

**Department of Education**  
**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**  
**Fiscal Year 2013 Request**

**CONTENTS**

|  | <u><b>Page</b></u> |
|--|--------------------|
| Appropriations language .....                                  | D-1                |
| Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes .....              | D-3                |
| Amounts Available for Obligation.....                          | D-5                |
| Obligations by Object Classification .....                     | D-7                |
| Summary of Changes .....                                       | D-8                |
| Authorizing Legislation .....                                  | D-10               |
| Appropriations History.....                                    | D-13               |
| Significant Items in FY 2012 Appropriation Reports.....        | D-14               |
| Summary of Request .....                                       | D-18               |
| Activities:  |                    |
| Effective teaching and learning for a complete education ..... | D-20               |
| Ready-to-learn television .....                                | D-28               |
| Striving readers .....   | D-35               |
| Mathematics and science partnerships .....                     | D-42               |
| Arts in education .....  | D-47               |
| College pathways and accelerated learning.....                 | D-55               |
| High school graduation initiative .....                        | D-58               |
| Advanced placement .....                                       | D-63               |
| Assessing Achievement.....                                     | D-69               |
| Training and advisory services .....                           | D-75               |
| Rural education.....   | D-80               |
| Supplemental education grants .....                            | D-90               |
| Comprehensive centers.....                                     | D-93               |
| Native Hawaiian student education .....                        | D-102              |
| Alaska Native student education .....                          | D-105              |
| State Tables .....   | D-109              |

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

For carrying out school improvement activities authorized by [parts A and B of title II, part B of title IV, parts A and B of title VI, and parts B and C of title VII of the ESEA; the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act;] section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002; the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003; and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, [\$4,550,018,000] \$68,732,000, of which [\$2,725,246,000 shall become available on July 1, 2012, and remain available through September 30, 2013, and of which \$1,681,441,000 shall become available on October 1, 2012, and shall remain available through September 30, 2013, for academic year 2012-2013:<sup>2</sup> *Provided*, That funds made available to carry out part B of title VII of the ESEA may be used for construction, renovation, and modernization of any elementary school, secondary school, or structure related to an elementary school or secondary school, run by the Department of Education of the State of Hawaii, that serves a predominantly Native Hawaiian student body:<sup>3</sup> *Provided further*, That funds made available to carry out part C of title VII of the ESEA shall be awarded on a competitive basis, and also may be used for construction:<sup>4</sup> *Provided further*, That \$51,210,000] \$51,113,000 shall be available to carry out section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002:<sup>5</sup> *Provided [further]*, That [\$17,652,000] \$17,619,000 shall be available to carry out the Supplemental Education Grants program for the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands:<sup>6</sup> *Provided further*, That up to 5 percent of [these amounts] the amount referred to in the previous proviso may be reserved by the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands to administer the Supplemental Education Grants programs and to obtain technical assistance, oversight and consultancy services in the administration of these grants and to reimburse the United States Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for such services:<sup>7</sup> *Provided further*, That up to 1.5 percent of the funds for subpart 1 of part A

of title II of the ESEA shall be reserved by the Secretary for competitive awards for teacher or principal training or professional enhancement activities to national not-for-profit organizations].<sup>8</sup>

*(Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2012.)*

#### NOTES

No language is included for programs authorized under the expired Elementary and Secondary Education Act; when new authorizing legislation for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is enacted, a budget request for these programs will be proposed.

