiian Student Education program supports the provision of supplemental education services to the Native Hawaiian population. Competitive grants are awarded to eligible applicants for a variety of authorized activities in such areas as teacher training, family-based education, gifted and talented education, special education, higher education, and community-based education learning centers. Eligible applicants include Native Hawaiian educational organizations and community-based organizations, public and private nonprofit organizations, agencies, and institutions with experience in developing or operating Native Hawaiian programs or programs of instruction in the Native Hawaiian language, and other entities. In recent years, the appropriation for this program has also included earmarked awards for the Hawaii Department of Education (for school construction) and for the University of Hawaii School of Law (for a Center of Excellence in Native Hawaiian Law). For fiscal year 2010, the appropriations language also included an earmark for the University of Hawaii Academy for Creative Media to establish, maintain, and modernize the Henry K. Giugni Kupuna Memorial Archives at the University of Hawaii.

The program also supports the activities of the Native Hawaiian Education Council. The Council uses funds directly and is authorized to make grants to facilitate its coordination of the educational and related services and programs available to Native Hawaiians. It also provides administrative support and financial assistance to island councils authorized by the statute. The Council receives a minimum award of \$500,000 annually.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Native Hawaiian student education

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2007	\$33,907
2008	33,315
2009	33,315
2010	34,315
2011 CR	34,315

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2012, the Administration requests \$34.3 million for the Native Hawaiian Student Education program, the same amount as the 2011 annualized CR level. The Native Hawaiian Student Education program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2012 under reauthorized legislation. For the reauthorization, the Administration's proposal would require that grantees ensure that academic projects use evidence-based approaches and report academic achievement data for the students they serve. Program funds would continue to be used for education-related services to the Native Hawaiian population. Federal support through this program is justified by the educational status and continuing needs of Native Hawaiians. Program grants support projects intended to improve the educational achievement of Native Hawaiian students by developing programs tailored to the unique educational and cultural needs of those students.

Results from Hawaii's statewide assessment for 2010 show that an achievement gap persists between Native Hawaiian students and students in Hawaii in general. In all assessed grades, 58 percent of Native Hawaiian students demonstrated grade-level proficiency in reading and 37 percent demonstrated grade-level proficiency in mathematics, compared to 67 percent in reading and 48 percent in mathematics for Hawaiian students in general. This gap between Native Hawaiians and their peers remains consistent across grade levels. In 5th grade, while 64 percent of all Hawaiian students met or exceeded proficiency in reading and 47 percent met or exceeded proficiency in mathematics, 54 percent and 37 percent of Native Hawaiians met these levels in reading and mathematics, respectively. In 8th-grade reading, 72 percent of all students in Hawaii met or exceeded proficiency in reading and 44 percent met this level in mathematics, compared to 64 percent in reading and 32 percent in mathematics for Native Hawaiians.

In recent years, Congress has earmarked a portion of funding for this program for awards to specific entities. The fiscal year 2012 request would continue the appropriation at the fiscal year 2011 level. However, as the Administration believes that competing funds rather than earmarking them will lead to higher-quality programs and improved student outcomes, the request would discontinue funding for the earmarks included in the fiscal year 2010 appropriations act.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Native Hawaiian student education

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Amount for new awards	\$2,898	\$15,646	\$13,498
Number of new awards	8	37	32
Amount for continuation awards	\$27,227	\$17,869	\$20,017
Number of continuation awards	38	24	45
Earmarks in appropriation	\$3,500	0	0
Native Hawaiian Education Council	\$500	\$500	\$500
Peer review of new award applications	\$190	\$300	\$300

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 2012 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department established new performance measures for this program in 2008 that, consistent with the GAO recommendation discussed below, should more accurately and reliably gauge the effectiveness of this program. The new indicators will measure the percentage of Native Hawaiian students in schools served by the program who meet or exceed proficiency standards for reading, mathematics, and science on the State's annual assessments; the percentage of Native Hawaiian children participating in early learning programs who demonstrate school readiness in literacy as measured by the Hawaii School Readiness Assessment (HSRA); the percentage of students in schools served by the program who graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma in 4 years; and the percentage of students receiving Hawaiian language instruction through a grant under the program who meet or exceed proficiency standards in reading on a test of the Hawaiian language. The Department will use these measures beginning with the fiscal year 2009 cohort of new grantees and will have baseline data in early 2011.

