

Department of Education
INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language	F-1
Amounts Available for Obligation	F-2
Obligations by Object Classification	F-5
Summary of Changes	F-6
Authorizing Legislation	F-9
Appropriations History	F-12
Significant Items in FY 2011 Appropriations Reports.....	F-13
Summary of request.....	F-15
Activities:	
Race to the Top	F-20
Investing in innovation	F-24
Excellent instructional teams	F-29
Effective teachers and leaders state grants	F-30
Teacher and leader innovation fund	F-31
Teacher and leader pathways	F-32
Effective teachers and leaders consolidations:	
Improving teacher quality State grants	F-36
Teacher and leader innovation fund consolidations:	
Teacher incentive fund	F-45
Advanced credentialing	F-51
Teacher and leader pathways consolidations:	
Transition to teaching	F-55
Teacher quality partnership	F-61
Teachers for a competitive tomorrow.....	F-68
Teach for America	F-74
School leadership.....	F-79
Expanding educational options	F-83
Expanding educational options consolidations:	
Charter schools grants	F-87
Credit enhancement for charter school facilities	F-96
Voluntary public school choice	F-101
Parental information and resource centers	F-106
Smaller learning communities.....	F-111
Magnet schools assistance.....	F-117
Fund for the improvement of education: programs of national significance	F-122
Exchanges with historic whaling and trading partners.....	F-127
Women’s educational equity	F-129
Troops-to-teachers	F-134
State Tables.....	F-139

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

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. No new language is included for this account. All programs are 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.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Amounts Available for Obligation (\$000s)

	2010	2011 CR	2012
Discretionary appropriation	\$1,389,065	0	\$4,995,000
Annualized CR (P.L. 111-322)	0	\$1,389,065	0
Subtotal, discretionary appropriation	1,389,065	1,389,065	4,995,000
Rescission (PL 111-226)	10,700	0	0
Subtotal, adjusted discretionary appropriation	1,378,365	1,389,065	4,995,000
 <u>Comparative transfers to Education Improvement Programs for:</u>			
National writing project	-25,646	-25,646	0
Teaching American History	-118,952	-118,952	0
Academies for American history and civics	-1,815	-1,815	0
Advanced placement	-45,840	-45,840	0
Close Up fellowships	-1,942	-1,942	0
Ready-to-learn television	-27,300	-27,300	0
Reading is fundamental	-24,803	-24,803	0
Excellence in economic education	-1,447	-1,447	0
Arts in education	-40,000	-40,000	0
 <u>Comparative transfers to Supporting Student Success for:</u>			
Promise neighborhoods	-10,000	-10,000	0
Mental health integration in schools	-5,913	-5,913	0
Foundations for learning	-1,000	-1,000	0
 <u>Comparative transfer from Education Improvement Programs for:</u>			
Improving teacher quality State grants	2,947,749	2,947,749	0
 <u>Comparative transfer from Career, Technical, and Adult Education for:</u>			
Smaller learning communities	88,000	88,000	0

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

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

	2010	2011 CR	2012
<u>Comparative transfer from <u>Higher Education</u> for:</u>			
Teachers for a competitive tomorrow	\$2,184	\$2,184	0
Teacher quality partnership	<u>43,000</u>	<u>43,000</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, comparable adjusted discretionary appropriation	4,154,640	4,165,340	\$4,995,000
Mandatory appropriation	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>40,000</u>
Subtotal, comparable discretionary and mandatory appropriation	4,154,640	4,165,340	5,035,000
<u>Comparative transfer from <u>Education Improvement Programs</u> for:</u>			
Improving teacher quality State grants			
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	-1,681,441	-1,681,441	0
Advance from prior year	<u>1,681,441</u>	<u>1,681,441</u>	<u>1,681,441</u>
Subtotal, comparable budget authority	4,154,640	4,165,340	6,716,441
Unobligated balance, start of year, Recovery Act	199,932	0	0
Unobligated balance expiring	-867	0	0
Unobligated balance expiring, Recovery Act	-11	0	0
<u>Comparative transfers:</u>			
<u>Unobligated balance, start of year from Education Improvement Programs</u>	21,311	29,375	0
<u>Unobligated balance, start of year from Career, Technical and Adult Education</u>	87,999	74,577	60,394

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Amounts Available for Obligation (\$000s)

	2010	2011 CR	2012
Unobligated balance, end of year from <u>Education Improvement Programs</u>	-\$29,375	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year from <u>Career, Technical and Adult Education</u>	-74,577	-\$60,394	0
Subtotal, direct obligations	4,159,131	4,208,898	\$6,776,835
Subtotal, Recovery Act direct obligations	<u>199,381</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations	4,358,512	4,208,898	6,776,835

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Obligations by Object Classification
(\$000s)

	2010	2011 CR	2012
Personnel compensation and benefits:			
Personnel compensation:			
Full-time permanent, Recovery Act	\$33	0	0
Civilian personnel benefits, Recovery Act	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal.....	41	0	0
Travel, Recovery Act.....	4	0	0
Other contractual services:			
Advisory and assistance services	3,222	\$57,428	\$301,112
Peer review	1,099	3,189	14,320
Other services	56,830	0	0
Other services, Recovery Act.....	2,750		
Research and development contracts	750	0	0
Research and development contracts, Recovery Act.....	<u>2,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal.....	66,651	60,617	315,342
Purchases of goods and services from other government agencies.....	3,664	0	0
Grants, subsidies, and contributions	4,093,567	4,148,281	6,461,403
Grants, Recovery	<u>194,585</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, obligations.....	4,159,132	4,208,898	6,776,835
Subtotal, Recovery obligations.....	199,380	0	0
Total, direct obligations	4,358,512	4,208,898	6,776,835

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Summary of Changes (\$000s)

2011 CR.....	\$4,165,340
2012.....	<u>4,995,000</u>
Net change.....	+829,660

	<u>2011 CR</u>	Change from <u>2011 CR</u>
Increases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
Funding for the Race to the Top program to create incentives for State and local reforms and innovations designed to lead to significant improvements in student achievement, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment rates, and to significant reductions in achievement gaps.	0	+\$900,000
Funding for Investing in Innovation to expand innovative strategies and practices that have been shown to be effective in improving educational outcomes for students and to test and evaluate promising practices, strategies, or programs for which there is potential but whose efficacy has not yet been systematically studied.	0	+300,000
Initial funding for the new Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program to provide formula grants to States and LEAs to improve the effectiveness and equitable distribution of teachers and leaders.	0	+2,500,000
Initial funding for the new Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund to support the development and implementation of innovative teacher and leader policies.	0	+500,000
Initial funding for the Teacher and Leader Pathways program to fund competitive grants to LEAs to support the creation or expansion of high-quality pathways into teaching and school leadership.	0	+250,000

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Summary of Changes (\$000s)

	<u>2011 CR</u>	Change from <u>2011 CR</u>
Increases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
Initial funding for the Expanding Educational Options program to support competitive grants to State educational agencies, charter school authorizers, charter management organizations, local educational agencies and other nonprofit organizations to start or expand effective charter and other autonomous schools. A portion of the funds would also support competitive grants to LEAs, and to SEAs in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs, to develop and implement programs of public school choice that increase the range of high-quality educational options available to students.	0	+\$372,000
Increase for the Magnet Schools Assistance program to support magnet schools that are part of a court-ordered or court-approved desegregation plan to eliminate, reduce, or prevent minority group isolation in elementary and secondary schools.	\$100,000	+10,000
Increase for the Fund for the Improvement of Education to support the Advanced Research Projects Agency – Education (ARPA-ED), an initiative designed to improve early childhood through postsecondary education by pursuing breakthrough developments in education technology, including learning systems and support systems for educators. In addition, \$40,000 thousand in mandatory funds are requested for ARPA-ED from the Wireless Innovation (WIN) Fund.	0	<u>+\$50,000</u>
Subtotal, increases		+4,882,000
Decreases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
Eliminate funding for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants and Ready to Teach and redirect the funding to the proposed Effective Teachers and Leaders program.	2,947,749	-2, 947,749
Eliminate funding for the Teacher Incentive Fund and the Advanced Credentialing program and redirect the funding to the proposed Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund.	410,649	-410,649

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Summary of Changes (\$000s)

	<u>2011 CR</u>	Change from <u>2011 CR</u>
Decreases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
Eliminate funding for the Transition to Teaching, Teacher Quality Partnership, Teachers for a Competitive Tomorrow, Teach for America, and School Leadership programs and redirect the funding to the proposed Teacher and Leader Pathways program.	\$136,111	-\$136,111
Eliminate funding for the Charter Schools Grants, Voluntary Public School Choice, Parental Information and Resource Centers, and Smaller Learning Communities programs and redirect the funding to the proposed Expanding Educational Options program.	409,104	-409,104
Reduction in funding for FIE: Programs of National Significance resulting from the elimination of non-competitive earmarks and special-purpose grants.	136,161	-123,161
Eliminate funding for the Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners program.	8,754	-8,754
Eliminate funding for the Women's Educational Equity program.	2,423	-2,423
Provide Troops-to-Teachers funds directly to the Department of Defense (DOD) by funding the program through the DOD appropriation.	14,389	<u>-14,389</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-4,052,340
Net change		+829,660

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

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

Activity	2011 Authorized	2011 CR	2012 Authorized	2012 Request
Race to the Top (<i>proposed legislation</i>)	--	--	To be determined	\$900,000
Investing in Innovation (<i>proposed legislation</i>)	--	--	To be determined	300,000
Excellent instructional teams:				
Effective teachers and leaders:				
Effective teachers and leaders State grants (<i>proposed legislation</i>)	--	--	To be determined	2,500,000
Improving teacher quality State grants (<i>ESEA II-A</i>)	0 ¹	\$2,947,749	0 ¹	0
Teacher and leader innovation fund:				
Teacher and leader innovation fund (<i>proposed legislation</i>)	--	--	To be determined	500,000
Teacher incentive fund (<i>ESEA V-D-1</i>)	0 ¹	400,000	0 ¹	0
Advanced credentialing (<i>ESEA II-A-5-2151(c)</i>)	0 ¹	10,649	0 ¹	0
Teacher and leader pathways:				
Teacher and leader pathways (<i>proposed legislation</i>)	--	--	To be determined	250,000
Transition to teaching (<i>ESEA II-C-1-B</i>)	0 ¹	43,707	0 ¹	0
Teacher quality partnership (<i>HEA II-A</i>)	Indefinite	43,000	Indefinite ²	0
Teachers for a competitive tomorrow (<i>America COMPETES Act VI-A-1</i>)				
Baccalaureate STEM and foreign language teacher training (<i>Sec. 6113</i>)	\$2,000	1,092	\$2,000 ²	0
Masters STEM and foreign language teacher training (<i>Sec. 6114</i>)	2,000	1,092	2,000 ²	0

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Authorizing Legislation (\$000s)

Activity	2011 Authorized	2011 CR	2012 Authorized	2012 Request
Teach for America (<i>HEA XIII-F</i>)	\$25,000	\$18,000	\$25,000 ²	0
School leadership (<i>ESEA II-A-5-2151 (b)</i>)	0 ¹	29,220	0 ¹	0
Expanding educational options:				
Expanding educational options (<i>proposed legislation</i>)	--	--	To be determined	\$372,000
Charter schools grants (<i>ESEA V-B-1</i>)	0 ¹	256,031 ³	0 ¹	0
Credit enhancement for charter school facilities (<i>ESEA V-B-2</i>)	0 ⁴	0 ³	0 ⁴	0
Voluntary public school choice (<i>ESEA V-B-3</i>)	0 ¹	25,819	0 ¹	0
Parental information and resource centers (<i>ESEA V-D-16</i>)	0 ¹	39,254	0 ¹	0
Smaller learning communities (<i>ESEA V-D, subpart 4</i>)	0 ¹	88,000	0 ¹	0
Magnet schools assistance (<i>ESEA V-C</i>)	0 ⁵	100,000	To be determined ⁵	110,000
FIE programs of national significance (<i>ESEA V-D-1</i>)	0 ⁵	136,161 ⁶	To be determined ⁵	13,000
ARPA-ED (<i>ESEA-V-D-1</i>) (<i>discretionary</i>)	0 ⁵	0	To be determined ⁵	50,000
ARPA-ED (<i>proposed legislation</i>) (<i>mandatory</i>)	--	--	To be determined ⁷	40,000
Exchanges with historic whaling and trading partners (<i>ESEA V-D, subpart 12</i>)	0 ⁸	8,754	0 ⁸	0
Women's educational equity (<i>ESEA V-D-21</i>)	0 ⁸	2,423	0 ⁸	0
Troops-to-teachers (<i>ESEA II-C-1-A</i>)	0 ⁹	14,389	0 ⁹	0

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Authorizing Legislation (\$000s)

Activity	2011 Authorized	2011 CR	2012 Authorized	2012 Request
<u>Unfunded authorizations</u>				
Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate Programs (<i>America COMPETES Act, VI-A-II</i>)	\$75,000	0	\$75,000	0
Ready to Teach (<i>ESEA V-D-8</i>)	0 ¹⁰	0	0 ¹⁰	0
Star schools (<i>ESEA V-D-7</i>)	0 ¹⁰	0	0 ¹⁰	0
Total definite authorization	104,000	0	104,000	0
Total appropriation (request subject to reauthorization)		\$4,165,340		\$4,995,000
Total mandatory appropriation (request not authorized)		0		50,000

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

² The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

³ From the amount provided for charter schools in FY 2010, the appropriations language permitted the Secretary to use up to \$23,082 thousand for Charter Schools Facilities Incentive Grants and Credit Enhancement for Charter Schools Facilities and up to \$50,000 thousand to make awards to charter management organizations and other nonprofit entities for replication and expansion of successful charter school models. This authority is continued by the FY 2011 CR. The Department anticipates using \$14,782 thousand for the Charter School Facilities Incentive grants program and \$8,300 thousand for the Credit Enhancement program.

⁴ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2004. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

⁵ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing legislation is being sought for FY 2012.

⁶ Adjusted for comparability. Excludes \$10,000 thousand from Fund for the Improvement of Education/Programs of National Significance that was appropriated in FY 2010 for Promise Neighborhoods, which is in the Safe Schools and Citizenship Education Account in FY 2011 (proposed in FY 2012 as the Supporting Student Success account). Includes \$10,700 thousand that was appropriated for Ready to Teach in FY 2012 that was rescinded by P.L. 111-226, which established the Education Jobs Fund. The 2011 CR provides funds at the pre-rescission level.

⁷ Authorizing legislation is sought for FY 2012.

⁸ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The Administration is not proposing appropriations language nor seeking reauthorizing legislation for FY 2012.

⁹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. In FY 2012 the program is proposed for transfer to the Department of Defense in FY 2012 under new legislation.

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Appropriations History (\$000s)

	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2004	\$807,400	\$807,959	\$782,133	\$1,102,628
2005	885,181	669,936	1,154,894	1,092,642
2006	1,307,871	708,522	1,308,785	936,488
2007	850,966	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	837,686
2008	922,018	982,354	962,889	985,517
2009	867,517	976,846 ²	944,314 ²	996,425
Recovery Act Supplemental (PL 111-5)	0	225,000	0	200,000
2010 Rescission (PL 111-226)	1,489,949	1,347,363	1,234,787 ³	1,389,065 -10,700
2011	6,330,000	1,870,123 ⁴	2,224,843 ³	1,389,065 ⁵
2012	4,995,000			

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Significant Items in FY 2011 Appropriations Reports

School Leadership

Senate: The Committee bill includes language directing the Secretary to establish priorities for these funds for those eligible entities that propose programs to prepare school leaders to turn around low-performing schools and to those entities that would prepare leaders for service in rural schools. The Committee intends that the Secretary shall give priority to applicants that propose to focus on providing principals and other school leaders with the skills and knowledge needed to turn around low-performing schools. The Committee expects that those applicants will offer a process to place such trained school leaders in low-performing schools and that low-performing schools should include those schools eligible for funds under section 1003(g) of ESEA that have been identified by States and districts as being in the bottom 5 percent of schools statewide or have otherwise demonstrated persistent low performance.

Response: The Department does not intend to hold a new competition under this program's authority with funding at the FY 2011 CR level, which is expected to be sufficient to cover only continuation costs for current grants. The proposed Transformational Leaders program would support the recruitment, preparation, and retention of effective principals and school leadership teams who are able to turn around low-performing schools.

TEACH Campaign

Senate: From the amount available on October 1, 2010, the Department may use up to \$7,000,000 to continue its TEACH campaign. This initiative is designed to recruit the next generation of American teachers. While the Committee strongly supports this goal, it also notes that the National Research Council [NRC] report "Preparing Teachers: Building Evidence for Sound Policy" released earlier this year found there was much we still don't know about teacher preparation and its effectiveness. The report noted that improved understanding of the relationships between characteristics of teacher preparation and student learning, and the development of a comprehensive, coherent system for collecting data about teacher preparation are two overarching needs. The Committee believes the Department should utilize available resources to address both needs, while also continuing its efforts to attract the new teachers needed for America's classrooms. The Committee requests a report, not later than 30 days after enactment of this act, which describes the actions the Department is proposing, planning, and taking to address relevant conclusions and recommendations from the NRC report.

Response: The Department will submit the requested report.

New Leaders for New Schools

Senate: The Committee also directs \$5,000,000 to continue a national initiative to recruit, train, and support results-oriented, highly motivated individuals to lead high-need

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Significant Items in FY 2009 Appropriations Reports

schools with a focus on raising the achievement of all students and closing the achievement gap in these schools. These funds shall be awarded to the New Leaders for New Schools for the organization's efforts to develop and deliver training for aspiring principals and support for principals, and conduct research to create a knowledge base to inform the recruitment, selection, and training of principals for high-need schools

Response: The Department cannot make this award to New Leaders for New Schools under the fiscal year 2011 continuing resolution but will do so if this directive is included in the final appropriation.

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
Innovation and Instructional Teams						
1. Race to the Top (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	900,000	900,000	---
2. Investing in innovation (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	300,000	300,000	---
3. Excellent instructional teams:						
(a) Effective teachers and leaders:						
(1) Effective teachers and leaders State grants (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	2,500,000	2,500,000	---
(2) Improving teacher quality State grants (ESEA II-A)						
Annual appropriation	D	1,266,308	1,266,308	0	(1,266,308)	-100.0%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	1,681,441	1,681,441	0	(1,681,441)	-100.0%
Subtotal		2,947,749	2,947,749	2,500,000	(447,749)	-15.2%
(b) Teacher and leader innovation fund:						
(1) Teacher and leader innovation fund (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	500,000	500,000	---
(2) Teacher incentive fund (ESEA V-D-1)	D	400,000	400,000	0	(400,000)	-100.0%
(3) Advanced credentialing (ESEA section 2151(c))	D	10,649	10,649	0	(10,649)	-100.0%
Subtotal	D	410,649	410,649	500,000	89,351	21.8%
(c) Teacher and leader pathways:						
(1) Teacher and leader pathways (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	250,000	250,000	---
(2) Transition to teaching (ESEA II-C-1-B)	D	43,707	43,707	0	(43,707)	-100.0%
(3) Teacher quality partnership (HEA II-A)	D	43,000	43,000	0	(43,000)	-100.0%
(4) Teachers for a competitive tomorrow (America COMPETES Act VI-A-1):						
(a) Baccalaureate STEM and foreign language teacher training (Sec. 6113)	D	1,092	1,092	0	(1,092)	-100.0%
(b) Masters STEM and foreign language teacher training (Sec. 6114)	D	1,092	1,092	0	(1,092)	-100.0%
(6) Teach for America (HEA VIII-F)	D	18,000	18,000	0	(18,000)	-100.0%
(7) School leadership (ESEA section 2151(b))	D	29,220	29,220	0	(29,220)	-100.0%
Subtotal	D	136,111	136,111	250,000	113,889	83.7%
Subtotal	D	3,494,509	3,494,509	3,250,000	(244,509)	-7.0%
4. Expanding educational options:						
(a) Expanding educational options (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	372,000	372,000	---
(b) Charter schools grants (ESEA V-B-1) ¹	D	256,031	256,031	0	(256,031)	-100.0%
(c) Credit enhancement for charter school facilities (ESEA Title V-B-2) ¹	D	0	0	0	0	---
(d) Voluntary public school choice (ESEA V-B-3)	D	25,819	25,819	0	(25,819)	-100.0%
(e) Parental information and resource centers (ESEA V-D-16)	D	39,254	39,254	0	(39,254)	-100.0%
(f) Smaller learning communities (ESEA V-D-4)	D	88,000	88,000	0	(88,000)	-100.0%
Subtotal	D	409,104	409,104	372,000	(37,104)	-9.1%

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 From the amount appropriated for Charter Schools in the FY 2010, the appropriations language permitted the Secretary to use up to \$23,082 thousand for Charter School Facilities Incentive Grants and Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities. This authority is continued by the FY 2011 CR.