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

| Language Provision  | Explanation  |
|---|--|
| <p><sup>1</sup> <u>[SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS]</u><br/><u>EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS</u></p>  | <p>This language reflects the proposed change in the name of the account.</p>  |
| <p><sup>2</sup> ... of which [\$2,725,246,000 shall become available on July 1, 2012, and remain available through September 30, 2013, and of which \$1,681,441,000 shall become available on October 1, 2012, and shall remain available through September 30, 2013, for academic year 2012-2013...]</p>   | <p>This language provides for a portion of funds to be appropriated on a forward-funded basis for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, Mathematics and Science Partnerships, Educational Technology State Grants, 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers, State Assessments, Education for Homeless Children and Youths, and Rural Education. This language also provides that a portion of funds for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants is available on an advance-funded basis.</p> |
| <p><sup>3</sup> ... [<i>Provided</i>, That funds made available to carry out part B of title VII of the ESEA may be used for construction, renovation, and modernization of any elementary school, secondary school, or structure related to an elementary school or secondary school, run by the Department of Education of the State of Hawaii, that serves a predominantly Native Hawaiian student body:...]</p> | <p>This language authorizes the use of funds appropriated for the Education for Native Hawaiians program for school construction, renovation, and modernization.</p>   |
| <p><sup>4</sup> ... [<i>Provided further</i>, That funds made available to carry out part C of title VII of the ESEA shall be awarded on a competitive basis, and also may be used for construction:...]</p>  | <p>This language authorizes the use of funds appropriated for the Alaska Native Education Equity program for construction.</p>   |
| <p><sup>5</sup> ... <u>\$51,113,000</u> shall be available to carry out section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002:</p>  | <p>This language specifies the funding level for the Comprehensive Centers program.</p>  |
| <p><sup>6</sup> <i>Provided [further]</i>, That [<u>\$17,652,000</u>] <u>\$17,619,000</u> shall be available to carry out the Supplemental Education Grants program for the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands:</p>  | <p>This language specifies the funding level for Supplemental Education Grants to the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands.</p>   |

**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

**Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes—continued**

| Language Provision   | Explanation   |
|--|---|
| <p><sup>7</sup> <i>Provided further, That up to 5 percent of [these amounts] <u>the amount referred to in the previous proviso</u> may be reserved by the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands to administer the Supplemental Education Grants programs and to obtain technical assistance, oversight and consultancy services in the administration of these grants and to reimburse the United States Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for such services...</i></p> | <p>This language allows the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands to reserve up to 5 percent of their Supplemental Education Grants funds for administration and for technical assistance, oversight, and consultancy services for these grants and to reimburse the United States Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for these services.</p> |
| <p><sup>8</sup>...[: <i>Provided further, That up to 1.5 percent of the funds for subpart 1 of part A of title II of the ESEA shall be reserved by the Secretary for competitive awards for teacher or principal training or professional enhancement activities to national not-for-profit organizations].</i></p>  | <p>This language provides a specific amount for the Supporting Effective Educator Development program from the appropriation for the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program.</p>  |

**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

**Amounts Available for Obligation**  
(dollars in thousands)

| Appropriation and Adjustments   | 2011          | 2012          | 2013        |
|---|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| <b>Discretionary budget authority:</b>  |               |               |             |
| Appropriation .....   | \$4,606,232   | \$4,550,018   | \$1,219,357 |
| Across-the-board reduction (P.L. 112-10).....   | -9,213        | 0             | 0           |
| Across-the-board reduction (P.L. 112-74).....   | <u>-3,178</u> | <u>-5,422</u> | <u>0</u>    |
| Subtotal, appropriation .....   | 4,593,841     | 4,544,596     | 1,219,357   |
| <b>Comparative transfer to <u>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity</u> for:</b>   |               |               |             |
| Homeless children and youth education.....  | -65,296       | -65,427       | 0           |
| <b>Comparative transfer to <u>Innovation and Instructional Teams</u> for:</b>             |               |               |             |
| Improving teacher quality State grants .....  | -2,464,876    | -2,466,567    | 0           |
| <b>Comparative transfer to <u>Supporting Student Success</u> for:</b>                     |               |               |             |
| 21 <sup>st</sup> century community learning centers .....                                 | -1,153,854    | -1,151,673    | 0           |
| <b>Comparative transfer from <u>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity</u> for:</b> |               |               |             |
| Striving readers .....  | 0             | 159,698       | 0           |
| High school graduation initiative .....   | 48,902        | 48,809        | 0           |
| <b>Comparative transfer from <u>Innovation and Instructional Teams</u> for:</b>           |               |               |             |
| Ready-to-learn television .....   | 27,245        | 27,194        | 0           |
| Excellence in economic education .....  | 1,444         | 0             | 0           |
| Teaching American history .....   | 45,908        | 0             | 0           |
| Arts in education .....   | 27,447        | 24,953        | 0           |
| Advanced placement .....  | 43,253        | 26,949        | 0           |
| <b>Comparative transfer from <u>Supporting Student Success</u> for:</b>                   |               |               |             |
| Civic education: Cooperative education exchange ...                                       | <u>1,155</u>  | <u>0</u>      | <u>0</u>    |
| Subtotal, comparable discretionary appropriation.....                                     | 1,105,169     | 1,148,532     | 1,219,357   |
| Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....   | -1,678,263    | -1,681,441    | 0           |
| Advance from prior year .....   | 1,681,441     | 1,678,263     | 1,681,441   |