The Department continues to collect data on the old indicators, which apply to grants made prior to the 2009 cohort. On these measures, in 2008, the number of Native Hawaiian children participating in grantees' early learning programs who improved on measures of school readiness and literacy remained relatively steady with the previous year at 60 percent; students participating in the program who met or exceeded proficiency standards in mathematics,

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Native Hawaiian student education

science, or reading increased from 66 percent to 70 percent; and the percentage of teachers involved in professional development activities that address the unique educational needs of Native Hawaiians increased marginally, from 79 percent to 80 percent. The Department has had concerns regarding the accuracy of the data for each of these measures. In the case of the proficiency measure, the Department is not changing the language of the measure but will begin obtaining the data directly from the Hawaii Department of Education. This action should ensure greater accuracy. Data for 2009 will likely become available in March, 2011.

Other Performance Information

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) released a report on the program in March 2008. GAO recommended that the Department, the Native Hawaiian Education Council, and the island councils do more to fulfill their roles and responsibilities under the statute. Regarding the Department specifically, GAO recommended that the Secretary report to Congress on program activities, establish performance measures that cover a greater proportion of the grantees' activities, track grant activities more closely, and provide more guidance and assistance to grantees and the Native Hawaiian Education Council. The Department continues to work on each of these recommendations. Most notably, the Department revised the GPRA measures and developed guidance documents for grantees on their implementation.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Alaska Native student education

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined^{1, 2}

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$33,315 ³	\$33,315	0

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2012.

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

³ Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Alaska Native Student Education program supports supplemental educational programs and services to Alaska Natives. The program awards competitive grants to eligible applicants for a variety of authorized activities, such as teacher training and student enrichment programs. Eligible applicants include Alaska Native organizations, educational entities with experience in developing or operating Alaska Native programs or programs of instruction conducted in Alaska Native languages, cultural and community-based organizations, and other entities. At least \$1 million must be used for parenting education activities.

Projects supported by these grants include the development and implementation of curricula and educational programs that address needs of the Alaska Native student population, professional development activities for educators, the development and operation of home instruction programs for Alaska Native preschool children that help ensure the active involvement of parents in their children's education, family literacy services, student enrichment programs in science and mathematics, and dropout prevention programs.

Section 7304(d)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requires the following grants to be awarded annually: \$1 million for cultural education programs operated by the Alaska Native Heritage Center; \$1 million for a cultural exchange program operated by the Alaska Humanities Forum; \$2 million for an Alaska Initiative for Community Engagement; and \$2 million for the Cook Inlet Tribal Council's Partners for Success program, a dropout prevention program.

All grantees may use no more than 5 percent of the funding for administrative costs.

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Alaska native student education

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2007	\$33,907
2008	33,315
2009	33,315
2010	33,315
2011 CR.....	33,315

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2012, the Administration requests \$33.3 million for the Alaska Native Student Education program, the same amount as the 2011 annualized CR level. The Alaska Native Student Education program is authorized by the ESEA and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2012 under reauthorized legislation. The Administration's reauthorization proposal would require that grantees report academic achievement data for the students they serve. In addition, the proposal would discontinue the funding for earmarks in the current statute because the Administration believes that competing these funds rather than earmarking them will lead to higher-quality programs and improved student outcomes. The request would support the continued provision of education-related services to the Alaska Native population and would fund the program's first year of operation under a reauthorized ESEA.