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
Innovation and Instructional Teams (continued)						
5. Magnet schools assistance (ESEA V-C)	D	100,000	100,000	110,000	10,000	10.0%
6. Fund for the improvement of education:						
(a) Programs of national significance (ESEA V-D-1) ¹	D	125,461	136,161	13,000	(123,161)	-90.5%
(b) Advanced research project agency-Education (ARPA-ED) (ESEA V-D-1)	D	0	0	50,000	50,000	---
(c) Mandatory advanced research project agency-Education (ARPA-ED) (proposed legislation)	M	0	0	40,000	40,000	---
7. Exchanges with historic whaling and trading partners (ESEA V-D-12)	D	8,754	8,754	0	(8,754)	-100.0%
8. Women's educational equity (ESEA V-D-21)	D	2,423	2,423	0	(2,423)	-100.0%
9. Troops-to-teachers (ESEA II-C-1-A) ²	D	14,389	14,389	0	(14,389)	-100.0%
Total, Appropriation ³		4,154,640	4,165,340	5,035,000	869,660	20.9%
Total, Budget authority		4,154,640	4,165,340	6,716,441	2,551,101	61.2%
Current ³		2,473,199	2,483,899	5,035,000	2,551,101	102.7%
Prior year's advance		1,681,441	1,681,441	1,681,441	0	0.0%
TOTAL APPROPRIATION		4,154,640	4,165,340	5,035,000	869,660	20.9%
Discretionary	D	4,154,640	4,165,340	4,995,000	829,660	19.9%
Mandatory	M	0	0	40,000	40,000	---
TOTAL BUDGET AUTHORITY		4,154,640	4,165,340	6,716,441	2,551,101	61.2%
Discretionary	D	4,154,640	4,165,340	6,676,441	2,511,101	60.3%
Mandatory	M	0	0	40,000	40,000	---

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 \$10,000 thousand from the Fund for the Improvement of Education/Programs of National Significance that was appropriated in FY 2010 for Promise Neighborhoods, which is in the Safe Schools and Citizenship Education account (proposed in FY 2012 as the Supporting Student Success account). Includes \$10,700 thousand that was appropriated for Ready to Teach in FY 2010 and was rescinded under P.L. 111-226. The 2011 CR provides funds at the pre-rescission level.

² This program is expected to be transferred to the Department of Defense in fiscal year 2012.

³ Adjusted for comparability. Includes advance appropriations of \$1,681,441 thousand in fiscal years 2010 and in the 2011 CR that become available on October 1 of the following fiscal year. Advance appropriations shown in this account are associated with Improving Teacher Quality State grants and were appropriated in the School Improvement Programs account (proposed in FY 2012 as the Education Improvement Programs account).

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Summary of Request

Programs in the Innovation and Instructional Teams account support the goals of implementing innovative and effective approaches and strategies in four key areas: providing incentives for States and local educational agencies to implement comprehensive reforms and innovations; testing, evaluating, and expanding innovative strategies and practices; increasing the supply of effective teachers and principals; and providing parents with expanded options for the education for their children within the public school system. The Administration requests a total of \$4.995 billion for programs in this account.

The new structure of this account, named “Innovation and Improvement” since fiscal year 2004, reflects the framework of the Administration’s proposal for reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). A key objective of this proposal is to increase efficiency at the Federal, State, and local levels by consolidating currently authorized programs with similar purposes. In fiscal year 2010, for example, the Department’s appropriation contained numerous separate programs focused on teaching and school leadership issues with different purposes, requirements, and authorized activities. While each of these programs has worthy goals, the result of these fragmented funding streams has been inefficiencies at the Federal, State, and local levels; grantees have had to deal with numerous small grant competitions with different applications and requirements rather than focusing on improving outcomes for students, and the Department has focused on running separate grant competitions and monitoring compliance with different programs rather than providing strong support and directing funding to the most proven or promising practices. The Administration expects that the new structure for programs in this account will allow States and districts to identify how to best meet the needs of their students and teachers, and allow the Department to focus funding on programs that improve student achievement, especially for students in high-need schools.

System-wide Reform and Innovation

The Administration requests \$1.263 billion to support efforts to drive State and local reform and innovation. Specifically, the request includes:

- \$900 million for the **Race to the Top** program to create incentives for State and local reforms and innovations designed to lead to significant improvements in student achievement, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment rates, and to significant reductions in achievement gaps.
- \$300 million for the **Investing in Innovation** program, to expand innovative strategies and practices that have been shown to be effective in improving educational outcomes for students and to test and evaluate promising practices, strategies, or programs for which there is potential but whose efficacy has not yet been systematically studied.
- \$63 million for the **Fund for the Improvement of Education: Programs of National Significance** (FIE) to support nationally significant projects to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education, including continuation of a data quality initiative that helps improve the quality, analysis, and reporting of Department of Education elementary and secondary education data. Of the amount requested, the Department would use \$50 million to fund development of innovative educational products through a new **Advanced Research Projects Agency – Education (ARPA-ED)**, which would pursue breakthrough development of educational technology and learning systems, support systems for educators, and education tools to improve student achievement and informal and out-of-school learning for individuals of all ages. The Administration will

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Summary of Request

seek an additional \$40 million in mandatory funds from the Wireless Innovation Fund for ARPA-ED to support the improvement of early childhood through postsecondary education through a mandatory appropriation for the Fund for the Improvement of Education. The Wireless Innovation Fund will be financed by the sale of spectrum bands by the Federal Communications Commission, and its main purpose would be to spur innovation in the use of wireless technologies.

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

Excellent Instructional Teams

The budget includes \$3.25 billion for the new **Excellent Instructional Teams** programs, which would help States and local educational agencies (LEAs) promote and enhance the education profession and improve teacher and principal effectiveness. Funds would also be used to foster teacher collaboration, to create instructional teams, and to recruit, prepare, support, and retain effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders, especially in high-need LEAs, schools, fields, and subjects. These programs would also help States and LEAs ensure the equitable distribution of qualified and effective teachers and effective principals.

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

Expanding educational options

The Administration requests \$372 million for the new **Expanding Educational Options** program to support competitive grants to State educational agencies (SEAs), charter school authorizers, charter management organizations, local educational agencies and other nonprofit organizations to start or expand high-performing autonomous schools, including charter schools. A portion of the funds would also support competitive grants to LEAs, and to SEAs in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs, for the development and implementation of a comprehensive choice program that increases the range of high-quality educational options available to students and helps improve the academic achievement of students attending low-performing schools. All grantees would also be required to fund or operate parent information and outreach programs to make families and students aware of these options.

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

In addition, the request includes \$110 million, a \$10 million increase, for **Magnet Schools Assistance** to operate magnet schools that are part of a court-ordered or court-approved desegregation plan to eliminate, reduce, or prevent minority group isolation in elementary and secondary schools.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Summary of Request

Other programs

The request would eliminate funding for **Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners**, which earmarks funding for activities and programs carried out by certain entities in Massachusetts, Alaska, Mississippi, and Hawaii. In addition, the request would eliminate funding for the **Women's Educational Equity Act** program, which promotes educational equity for girls and women.

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Race to the Top

(Proposed legislation)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
0	\$900,000	+\$900,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Under the Administration's proposal for the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), this program would be modeled after the Race to the Top program authorized under Section 14006 of the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act of 2009 (Recovery Act). The purpose of the program would be to create incentives for comprehensive State and local reforms and innovations designed to lead to significant improvements in student achievement, high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates, and rates of college persistence, and to significant reductions in achievement gaps, including for students with disabilities and English Learners. In addition, the program would encourage the broad identification, dissemination, adoption, and use of effective State and local policies and practices that lead to significant improvement in outcomes for all students and the elimination of those policies and practices that are not effective in improving student outcomes.

The Department would make Race to the Top awards on a competitive basis to State educational agencies (SEAs) or local educational agencies (LEAs), or both, based on applicants' recent records of improving student outcomes and on their record of and commitment to putting in place conditions for innovation and reform. Applications would also be evaluated based on the quality and likelihood of success of the applicant's comprehensive and coherent plan for improving student achievement and attaining the other objectives of the program, including the level of support from relevant stakeholders.

For FY 2012, the Department would build on the lessons and progress of the Recovery Act Race to the Top State competition, including by supporting and encouraging district-level comprehensive reform and innovation through a Race to the Top LEA competition. This competition would focus on the reforms that are best executed at the local level and would align with the four reforms promoted in the Recovery Act: implementing standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy; using data to improve instruction and inform decision-making, and sharing appropriate data with teachers, principals, and families; recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially for high-need schools; and turning around the lowest-performing schools. The Race to the Top district competition would also expand the program's focus to incorporate improving productivity and efficiency to make the most of every dollar. The Department will hold public input sessions with stakeholders to inform the design of this district-level competition. Recognizing the unique needs of rural communities, the

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Race to the Top

Department would structure the competition to ensure that rural districts are able to compete for funding in a competition that reflects their needs and priorities. In addition, the Department would consider appropriate priorities for the competition, such as for projects that are designed to improve early learning outcomes.

In the fiscal year 2012 competition and in subsequent years, the Department would award Race to the Top grants for up to 4 years. To receive continuation grants, a grantee would be required to demonstrate that it is meeting the performance targets specified in its application and approved by the Secretary. The Department would reserve up to 10 percent of the appropriated funds for technical assistance, outreach, dissemination, and prize awards.

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Department requests \$900 million in fiscal year 2012 funding for Race to the Top. The request would support the first year of the program under the reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The program would drive educational improvement in States and LEAs by providing a financial incentive for system-wide reform.

The Department's implementation of the Race to the Top program under the Recovery Act has spurred considerable educational reform across the Nation, with States rethinking long-standing policies and demonstrating a renewed focus on effective practice and improved student achievement. In 2009 and 2010, numerous States changed State laws and policies to put in place conditions for reform consistent with the Race to the Top criteria published in the *Federal Register* on November 18, 2009. Over the two phases of the competition, 46 States and the District of Columbia applied for Race to the Top funding, and 11 of these States and the District of Columbia received grants. Those grantees are now implementing their high-quality plans to reform their approaches to recruiting, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals; turning around low-achieving schools; encouraging the use of data to improve instruction; and supporting high-quality charter schools. To assist the Department in providing support to States, including those that did not receive grants, the Department awarded a contract to run the Race to the Top Technical Assistance Network. This effort will be guided by grantee States' needs and requests and will include completion of reports that will be broadly available and other technical assistance to both grantee and non-grantee States.

Given the extraordinary response generated by this initial effort, and the unmet demand across the country, we expect a similarly strong response to the reauthorized program. Continuation of the program through the reauthorization should, thus, result in major benefits through the broad identification, dissemination, adoption, and use of effective policies and practices, and the cessation of ineffective ones. These factors argue clearly for building on the momentum created by the initial competitions and providing funding at the requested level. The ultimate goal of the Race to the Top program is to improve educational outcomes for students, and the program would be strongly focused on the applicant's recent record of positive outcomes, commitment to innovation and reform, and the quality and likelihood of success of its plan to improve student outcomes dramatically. The program's structure, which would require that States and districts set and be held to ambitious performance targets while having the flexibility

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Race to the Top

to use funds in a manner that supports the implementation of their reform plans, will foster creative thinking and accountability for results.

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

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2012</u>
Amount for new awards	\$806,000
Technical assistance, outreach, dissemination, and prize awards	90,000
Peer review of applications	4,000

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Department has established eight performance measures for the program's 12 current grantees. The first four measures, designed to gauge grantee States' achievement on the implementation of their Race to the Top plans, are: (1) the number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems; (2) the number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or highly effective in the prior academic year; (3) the percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both who were evaluated as highly effective in the prior academic year; and (4) the percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both who were evaluated as highly effective in the prior academic year. The remaining four measures, which seek to determine the program's effect on student outcomes, are: (1) the number of States that achieve greater than the 75th percentile in overall score gains across all States in at least 3 of the 4 subject-grade combinations (grade 4 reading, grade 4 math, grade 8 reading, and grade 8 math) on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and have no statistically significant increase in exclusion rates for students with disabilities or English learners; (2) the number of States that meet their Title I high school graduation rate target; (3) the number of States that report an increase in the percentage of students graduating from high school who enroll in an institution of higher education; and (4) The number of States that report an increase in the number of students who complete at least 1 year's worth of college credit that is applicable to a degree within 2 years of enrollment in an institution of higher education.

The Department will begin reporting data for the four State implementation measures in fall 2011 and for the first two student outcome measures in 2012. To provide time for States to drive improvements in student enrollment (and student attainment of credit applicable toward a degree) in higher education, the Department will first report data for the final two measures in

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Race to the Top

2013. The Department would establish separate program performance measures for district grantees to ensure the collection of high-quality, comparable data that will inform the assessment of the effectiveness of the program.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Investing in innovation

(Proposed legislation)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
0	\$300,000	+\$300,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

The Department would reserve a portion of the appropriated funds for technical assistance, dissemination, prize awards that would create incentives for the achievement of ambitious outcomes (such as technology solutions like mobile device-based games that help low-income early learners develop vocabulary), and other national activities. The purpose of the prize

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Investing in innovation

authority would be to provide incentives for breakthrough innovations from entities that might not otherwise apply for Federal funding.

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2012, the Department requests \$300 million for the proposed Investing in Innovation (i3) program. The request would support the first year of the reauthorized program, which would build on the Department's success in using funds appropriated for the program under Section 14007 of the Recovery Act to help ensure that schools and districts have access to innovative strategies and practices that have been shown to be effective in improving educational outcomes for students.

The Department's implementation of the Investing in Innovation Fund under the Recovery Act generated considerable excitement and interest across the Nation. Almost 1,700 school districts, colleges and universities, and nonprofit organizations applied for funding in 2010, requesting approximately \$12.8 billion in total under the first competition for this program. The Department's use of a three-tier evidence framework, as described above, encouraged the field to focus on expanding the implementation of practices that are proven and evaluating practices that are promising. In addition, the program generated great interest from the private sector, leading to the establishment of the Foundation Registry, through which 12 private foundations have made available almost \$1 billion to help support innovative educational projects. The Foundation Registry allows interested parties to submit an online application for private funding. While the Registry provides a simple avenue for i3 applicants to request private funding in order to meet the program's matching requirement, it also allows other interested organizations to apply for private funding in order to implement their ideas. Continuation of the program through the reauthorization should result in major benefits to American education, as more innovations are tested, validated, and scaled up, and the private-sector investment continues to complement the Federal investment.

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

The Department would continue to award three types of grants, each of which is aligned with the three-tier evidence framework. Under Scale-Up grants, applicants would receive grants to scale up practices, strategies, or programs for which there is strong evidence that the proposed activity has had a significant effect on improving student achievement, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, or increasing high school graduation rates. Under Validation grants, the Department would make grants to validate and expand practices, strategies, or programs for which there is moderate evidence that the proposed activity has had a significant effect on those same outcomes. Finally, under Development grants, the grantees would receive

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Investing in innovation

support to develop and test promising practices, strategies, or programs for which there is potential and some research-based findings, but whose efficacy has not yet been systematically studied.

The Department is considering priorities for the 2012 grant competition. The priorities under consideration include funding for projects that propose to improve early learning outcomes; improve student attainment in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) subjects; and improve productivity by improving student learning or other educational outcomes while significantly increasing efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources.

The priority for improving early learning outcomes reflects the Department's commitment to investing in activities that improve the school readiness of young children across a range of domains and lay the foundation for success for children in kindergarten through third grade. The STEM priority would be part of the Administration's Governmentwide effort to support and improve STEM education. The STEM and education technology activities supported through Investing in Innovation will be part of a coordinated Federal strategy developed in partnership with the Institute of Education Sciences, the National Science Foundation, and other Federal agencies.

As provided for in the reauthorization proposal, the Department would reserve a portion of the appropriation to carry out activities of national significance, including a productivity prize competition that would be designed to match real savings that States or districts achieve through cost-cutting measures or improvements in efficiency while also improving effectiveness. In addition, in order to continue to identify strategies to ensure that funds are used for effective programs, the Department might use program funds to support a multi-agency productivity initiative designed to employ "pay-for-performance" models to drive better results and greater cost-efficiency from Federal investments. Through such innovations as Pay for Success pilots modeled on social impact bonds, a mechanism through which private investors provide the capital to finance services and the government compensates investors and service providers only after they achieve results, the initiative would seek to incentivize service providers to achieve better results and in a most cost-effective manner while transferring the risk from the taxpayer to the investors. Under this proposal, appropriated funds not needed for repayment of the bonds would be used to supplement the appropriation for existing, high-priority Department programs.

For fiscal year 2012, the Department would use up to \$5 million for competitions for prizes, up to \$15 million for social impact bonds, and up to \$20 million for other national activities in 2012. The Administration requests that \$5 million of the funds (for prizes) be appropriated on a no-year basis to remain available for obligation until expended.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Investing in innovation

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2012</u>
Amount for new awards	\$257,000
Number of new awards	35-55
Range of awards	\$5,000-50,000
National activities:	
Prize awards	\$5,000
Pay for Success pilot	\$15,000
Other national activities (technical assistance, dissemination, professional development)	\$20,000
Peer review of applications	\$3,000

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Department has developed short-term and long-term performance measures for each type of grant category funded under the program. Baseline data will be available late in 2012.

The short-term measures for Scale-Up grants are: (1) the percentage of grantees that reach their annual target number of students as specified in the application; (2) the percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Scale-Up grant that have ongoing, well-designed, and independent evaluations that will provide evidence of their effectiveness in improving student outcomes at scale; (3) the percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Scale-Up grant that have ongoing evaluations that are providing high-quality implementation data and performance feedback that allow for periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes; and (4) the cost per student served by the grant.

The long-term performance measures for Scale-Up grants are: (1) the percentage of grantees that reach the targeted number of students specified in the application; (2) the percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Scale-Up grant that implement a completed, well-designed, well-implemented, and independent evaluation that provides evidence of their effectiveness in improving student outcomes at scale; (3) the percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Scale-up grant that complete a well-designed, well-implemented and independent evaluation that provides information about the key elements and the approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings; and (4) the cost per student for programs, practices, or strategies that are proven to be effective at improving educational outcomes for students.

The short-term performance measures for Validation grants are: (1) the percentage of grantees that reach their annual target number of students as specified in the application; (2) the percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Validation grant that have ongoing, well-designed, and independent evaluations that will provide evidence of their

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Investing in innovation

effectiveness at improving student outcomes; (3) the percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Validation grant that have ongoing evaluations that are providing high-quality implementation data and performance feedback that allow for periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes; and (4) the cost per student served by the grant. The long-term performance measures for Validation grants are: (1) the percentage of grantees that reach the targeted number of students specified in the application; (2) the percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Validation grant that implement a completed, well-designed, well-implemented, and independent evaluation that provides evidence of their effectiveness at improving student outcomes; (3) the percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Validation grant that complete a well-designed, well-implemented and independent evaluation that provides information about the key elements and the approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings; and (4) the cost per student for programs, practices, or strategies that are proven to be effective at improving educational outcomes for students.

The short-term performance measures for Development grants are: (1) the percentage of grantees whose projects are being implemented with fidelity to the approved design; (2) the percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Development grant that have ongoing evaluations that provide evidence of their promise for improving student outcomes; (3) the percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Development grant that have ongoing evaluations that are providing high-quality implementation data and performance feedback that allow for periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes; and (4) the cost per student served by the grant.

The long-term performance measures for Development grants are: (1) the percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Development grant that complete an evaluation that provides evidence of their promise for improving student outcomes; (2) the percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Development grant that complete an evaluation that provides information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings; and (3) the cost per student for programs, practices, or strategies that were proven promising at improving educational outcomes for students.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Excellent instructional teams

(Proposed legislation)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
Effective teachers and leaders State grants	0	\$2,500,000	+\$2,500,000
Teacher and leader innovation fund	0	500,000	+500,000
Teacher and leader pathways			
Teacher pathways	0	180,000	+180,000
Transformational leaders	<u>0</u>	<u>70,000</u>	<u>+70,000</u>
Subtotal	0	250,000	+250,000
Total	0	3,250,000	+3,250,000

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

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

The Excellent Instructional Teams programs would have three components: the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program, the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund, and the Teacher and Leader Pathways program. These three programs would replace 9 programs in current law that focus on teaching and school leadership. The new programs would provide formula grants to States and districts to improve the effectiveness and equitable distribution of teachers and leaders, competitive grants to States and districts to support the development and implementation of innovative teacher and leader policies, and competitive grants to recruit and prepare effective and highly effective teachers and leaders.

This integrated approach would be more effective in supporting State and local efforts to: (1) promote and enhance the teaching profession; (2) recruit, prepare, develop, reward, and retain effective and highly effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders and foster excellent instructional teams, especially in high-need local educational agencies, schools, fields, and subjects; (3) ensure the equitable distribution of effective and highly effective teachers and principals; (4) increase the effectiveness of teachers and principals; (5) improve the preparation of teachers and principals, by developing, supporting, and expanding high-performing pathways

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Excellent instructional teams

to becoming a teacher or principal; (6) strengthen teacher and principal evaluation systems; (7) ensure that teachers have the knowledge, skills, data, support, and collaborative opportunities needed to be effective in the classroom; and (8) improve the management of the education workforce in States and local educational agencies.

Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants would be distributed by formula to States based 35 percent on each State's relative share of the population aged 5 to 17 and 65 percent on each State's relative share of low-income children aged 5 to 17, consistent with the current ESEA Title II, Part A (Improving Teacher Quality State Grants) formula. The Department of the Interior/Bureau of Indian Education and the Outlying Areas would each receive one-half of 1 percent of the total appropriation. States would use at least 90 percent of their formula grants to make subgrants to LEAs.

States could use their State-level funds for a variety of activities, including those designed to support the creation of effective teacher career ladders, reform certification and licensure, increase the effectiveness of professional development, and reform teacher and school leader compensation. States would be required to take steps to strengthen teacher and principal evaluation systems within the State, to develop definitions of effective teachers and principals, to design and implement plans to ensure that low-income and minority students have equitable access to effective teachers and leaders, and to report on the effectiveness of their teacher and principal preparation programs. In addition, some State-level funds would be focused on improving the effectiveness of the State's principals.

In order to receive an award, an LEA would be required to develop and implement high-quality teacher and principal evaluation systems that, among other things, differentiate teachers across multiple performance levels, based in significant part on student academic growth as well as other measures. LEAs would also be required to conduct an assessment of local needs, and use program funds, along with other local, State, and Federal funds, to meet those needs and to ensure the equitable distribution of effective and highly effective teachers and principals within the LEA. LEAs would use program funds to carry out a broad range of activities, including those designed to recruit, prepare, support, and retain effective and highly effective teachers and principals, particularly for high-need and low-performing schools.

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Excellent instructional teams

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

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$2.5 billion for the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program for fiscal year 2012. This program would focus on improving teacher and principal effectiveness and ensuring the equitable distribution of effective and highly effective teachers and principals. States and LEAs would have flexibility in how they use formula grant funds, but would be accountable for improving their teacher and principal evaluation systems and ensuring that low-income and minority students have equitable access to teachers and principals who are effective at raising student achievement.

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

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2012</u>
Range of awards to States	\$11,611 – 272,750
Average State grant	46,154
Amount for Outlying Areas	12,500
Amount for BIE	12,500
National leadership activities	37,500
Evaluation	37,500

Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

Grantees, selected competitively, would use funds to reform teacher and school leader compensation and career advancement systems, improve the use of evaluation results for retention and compensation decisions, improve hiring and placement practices, improve

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Excellent instructional teams

certification and licensure systems, and implement other innovations to strengthen the workforce.

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$500 million for the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund for fiscal year 2012. This program would help support States and LEAs in improving the effectiveness of teachers and leaders in high-need schools and LEAs, in particular by creating the conditions to identify, recruit, prepare, retain, and advance effective and highly effective teachers, principals, and school leadership teams in those schools. It would also support activities to improve teacher and leader effectiveness, reduce disparities in the access of students to effective and highly effective teachers and leaders, and support the improvement of persistently low-performing schools.

In fiscal year 2012, continuation costs for the Teacher Incentive Fund would be funded from the appropriation for the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2012</u>
Funding for new awards	\$232,500
Number of new awards	10
Average new award	\$23,250
Peer review of new award applications	\$5,000
Evaluation	\$7,500

NOTE: Approximately \$255,000 thousand in 2012 would be provided from the appropriation for the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund for continuation costs under the Teacher Incentive Fund.

Teacher and Leader Pathways

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Teacher Pathways

Teacher Pathways would fund competitive grants to States, LEAs, institutions of higher education, and nonprofit organizations to support the creation or expansion of high-quality traditional and alternative pathways into the teaching profession, with an emphasis on partnerships and on increasing the number of effective and highly effective teachers serving in high-need and low-performing schools and high-need LEAs, fields, and subjects.

The Secretary would be authorized to reserve up to 5 percent of funds from this program for a teacher recruitment campaign to increase awareness of teaching nationwide as a valuable and

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Excellent instructional teams

important profession, and to increase the number, quality, and diversity of candidates seeking to become teachers, particularly in high-need schools, fields, and subjects.

Transformational Leaders

The Transformational Leaders program would fund competitive grants to States, LEAs, institutions of higher education, and nonprofit organizations to support the recruitment, preparation, and retention of effective and highly effective principals and school leadership teams who are able to turn around low-performing schools.

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

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$250.0 million for the Teacher and Leader Pathways in fiscal year 2012: \$180.0 million for the Teacher Pathways program and \$70.0 million for the Transformational Leaders program.

The Teacher Pathways program would support investments in the preparation of new teachers, particularly science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) teachers. Although the current economic climate may have temporarily slowed teacher hiring and postponed retirements, over the coming years the Nation faces the challenge of preparing and hiring hundreds of thousands of teachers and school leaders, in part as a result of increasing enrollments and the retirement of many veteran educators. High-quality pathways to teacher certification and other innovative approaches for recruiting, training, and placing mid-career professionals and recent college graduates whose knowledge and experience can help them become successful teachers in high-need schools are an essential mechanism for preparing new teachers to enter the classroom, supporting them during their first years in the profession, and addressing inequities in the distribution of effective and highly effective teachers. The Department would reserve \$80 million to support the Administration's goal of recruiting and preparing 100,000 effective and highly effective STEM teachers over the next 10 years. This emphasis on STEM teacher preparation reflects the Administration's commitment to promoting excellence in STEM throughout our education system, and will complement other proposed activities, including the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education initiative and the Investing in Innovation program.

The proposed Transformational Leaders program would support the recruitment, preparation, and retention of effective principals and school leadership teams who are able to turn around low-performing schools. A growing body of research indicates that the quality of a school's leadership has a substantial effect on student achievement. Good school leaders are able to create cultures focused on learning, with high expectations for all students, as well as recruit and retain highly effective teachers. Moreover, the impact of strong leadership may be greatest in high-need and low-performing schools. These schools need serious, systematic change, requiring effective leaders. Federal investments in the recruitment, preparation, and retention of

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Excellent instructional teams

effective principals and school leadership teams will also be particularly important given that the Bureau of Labor Statistics expects increased demand for educational administrators through 2016, as the number of school-age children grows and current school leaders retire in greater numbers.

In fiscal year 2012, School Leadership, Teacher Quality Partnership, Teachers for a Competitive Tomorrow, and Transition to Teaching continuation costs would be funded from the appropriation for Teacher and Leader Pathways programs.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2012</u>
<u>Teacher pathways</u>	
Funding for new awards	\$87,566
Number of new awards	18
Average new award	\$4,865
Peer review of new award applications	\$1,800
National teacher recruitment campaign	\$9,000
National leadership activities	\$9,000
Evaluation	\$2,700
<u>Transformational leaders</u>	
Funding for new awards	\$30,505
Number of new awards	6
Average new award	\$5,084
Peer review of new award applications	\$700
Grants to train SEA and LEA managers	\$3,500
National leadership activities	\$3,500
Evaluation	\$1,050

NOTE: Approximately \$100,679 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Teacher and Leader Pathways programs for continuation costs under School Leadership (\$30,745 thousand), Teacher Quality Partnerships (\$59,350 thousand), Teachers for a Competitive Tomorrow (\$1,199 thousand), and Transition to Teaching (\$9,385 thousand).

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Excellent instructional teams

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
Annual appropriation	\$1,266,308 ²	0	-\$1,266,308
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	<u>1,681,441²</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-1,681,441</u>
Total	2,947,749 ²	0	-2,947,749

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

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

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

The State awards subgrants to LEAs using a formula that is similar to the one that the Department uses for State allocations, except that, after LEAs receive the amount equivalent to their 2001 allocations from the Eisenhower Professional Development State Grants and Class Size Reduction programs, remaining funds are then allocated to LEAs by a formula based 20 percent on LEAs' share of the population aged 5 to 17 and 80 percent on LEAs' share of children from low-income families aged 5 to 17. In addition to using these funds for professional development and class-size reduction, LEAs may use program funds for other activities to improve teacher quality, including teacher and principal recruitment and retention initiatives, signing bonuses and other financial incentives, teacher and principal mentoring, reforming tenure systems, merit pay, teacher testing, and pay differentiation initiatives.

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

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) required all SEAs receiving Title I, Part A funds to develop a plan to have all public school teachers of core academic subjects meet the Act's highly qualified teacher requirements no later than the end of the 2005-2006 school year. "Highly qualified" means that the teacher: (1) has obtained full State certification as a teacher; (2) holds a minimum of a bachelor's degree; and (3) has demonstrated subject-matter competency in each of the academic subjects in which he or she teaches. LEAs have commonly used their Improving Teacher Quality State Grants funds to help enable teachers to meet this requirement.

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

The goal of the TEACH campaign is twofold: to increase the number, quality, and diversity of prospective teachers, particularly for high-need schools, fields, and subject areas, and, secondly, to enhance the overall perception of the teaching profession by increasing awareness of teaching as valuable and important service. The activity has three core components: research and information; the TEACH.gov website; and a comprehensive, integrated marketing plan. The research and information activities help ensure that the entire project is grounded in evidence related to teacher recruitment. The TEACH.gov website provides a common virtual space for aspiring teachers, school districts with jobs to offer, States (which license teachers and set licensure requirements), and teacher preparation programs. Finally, the comprehensive, integrated marketing campaign is helping inspire prospective teachers to join the profession.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

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

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$2,887,439
2008	2,935,248
2009	2,947,749
2010	2,947,749
2011 CR.....	2,947,749

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program for fiscal year 2012. In place of several, sometimes narrowly targeted programs that serve current and prospective teachers and school leaders, the Administration has proposed to create a broader Excellent Instructional Teams initiative through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization. This new initiative would include three new programs that would provide formula grants to States and districts to improve the effectiveness and equitable distribution of teachers and leaders, competitive grants to States and districts to support the development and implementation of innovative teacher and leader policies, and competitive grants to recruit and prepare effective and highly effective teachers and leaders.

This integrated approach would be more effective in supporting State and local efforts to: (1) promote and enhance the teaching profession; (2) recruit, prepare, develop, reward, and retain effective and highly effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders and foster excellent instructional teams, especially in high-need local educational agencies, schools, fields, and subjects; (3) ensure the equitable distribution of effective and highly effective teachers and principals; (4) increase the effectiveness of teachers and principals; (5) improve the preparation of teachers and principals, by developing, supporting, and expanding high-performing pathways to becoming a teacher or principal; (6) strengthen teacher and principal evaluation systems; (7) ensure that teachers have the knowledge, skills, data, support, and collaborative opportunities needed to be effective in the classroom; and (8) improve the management of the education workforce in States and local educational agencies.

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

The State grants portion of the Excellent Instructional Teams programs would focus on developing systems to evaluate teacher and principal effectiveness, based in significant part on student growth as well as other factors, and on using these evaluation systems to inform decisions about professional development, mentoring, compensation, and career advancement. States and local educational agencies (LEAs) would have flexibility in how they use formula grant funds, but would be accountable for improving their teacher and principal evaluation systems and for ensuring that all students, including students in high-poverty and high-minority schools, and all LEAs, have equitable access to teachers and principals who are effective at raising student achievement.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Range of awards to States	\$14,024- 331,063	\$14,024- 329,423	0
Average State award	55,744	55,744	0
Amount for Outlying Areas	14,665	14,665	0
Amount for BIE	14,665	14,665	0
Evaluation	14,739	14,739	0

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

The measures established by the Department to assess the performance of the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program gauge the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in high-poverty schools and by highly qualified teachers in elementary and secondary schools. Since 2007, these data have been collected by the Department's *EDFacts*/Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN).

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

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

Measure: The percentage of core academic elementary classes in high-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	100	94
2008	100	95
2009	100	96
2010	100	
2011	100	

Measure: The percentage of core academic classes in high-poverty secondary schools taught by highly qualified teachers.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	100	89
2008	100	90
2009	100	93
2010	100	
2011	100	

Measure: The percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in elementary schools.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	100	96
2008	100	97
2009	100	97
2010	100	
2011	100	

Measure: The percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in secondary schools.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	100	93
2008	100	94
2009	100	95
2010	100	
2011	100	

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

Additional information: The program made progress on this objective from 2007 to 2008 and from 2008 to 2009, but did not meet the 100 percent targets called for under current law. No targets are shown for 2012 because the Administration is proposing to consolidate this program.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

Measure: The number of States that reduce the difference between the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in elementary schools in the highest-poverty quartile and the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in elementary schools in the lowest-poverty quartile.

Year	Target	Actual
2007		32
2008		27
2009		31
2010		
2011		

Measure: The number of States that reduce the difference between the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in secondary schools in the highest-poverty quartile and the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in secondary schools in the lowest-poverty quartile.

Year	Target	Actual
2007		38
2008		33
2009		31
2010		
2011		

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

Efficiency Measure

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

Measure: The average number of days it takes the Department of Education to send a monitoring report to States after monitoring.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	81	Data not collected
2008	36	29
2009	35	29
2010	34	
2011	33	

Additional information: The Department did not conduct any monitoring visits in fiscal year 2007 because program staff were working with States on their revised State plans and preparing for the second round of monitoring visits. Beginning in 2008, data reflect the Department's second round of State monitoring. No targets are shown for 2012 because the Administration is proposing to consolidate this program.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

Other Performance Information

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

A study of pre-service training, released in early 2009, identified different models of teacher training, including models of alternative certification, and compared the performance of students taught by teachers who have received different types of preparation. It found no empirical differences in performance on reading and math assessments of students taught by teachers trained through traditional routes versus teachers who had pursued alternative routes to certification. A second study will look at the effectiveness of teachers who chose to enter teaching through highly selective alternative certification programs; the report is expected in summer 2012.

The Department has invested in two studies of teacher professional development activities to identify and then test promising approaches to in-service training. The first, which was completed in September 2008, examined the extent to which particular professional development activities change teaching practices in ways that research suggests are effective in improving student achievement in early reading. It found that although there were positive impacts on teachers' knowledge of scientifically based reading instruction, neither of the two professional development activities evaluated led to higher student test scores over a 1-year period, and any additional effect of coaching activities on teaching practices was also insignificant. The second study is examining professional development activities that focus on improving student achievement in mathematics. An interim report on this study, published in April 2010, found that providing teachers 1 year of math professional development (about 55 hours of specialized training during school year 2007-08) did not significantly improve their students' math achievement compared to achievement among students whose teachers did not receive the study-provided professional development. The training did not significantly improve teacher knowledge, either, relative to the comparison group of teachers, but did affect one aspect of instructional practice: teachers who received the study-provided training more frequently engaged in activities that elicited student thinking. Teachers in the comparison group were eligible to participate in other district-provided professional development. The final report is expected to be released in spring 2011.

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

and math in the third and final year of the study. Receiving only 1 year of induction services had no impact on student achievement. However, neither 1 year nor 2 years of comprehensive induction services led to improvements in teacher retention rates.

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

Key findings of the study include:

- By 2006-07, the vast majority of teachers met their States' requirements for being considered highly qualified under the ESEA. In that year, 94 percent of classes were taught by a highly qualified teacher. However, requirements for the demonstration of content-knowledge expertise varied greatly among States, both in the passing scores that new teachers must meet to demonstrate content knowledge on assessments and in the extent to which States give teachers credit for years of prior teaching experience in determining their highly qualified teacher status.
- Teachers in high-poverty and high-minority schools were more likely to report that they were not highly qualified. Moreover, even among teachers who were considered highly qualified, teachers in high-poverty schools had less experience and were less likely to have a degree in the subject they taught.
- The percentage of teachers who were not highly qualified was higher for special education teachers and middle-school teachers.
- In 2006-07, 44 percent of school districts reported facing moderate or major challenges in attracting qualified applicants for teaching positions in mathematics, 53 percent for science, and 55 percent for special education. More than 90 percent of high-minority districts reported difficulty attracting applicants in science and mathematics who met the highly qualified teacher requirements.
- Although nearly all teachers reported taking part in content-focused professional development related to teaching reading or mathematics during the 2005-06 school year and summer, a relatively small proportion participated in such learning opportunities for an extended period of time, notwithstanding the ESEA's emphasis on sustained, intensive, classroom-focused professional development. For example, only 13 percent of elementary teachers participated for more than 24 hours in professional development that included in-depth study of topics in reading, and only 6 percent received more than 24 hours of professional development that included in-depth study of topics in mathematics.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher incentive fund

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$400,000 ²	0	-\$400,000

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

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

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

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (the Recovery Act) provided an additional \$200 million in fiscal year 2009 for new TIF awards. With the Recovery Act funds, and in response to lessons learned from the first two rounds of TIF grants and from other efforts

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher incentive fund

around the country to improve educator effectiveness, the Department placed a priority on the support of projects that will develop and implement a performance-based compensation system that (1) rewards, at differentiated levels, teachers and principals who demonstrate their effectiveness by improving student achievement; (2) uses student growth as a significant factor in calculating differentiated levels of compensation provided to teachers and principals; (3) is designed to assist high-need schools to (a) retain effective teachers in teaching positions in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas, such as mathematics, science, special education, and English language acquisition, and (b) fill vacancies with teachers of those subjects or specialty areas who are effective or likely to be effective; and (4) is sustainable and aligned with a coherent strategy for strengthening the educator workforce in an LEA participating in the project. Grantees were required to demonstrate the involvement and support of teachers and principals, to develop a plan for communicating the components and measures of the system to teachers and principals, and to provide professional development to teachers and principals that enables them to use data generated by these measures to improve their practice.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$200
2008	97,270
2009	97,270
Recovery Act.....	200,000
2010	400,000
2011 CR.....	400,000

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for the Teacher Incentive Fund for fiscal year 2012. In place of several, sometimes narrowly targeted programs that serve current and prospective teachers and school leaders, the Administration has proposed to create a broader Excellent Instructional Teams initiative through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization. This new initiative would include three new programs that would provide formula grants to States and districts to improve the effectiveness and equitable distribution of teachers and leaders, competitive grants (expanding on the TIF) to States and districts to support the development and implementation of innovative teacher and leader policies, and competitive grants to recruit and prepare effective and highly effective teachers and leaders.

This integrated approach would be more effective in supporting State and local efforts to: (1) promote and enhance the teaching profession; (2) recruit, prepare, develop, reward, and

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher incentive fund

retain effective and highly effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders and foster excellent instructional teams, especially in high-need local educational agencies, schools, fields, and subjects; (3) ensure the equitable distribution of effective and highly effective teachers and principals; (4) increase the effectiveness of teachers and principals; (5) improve the preparation of teachers and principals, by developing, supporting, and expanding high-performing pathways to becoming a teacher or principal; (6) strengthen teacher and principal evaluation systems; (7) ensure that teachers have the knowledge, skills, data, support, and collaborative opportunities needed to be effective in the classroom; and (8) improve the management of the education workforce in States and local educational agencies.

Building on the initiatives undertaken and advances made through the TIF, the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund and the other Excellent Instructional Teams programs proposed for reauthorization in ESEA would provide support for State and school district efforts to develop and implement innovative approaches to human capital systems that improve teacher and leader effectiveness and student outcomes. The new programs would include a focus on the recruitment, retention, and reward of teachers and principals who raise student achievement and close the achievement gap in high-need schools.

Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund grantees would use program funds to reform teacher and school leader compensation and career development systems, improve the use of evaluation results for retention and compensation decisions, improve hiring and placement practices, improve certification and licensure decisions, and implement other human resource reforms and other innovations to strengthen the workforce.

The Excellent Instructional Teams initiatives will encourage and support State educational agencies and LEAs in advancing comprehensive strategies for strengthening the educator workforce and driving improvements in teacher effectiveness, including through the types of activities currently supported under the TIF. As States and LEAs seek to increase educator effectiveness by aligning their approaches to recruitment and placement, preparation and certification, induction and development, and retention and advancement of effective and highly effective teachers and leaders, compensation systems that reward teacher contribution can reinforce these efforts. For example, compensation reform can be an important tool in efforts to attract effective and highly effective teachers and leaders and build strong instructional teams in high-need schools, to create robust career advancement systems for teachers and other school leaders, and to create more effective professional development systems.

Because of the interconnectedness of these areas, it is important to think of them in a coherent, integrated way, with emphasis consistently placed on approaches that measure, support, and reward teachers and school leaders based on their effectiveness in delivering improved student outcomes and that support educators' efforts to improve throughout the course of their careers. The FY 2010 TIF competition placed a strong emphasis on developing fair and rigorous evaluation systems and providing targeted professional development; this emphasis will continue both in the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund and in the requirements under the new Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program.

Under the Administration's reauthorization proposal, TIF continuation grant costs of approximately \$255.0 million would be funded from the \$500 million appropriation for the new Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher incentive fund

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Amount for continuation awards	\$80,559	\$40,000	0
Number of continuation awards	33	100	0
Amount for new awards	\$303,830	\$340,000	0
Number of new awards	62	60-80	0
Technical assistance, training, outreach, and evaluation	\$15,611	\$19,000	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$1,000	0

NOTES: The Department used approximately \$144,000 thousand of the Recovery Act appropriation for new awards, \$51,000 thousand for continuation awards, and \$5,000 thousand for the mandated national evaluation, peer review of new award applications, and management and oversight.

Continuation costs of approximately \$255,000 thousand in 2012 would be provided from the appropriation for the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund.