Data on the educational performance of Alaska Native students demonstrate the continuing need for this program. Preliminary results from the spring 2010 Alaska Standards-Based Assessment indicated that Alaska Native and American Indian students in the State continue to lag behind their peers in academic performance. (Because Alaska Natives constitute approximately 95 percent of the State's American Indian/Alaska Native (AI/AN) student population, the AI/AN scores are good proxies for Alaska Native achievement.) Sixty-three percent of AI/AN students achieved at least at the proficient level on the 4th-grade reading assessment, compared to 80 percent of all 4th-grade students, and 58 percent of AI/AN students achieved proficiency in mathematics, compared to 76 percent of all 4th-grade students. Eighth-grade assessments showed similar results. Seventy-one percent of AI/AN students demonstrated proficiency on the 8th-grade reading assessment, compared to 85 percent of all 8th-grade students, and 53 percent of AI/AN students achieved at the proficient level or higher in mathematics, compared to 70 percent of all 8th-grade students.

Data from the 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) show a similar achievement gap. In 4th-grade reading, AI/AN students in Alaska averaged a score of 179, while the overall national average for all students was 221. There were similar differences in 8th-grade reading (239 to 264), 4th-grade mathematics (216 to 240), and 8th-grade mathematics (262 to 283).

According to the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development, in the 2008-09 school year the "event dropout rate" (the proportion of students who drop out of school during the course of a year) among Alaska Natives and American Indian students in Alaska in grades 7 through 12 was 8.5 percent. This was higher than the rate for any other racial or ethnic group in

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Alaska native student education

the State and well above the statewide rate of 5.2 percent. Further, Alaska's *Report Card to the Public: 2008-2009* reported that the American Indian/Alaska Native high school graduation rate was 55 percent, while the statewide figure was 68 percent.

Alaska's geography and population patterns add to the challenge of delivering quality educational services to Alaska Native students. The State has many rural districts, which often house few schools spread out over large remote areas. In the 2009-10 school year, the State's largest 5 school districts enrolled 73 percent of the student population, while 40 of the State's 54 districts together enrolled 11 percent. Alaska Native students are disproportionately enrolled in small, rural, and isolated schools.

Program grants help address these barriers by developing programs tailored to the educational and cultural needs of Alaska Native students in order to improve their performance in the classroom.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Amount for new awards	\$764	\$9,488	\$21,113
Number of new awards	2	20	43
Amount for continuation awards	\$26,551	\$17,527	\$11,902
Number of continuation awards	45	33	22
Earmarks	\$6,000	\$6,000	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$300	\$300

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 2012 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department established new performance measures (or, for one measure, strengthened data collection methods) for this program in 2008 that should more accurately and reliably gauge the effectiveness of this program. The new indicators will measure the percentage of Alaska Native students in schools served by the program who meet or exceed proficiency standards for reading, mathematics, and science on the State's annual assessments; the percentage of Alaska Native children participating in early learning and preschool programs who

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Alaska native student education

demonstrate school readiness in language and literacy as measured by the Revised Alaska Developmental Profile (RADP); and the percentage of students in schools served by the program who graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma in 4 years. The Department used these measures beginning with the fiscal year 2009 cohort of new grantees and will have baseline data in early 2011.

The Department continues to collect data on the old indicators, which apply to grants made prior to the 2009 cohort. On these measures, in 2008, the percentage of students participating in the program who met proficiency standards in mathematics, science, and reading increased from 35 percent to 38 percent, Alaska Native children participating in funded early learning and preschool programs who made improvements in school readiness increased 10 percentage points to 79 percent, and the dropout rate among program participants remained at the 2007 level of 2 percent. However, concerns regarding the validity and reliability of data for each of these indicators led the Department to revise the program's GPRA measures. The proficiency measure has been improved by making the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development the single source of data; the school readiness measure has been improved by using a single, valid and reliable instrument as the assessment tool; and the graduation measure has been improved through the use of a uniform definition tied to the Title I regulatory definition of graduation rate. Data for 2009 for these older grants will likely become available in March 2011.