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher incentive fund

The Department has established the following goal and performance indicators to assess the impact of the Teacher Incentive Fund:

Goal: Improve student achievement by increasing teacher and principal effectiveness by reforming teacher and principal compensation systems so that teachers and principals are rewarded for increases in student achievement.

Objective: *Show an increase in the percentage of teachers and principals in high-need schools who have a record of effectiveness.*

Measure: The percentage of teachers and principals in high-need schools who have a record of effectiveness.				
Year	Target		Actual	
	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort
2007			30.9	
2008			29.7	57.6
2009			32.6	45.1
2010				
2011				
2012				

Additional information: The 2007 result for the 2006 cohort excludes five grantees that did not report on this measure. The 2008 result for the 2007 cohort excludes six grantees that did not report on this measure, and the 2009 result excludes one grantee that did not report on this measure. The Department will use final results for this measure for 2008 and 2009, which will be available in spring 2011, to set targets. Data for 2010 will be available in fall 2011.

Objective: *Show an increase in the percentage of a district's personnel budget that is used for performance-related payments to effective (as measured by student achievement gains) teachers and principals.*

Measure: The percentage of a district's personnel budget that is used for performance-related payments to effective teachers and principals (as measured by student achievement gains).				
Year	Target		Actual	
	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort
2007			0.3	
2008			0.5	1.2
2009			0.8	1.2
2010				
2011				
2012				

Additional information: The 2007 and 2008 results for the 2006 cohort exclude one grantee that did not report on this measure. The 2009 result for the 2006 cohort excludes two grantees that did not report on this measure. The 2008 result for the 2007 cohort excludes five grantees that did not report on this measure, and the 2009 result excludes one grantee that did not report on this measure. The Department will use final results for this measure for 2008 and 2009, which will be available in spring 2011, to set targets. Data for 2010 will be available in fall 2011.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher incentive fund

Other Performance Information

As discussed under Program Description, the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) is conducting a rigorous national evaluation, using a randomized controlled methodology, to assess the impact of performance-based teacher and principal compensation systems on teacher and principal recruitment and retention in high-need schools and subjects.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Advanced credentialing

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$10,649 ²	0	-\$10,649

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

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Advanced credentialing

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2007	\$16,695
2008	9,649
2009	10,649
2010	10,649
2011 CR	10,649

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for Advanced Credentialing for fiscal year 2012. In place of several, sometimes narrowly targeted programs that serve current and prospective teachers and school leaders, the Administration has proposed to create a broader Excellent Instructional Teams initiative through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization. This new initiative would include three new programs that would provide formula grants to States and districts to improve the effectiveness and equitable distribution of teachers and leaders, competitive grants to States and districts to support the development and implementation of innovative teacher and leader policies, and competitive grants to recruit and prepare effective and highly effective teachers and leaders.

This integrated approach would be more effective in supporting State and local efforts to: (1) promote and enhance the teaching profession; (2) recruit, prepare, develop, reward, and retain effective and highly effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders and foster excellent instructional teams, especially in high-need local educational agencies, schools, fields, and subjects; (3) ensure the equitable distribution of effective and highly effective teachers and principals; (4) increase the effectiveness of teachers and principals; (5) improve the preparation of teachers and principals, by developing, supporting, and expanding high-performing pathways to becoming a teacher or principal; (6) strengthen teacher and principal evaluation systems; (7) ensure that teachers have the knowledge, skills, data, support, and collaborative opportunities needed to be effective in the classroom; and (8) improve the management of the education workforce in States and local educational agencies.

The Excellent Instructional Teams initiatives, particularly the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund, would enable States and districts to reform their compensation, hiring, licensure, and tenure systems and would also provide support for national activities to strengthen teaching and leadership. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and other nonprofit organizations that are eligible for funding under the Advanced Credentialing program would be eligible to partner with States and districts to compete for funding under the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund for which \$500 million is requested, and may also be eligible for funding under the National Leadership Activities set-aside within the Effective Teachers and Leaders State grants program.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Advanced credentialing

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Administration (includes grantee personnel costs, benefits, travel, and indirect costs)	\$1,292	\$1,292	0
Candidate support services and evaluation activities	1,999	1,999	0
Candidate subsidies	<u>7,358</u>	<u>7,358</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	10,649	10,649	0

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

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

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

In the Consolidated Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2004, Congress directed the Department to award a contract to the National Research Council to assess the impact of the NBPTS credential and to provide a framework for evaluating other advanced teaching credentials or certifications. On June 11, 2008, the National Research Council's Committee on Evaluation of Teacher Certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards issued its final report on its evaluation of the advanced teaching credential offered by the NBPTS (http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12224).

The report included the following findings and recommendations:

- Teachers who have earned NBPTS certification are more effective at improving their students' achievement than teachers who have not earned NBPTS certification, but research is mixed as to whether this relationship is correlational or causal.
- Existing research neither supports nor refutes hypotheses about the effects of the certification process on teachers' practice. The National Research Council Committee recommended further research on this topic and on the effect of the certification on teacher retention.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Advanced credentialing

- High standards were employed in the initial design and development of NBPTS assessments. However, some documentation on the subsequent development, administration, and scoring of assessments was not easily accessible. The National Research Council Committee recommended that NBPTS take several steps to improve the reliability of its assessments and to regularly evaluate its assessments to continuously improve them.
- There were disparities in applicants' participation across States, across the types of schools where Board-certified teachers work, and across teachers from different racial and ethnic backgrounds. To address this, the National Research Council Committee recommended that NBPTS implement and maintain a database of information on NBPTS applicants and their career paths.
- The current research base is inadequate to support an evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of the NBPTS credential.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Transition to teaching

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$43,707 ²	0	-\$43,707

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 Transition to Teaching program helps high-need schools and local educational agencies (LEAs) recruit and employ qualified licensed or certified teachers by encouraging the development and expansion of alternative routes to certification. The program provides 3- to 5-year grants to recruit, train, certify, and place talented individuals into teaching positions and to support them during their first years in the classroom. In particular, the program focuses on encouraging two groups of nontraditional teaching candidates to become classroom teachers: (1) mid-career professionals with substantial career experience, including highly qualified paraprofessionals, and (2) recent college graduates.

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Transition to teaching

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$44,484
2008	43,707
2009	43,707
2010	43,707
2011 CR.....	43,707

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for Transition to Teaching for fiscal year 2012. In place of several, sometimes narrowly targeted programs that serve current and prospective teachers and school leaders, the Administration has proposed to create a broader Excellent Instructional Teams initiative through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization. This new initiative would include three new programs that would provide formula grants to States and districts to improve the effectiveness and equitable distribution of teachers and leaders, competitive grants to States and districts to support the development and implementation of innovative teacher and leader policies, and competitive grants to recruit and prepare effective and highly effective teachers and leaders.

This integrated approach would be more effective in supporting State and local efforts to: (1) promote and enhance the teaching profession; (2) recruit, prepare, develop, reward, and retain effective and highly effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders and foster excellent instructional teams, especially in high-need local educational agencies, schools, fields, and subjects; (3) ensure the equitable distribution of effective and highly effective teachers and principals; (4) increase the effectiveness of teachers and principals; (5) improve the preparation of teachers and principals, by developing, supporting, and expanding high-performing pathways to becoming a teacher or principal; (6) strengthen teacher and principal evaluation systems; (7) ensure that teachers have the knowledge, skills, data, support, and collaborative opportunities needed to be effective in the classroom; and (8) improve the management of the education workforce in States and local educational agencies.

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

The new Excellent Instructional Teams programs would build on Transition to Teaching's record of support for alternative-route programs. The Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund would provide support for States and LEAs to reform their certification or licensure policies and practices. In addition, the Teacher Pathways program would provide competitive grants to support the creation or expansion of high-quality pathways, including traditional and alternative routes, into the teaching profession, and support a teacher recruitment campaign that would help recruit into the teaching profession such individuals as high-school and college students, recent college graduates, mid-career professionals, retirees, and veterans, including those

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Transition to teaching

recently separated from military service, and direct these individuals into high-quality preparation programs. Finally, the types of activities supported by the Transition to Teaching program could also be funded through Race to the Top and the Investing in Innovation Fund.

Under the Administration's reauthorization proposal, Transition to Teaching continuation grant costs of approximately \$9.4 million would be funded from the \$250 million appropriation for the new Teacher and Leader Pathways programs.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Funding for new awards	0	\$12,638	0
Number of new awards	0	15	0
Average new award	0	\$843	0
Funding for continuation awards	\$43,588	\$30,600	0
Number of continuation awards	93	60	0
Average continuation award	\$469	\$510	0
Evaluation	\$119	\$219	0
Peer review	0	\$250	0
Number of participants	11,800	12,000	0

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$9,385 thousand in 2012 would be provided from the appropriation for the Teacher and Leader Pathways programs.

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Transition to teaching

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

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

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

Measure: The percentage of Transition to Teaching participants who become teachers of record in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.										
Year	Target					Actual				
	2002 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2009 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2009 Cohort
2007	75	75				75	83	81		
2008	75	83	60			76	83	74	65	
2009		85	79	60			76	66	67	
2010		85	83	79				74	68	57
2011			85	83	58					
2012			85	85	59					

Additional information: In 2005, the Department set targets for 2007 for the 2002 cohort and for 2007-09 for the 2004 cohort based on the most recent data and the adoption of a standardized definition for “teacher of record” in 2005.

Grantees have reported several reasons for the decline in this measure from 2008 to 2009. First, the high-need LEAs served by this program generally reduced hiring in 2009 in response to budget cuts. In addition, many grantees reported recruiting more participants later in the grant period than the previous cohort, raising the total number of participants. Finally, grantees also reported recruiting an increasing percentage of paraprofessionals, who typically take longer to complete project requirements. Both the 2006 and 2007 cohorts, however, showed increases in 2010.

Because the Department does not expect participants to become “teachers of record” in the first year of the program, baseline data are not provided for the first year of each cohort. Data for this measure for FY 2011 will be available in December 2011.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Transition to teaching

Measure: The percentage of Transition to Teaching participants receiving certification or licensure within 3 years.

Year	Target					Actual				
	2002 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2009 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2009 Cohort
2007	65	40				50	42	6		
2008	65	48	15			53	44	19	9	
2009		50	40	15			47	31	23	
2010		50	48	40				45	33	17
2011			50	48	18					
2012			50	50	19					

Additional information: Data for FY 2011 for this measure will be available in December 2011.

Measure: The percentage of Transition to Teaching teachers of record who teach in high-need schools in high-need LEAs for 3 years.

Year	Target					Actual				
	2002 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2009 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2009 Cohort
2007	74					75	80			
2008	75					70	76			
2009		77					66			
2010		77						42		
2011			43							
2012			43							

Additional information: This measure is the number of teachers of record who are still teaching after 3 years divided by the total number who began teaching 3 years earlier. Since it usually takes at least a year for a participant to find a teaching position, the baseline year for each cohort is 4 years after the start of the grant. The Department used baseline data to set targets for 2009 and 2010. In 2009, 66 percent of teachers of record in the 2004 cohort of grantees had taught in high-need schools in high-need LEAs for 3 years, falling short of the target. Grantees noted in their annual reports that when the high-need LEAs served by their projects reduced personnel due to budget cuts, the process was driven mainly by seniority; many of the Transition to Teaching participants serving as teachers of record in these districts were let go first because they had the fewest years of experience. Data for FY 2011 for this measure will be available in December 2011.

Efficiency Measures

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Transition to teaching

Measure: The cost per participant who teaches in a high-need school in a high-need LEA for 3 years.										
Year	Target					Actual				
	2002 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2009 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2009 Cohort
2007	\$35,000					\$17,705	\$31,240			
2008	\$30,000	\$21,240				\$14,154	\$19,524			
2009		\$16,240					\$15,287	\$33,317		
2010		\$16,240	\$23,317					\$21,951	\$65,537	
2011			\$18,317	\$55,537						
2012			\$18,317	\$50,537						

Measure: The cost per participant receiving certification or licensure.										
Year	Target					Actual				
	2002 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2009 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2009 Cohort
2007	\$11,500	\$12,000				\$10,959	\$13,943			
2008	\$11,500	\$11,500				\$10,848	\$14,333	\$28,505		
2009		\$11,500	\$23,505				\$13,013	\$19,733	\$42,392	
2010		\$11,500	\$18,505	\$37,392				\$15,032	\$29,631	
2011			\$18,505	\$32,392						
2012			\$18,505	\$32,392						

Additional information: The denominator for these measures is the cumulative amount of money expended for each cohort. Data for FY 2011 for this measure will be available in December 2011.

Other Performance Information

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher quality partnership

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$43,000 ²	0	-\$43,000

¹ The program is proposed for consolidation under new legislation to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

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

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

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

The following three types of Partnership grants are eligible to be funded through the program:

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher quality partnership

Pre-Baccalaureate Preparation of Teachers program (Pre-Baccalaureate) — Grants are provided to implement a wide-range of reforms in teacher preparation programs and, as applicable, preparation programs for early childhood educators. These reforms may include, among other things, implementing curriculum changes that improve, evaluate, and assess how well prospective teachers develop teaching skills; using teaching and learning research so that teachers implement research-based instructional practices and use data to improve classroom instruction; developing a high-quality and sustained pre-service clinical education program that includes high-quality mentoring or coaching; creating a high-quality induction program for new teachers; implementing initiatives that increase compensation for qualified early childhood educators who attain 2-year and 4-year degrees; developing and implementing high-quality professional development for teachers in the partner high-need LEAs; developing effective mechanisms, which may include alternative routes to State certification, to recruit qualified individuals into the teaching profession; and strengthening literacy teaching skills of prospective and new elementary and secondary school teachers.

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

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

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

- Create a school climate conducive to professional development for teachers;
- Understand the teaching and assessment skills needed to support successful classroom instruction;
- Use data to evaluate teacher instruction and drive teacher and student learning,

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher quality partnership

- Manage resources and time to improve academic achievement,
- Engage and involve parents and other community stakeholders, and
- Understand how students learn and develop in order to increase academic achievement.

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

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) provided \$100 million for the TQP program. These funds were available for obligation for 2 fiscal years. The Department awarded these grants in March 2010 and fully funded the out-year continuation costs with the Recovery Act funds.

In 2008, the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA) reauthorized the antecedent program, the Teacher Quality Enhancement program, renamed it the Teacher Quality Partnership program, and extensively redesigned the program. HEOA eliminated the State and Recruitment programs and the Partnership program was restructured as discussed above. The revised authority allows program funds to be used to implement an evaluation plan. In 2010, the Department awarded a contract for an evaluation of teacher residency programs supported through grants awarded in 2009 and 2010.

The HEOA also allows for the State teacher quality accountability reporting system, established by title II, sections 205-207 of the Higher Education Act, to be funded out of the program's appropriation. Previously, the system had been funded out of the Department's salaries and expenses account or through the GPRA Data/HEA Program Evaluation program. The State teacher quality accountability reporting system gathers data from all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the outlying areas, and the Freely Associated States on such topics as the completion rates for traditional and alternative route teacher preparation programs, and State teacher assessments and certifications. These data are reported to Congress and the Nation through the Secretary's annual report on teacher quality, and they provide critical information on both the progress toward the Nation's goal of a highly qualified teacher in every classroom, and the areas where further improvements are needed (<http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/teachprep/index.html>).

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2007	\$59,895 ¹
2008	33,662 ¹
2009	50,000 ²
Recovery Act.....	100,000
2010	43,000
2011 CR.....	43,000

¹ Funds were provided under the antecedent Teacher Quality Enhancement program.

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher quality partnership

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for the Teacher Quality Partnership program for fiscal year 2012. In place of several, sometimes narrowly targeted programs that serve current and prospective teachers and school leaders, the Administration has proposed to create a broader Excellent Instructional Teams initiative through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization. This new initiative would include three new programs that would provide formula grants to States and districts to improve the effectiveness and equitable distribution of teachers and leaders, competitive grants to States and districts to support the development and implementation of innovative teacher and leader policies, and competitive grants to recruit and prepare effective and highly effective teachers and leaders.

This integrated approach would be more effective in supporting State and local efforts to: (1) promote and enhance the teaching profession; (2) recruit, prepare, develop, reward, and retain effective and highly effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders and foster excellent instructional teams, especially in high-need local educational agencies, schools, fields, and subjects; (3) ensure the equitable distribution of effective and highly effective teachers and principals; (4) increase the effectiveness of teachers and principals; (5) improve the preparation of teachers and principals, by developing, supporting, and expanding high-performing pathways to becoming a teacher or principal; (6) strengthen teacher and principal evaluation systems; (7) ensure that teachers have the knowledge, skills, data, support, and collaborative opportunities needed to be effective in the classroom; and (8) improve the management of the education workforce in States and local educational agencies.

Strengthening teacher preparation, including through partnerships between districts and IHEs, will be a key component of the Excellent Instructional Teams initiatives. This emphasis is appropriate, given that, as a result of increasing enrollments and the retirement of many veteran educators, the Nation faces the challenge of preparing and hiring hundreds of thousands of teachers and school leaders in the next few years.

The new Excellent Instructional Teams initiatives, particularly Teacher and Leader Pathways, would allow States and districts to create or fund teacher and leader preparation programs that meet their needs by giving them the authority to spend funds on a variety of activities, including creating or funding efforts to recruit, train, and support teachers of a variety of ages and backgrounds, to teach in high-need schools or high-need subjects. Partnerships of high-need districts, States, and institutions of higher education that are eligible for funding under the Teacher Quality Partnership program would be encouraged to compete for funding under the Teacher and Leader Pathways program, for which \$250 million is requested.

Under the Administration's reauthorization proposal, the fiscal year 2012 continuation costs for Teacher Quality Partnership grants would be funded from the appropriation for the Teacher and Leader Pathways program. The costs of the State teacher quality accountability reporting system, established by title II, sections 205-207 of the Higher Education Act, would be supported by funds set aside for evaluation under the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher quality partnership

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Number of continuation awards	28	28	0
Average continuation award	\$1,487	\$1,470	0
Total continuation award funding	\$41,635 ¹	\$41,165 ²	0
Evaluation	\$1,000	\$1,000	0
State teacher quality accountability reports	\$365	\$550	0
Data quality and grantee evaluation activities		\$285	0

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$58,800 thousand in FY 2012 would be provided from the appropriation for the Teacher and Leader Pathways program. Projected costs of \$550 thousand for data collection for the State teacher quality accountability reports in FY 2012 would be provided from the appropriation for the Effective Teachers State Grants program.

¹ Continuation costs for these grants in 2010 were \$57,000 thousand, which exceeded the amount available, so the awards were reduced proportionately.

² Continuation costs for these grants in 2011 are \$57,000 thousand, which exceeds the amount available under the annualized CR, so the awards would have to be reduced accordingly. Some grantees are expected to carry over 2010 funds in these grants, so final continuation awards will be based on actual carryover amounts.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

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

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

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher quality partnership

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Efficiency Measure

The Department also developed an efficiency measure for this program. The measure is the cost of a successful outcome, where successful outcome is defined as retention in the partner high-need LEA or ECE program 3 years after initial employment. This measure ties in with the program's new performance measures. Data for the efficiency measure will come from the revised annual performance report and will not be available until fiscal year 2013 at the earliest.

Other Performance Information

In 2010, the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) awarded a contract for an evaluation of the Teacher Residency programs to Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. The evaluation will provide both impact and implementation information to address the following research questions:

- How do teachers who complete Teacher Residency programs compare to other novice teachers and to all teachers in their district, using value-added measures of the achievement of their students?
- What is the retention rate of the residency program teachers compared to their novice colleagues who didn't go through a residency program?
- What are the characteristics of the Teacher Residency programs (e.g., length of overall program, nature of required coursework and apprenticeship activities, characteristics of their assigned mentor teacher, criteria for selecting program participants, etc.)?

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher quality partnership

- What are the characteristics of the teacher applicants and participants in the Teacher Residency programs?

The evaluation will follow approximately 300 program participants as they complete their teacher residency year and a subset of these will be followed for 2 years as the teacher of record to look at student achievement and teacher retention rates. Based on the characteristics of the projects supported by grants awarded during the fiscal year 2009 and 2010 competitions, IES will select approximately 8 programs to look at the performance in the classroom and whether residency teachers remain in the teaching profession.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teachers for a competitive tomorrow

(America COMPETES Act of 2007, Title VI, Subtitle A, Part I)

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): \$4,000

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
Baccalaureate STEM and foreign language teacher training (Section 6113)	\$1,092 ²	0	-\$1,092
Master's STEM and foreign language teacher training (Section 6114)	<u>1,092²</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-1,092</u>
Total	2,184 ²	0	-2,184

¹ The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

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 Teachers for a Competitive Tomorrow program is designed to enhance and improve teachers' content knowledge by funding the development of master's and baccalaureate level degree programs that provide integrated courses of study in science, technology, engineering, mathematics (STEM), or critical foreign languages (CFL), and teacher education. The program requires that grantees put particular emphasis on encouraging members of groups that are underrepresented in the teaching of STEM or CFL subjects to participate in the program. In addition, the program gives priority to grantees whose primary focus is on placing participants in high-need local educational agencies. Partnerships are eligible to receive grants for up to 5 years. Partnerships must match 50 percent of the grant amount in cash or in kind.

The program supports two types of activities:

Baccalaureate Degrees in STEM and CFL: The program provides competitive grants to enable partnerships to develop and implement programs that provide courses of study in STEM or CFL subjects that are integrated with teacher education and would lead to a baccalaureate degree in the primary subject matter with a concurrent teacher certification.

Master's Degrees in STEM and CFL: The program provides competitive grants to enable partnerships to develop and implement programs that provide 2- or 3-year part-time master's degree programs in STEM or CFL subject-matter education for teachers in order to enhance the teacher's content knowledge and teaching skills; or programs for professionals in STEM or CFL subjects that lead to a 1-year master's degree in teaching that results in teacher certification.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teachers for a competitive tomorrow

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2007	0 ¹
2008	\$1,966
2009	2,184
2010	2,184
2011 CR	2,184

¹ This program was not authorized prior to fiscal year 2008.

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for the Teachers for a Competitive Tomorrow program for fiscal year 2012. In place of several, sometimes narrowly targeted programs that serve current and prospective teachers and school leaders, the Administration has proposed to create a broader Excellent Instructional Teams initiative through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization. This new initiative would include three new programs that would provide formula grants to States and districts to improve the effectiveness and equitable distribution of teachers and leaders, competitive grants to States and districts to support the development and implementation of innovative teacher and leader policies, and competitive grants to recruit and prepare effective and highly effective teachers and leaders.

This integrated approach would be more effective in supporting State and local efforts to: (1) promote and enhance the teaching profession; (2) recruit, prepare, develop, reward, and retain effective and highly effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders and foster excellent instructional teams, especially in high-need local educational agencies, schools, fields, and subjects; (3) ensure the equitable distribution of effective and highly effective teachers and principals; (4) increase the effectiveness of teachers and principals; (5) improve the preparation of teachers and principals, by developing, supporting, and expanding high-performing pathways to becoming a teacher or principal; (6) strengthen teacher and principal evaluation systems; (7) ensure that teachers have the knowledge, skills, data, support, and collaborative opportunities needed to be effective in the classroom; and (8) improve the management of the education workforce in States and local educational agencies..

The Excellent Instructional Teams initiatives, particularly Teacher and Leader Pathways, would allow States and districts to create or fund teacher and leader preparation programs that meet their needs by giving them the authority to spend funds on a variety of activities, including creating or funding efforts to recruit, train, and support teachers of a variety of ages and backgrounds, to teach in high-need schools or high-need subjects, including STEM and CFL. Institutions of higher education that are eligible for funding under the Teachers for a Competitive Tomorrow program would be encouraged to partner with States and districts to compete for funding under the Teacher and Leader Pathways program, for which \$250 million is requested.

Under the Administration's reauthorization proposal, Teachers for a Competitive Tomorrow fiscal year 2012 continuation grant costs of \$1.199 million would be funded from the appropriation for the new Teachers and Leaders Pathways program.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teachers for a competitive tomorrow

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Baccalaureate Program:			
Number of continuation awards	5	5	0
Average continuation award	\$218	\$218	0
Total continuation award funding	\$1,092	\$1,092	0
Total award funding	\$1,092	\$1,092	0
Total number of awards	5	5	0
Master's Program:			
Number of new awards	1	1	0
Average new award	\$1,001 ¹	\$990	0
Total new award funding	\$1,001 ¹	\$990	0
Number of continuation awards	0	1	0
Average continuation award	0	\$102 ¹	0
Total continuation award funding	0	\$102 ¹	0
Total award funding	\$1,001	\$1,092	0
Total number of awards	1	2	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$4	0	0
Evaluation	\$87	0	0
Total program funding	\$2,184	\$2,184	0
Total number of awards	6	7	0

NOTE: Continuation costs of \$1,199 thousand for the Baccalaureate program in fiscal year 2012 would be provided from the appropriation for the Teacher and Leader Pathways program.

¹Continuation costs for fiscal years 2011 through 2013 for this grant were supported with fiscal year 2010 funds: continuation costs for 2014 will be supported with fiscal year 2011 funds.

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.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teachers for a competitive tomorrow

Annual Measures

Measure: The percent of participants in the Baccalaureate program achieving initial certification/licensure in a science, technology, engineering or mathematics (STEM) or critical foreign language (CFL) area.		
Year	Target	Actual
2010	100	100
2011	100	
2012	100	

Measure: Percent of participants in the Baccalaureate program becoming a teacher of record in a science, technology, engineering or mathematics (STEM) or critical foreign language (CFL) area in a high need school.		
Year	Target	Actual
2010	20	13
2011	20	
2012	20	

Measure: Percent of participants in the Baccalaureate program who remain teaching in a science, technology, engineering or mathematics (STEM) or critical foreign language (CFL) area in a high need school for 3 or more years		
Year	Target	Actual
2010	48	100
2011	50	
2012	50	

Additional information: These data are collected through annual performance reports from grantees and provide information on the program participants who have completed the baccalaureate teacher preparation program. Data for the first measure are based on reports from four of the five grantees in the 2008 cohort and represent all 24 participants served by these grantees who have completed their teacher preparation program. For the second measure, only three grantees reported on 23 participants, and data for the third measure are based on reports from a single grantee and are based on only 8 program participants. Due to both incomplete reporting and the small number of participants served by these grantees who have completed their teacher preparation programs to date, these data cannot be used for a meaningful assessment of the program. The evaluation contract described below should yield some information that can inform the Administration's efforts to enhance the supply and quality of teachers of mathematics, science, and critical foreign languages.

Measure: The percent of participants in the Master's program achieving initial certification/licensure in a science, technology, engineering or mathematics (STEM) or critical foreign language (CFL) area.		
Year	Target	Actual
2010	100	24
2011	100	
2012	100	

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teachers for a competitive tomorrow

Measure: Percent of participants in the Master's program becoming a teacher of record in a science, technology, engineering or mathematics (STEM) or critical foreign language (CFL) area in a high need school.

Year	Target	Actual
2010	100	72
2011	100	
2012	100	

Measure: Percent of participants in the Master's program who remain teaching in a science, technology, engineering or mathematics (STEM) or critical foreign language (CFL) area in a high need school for 3 or more years

Year	Target	Actual
2010	100	50
2011	100	
2012	100	

Additional information: These data are collected through annual performance reports from two grantees. Due to both incomplete reporting and unexplained discrepancies in the number of participants grantees reported for the different measures, these data cannot be used for a meaningful assessment of either the performance of individual grantees or of the program as a whole. The evaluation contract described below should yield some information that can inform the Administration's efforts to enhance the supply and quality of teachers of mathematics, science, and critical foreign languages.

Efficiency Measures

The efficiency measure for this program is the cost of a successful outcome, where success is defined as a program participant who remains in teaching in the STEM or CFL area in a high need school for 3 or more years. This is a new measure linked to the program's other performance measures. Due to incomplete reporting and discrepancies in the data that were reported, the Department is unable to calculate this measure at this time.

Evaluation

In fiscal year 2010, the Department awarded a contract for an assessment and analysis of performance data submitted by grantees under the Teachers for a Competitive Tomorrow program. The contract will address the following evaluation questions:

- Are the data upon which the performance of the Teachers for a Competitive Tomorrow programs is measured of high quality and are the methods used to aggregate and report these data sound?
- What do the grantee-provided data suggest about the performance of the Teachers for a Competitive Tomorrow programs? Specifically, the contract will analyze grantee performance data to determine:
 - Who participates in the programs;
 - What activities are supported with grant funds; and

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teachers for a competitive tomorrow

- Whether the programs produce improvements in key outcomes, such as whether participants become certified teachers, are placed in high-need schools, and teach high-level mathematics, science, or critical foreign language courses; the retention rates for these teachers; and the number of students taking courses in high-level mathematics, science, or critical foreign languages in districts that partner with grantees.

The Department expects to receive the final report analyzing grantee performance data by the end of fiscal year 2011.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teach for America

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$18,000 ²	0	-\$18,000

¹ The program is proposed for consolidation under new legislation to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

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

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teach for America

educational agencies and principals with teachers placed in their districts and schools through this grant.

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

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2007	0 ¹
2008	0 ²
2009	0 ³
2010	\$18,000
2011 CR	18,000

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

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

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

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for Teach For America for fiscal year 2012. In place of several, sometimes narrowly targeted programs that serve current and prospective teachers and school leaders, the Administration has proposed to create a broader Excellent Instructional Teams initiative through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization. This set

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teach for America

of three new programs would provide formula grants to States and districts to improve the effectiveness and equitable distribution of teachers and leaders, competitive grants to States and districts to support the development and implementation of innovative teacher and leader policies, and competitive grants to recruit and prepare effective and highly effective teachers and leaders.

This integrated approach would be more effective in supporting State and local efforts to: (1) promote and enhance the teaching profession; (2) recruit, prepare, develop, reward, and retain effective and highly effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders and foster excellent instructional teams, especially in high-need local educational agencies, schools, fields, and subjects; (3) ensure the equitable distribution of effective and highly effective teachers and principals; (4) increase the effectiveness of teachers and principals; (5) improve the preparation of teachers and principals, by developing, supporting, and expanding high-performing pathways to becoming a teacher or principal; (6) strengthen teacher and principal evaluation systems; (7) ensure that teachers have the knowledge, skills, data, support, and collaborative opportunities needed to be effective in the classroom; and (8) improve the management of the education workforce in States and local educational agencies.

The Teacher and Leader Pathways program, in particular, would allow States, districts, institutions of higher education, and nonprofit entities to create or fund teacher and leader preparation programs that meet their needs by giving them the authority to spend funds on a variety of activities, including creating or funding efforts to recruit, train, and support teachers of a variety of ages and backgrounds, to teach in high-need schools or high-need subjects. Teach For America could compete for funding under the Teacher and Leader Pathways program, for which \$250 million is requested. In addition, Teach For America could compete for funding under the Investing in Innovation program, through which it received \$50 million in fiscal year 2010 for a 5-year project, and could partner with States or districts in their applications for funds under the Race to the Top program. States and districts may also use funds awarded under the Effective Teachers and Leaders State grants program to support Teach For America projects.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Teach For America corps members supported	857 ¹	857 ¹	0

¹ Estimate of the number of corps members supported with grant funds awarded under this program based on the average cost of \$21,011 per corps member in FY 2010.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance measures have not yet been established for this program. The authorizing statute requires Teach For America to report annually on the number and quality of the teachers it places in local educational agencies through a grant under this program. Teach For America is

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teach for America

also required to report annually on the results of an externally conducted analysis of the satisfaction of local educational agencies and principals with the teachers it places and provide comprehensive data on the background of its corps members, the pre-service training they receive, the sites in which they are placed, the professional development they receive in their placements, and their retention. The Department does not expect to receive data in response to these annual reporting requirements until the end of the first performance period for the grant that was awarded at the end of fiscal year 2010.

In the past several years, various studies have examined whether Teach For America efforts to expand the pool of qualified candidates for teaching positions in schools serving students from low-income communities has achieved its goal of redressing educational inequities and ensuring that disadvantaged students have teachers committed to helping them succeed at high levels, as measured by student achievement on academic assessments. The majority of non-Teach For America teachers are prepared through traditional programs within colleges of education, which include more coursework on pedagogical approaches to improve student learning and require supervised practical experience teaching in a classroom setting. The key research question is whether the Teach For America approach of selecting college seniors and recent graduates with exceptional academic credentials, who then undergo intensive training in a summer institute, can produce teachers who are as effective as teachers prepared through other routes.

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

The Department is currently conducting an evaluation of the impact of teachers selected through two highly selective alternative certification programs, Teach For America and The New Teacher Project, on the achievement of students in secondary school mathematics courses. The study randomly assigned students to either a teacher who entered through a highly selective route to alternative certification or another teacher who teaches the same math course at the same school. The sample of teachers who entered through highly selective alternative routes is equally divided between teachers selected through the Teach For America and The

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teach for America

New Teacher Project programs. The study involves approximately 112 schools in up to 20 school districts, with a focus on 300 secondary school math teachers and their approximately 18,000 students and involves roughly equal samples of middle school and high school teachers. The research questions examined by this study include:

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

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

School leadership

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$29,220 ²	0	-\$29,220

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

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

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$14,731
2008	14,474
2009	19,220
2010	29,220
2011 CR	29,220

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for School Leadership for fiscal year 2012. In place of several, sometimes narrowly targeted programs that serve current and prospective teachers

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

School leadership

and school leaders, the Administration has proposed to create a broader Excellent Instructional Teams initiative through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization. This new initiative would include three new programs that would provide formula grants to States and districts to improve the effectiveness and equitable distribution of teachers and leaders, competitive grants to States and districts to support the development and implementation of innovative teacher and leader policies, and competitive grants to recruit and prepare effective and highly effective teachers and leaders.

This integrated approach would be more effective in supporting State and local efforts to: (1) promote and enhance the teaching profession; (2) recruit, prepare, develop, reward, and retain effective and highly effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders and foster excellent instructional teams, especially in high-need local educational agencies, schools, fields, and subjects; (3) ensure the equitable distribution of effective and highly effective teachers and principals; (4) increase the effectiveness of teachers and principals; (5) improve the preparation of teachers and principals, by developing, supporting, and expanding high-performing pathways to becoming a teacher or principal; (6) strengthen teacher and principal evaluation systems; (7) ensure that teachers have the knowledge, skills, data, support, and collaborative opportunities needed to be effective in the classroom; and (8) improve the management of the education workforce in States and local educational agencies.

Recognizing the importance of leadership in educational improvement, the Transformational Leaders program, one component of the Excellent Instructional Teams initiative, would significantly increase support for strengthening school leadership and would support the recruitment, preparation, and retention of effective principals and school leadership teams with the skills to turn around low-performing schools. Competitive grants made under this program would help prepare principals and school leadership teams to improve student achievement in low-performing schools, and help recruit and train local educational agency (LEA) and State educational agency (SEA) managers who are able to lead transformational change in their States and LEAs.

In addition, the Administration has placed a new emphasis on school leaders across its budget request to match similar priorities in the ESEA reauthorization proposal. Training for current and prospective school leaders will be a key component of these initiatives because of the importance of school leadership in education reform and innovation and, particularly, in turning around low-performing schools. Each State would use a portion of its Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grant for activities to improve the quality of the State's school leadership, particularly in high-need and low-performing schools. In addition, the Department would make competitive Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund grants to support innovative strategies undertaken by States and LEAs to raise the quality of teaching and school leadership, including by empowering principals in high-need schools with greater authority to select effective instructional teams for their schools.

Under the Administration's reauthorization proposal, School Leadership continuation grant costs of approximately \$30.7 million in fiscal year 2012 would be funded from the \$250 million appropriation for the new Teacher and Leader Pathways programs.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

School leadership

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Funding for new awards	\$9,198 ¹	0	0
Number of new awards	14	0	0
Average new award	\$657	0	0
Funding for continuation awards	\$23,842	\$29,220	0
Number of continuation awards	29	43	0
Average continuation award	\$822	\$680	0
Evaluation	\$105	0	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$75	0	0

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$30,745 thousand in fiscal year 2012 would be provided from the appropriation for the Teacher and Leader Pathways programs.

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

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

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

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

School leadership

Measure: The percentage of participants who become certified as principals and assistant principals.						
Year	Target			Actual		
	2005 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2009 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2009 Cohort
2007	50			65		
2008	60					
2009						
2010						
2011						
2012						

Measure: The percentage of program completers earning certification as a principal or assistant principal who are employed in those positions in high-need schools in high-need local educational agencies (LEAs).						
Year	Target			Actual		
	2005 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2009 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2008 Cohort	2009 Cohort
2007	50			54		
2008	60					
2009						
2010						
2011						
2012						

Additional information: These measures track participants who are enrolled in projects designed to train and certify new principals and assistant principals. Grantees report data through annual performance reports. The Department will use 2008 data, which will be available in spring 2011, to set a baseline and targets for the third cohort of grantees.

The Department established the following two new performance measures as part of the 2008 grant competition for assessing the effectiveness of the School Leadership program: (1) the percentage of principals and assistant principals from schools in high-need LEAs who participated in the School Leadership Program-funded professional development activities and showed an increase in their pre-post scores on a standardized measure of principal skills; and (2) the percentage of principals and assistant principals from schools in high-need LEAs who participated in the School Leadership Program-funded professional development activities and remained in their administrative position for at least 2 years. The Department will use 2008 data, which will be available in spring 2011, to set a baseline and targets for the 2008 and 2009 cohorts.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Expanding educational options

(Proposed legislation)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
Supporting Effective Charter Schools Grants	0	\$316,313	+\$316,313
Promoting Public School Choice Grants	0	37,087	+37,087
National Activities	0	18,600	+18,600
	0	372,000	+372,000
Magnet Schools Assistance program ¹	\$100,000 ²	110,000	+10,000

¹ The Magnet Schools Assistance program is one of three separate components under the proposed Expanding Educational Options initiative. However, the amounts on this table for the Magnet Schools Assistance program are included for informational purposes only, and a separate justification is provided for the Magnet Schools Assistance program.

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

The Administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization proposal includes three components programs within the Expanding Educational Options initiative:

(1) Supporting Effective Charter Schools Grants; (2) Promoting Public School Choice Grants, and (3) the Magnet Schools Assistance program. The Secretary would also be authorized to use program funds to continue grants made prior to reauthorization for programs that would be consolidated as part of the reauthorization and to reserve up to 5 percent of the appropriation for national research, data collection, technical assistance to grantees, activities to improve the quality of charter school authorizers, and activities that help families identify and access high-quality educational options.

The Department would, under Supporting Effective Charter Schools Grants, make competitive grants to State educational agencies (SEAs), charter school authorizers, charter management

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Expanding educational options

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

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

Under the Magnet Schools Assistance program, LEAs implementing a court-ordered or federally approved voluntary desegregation plan would be eligible for funding to support high-quality magnet schools, with an emphasis on raising student academic achievement and reducing minority group isolation. The request for the Magnet Schools Assistance program is discussed in a separate justification.

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2012, the Administration requests \$372 million for the proposed Expanding Educational Options initiative. This new initiative would build on existing programs that expand

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Expanding educational options

educational options by focusing on improving educational outcomes for students and providing real, high-quality educational choice to students and parents by funding effective charter and other effective autonomous public schools; providing resources to States and districts in implementing comprehensive systems of choice that improve public school options for students; supporting magnet schools that increase diversity and promote student learning (for which funding is included under a separate activity narrative); and supporting the development and implementation of parent information and outreach programs.

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

The Department would allocate the \$372 million requested for the first year of this initiative in the following manner:

- \$316.3 million for Supporting Effective Charter Schools Grants, which would provide support for SEAs, charter school authorizers, CMOs, LEAs and nonprofit organizations to start or expand effective charter schools and other effective autonomous public schools. Of the \$316.3 million, approximately \$77.3 million would support new grant awards and \$239 million would support continuation awards for projects originally funded under the following programs: Charter Schools (including State Facilities Incentive Grants and Charter School National Leadership Grants) and Smaller Learning Communities;
- \$37.1 million for Promoting Public School Choice Grants, which would support State and district efforts to develop and implement comprehensive public school choice programs. Of the \$37.1 million, approximately \$23.9 million would support new grant awards and \$13.2 million would support continuation awards for projects originally funded under the Smaller Learning Communities program; and
- \$18.6 million for national activities, which would support research, data collection, technical assistance to grantees, activities to improve the quality of charter school authorizers, and dissemination and outreach activities.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

2012

Supporting Effective Charter Schools Grants

Amount for new grants	\$77,200
Peer review of new award applications	\$150

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Expanding educational options

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) – continued

	<u>2012</u>
<u>Promoting Public School Choice Grants</u>	
Amount for new grants	\$23,817
Peer review of new award applications	\$50
National activities	\$18,600

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$238,963 thousand in fiscal year 2012 would be provided under Supporting Effective Charter School Grants to fund continuation awards (through their scheduled completion) for grants made under the following programs prior to enactment of the reauthorization: Charter Schools (\$169,405 thousand), Charter Management Organization Grants (\$39,238 thousand), State Charter School Facilities Incentive Grants (\$14,000 thousand), Charter School National Leadership Grants (\$3,101 thousand), and Smaller Learning Communities (\$13,219 thousand).

Continuation costs of approximately \$13,220 thousand in fiscal year 2012 would be provided under Promoting Public School Choice Grants to fund continuation awards (through their scheduled completion) for grants made under the Smaller Learning Communities program.

The amount available for national activities would be 5 percent of the fiscal year 2012 budget request for the Expanding Educational Options Initiative (approximately \$18,600 thousand).

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Program performance would be assessed through annual grantee reporting on indicators established by the Secretary, such as the number of new charter and autonomous public schools opened, created, or expanded with program funds, student achievement, student academic growth, graduation rates, and the number of students enrolled in high-quality educational options.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Charter schools grants

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$256,031 ^{2,3}	0	-\$256,031

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

² From the amount provided for charter schools in FY 2010, the appropriations language permitted the Secretary to use up to \$23,082 thousand for Charter Schools Facilities Incentive Grants and Credit Enhancement for Charter Schools Facilities and up to \$50,000 thousand to make awards to charter management organizations and other nonprofit entities for replication and expansion of successful charter school models. This authority is continued by the FY 2011 CR.

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

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

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

Under the authorizing statute, the Secretary must use the amount appropriated above \$200 million, but not exceeding \$300 million, to make competitive 5-year grants for the State Facilities program. States eligible for these grants are those with per-pupil aid programs to assist charter schools with their school facility costs. Federal funds are used to match State-funded programs that make payments to provide charter schools with facilities financing. States

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Charter schools grants

pay an increasing share of the cost of the program. Of funds appropriated in excess of \$300 million, 50 percent must be used for the State Charter School Facilities Incentive Grant program and 50 percent for the other authorized activities. In fiscal year 2010, the appropriations act revised these allocation rules to permit the Secretary to use up to \$23.082 million for the State Facilities and Credit Enhancement for Charter Schools Facilities programs and up to \$50 million to make multiple awards to charter management organizations (CMOs) and other nonprofit entities for the replication and expansion of successful charter school models. (The appropriations acts in other recent years have also overridden the allocation rules in the authorizing statute.) The 2010 appropriations language also allowed the Secretary to reserve \$10 million to fund technical assistance, evaluation, research, and dissemination of information on charter schools and model programs, overriding the \$8 million national activities cap in the authorizing statute. The provisions in the 2010 appropriations language are continued under the fiscal year 2011 CR.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2007	\$214,783 ¹
2008	211,031
2009	216,031
2010	256,031
2011 CR	256,031

¹ This amount does not include funding for Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities, which was funded separately in 2007.

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Charter Schools program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that seek to expand educational options for students and families, the Administration has proposed to create a broader initiative, Expanding Educational Options, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization. This new initiative would address the need to increase the supply of high-quality public educational options available to students, especially students attending low-performing schools, by creating and expanding effective charter and other autonomous public schools, by implementing comprehensive systems of public school choice, by supporting magnet schools that improve student achievement and promote diversity, and by strengthening parent information and outreach efforts across these programs.

The Expanding Educational Options initiative would consist of three separate authorizations: (1) Supporting Effective Charter Schools grants; (2) Promoting Public School Choice grants; and (3) the Magnet Schools Assistance program. Under the Supporting Effective Charter Schools grants program, the Department would make competitive grants to SEAs, charter school authorizers, CMOs, local educational agencies (LEAs), and other nonprofit organizations to start or expand effective charter and other autonomous public schools. Funds would also be available for competitive grants for charter schools facilities programs. Under the Promoting Public School Choice grants program, the Department would make competitive grants to LEAs,

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Charter schools grants

individually or in a consortium, and to SEAs in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs, to develop and implement a comprehensive choice program that increases the range of high-quality educational options available to students and improves the academic achievement of students attending low-performing schools. Under the Magnet Schools Assistance program, the Department would make competitive grants to LEAs implementing a court-ordered or federally approved desegregation plan for the support of high-quality magnet schools, with an emphasis on raising student academic achievement and reducing minority group isolation.

The creation and expansion of charter schools will remain a key element of the Administration's strategy to promote successful models of school reform. Recipients of funds under the current Charter Schools program and other applicants would be eligible to apply for funds under the new Supporting Effective Charter Schools grants program to start or expand high-quality charter and other autonomous public schools. The Department would work to ensure the creation of quality schools by selecting applicants based on their record of success in supporting, overseeing, or operating (depending on the type of grantee) effective charter and other autonomous public schools, including their record of closing ineffective charter and other autonomous schools, as appropriate, and their commitment to starting schools that would expand options for students attending low-performing schools. In addition, the Department would give priority to applicants proposing to create or expand charter schools, and to applicants proposing to create expand schools that serve significant numbers of students from families with incomes below the poverty line. Funds also would be available for competitive grants for charter schools facilities programs. In addition, the Supporting Effective Charter Schools grants program would help strengthen and expand parental outreach by requiring grantees to develop and implement strategies to inform parents and students about the availability and accessibility of high-quality educational options.

The fiscal year 2012 request for the Expanding Educational Options initiative would include approximately \$225.7 million to pay continuation costs for Charter Schools grants made in previous years.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
<u>Charter Schools Grants</u>			
Amount for new awards	\$139,250	\$53,817	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$33,618	\$119,764	0
Number of schools supported	1,400-1,600	1,400-1,600	0
<u>Charter Management Organization Grants</u>			
Amount for new awards	\$50,000	\$50,000	0
<u>Facilities Incentive Grants</u>			
Amount for continuation awards	\$14,782	\$14,000	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$81	\$150	0

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Charter schools grants

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) – continued

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
National activities, including evaluation	\$10,000	\$10,000	0

NOTES: Continuation costs of \$225,744 thousand in FY 2012, including \$169,405 thousand for Charter Schools Grants, \$39,238 for the Charter Management Organization grants, and \$14,000 thousand for Facilities Incentive Grants programs and \$3,101 thousand for National Leadership Grants, would be provided from the appropriation for the Expanding Educational Options program.

The amounts shown on this table do not include \$8,300 thousand in FYs 2010 and 2011 for the Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program, which are shown in the program output measures for that activity.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

Goal: To support the creation of a large number of high-quality charter schools.

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

Measure: The number of States that have charter school legislation (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico).		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	44	41
2008	44	41
2009	44	41
2010	44	
2011	44	
2012	44	

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Charter schools grants

Measure: The number of charter schools in operation around the Nation.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	3,900	4,155
2008	4,290	4,376
2009	4,720	4,700
2010	5,191	
2011	5,710	
2012	6180	

Additional information: While States have taken actions to lift their charter school caps and strengthen charter school accountability, the number of States that authorize charter schools has plateaued in recent years. The remaining States without charter school laws are mainly rural (e.g., South Dakota, Vermont, and West Virginia). Meanwhile, the number of charter schools opening each of the past 3 years has continued to increase steadily, but was slightly below the Department's performance target in 2009. Data are supplied annually by State educational agencies and are verified by Department staff.

Measure: The percentage of fourth-grade charter school students who are achieving at or above proficient on State assessments in reading.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		64.1
2008	69.2	69.1
2009	74.4	71.1
2010	79.5	
2011	84.6	
2012	89.7	

Measure: The percentage of fourth-grade students in charter schools who are achieving at or above proficient on State assessments in mathematics.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		61.5
2008	67	68.1
2009	72.5	70.1
2010	78	
2011	83.5	
2012	89	

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Charter schools grants

Measure: The percentage of eighth-grade charter school students who are achieving at or above proficient on State assessments in reading.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		64.6
2008	69.7	67.8
2009	74.7	70.8
2010	79.8	
2011	84.8	
2012	89.9	

Measure: The percentage of eighth-grade students in charter schools who are achieving at or above proficient on State assessments in mathematics		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		51.1
2008	58.1	56.6
2009	65.1	62.3
2010	72.1	
2011	79.1	
2012	86.0	

Additional information: These data, collected through annual grantee reports, show sizeable increases in the percentage of fourth- and eighth-grade students who achieved at or above proficient on State assessments in reading and mathematics between baseline (school year 2006-2007) and 2008-2009. However, the proficiency rates have not met the established performance targets, which are based on the ESEA, Title I statutory goal of ensuring that all students are proficient in reading and mathematics by 2014. Analysis of these data has found that there was notable variation in performance among the schools funded. The 2010 data, reflecting the 2009-2010 school year, are expected to be available this spring.

Efficiency Measures

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Charter schools grants

Measure: The ratio of funds leveraged by States for charter facilities to funds awarded by the Department under the State Charter School Facilities Incentive Grant Program.				
Year	Cohort 1		Cohort 2	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
2007	3.1	5.8		
2008	7.0	44.8		
2010			2.91	
2011			4.22	
2012			5.79	

Additional information: In 2007 and 2008, the program far exceeded its performance targets, as shown in the chart above. In 2008, the fifth year of the grant, the leveraging ratio increased to 44.8, exceeding the Department’s performance target more than six-fold. The Department reconfirmed the data provided by the four State grantees and determined that the figures were accurate and that the high ratio was due to one grantee achieving an exceptionally high leveraging ratio of 50.5 to 1. The targets, beginning in 2010, reflect a new performance cycle for the second cohort of grants and may need to be adjusted once baseline data are received. The Department expects to have baseline data available later this spring.

The Department has also developed a second outcome-based efficiency measure to capture the cost efficiency, across States, of the Federal investment in supporting charter school start-ups. The measure is defined as the Federal cost per student of launching a successful school (defined as a school in operation for 3 or more years). Data for school year 2006-2007 show an average cost of \$866 per student; school year 2007-2008 an average cost of \$768 per student; and school year 2008-2009 an average cost of \$904 per student. Efficiency data, collected through annual grantee performance reports, will assist the Department in determining what constitutes a reasonable cost per student based on different program types and grade levels.

Other Performance Information

A number of studies of charter schools’ effectiveness have shown mixed results, but together suggest that charter schools with more experience provide added value when compared to conventional public schools, and that charter schools serving at-risk students can be effective in improving academic achievement.

In 2010, the Department released findings from its first evaluation of charter school impacts. The study addressed the following research issues: the impact of charter school strategies on student achievement, school success, and satisfaction; the impact on parent satisfaction; school factors or characteristics independent of, or associated with, charter schools, that affect student outcomes (e.g., school or class size, proportion of certified teachers); and the extent to which the degree of autonomy or the policy environment in which the schools operate influence their effectiveness. Approximately 36 charter middle schools across 15 States participated in this random assignment study. The researchers followed two treatment groups of students and a control group for two consecutive grade levels and also surveyed students, parents, and principals. The analysis also examined how the policy conditions contribute to student achievement.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Charter schools grants

The evaluation showed that the impact of charter middle schools on student achievement varied widely across the participating charter schools, with schools serving more low-income or low-achieving students showing statistically significant positive effects in math and no significant effects in reading, but schools serving more advantaged students showing significant negative effects in both math and reading. The effects were statistically significant on reading scores in only 4 of the schools and on mathematics scores in only 10. The evaluation also examined whether achievement impacts were associated with certain school characteristics and found some impacts for charter schools with longer versus shorter hours of operation or higher versus lower revenue per student, but these findings were not statistically significant once the researchers controlled for particular school and student characteristics. Lastly, the evaluation found no significant relationship between charter school policies and student achievement.

Achievement in Charter Schools and Regular Public Schools in the United States: Understanding the Differences, a national study released in 2004 by Harvard University, showed that students in charter schools outperformed their peers in traditional public schools on State reading and math assessments. Students in charter schools were 5.2 percent more likely to be proficient in reading and 3.2 percent more likely to be proficient in math than students in matched public schools. The study also found that the longer a charter school had been in operation, the better students in that charter school performed in comparison to students in traditional public schools.

A 2009 study, *Multiple Choice: Charter School Performance in 16 States*, by researchers at Stanford University's Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO), examined longitudinal student-level data from a sample of 2,403 charter schools across 15 States and the District of Columbia to determine whether students who attend charter schools performed better academically than if they had attended a traditional public school. The researchers found that students in approximately 83 percent of the 2,403 charter schools in their sample performed either the same or worse than students in traditional public schools on mathematics tests. More specifically, 17 percent of charter schools in the sample demonstrated significant growth in mathematics compared to traditional public schools in the sample. Forty-six percent of charter schools produced math gains that were indistinguishable from the average growth among traditional public schools. The remaining 37 percent of charter schools in the sample posted gains that were significantly below what those students would have seen if enrolled in a traditional public school instead. The researchers also performed a State-by-State analysis of charter school results and found that the effectiveness of charter schools varies widely by State and depends greatly on each State's charter school law and policies, including whether a State has imposed caps and allowed for multiple authorizers.

Further, the national analysis showed that, in general, charter schools have had different effects on students of different family backgrounds. For students from low-income families or English learners, charter schools had a larger, more positive effect academically compared to similar students in traditional public schools. The researchers also found that students perform better in charter schools over time, with first-year charter students on average experiencing some decline in learning, but in the second and third years these same students experience positive academic gains.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Charter schools grants

Other recent studies have used a more rigorous experimental research design to compare the performance of students who were admitted by lottery into oversubscribed charter schools and those who were not admitted and instead attended traditional public schools. Hoxby, Murarka, and Kang (2009), in a report for the New York City (NYC) Charter School Evaluation Project, found a positive achievement effect for students attending the city's charter schools. By the third grade, the average NYC charter school student scored 5.3 scale score points above his or her peers in traditional public schools in English language arts and 5.8 scale score points above his or her peers in traditional public schools in mathematics. In grades four through eight, the average charter school student gained 3.6 more scale score points in English language arts and 5.0 more scale score points in mathematics than peers in traditional public schools each year. Hoxby and colleagues noted that on average students who attended a charter school for grades kindergarten through eight would score about 23 scale score points higher in English language arts and 30 scale score points higher in mathematics compared to their peers in traditional public schools, closing about 66 and 86 percent of the achievement gap in those subject areas, respectively. These improvements were in addition to typical developmental gains that the students would have been expected to make in the traditional public school, had they not been awarded a seat through the lottery. The evaluation also included demographic information and found that students applying to New York City's charter schools were more likely to be African American (63 percent versus 34 percent) and eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (92 percent versus 72 percent) than students in the traditional public schools in the district. The researchers also examined charter school policies in relation to achievement and found that effects on achievement were associated with the length of the school year; the number of minutes devoted to English language arts during the school day; whether teacher compensation was based on performance; and whether a school's mission statement emphasized academic performance.

In light of the changing charter school landscape and recent research findings, the Department, in 2009, initiated a new evaluation of the Charter Schools Program. This 5-year research effort will examine the conditions and characteristics of charter schools; document the contributions and impact of the Federal role in creating and supporting high-quality charter schools; examine the academic achievement of charter school students; and assess factors and conditions at the State, local, and school levels that lead to successful charter schools. The Department expects the first evaluation product to be available this summer.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Credit enhancement for charter school facilities

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$8,300 ^{2,3}	0	-\$8,300

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2004. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2012 under new legislation.

² From the amount provided for Charter Schools in FY 2010, the appropriations language permitted the Secretary to use up to \$23,082 thousand for Charter School Facilities Incentive Grants and Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities. This authority is continued by the FY 2011 CR.

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

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Credit enhancement for charter school facilities

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$36,611
2008	8,300 ¹
2009	8,300 ¹
2010	8,300 ¹
2011 CR	8,300 ¹

¹ The Department used \$8,300 thousand from the FY 2008, FY 2009, and FY 2010 appropriations and would use the same amount from the FY 2011 CR Charter Schools appropriation for Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities.

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that seek to expand educational options for students and families, the Administration has proposed to create a broader initiative, Expanding Educational Options, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization. This new initiative would address the need to increase the supply of high-quality public educational options available to students, especially students attending low-performing schools, by creating and expanding effective charter and other autonomous schools, by implementing comprehensive systems of public school choice, by supporting magnet schools that improve student achievement and promote diversity, and by strengthening parent information and outreach efforts across these programs.

The Expanding Educational Options initiative would consist of three separate authorizations: (1) Supporting Effective Charter Schools grants; (2) Promoting Public School Choice grants; and (3) the Magnet Schools Assistance program. Under the Supporting Effective Charter Schools grants program, the Department would make competitive grants to State educational agencies (SEAs), charter school authorizers, charter management organizations (CMOs), local educational agencies (LEAs), and other nonprofit organizations to start or expand effective charter and other autonomous schools. Funds would also be available for competitive grants for charter schools facilities programs. Under the Promoting Public School Choice grants program, the Department would make competitive grants to LEAs, individually or in a consortium, and to SEAs in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs, to develop and implement a comprehensive choice program that increases the range of high-quality educational options available to students and improves the academic achievement of students attending low-performing schools. Under the Magnet Schools Assistance program, the Department would make competitive grants to LEAs implementing a court-ordered or federally approved desegregation plan for the support of high-quality magnet schools, with an emphasis on raising student academic achievement and reducing minority group isolation.

The Administration recognizes the importance of and need for continued support for charter school facilities and the struggles inherent in their financing. While charter schools receive

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Credit enhancement for charter school facilities

public funding for operations, they often must find and finance their own facilities and have had difficulty obtaining funds on a basis equal to traditional LEAs and public schools. Charter schools have persistently received mediocre credit ratings, which has made capital financing challenging. In a March 2006 article, *U.S. Charter School Ratings Continue to Grow as the Market Broadens*, Standard & Poor's indicated that 74 percent of charter school bonds held were at or below the lowest investment grade rating. The Expanding Educational Options initiative would include, among its authorized activities, grants to State educational agencies, local educational agencies, community development financial institutions, and State financing authorities to improve access to facilities and facilities financing for high-performing charter schools, including credit enhancement strategies.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Amount of new awards	\$8,300	\$8,263	0
New awards	1	1	0
Peer review of new award applications	0 ¹	37	0
Estimated amount of charter school facilities funds leveraged over the life of the grant	\$95,450 ²	\$95,450 ²	0
Estimated number of charter schools served over the life of the grant	10-20	10-20	0

¹The Department funded the next highest-scoring applicant from the FY 2009 slate.

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

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

Goal: To increase the number of charter school facilities acquired, constructed, or renovated.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Credit enhancement for charter school facilities

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

Measure: The amount of funding Credit Enhancement program grantees leverage for the acquisition, construction, or renovation of charter school facilities (in millions of dollars).		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	\$120	\$343
2008	140	520
2009	200	538
2010	200	
2011	200	
2012	200	

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

Measure: The number of charter schools served through the Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities Program.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	40	64
2008	50	82
2009	60	92
2010	60	
2011	60	
2012	60	

Additional information: Data for the program show a continuing trend of increasing amounts leveraged and an increasing number of charter schools served. For FY 2007, new and continuing grantees leveraged \$343 million for 64 schools. In FY 2009, this amount had increased to \$538 million and 92 schools. The program has exceeded its targets for both measures in each of the last 3 years. The Department plans to update the targets for these measures in 2011. Data for 2010 will be available in spring 2011. Targets for FY 2012 are included because, while this program does not make multi-year awards (and, thus, will have no continuations in FY 2012), the grant activities are implemented over a number of years and existing grantees will continue to report on these measures.

Other Performance Information

The Department has tracked the level of defaults on loans facilitated. As of 2010, only 15 cents of every \$100 of grant funds had been lost to default over the life of the program. When leveraged funds are taken into account, this comes to less than 2 cents for every \$100 of the total amount supported through the program.

The Department completed an evaluation of the program in 2008. The evaluation addressed three primary research questions: (1) Is the program achieving its legislative purpose?; (2) Does the program provide for improved access to capital markets for facilities and for better

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Credit enhancement for charter school facilities

rates and terms on financing than would be otherwise available to charter schools?; and (3) Do certain models of credit enhancement provide for more favorable outcomes than others?

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Voluntary public school choice

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$25,819 ²	0	-\$25,819

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

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Voluntary public school choice

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2007	\$26,278
2008	25,819
2009	25,819
2010	25,819
2011	25,819

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Voluntary Public School Choice program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that seek to expand educational options for students and families, the Administration has proposed to create a broader initiative, Expanding Educational Options, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization. This new initiative would address the need to increase the supply of high-quality public educational options available to students, especially students attending low-performing schools, by creating and expanding effective charter and other autonomous schools, by implementing comprehensive systems of public school choice, by supporting magnet schools that improve student achievement and promote diversity, and by strengthening parent information and outreach efforts across these programs.

The Expanding Educational Options initiative would consist of three separate authorizations: (1) Supporting Effective Charter Schools grants; (2) Promoting Public School Choice grants; and (3) the Magnet Schools Assistance program. Under the Supporting Effective Charter Schools grants program, the Department would make competitive grants to SEAs, charter school authorizers, charter management organizations (CMOs), LEAs, and other nonprofit organizations to start or expand effective charter and other autonomous schools. Funds would also be available for competitive grants for charter schools facilities programs. Under the Promoting Public School Choice grants program, the Department would make competitive grants to LEAs, individually or in a consortium, and to SEAs in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs, to develop and implement a comprehensive choice program that increases the range of high-quality educational options available to students and improves the academic achievement of students attending low-performing schools. Under the Magnet Schools Assistance program, the Department would make competitive grants to LEAs implementing a court-ordered or federally approved desegregation plan for the support of high-quality magnet schools, with an emphasis on raising student academic achievement and reducing minority group isolation.

The Administration is committed to providing students and families with high-quality educational options and empowering them with information about the options available to them. Grantees under the current VPSC program would be eligible to apply for funds under the new Promoting Public School Choice grants program. This new program would support the development, implementation, and expansion of comprehensive school choice programs, which may include inter- and intra-district public school choice programs, academic pathways, theme-based schools, and online learning programs. The Promoting Public School Choice grants program would also help strengthen and expand parental outreach by requiring grantees to develop and

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Voluntary public school choice

implement strategies to inform parents and students about the availability and accessibility of high-quality educational options.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Amount for awards	\$24,529	\$24,529	0
Number of continuation awards	14	14	0
National activities/evaluation	\$1,290	\$1,290	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 assist States and local school districts in creating, expanding, and implementing a public school choice program.

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

Measure: The number of students who have the option of attending participating Voluntary Public School Choice schools selected by their parents.				
Year	Cohort 1		Cohort 2	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
2007	843,384	739,068		
2008				1,428,275
2009			1,241,748	1,652,505
2010			1,300,879	1,724,709
2011			1,360,010	

Additional information: In 2008, the Department established initial performance targets for the program's second cohort of grantees (which received their initial year of funding in SY 2007- 2008) using baseline data on 1,545,834 students and based on the expectation that the number of eligible students would be similar to that of the first cohort of grantees. However, in 2009, reanalysis of the baseline data from the second cohort showed a lower number of eligible students (1,182,617) in the new cohort and, as a result, the Department revised its

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Voluntary public school choice

targets to better align with the second cohort's initial performance and with the program's goal of increasing the number of eligible students by 5 percent annually.

In 2010, several grantees submitted revised 2008 and 2009 data to the Department resulting in new adjustments to data reported previously. The revised 2009 data, reflecting SY 2008- 2009, showed an increase of more than 15 percent over baseline in the number of students eligible to participate in school choice, which exceeded the performance target by more than 410,000 students. The 2010 data, reflecting SY 2009- 2010, showed an increase of more than 20 percent over baseline in the number of students eligible to participate in school choice, which exceeded the performance target by more than 420,000 students. The Administration is not requesting funding for this program in fiscal year 2012, so no target is shown for that year.

Measure: The percentage of students participating at Voluntary Public School Choice sites who exercise school choice by changing schools.				
Year	Cohort 1		Cohort 2	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
2007	2.5	4.1		
2008				5.6
2009			7.1	5.4
2010			8.6	4.8
2011			10.0	

Additional information: In 2008, the Department established initial performance targets for the second cohort of grantees based on the expectation that the baseline numbers would be similar to those of the first cohort. Analysis of the baseline data from the second cohort showed a much larger percentage of eligible students changing schools over the previous cohort's baseline year and, as a result, the Department revised its targets to better align with the second cohort's initial performance and with the program's goal of doubling the percentage of students changing schools by the end of the 5-year grant period.

In 2010, several grantees submitted revised 2008 and 2009 data to the Department resulting in minor adjustments to data reported previously. Performance data for 2009 and 2010 showed a decrease in the percentage of eligible students changing schools, which resulted in the program not meeting its performance targets for 2009 and 2010. The Administration is not requesting funding for this program in fiscal year 2012, so no target is shown for that year.

Measure: Percentage of students who score proficient or above on reading/language arts assessments.		
Year	Cohort 2	
	Target	Actual
2008		61.3
2009	68.4	67.3
2010	74.7	64.6
2011	81.1	

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Voluntary public school choice

Measure: Percentage of students who score proficient or above on mathematics assessments.		
Year	Cohort 2	
	Target	Actual
2008		68.5
2009	70.4	67.4
2010	76.3	76.7
2011	82.3	

Additional information: Beginning with the second cohort, the Department initiated the collection of achievement data for VPSC-participating students. In 2010, several grantees submitted revised 2008 and 2009 data to the Department resulting in minor adjustments to data reported previously. The 2009 data, reflecting SY 2008-2009, showed that grantees' performance in both subjects did not meet the established targets, which are based on the ESEA Title I statutory goal of ensuring that all students are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by 2014. In contrast, the 2010 data were mixed; these data showed a significant decline in the percentage of students who met or exceeded their State's annual progress standards in reading/language arts and a sizeable increase in the percentage of students who met or exceeded their State's annual progress standards in mathematics. Accordingly, grantees did not meet the established performance target for reading/language arts proficiency but exceeded the target for mathematics proficiency. The Administration is not requesting funding for this program in fiscal year 2012, so no target is shown for that year.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Parental information and resource centers

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$39,254 ²	0	-\$39,254

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

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

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

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$39,600
2008	38,908
2009	39,254
2010	39,254
2011 CR	39,254

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Parental information and resource centers

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for the Parental Information Resource Centers (PIRCs) program for fiscal year 2012. While making sure that families are informed of and better involved in the educational opportunities available in their community will remain a priority, the historically low funding levels and unfocused set of authorized activities have prevented this program from having a large-scale impact. In place of PIRCs and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that seek to expand educational options for students and families, the Administration has proposed to create a broader initiative, Expanding Educational Options, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization. This new initiative would address the need to increase the supply of high-quality public educational options available to students, especially students attending low-performing schools, by creating and expanding effective charter and other autonomous schools, by implementing comprehensive systems of public school choice, by supporting magnet schools that improve student achievement and promote diversity, and by supporting parent information and outreach efforts across these programs.

In addition, the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal for the renamed College- and Career-Ready Students (CCRS) program (currently Title I Grants to LEAs) 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 to engage parents and families. States would be allowed to use 1 percent of their CCRS allocations, totaling up to \$145 million nationally, for State-led competitions that would support local family-involvement programs. This Family Engagement and Responsibility Fund would support and expand district-level best practices, with a priority for evidence-based parental involvement activities.

PIRCs would be eligible to compete for these funds, along with districts, community-based organizations, and other nonprofit organizations. The reauthorization proposal would also double the local Title I set-aside for parent and family engagement, from 1 to 2 percent, increasing the total from about \$145 million to approximately \$270 million at the FY 2012 request level. PIRCs would be eligible to partner with districts or consortia of districts in implementing activities funded under this set-aside.

The Administration's proposal for the new Supporting Student Success title, which would consist of the Promise Neighborhoods, Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students, and 21st Century Community Learning Center (CCLC) programs, would also encourage and support parent and family engagement in a number of ways. Funds from each of these programs could be used to support and promote innovative programs that encourage the active and meaningful engagement and involvement of families in their children's education. Promise Neighborhoods would create a continuum of cradle-to-career solutions in distressed communities, with high-quality schools at the center. Projects would work to comprehensively address student needs, including through ambitious, rigorous, and comprehensive education reforms; effective community services; and strong systems of family and community support. State and local grants recipients under the new Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program would assess

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Parental information and resource centers

families' experiences and attitudes on the conditions for learning in their child's school, which could include experiences and attitudes 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. The reauthorized 21st CCLC program would seek to improve student achievement by supporting local projects 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 that may be funded to include full-service community schools, which coordinate and provide access to comprehensive and integrated services at the school site in order to meet comprehensively the needs of students, families, and members of the community.

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

In addition, ensuring that families are provided with better and clearer data on the schools in their communities and are engaged in their children's education would be a priority in other reauthorized programs. To receive funds under the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program, States and LEAs would be required to collect and report data on the qualifications, effectiveness, and retention of teachers and make these data accessible to parents. To receive funds under CCRS, LEAs would be required to collect school performance and parent survey data, and States would publish school report cards in a manner that is accessible and understandable.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Parental information and resource centers

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Funding for continuation awards	\$38,004	\$37,291	0
Number of continuation awards	62	62	0
Average continuation award	\$613	\$601	0
Technical assistance and evaluation	\$1,250	\$1,963	0

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

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

Measure: The number of parents of children in the PIRC program's target population (those attending schools not making adequate yearly progress) who receive information on their State accountability systems through direct PIRC services.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	72,306	99,933
2008	128,110	225,440
2009	153,028	275,775
2010		
2011		

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Parental information and resource centers

Measure: The number of parents of children in the PIRC program's target population (those attending schools not making adequate yearly progress) who receive information on their rights and opportunities for supplemental services through direct PIRC services.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	73,135	94,288
2008	110,479	200,134
2009	147,815	252,434
2010		
2011		

Measure: The number of parents of children in the PIRC program's target population (those attending schools not making adequate yearly progress) who receive information on their public school choice options through direct PIRC services.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	68,442	97,122
2008	105,252	196,953
2009	152,374	236,958
2010		
2011		

Additional information: Targets shown are the sums of targets set by individual grantees for their own projects and reported in their annual progress reports at the conclusion of the year. The data are reported by the PIRCs and are not verified by the Department, and some parents may have been counted more than once in each of these estimates. In previous years, these performance measures included the number of parents that PIRCs reported as receiving information through indirect services, but the data's accuracy were questionable and their usefulness as a performance measure was limited.

For reporting on outcomes from the first year of the grant cycle (2006-2007), PIRCs were instructed to complete their data collection in June 2007. This meant that grantees were able to report only 9 months of implementation data.

The Department planned to collect information from PIRCs on customer satisfaction, but was not able to administer the necessary survey in 2010.

Program Efficiency Measures

The Department is implementing a common measure of administrative efficiency for the PIRCs and other technical assistance programs. The measure is the percentage of grant funds carried over in each year of the project, which is an indicator of grantee efficiency in project implementation. Data for this efficiency measure were first collected in for the cohort of grantees funded in FY 2006. In FY 2006, a total of \$37,323,873 was awarded to new PIRC grantees. Of that amount, \$13,002,766, about 35 percent, was carried over to the following year. Data for this measure for 2008 and 2009 are expected in spring 2011.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Smaller learning communities

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 4)
FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$88,000 ²	0	-\$88,000

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

In fiscal years 2000 through 2010, appropriations language has directed the Department to make awards only to support the creation of smaller learning communities in large high schools. For purposes of this program, the Department has defined a large high school as a school that includes grades 11 and 12 and serves at least 1,000 students in grades 9 and above. Strategies for creating smaller learning communities within large high schools include establishing “houses” or career academies, block scheduling, and teacher advisory systems. In each fiscal year, appropriations language has also authorized the Department to reserve a portion of program funds for evaluation, technical assistance, school networking, peer review of applications, and program outreach activities.

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Smaller learning communities

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2007	\$93,531
2008	80,108
2009	88,000
2010	88,000
2011 CR.....	88,000

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funding for the Smaller Learning Communities program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that seek to expand educational options for students and families, the Administration has proposed to create a broader initiative, Expanding Educational Options, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization. This new initiative would address the need to increase the supply of high-quality public educational options available to students, especially students attending low-performing schools, by creating and expanding effective charter and other autonomous schools, by implementing comprehensive systems of public school choice, by supporting magnet schools that improve student achievement and promote diversity, and by strengthening parent information and outreach efforts across these programs.

The Expanding Educational Options initiative would consist of three separate authorizations: (1) Supporting Effective Charter Schools grants; (2) Promoting Public School Choice grants; and (3) the Magnet Schools Assistance program. Under the Supporting Effective Charter Schools grants program, the Department would make competitive grants to State educational agencies (SEAs), charter school authorizers, charter management organizations, LEAs, and other nonprofit organizations to start or expand effective charter and other autonomous schools. Funds would also be available for competitive grants for charter schools facilities programs. Under the Promoting Public School Choice grants program, the Department would make competitive grants to LEAs, individually or in a consortium, and to SEAs in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs, to develop and implement a comprehensive choice program that increases the range of high-quality educational options available to students and improves the academic achievement of students attending low-performing schools. Under the Magnet Schools Assistance program, the Department would make competitive grants to LEAs implementing a court-ordered or federally approved desegregation plan for the support of high-quality magnet schools, with an emphasis on raising student academic achievement and reducing minority group isolation.

Grantees under the proposed Promoting Public School Choice grants program would have flexibility in designing and implementing school choice programs and could, among other activities, create or expand theme-based schools or academic pathways. Through these activities, grantees could pursue strategies previously supported with Smaller Learning Communities funds as part of a comprehensive effort to provide students with high-quality educational options.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Smaller learning communities

In addition, activities previously supported with Smaller Learning Communities funds, such as creation of freshman and career academies, could be funded through the College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program.

Under the Administration's reauthorization proposal, Smaller Learning Communities continuation grant costs would be funded from the appropriation for the new Expanding Educational Options initiative.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Total budget authority	\$88,000	\$88,000	0
Amount for new awards	\$12,934 ¹	\$56,000 ¹	0
Number of new awards	6	20-30	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$70,666	\$27,600	0
Number of continuation awards	56 ²	28 ²	0
Number of schools served	180	180	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$3,800	0
National activities	\$4,400	\$600	0

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$26,439 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Expanding Educational Options program in fiscal year (FY) 2012 to support Smaller Learning Communities grantees selected in FY 2010 (using funds from the FY 2009 appropriation).

¹ Starting in FY 2010 (using funds from the FY 2009 and FY 2010 appropriations), the Department provides 2 years of funding for each grant from a single year's appropriation. Projects successfully implemented may then receive additional awards in years 3, 4, and 5 as applicable.

² Funds from the FY 2010 appropriation supported continuation awards to grantees selected in FY 2008 (using funds from the FY 2007 appropriation). Funds from the FY 2011 appropriation will support continuation awards to grantees selected in FY 2010 (using funds from the FY 2009 and FY 2010 appropriations). The Department did not select any new grantees in FY 2009.

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.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Smaller learning communities

The Department tracks performance data for each cohort of grantees for this program separately in order to make more meaningful comparisons of the impact of the Department's priorities, guidance, and technical assistance from one cohort of grantees to another. Each cohort (from 2004 on) reports 5 years of data for the 5 years of the grant. Each cohort is measured against the same targets. The data reported below are for the cohort of grantees that received their first year of funding in FY 2005. 2010 is this cohort's final year of reporting.

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

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

Measure: The percentage of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Communities grants scoring at or above proficient on State mathematics assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		45.5
2007	62	48.1
2008	64	49.9
2009	66	51.8
2010	68	

Measure: The percentage of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Communities grants scoring at or above proficient on State reading assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		43.4
2007	62	48.4
2008	64	49.8
2009	66	52.8
2010	68	

Measure: The percentage of graduates in schools receiving Smaller Learning Communities grants who enroll in postsecondary education, apprenticeships, or advanced training for the semester following graduation.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		80.3
2007	84	75.5
2008	85	76.1
2009	86	80.8
2010	88	

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Smaller learning communities

Measure: The percentage of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Communities grants who graduate from high school.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		80.4
2007	88	78.2
2008	89	78.3
2009	90	79.7
2010	91	

Additional Information: The data for performance measures are provided by grantees in their annual performance reports. The Department does not verify these data, although the Department is providing its grantees with assistance in improving the quality of the data provided in the reports. 2010 data will be available in the spring of 2011. No targets are shown for 2011 or 2012 because 2010 is this cohort's final year of reporting.

Efficiency Measures

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

Measure: The cost per student (in dollars) demonstrating proficiency or advanced skills in reading/language arts.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	\$425	\$559
2007	415	471
2008	405	476
2009	395	437
2010	395	

Measure: The cost per student (in dollars) demonstrating proficiency or advanced skills in mathematics.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	\$475	\$546
2007	465	474
2008	455	476
2009	445	443
2010	445	

Additional information: The Department calculates the cost by dividing the amount of program funds granted in a given year by the number of students served by the SLC program who score proficient or above on State reading and mathematics assessments. The data shown in these tables are for the cohort of grantees that received their first year of funding in FY 2005. 2010 data will be available in the spring of 2011. No targets are shown for 2011 or 2012 because 2010 is this cohort's final year of reporting.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Smaller learning communities

Other Performance Information

Many districts implementing Smaller Learning Communities projects have focused on the ninth grade, particularly through an intervention called “freshman academies” that provides tailored, intensive programs of study designed to ease the transition to high school for ninth-grade students. In 2004, the Department initiated the *Enhanced Reading Opportunities Study* to assess the impact of two supplemental reading interventions for struggling ninth-grade students that were implemented within participating freshman academies. The third and final report from this study, published in July 2010, found that participation in the supplemental reading interventions improved students’ reading comprehension skills and had a positive impact on students’ academic performance in core subject areas over the course of ninth grade. However, the report found that participation did not have an impact on students’ academic performance in the subsequent year or on students’ reading behaviors or school behaviors.

In addition, the Department conducted a descriptive evaluation of the Smaller Learning Communities program focusing on the FY 2001 grantee cohort. Among other things, the evaluation examined implementation of career academies and freshman academies (the two most common program structures), rating grantees as high, moderate, or low implementers based on a set of defined academy features, such as common planning time for teachers. The evaluation rated as high or moderate implementers 34 of 44 career academies and 46 of 58 freshman academies. The Department published results from this evaluation in May 2008.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Magnet schools assistance

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined ¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$100,000 ²	\$110,000	+\$10,000

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed 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 Magnet Schools Assistance program (MSAP) provides grants to eligible local educational agencies (LEAs) to establish and operate magnet schools that are operated under a court-ordered or federally approved voluntary desegregation plan. Magnet programs aim to eliminate, reduce, or prevent minority-group isolation in elementary and secondary schools while strengthening students' knowledge of academic subjects and their grasp of marketable vocational skills. The special curriculum of a magnet school can attract substantial numbers of students from different social, economic, ethnic, and racial backgrounds and provide greater opportunities for voluntary and court-ordered desegregation efforts to succeed.

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Magnet schools assistance

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2007	\$106,693
2008	104,829
2009	104,829
2010	100,000
2011 CR	100,000

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$110 million for the Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP) for fiscal year 2012, an increase of \$10 million over the 2011 CR level. The fiscal year 2012 appropriation would support new awards under the reauthorized MSAP and continuation grant awards made under the antecedent program.

This program, which would maintain its own dedicated funding stream as one of three programs under the proposed Expanding Educational Options initiative, would continue to be a vehicle for fostering education reform and innovation by increasing choice among, and accountability in, public schools. The Administration’s reauthorization proposal would strengthen our commitment to improving high-quality educational options for students and increasing diversity by placing a greater emphasis on funding magnet school programs (particularly whole-school programs) or models that have a record of effectiveness in raising student achievement and reducing minority-group isolation.

The request would provide approximately \$97.8 million for continuation grants, \$10 million for new awards, and approximately \$2.2 million for program evaluation and dissemination activities.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Amount of awards	\$97,778	\$98,000	\$107,760
Number of new awards	36	0	4-6
Number of continuation awards	0	36	36
Range of awards	\$350-\$4,000	\$350-\$4,000	\$350-\$4,000
Peer review of new award applications	\$222	0	\$40
Evaluation and dissemination	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,200

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Magnet schools assistance

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

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

Measure: The percentage of magnet schools whose student applicant pool reduces, prevents, or eliminates minority group isolation.						
Year	FY 2004 Cohort		FY 2007 Cohort		FY 2010 Cohort	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
2007	65.5	49.8				
2008			70.4			
2009			75.3	43		
2010			80.3	59		
2011					85.2	
2012					90.1	

Additional information: This measure provides information about magnet schools that are successful in bringing together students from different social, economic, ethnic, and racial backgrounds. Specifically, this measure tracks the percentage of magnet schools whose applicant pool reflects a racial and ethnic composition that, in relation to the total enrollment of the school or districtwide percentage for minority students at the same grade levels, reduces, prevents, or eliminates minority-group isolation. (Minority-group isolation refers to a condition in which minority students, including American Indian or Alaskan Natives, Asian or Pacific Islanders, Hispanics, and Blacks (not of Hispanic origin), constitute more than 50 percent of the enrollment of a school.) Under the 2004 cohort, the Department had established annual performance targets from a baseline of 58.3 percent in 2006 and with a goal of having 100 percent elimination of minority-group isolation by 2014. Performance data for the 2007 cohort showed improvement between 2009 and 2010 in the number of schools that reduced, prevented, or eliminated minority group isolation, but did not meet the Department's established performance targets. Only 2 years of performance data are available because a majority of the grantees implemented a planning year during the 2007-2008 school year. The Department may consider revising its performance targets to better align with the grantees' data collection schedule and recent performance.

In 2010, the Department published interim final regulations, which provide districts with greater flexibility in demonstrating that their magnet or feeder schools will eliminate, reduce, or prevent racial group isolation and that their voluntary desegregation plans are adequate under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. The regulations removed the definition of minority-group isolation because it required districts to use binary racial classifications and prohibited the creation of magnet schools that result in minority group enrollments in magnet and feeder schools that exceed the

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Magnet schools assistance

districtwide average of minority-group students. These interim final regulations apply to the 2010 cohort. The Department is considering revising the current measure, as it applies to the 2010 cohort, to align it with the new regulations.

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

Measure: Percentage of magnet schools whose students from major racial and ethnic groups meet or exceed their State's annual progress standards in reading.						
Year	FY 2004 Cohort		FY 2007 Cohort		FY 2010 Cohort	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
2007	73.1	63.7				
2008			76.9	38		
2009			80.7	43		
2010			84.6	49		
2011					88.4	
2012					92.2	

Measure: Percentage of magnet schools whose students from major racial and ethnic groups meet or exceed their State's annual progress standards in mathematics.						
Year	FY 2004 Cohort		FY 2007 Cohort		FY 2010 Cohort	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
2007	73.3	60.8				
2008			77.1	44		
2009			80.9	52		
2010			84.7	54		
2011					88.5	
2012					92.3	

Additional information: Performance data, collected through annual grantee reports, showed a steady increase in the percentage of schools whose minority students met or exceeded their State's annual progress standards in reading and mathematics. The 2010 data, however, showed that grantees' performance, in both subject areas, did not meet the targets, which are based on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I statutory goal of all students being proficient in reading and mathematics by 2014. Comparing data from the 2004 and 2007 cohorts, it is not clear why the achievement results for the 2007 cohort were so low. The Department is examining factors that may have influenced these results, such as whether or not programs were implemented fully or for a long enough time period to achieve intended effects, as well as the rigor of the magnet school curriculum and whether teacher training was sufficient. The Department expects to have performance data for the 2010 cohort available this fall.

The remaining performance measures focus on sustainability by examining the percentage of magnet schools in operation 3 years after Federal funding ends and the percentage of magnet schools that meet State adequate yearly progress standards at least 3 years after Federal

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Magnet schools assistance

funding ends. Analysis of the sustainability data for the 2004 MSAP cohort found that nearly 99 percent of magnet schools that received funding remain in existence today and that 45 percent of those magnet schools met their States' adequate yearly progress standards at the end of the 2009-2010 school year.

Other Performance Information

In 2008, following a year-long feasibility study, the Department initiated a new national evaluation of magnet schools focused on a single category of schools that receive funding through the MSAP program: elementary schools that convert to become whole-school magnets. The study is examining the relationship of magnet conversion to resident (those who live within the attendance zone) and non-resident (those who live outside the attendance zone, but choose to attend the magnet school) student outcomes independently. The evaluation uses a comparative interrupted time series design, involving fiscal year 2004 and 2007 grantees, to examine the relationship between magnet school conversion, student achievement, and other outcomes, including minority-group isolation in schools. Each magnet school is matched with two similar traditional public elementary schools that will serve as comparison schools. Further, the evaluation is examining how factors related to student achievement vary according to the characteristics of the magnet schools and of the regular public schools in the same districts. The data collection, which began in 2008, relies heavily on analysis of existing student records data, including demographic information, residence indicators, and academic test scores collected at various time points. Further, the evaluation is collecting one round of principal and magnet school coordinator surveys. The data collection is scheduled to conclude in the summer of 2012, with the final evaluation report expected to be released in the spring of 2013.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Fund for the improvement of education: programs of national significance

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

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$136,161 ²	\$63,000	-\$73,161

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

² Adjusted for comparability. Does not include \$10,000 thousand for Promise neighborhoods that is shown in the Supporting Student Success account. Includes \$10,700 thousand that was appropriated in FY 2010 for Ready to Teach and rescinded by P.L. 111-226. The 2011 CR provides funds at the pre-rescission level.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Fund for the improvement of education: programs of national significance

- Demonstrations of the effectiveness of programs under which school districts or schools contract with private management organizations to reform a school or schools.

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

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2007	\$16,051
2008	121,934 ¹
2009	115,965 ²
2010	125,461 ³
2011 CR	136,161

¹ Includes \$98,816 thousand for Congressional earmarks.

² Includes \$88,015 thousand for Congressional earmarks.

³ Includes \$88,791 thousand for Congressional earmarks.

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is requesting \$63 million for FIE Programs of National Significance in 2012, a decrease of \$73.161 million from the 2011 CR level. The reduction eliminates funding for one-time special purpose earmarks that do not advance the purposes of the authorizing legislation.

The requested level of funding would allow the Department to support the following activities in 2012:

- The Department would use \$50 million to support activities of the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Education (ARPA-ED), a new initiative modeled after similar research programs in the Department of Defense and Department of Energy. The mission of ARPA-ED would be to pursue breakthrough development of educational technology and learning systems, support systems for educators, and tools that result in improvements in educational achievement and attainment for all students, reductions in achievement gaps, improvement of informal and out-of-school learning for individuals of all ages, and improvement in the efficiency of educational delivery systems. The Administration requests

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Fund for the improvement of education: programs of national significance

that \$50 million of the funds (for ARPA-ED) be appropriated on a no-year basis to remain available for obligation until expended.

In addition to the discretionary funding for ARPA-ED requested herein, the Administration is seeking \$40 million in mandatory funding for 2012 from the Wireless Innovation Fund for ARPA-ED to support the improvement of early childhood through postsecondary education through a mandatory appropriation for the Fund for the Improvement of Education. The Wireless Innovation Fund will be financed by the sale of spectrum bands by the Federal Communications Commission and its main purpose is to spur innovation in the use of wireless technologies.

- The Department would use \$5 million to support the *Data Quality Initiative*, which began in 2006 and is designed to improve the quality, analysis, and reporting of Department of Education elementary and secondary program data. Technical assistance activities have included workshops and written guidance for grantees on what information to collect and report to the Department in order to meet GPRAs reporting requirements and assistance to program offices with the analysis of the data submitted by grantees. In 2009, the Department further expanded the initiative to include “data audits” of grant programs to examine program performance data quality and how the data are used in program management, as well as to examine the quality and usefulness of grantee local evaluations. The goal of the audits is to provide guidance to improve data quality and ensure that program decisions are based on sound information. This activity helps the Department comply with OMB Circular A-11, which requires Federal agencies to establish procedures to ensure the accuracy of all performance measurement data contained in their annual performance plans and reports and which encourages agencies to verify performance data at least every 2 years. The Department plans to use the 2012 funds to continue both the technical assistance efforts and the data audits.
- The Department would use \$1 million to fund the final year of a 3-year competitive award to support the Educational Facilities Clearinghouse (Clearinghouse), which provides technical assistance and training on issues related to educational facility planning, design, financing, construction, improvement, operation, and maintenance of public pre-kindergarten, elementary and secondary, and higher education facilities. The Clearinghouse also develops resources and assembles best practices on issues related to ensuring safe, healthy, and high-performance public facilities, including procedures for identifying hazards and conducting vulnerability assessments.
- The Department may use funds to support additional projects to improve students’ financial literacy. In 2010, the Department conducted a grant competition to support projects that are designed to develop, implement, and evaluate (1) personal finance instructional materials that focus on knowledge and skills to help high school students in high-need school districts make sound financial decisions regarding student financial aid and other financial matters in order to obtain access to, persist in, and complete postsecondary education; and (2) training that prepares teachers to integrate the instructional materials in one or more high school courses (e.g., career and technical education courses, social studies, economics, mathematics, personal finance). The Department made one award, but received other highly rated applications and is determining whether it would be appropriate to make additional awards from the funding slate in 2011.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Fund for the improvement of education: programs of national significance

In 2012, the Department could build on this effort by supporting additional financial literacy efforts. This could include funding new grants to support the development of additional instructional materials or supporting the adoption and evaluation of the materials being developed with the first grant(s) in additional sites.

- The Department also is requesting funds (including funding for peer review) to support activities in response to emerging issues. These could include special studies, conferences, and grant awards. One option under consideration is funding “Inducement Prizes”, which would provide awards to people or organizations that achieve a breakthrough result. Examples of activities that could be included are high school student achievement prizes, which would provide awards to the first 10 large, high poverty public high schools to have over half of their free and reduced price lunch students earn a score of 3 or higher on a STEM-related Advanced Placement test; reducing achievement gap prizes, which would provide awards to the first five high poverty districts that close the achievement gap between their students eligible for free or reduced price lunch and the highest achieving subgroup in their State; and outstanding student teacher prizes, which would reward institutions of higher education that have the highest percentages of students with high grade point averages who become elementary and secondary school teachers.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Earmarks	\$88,791	0	0
ARPA-ED	0	0	\$50,000 ¹
Full Service Community Schools Program grants	10,155	\$10,000	0 ²
Data Quality Initiative	1,087	5,000	5,000
Education Facilities Clearinghouse	1,000	1,000	1,000
Reach Out and Read	6,000	0	0
National History Day	500	0	0
Communities in Schools	3,500	0	0
Gulf Coast Schools	12,000	0	0
Financial literacy grants	1,700	TBD	TBD
Other activities	11	TBD	TBD
Peer review of new award applications	<u>717</u>	<u>600</u>	<u>130</u>
Total	125,461³	136,161^{3,4}	63,000¹

¹ The Department is seeking an additional \$40 million in mandatory funds for 2012 from the Wireless Innovation Fund for ARPA-ED.

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

³ Adjusted for comparability. Does not include \$10,000 thousand for Promise neighborhoods that is in the Supporting Student Success account, but does include Promise neighborhood peer review.

⁴ Includes \$10,700 thousand that was appropriated for Ready to Teach and rescinded by P.L. 111-226. The 2011 CR provides funds at the pre-rescission level.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Fund for the improvement of education: programs of national significance

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

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

- For the education facilities clearinghouse, the performance measure is the percentage of recipients of clearinghouse onsite training or technical assistance that implement one or more changes in improving their education facility based upon clearinghouse recommendations within 6 months of the training or technical assistance.
- For the full service community schools program, the measure is the percentage of individuals targeted for services who receive services during each year of the project period. All grantees are required to submit an annual performance report documenting their contribution in assisting the Department in measuring the performance of the program against this indicator, as well as performance on project-specific indicators.
- For the financial literacy grants, the grantee(s) will be required to report on the percentage of participating students who make an educationally significant improvement in their understanding of personal finance; the percentage of participating low income students who complete the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA); and the percentage of participating low-income students who enroll in college.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Exchanges with historic whaling and trading partners

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$8,754 ²	0	-\$8,754

¹The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. No appropriations language or new reauthorizing legislation is sought.

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

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$8,910
2008	8,754
2009	8,754
2010	8,754
2011 CR	8,754

2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for the Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners program. The Administration believes that funds for the program should be redirected to other, higher-priority activities that can have an impact on education reform and improvement

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Exchanges with historic whaling and trading partners

nationally. In addition, the program provides earmarked assistance to specific entities, and the Administration believes that competing funds rather than earmarking them will lead to higher-quality programs and improved student outcomes.

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

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Awards	\$8,754	\$8,754	0
Number of grants	6	6	0

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

In 2008, the Department undertook a comprehensive review of this program's performance measures and developed a set of more outcome-oriented measures. Beginning in 2009, grantees have collected data on: (1) the percentage of interns and apprentices participating in ECHO-funded internship or apprenticeship programs who rate their internship or apprenticeship positively; (2) the percentage of teachers of school groups participating in ECHO-funded programs who rate the student program positively; (3) the percentage of members of the general public attending ECHO-funded exhibits, displays, education programs, or cultural exchanges who rate their experience positively; and (4) the average number of visits that registered users make to the ECHO grantees' website during the program year. Baseline data will be available in spring 2011.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Women's educational equity

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 21)

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$2,423 ²	0	-\$2,423

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. No appropriations language or reauthorizing legislation is sought.

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 Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA) program promotes educational equity for girls and women, including those who face multiple aspects of discrimination based on gender and on race, ethnicity, national origin, disability, or age. The program provides funds to help educational agencies and other institutions meet the requirements of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.

At least two-thirds of the funding for WEEA must support projects, of up to 4 years in duration, that focus on local implementation of gender-equity policies and practices. The remaining funds may be used for research and development, including model training programs for teachers and other school personnel, and the development of (a) assessment instruments and methods to assist local educational agencies (LEAs) in replicating exemplary gender equity programs, and (b) policies and programs to address and prevent sexual harassment.

The most recent competition, held in fiscal year 2009, included three absolute priorities and one competitive preference priority. Applicants were required to address at least one of the following two priorities: (1) support for activities to enable students to achieve proficiency or advanced proficiency in mathematics, and (2) support for activities to enable students to achieve proficiency or advanced proficiency in science. All applicants were required to address the priority for projects to collect pre- and post-intervention test data to assess the impact of the projects on the academic achievement of student participants relative to appropriate comparison or control groups.

To be considered for up to 10 competitive preference priority points, applicants had to propose to support activities and interventions aimed at improving the academic achievement of secondary school students at greatest risk of not meeting challenging State academic standards and not completing high school. The Department made 13 grants to a combination of LEAs, institutions of higher education (IHEs), and nonprofit entities.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Women's educational equity

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$1,879
2008	1,846
2009	2,423
2010	2,423
2011 CR.....	2,423

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funding for the WEEA program for fiscal year 2012. In place of this small, narrowly targeted program, the Administration's budget includes a number of broader programs with more robust funding that would provide continued educational support for women, including at the graduate level where the educational gap for women persists in some specific STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) fields.

The Administration's reauthorization proposal for ESEA includes funding opportunities and accountability provisions that would provide continued support for entities contending with gender gaps in educational achievement and attainment. The proposal would continue the requirements for reporting on academic performance by gender under Title I, thereby highlighting achievement gaps and helping ensure that States and LEAs pay attention to the achievement of girls and boys at all levels. States, LEAs, and IHEs would have access to new sources of funding to improve teaching and learning, such as the proposed Teacher and Leader programs and the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education: STEM program. The request for the STEM program in fiscal year 2012 is \$206 million, which would provide eligible entities with resources to address gender equity issues in the STEM fields. At this funding level, the STEM program would likely have a much greater impact on improving girls' educational performance than could the WEEA program.

Girls and women have made significant educational gains since the enactment of the Women's Educational Equity Act. The 2004 National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) study, *Trends in Educational Equity of Girls and Women*, shows that on most indicators of achievement and educational attainment, the large gaps that once existed between males and females have significantly decreased or no longer exist at all. For example, while females accounted for 42 percent of all undergraduate students in 1970, that number increased to 56 percent by 2000. Females tend to persist in higher education and attain degrees at higher levels than their male counterparts. In 2001, females earned 57 percent of all bachelor's degrees. At the graduate level, female students accounted for 39 percent of all students in 1970, but that number rose to 58 percent in 2000. In 1970, females made up just 9 percent of first-professional students.¹ By 2000, that number had risen to 47 percent of full-time and 44 percent of part-time first-professional students.

In certain STEM subjects, males continue to pursue and persist in undergraduate majors and seek graduate degrees at higher rates than females. But even in STEM education and related

¹ First-professional degrees are defined as degrees awarded in the fields of dentistry, medicine, optometry, osteopathic medicine, pharmacy, podiatric medicine, veterinary medicine, chiropractic medicine, law, and the theological professions.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Women's educational equity

occupations, the gap is shrinking, particularly in some STEM fields. Scores on the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) show that gender differences in mathematics have been very small (between 1 and 3 percentage points) in recent years, with only slight fluctuations since 1990. A 2009 report, "Gender, Culture, and Mathematics Performance," from the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* underscores this point, saying that girls have now reached parity with boys in mathematics skill levels at all ages in the U.S. Findings from *Trends in Educational Equity of Girls and Women* indicate that gender differences in mathematics and science coursetaking and attainment have been nearly or completely eliminated in some areas (mathematics and the biological sciences) while continuing in others (engineering and the physical sciences). According to the 2010 *Condition of Education*, in 2007-08 females received 41 percent of baccalaureate degrees in the physical sciences and science technologies and only 17 percent in engineering and engineering technologies, but 59 percent in the biological and biomedical sciences. The same trend is in evidence in graduate and professional education. In 2007-08, women earned 51 percent of all doctoral degrees, and the number of women receiving doctorates increased 68 percent over a 10-year period. That same year, according to the Association of American Medical Colleges, women accounted for 49 percent of new medical school graduates, compared to 9 percent as recently as 1972-73. But major gaps in graduate degree attainment persist in such fields as engineering and computer and information science, where in 2007-08 women earned 21 and 22 percent of doctoral degrees, respectively.

The Administration has proposed funding for postsecondary education programs that could address the persistent gaps described above. In FY 2012, the Administration requests \$40.7 million for the Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) program. GAANN has helped support students who are pursuing education in critical scientific and technical fields. The designated areas of national need in FY 2011 include computer and information sciences, engineering, mathematics, and physics. The Minority Science and Engineering Improvement Program (MSEIP) provides funds to IHEs to increase the participation of underrepresented ethnic and racial minorities in scientific and technological careers. The Administration requests \$9.5 million for MSEIP in FY 2012.

The reauthorization of the ESEA and the fiscal year 2012 budget, with a priority for enhancements to STEM education and effective instructional practices, will provide States, LEAs, and IHEs with opportunities to address the remaining gaps noted above.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Amount for continuation awards	\$2,423	\$2,423	0
Number of awards	13	13	0

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, and measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Women's educational equity

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 promote gender equity in education in the United States.

Objective: *To ensure equal access to mathematics and science educational courses, programs, and careers for women and girls.*

The Department's Data Quality Initiative (DQI) contractor began working with WEEA program staff in fiscal year 2009 to improve the quality of the program's performance data through improved performance measures and guidance to grantees. The Department incorporated five new performance measures into the notice inviting applications for fiscal year 2009. They are: (1) the percentage of female students served by the program who achieve proficiency on State mathematics assessments; (2) the percentage of female students served by the program who achieve advanced proficiency on State mathematics assessments; (3) the percentage of female students served by the program who achieve proficiency on State science assessments; (4) the percentage of female students served by the program who achieve advanced proficiency on State science assessments; and, (5) the percentage of projects whose female participants demonstrate statistically significant mean increases in achievement compared to mean increases of a comparison group, based on pre- and post-test data.

All grantees that received an award under the fiscal year 2009 competition must provide data for the fifth measure. The design of each grantee's program determines which of the first four measures must be reported on each year. Of the 13 grantees, 11 have the goal of raising achievement in mathematics; 8 have the goal of raising achievement in science; and, 2 have the goal of raising achievement in both subjects. Data from year one will be available in February 2011.

Other Performance Information

In 2008, the Department released the study, *Early Implementation of Public Single-Sex Schools: Perceptions and Characteristics*, which was supported with WEEA funds. The study examined the effects of single-sex schooling on student achievement and other outcomes, especially for at-risk students. Site visits to 10 schools (8 single-sex and 2 coed), surveys, and a literature review informed this study. The study provides descriptive findings that could provide the basis for further investigations.

The study results indicate that single-sex schooling can be helpful. Among the academic outcomes, 10 percent had mixed results across sex or grade levels, 35 percent favored single-sex schooling, 2 percent favored coed schooling, and 53 percent favored neither single-sex nor coed schooling. Overall, the literature review findings suggest that there are more socio-emotional factors than academic factors favoring single-sex schools. In addition, more socio-emotional outcomes favor girls in single-sex schools than boys in single-sex schools. Survey results show that teachers believe that both girls and boys benefit from single-sex schooling, but for different reasons. The survey results also highlight the lack of professional development on single-sex education. Fewer than half of the teachers surveyed from single-sex schools received any professional development on single-sex education.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Women's educational equity

The WEEA program statute required the Department to issue a report on the status of educational equity for girls and women. This was the 2004 NCES report, *Trends in Educational Equity of Girls and Women*, which documented significant educational achievement and attainment gains for women over the past 40 years.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Troops-to-teachers

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

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$14,389 ²	0	-\$14,389

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for transfer to the Department of Defense 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 Department of Defense (DOD) established Troops-to-Teachers in 1994 to help improve education by recruiting, preparing, and supporting members of the military service as teachers in high-poverty public schools. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act, authorized the Department of Education to continue funding for this effort.

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

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Troops-to-teachers

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

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

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

	(\$000s)
2007	\$14,645
2008	14,389
2009	14,389
2010	14,389
2011 CR.....	14,389

FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funds for Troops-to-Teachers under the ESEA program authority because, in fiscal year 2012, funds for program activities would come directly from the Department of Defense (DOD) appropriation. The move to the DOD would ensure continued close oversight of Troops-to-Teachers program outcomes and simplify and streamline program management. The Department of Education would continue to work closely with the DOD in the transition. DANTES would continue to provide stipends, bonuses, and assistance to help members of the armed services to become qualified and effective teachers.

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Troops-to-teachers

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011 CR</u>	<u>2012</u>
Number of program participants	2,321	2,321	0
Number of participants hired	1,762	1,762	0

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

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

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

DAN TES’s FY 2007 report stated that 2,525 individuals became participants in FY 2007, and the FY 2008 report noted that 2,321 individuals became participants.

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

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Troops-to-teachers

Measure: The percentage of participants who become teachers of record in high-need LEAs.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	75	82
2008	85	76
2009	86	
2010	87	
2011	88	

Measure: The percentage of participants who become mathematics, science, or special education teachers.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	51	35
2008	53	33
2009	54	
2010	54	
2011	54	

Measure: The percentage of Troops-to-Teachers participants who remain in teaching for 3 or more years after placement in a teaching position in a high-need LEA.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	80	78
2008	85	74
2009	85	
2010	86	
2011	86	

Additional information: Data for this measure for 2009 are expected in spring 2011. The Department is not requesting funding for the program in fiscal year 2012, so no target for that year is shown.

Efficiency Measure

The Department developed the following efficiency measure for the Troops-to-Teachers program: recruitment cost per teacher of record.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Troops-to-teachers

Measure: Recruitment cost per teacher of record.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		\$3,127
2008	\$3,096	\$3,654
2009	\$3,064	
2010	\$3,033	
2011	\$3,002	

Additional information: Recruitment cost is defined as all overhead costs for the national headquarters and State offices. “Teacher of record” is defined as a Troops-to-Teachers participant who is hired by an eligible school district. DAN TES also collects and analyzes the data on a State-by-State basis and uses the data to improve program operations. Data for this measure for 2009 are expected in spring 2011. The Department is not requesting funding for the program in fiscal year 2012, so no target for that year is shown.

Other Performance Information

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

This trend has continued. According to statistical data received from DAN TES, as of the end of 2008 nearly 82 percent of the program’s participants have been male and over 26 percent have been African American.

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