**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

**Amounts Available for Obligation—continued**  
(dollars in thousands)

| Appropriation and Adjustments   | 2011              | 2012              | 2013                |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Comparative transfer to <u>Innovation and Instructional Teams</u> for:</b> |                   |                   |                     |
| Improving teacher quality State grants  |                   |                   |                     |
| Advance for succeeding fiscal year .....                                      | \$1,678,263       | \$1,681,441       | 0                   |
| Advance from prior year.....  | <u>-1,681,441</u> | <u>-1,678,263</u> | <u>-\$1,681,441</u> |
| Subtotal, comparable budget authority.....                                    | 1,105,169         | 1,148,532         | 1,219,357           |
| Unobligated balance, start of year .....                                      | 64,774            | 60,062            | 0                   |
| Recovery of prior-year obligations .....                                      | 50                | 3                 | 0                   |
| Unobligated balance expiring.....   | -96               | 0                 | 0                   |
| Unobligated balance, end of year .....  | -60,062           | 0                 | 0                   |
| <b>Comparative transfers:</b>   |                   |                   |                     |
| Unobligated balance, start of year to   |                   |                   |                     |
| <u>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity</u> ....                      | -65               | 0                 | 0                   |
| <u>Innovation and Instructional Teams</u> .....                               | -29,375           | -37,400           | -49,331             |
| <u>Supporting Student Success</u> .....                                       | -14,890           | -11,539           | -11,517             |
| Unobligated balance, start of year from                                       |                   |                   |                     |
| <u>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity</u> ....                      | 200               | 0                 | 0                   |
| Recovery of prior-year obligations to   |                   |                   |                     |
| <u>Innovation and Instructional Teams</u> .....                               | 0                 | -3                | 0                   |
| Unobligated balance, expiring to  |                   |                   |                     |
| <u>Innovation and Instructional Teams</u> .....                               | 1                 | 0                 | 0                   |
| <u>Supporting Student Success</u> .....                                       | 26                | 0                 | 0                   |
| Unobligated balance, expiring from  |                   |                   |                     |
| <u>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity</u> ....                      | -1                | 0                 | 0                   |
| Unobligated balance, end of year to   |                   |                   |                     |
| <u>Innovation and Instructional Teams</u> .....                               | 37,400            | 49,331            | 0                   |
| <u>Supporting Student Success</u> .....                                       | <u>11,539</u>     | <u>11,517</u>     | <u>0</u>            |
| Total, direct obligations .....   | 1,114,670         | 1,220,503         | 1,158,509           |

**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

**Obligations by Object Classification**  
(dollars in thousands)

---

| Object Class                              | 2011             | 2012             | 2013             |
|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| <hr/>                                     |                  |                  |                  |
| Other contractual services:               |                  |                  |                  |
| Advisory and assistance services .....    | \$602            | \$2,500          | 0                |
| Other services.....                       | 5,341            | 5,629            | \$25,472         |
| Peer review .....                         | 1,245            | 1,275            | 2,014            |
| Purchases of goods and services .....     | <u>373</u>       | <u>23</u>        | <u>23</u>        |
| Subtotal .....                            | 7,561            | 9,427            | 27,509           |
| Grants, subsidies, and contributions..... | <u>1,107,109</u> | <u>1,211,076</u> | <u>1,131,000</u> |
| Total, direct obligations.....            | 1,114,670        | 1,220,503        | 1,158,509        |

---

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Summary of Changes (dollars in thousands)

|                  |                  |
|------------------|------------------|
| 2012 .....       | \$1,148,786      |
| 2013 .....       | <u>1,219,357</u> |
| Net change ..... | +70,571          |

| <b>Increases:</b>   | <u>2012 base</u> | <u>Change<br/>from base</u> |
|---|------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u>Program:</u>   |                  |                             |
| Initial funding for the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program to support State and local efforts aimed at implementing a comprehensive literacy strategy that provides high-quality literacy instruction and support to students from pre-kindergarten to grade 12.  | 0                | +\$186,892                  |
| Initial funding for the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) program to support State efforts to improve the teaching and learning of STEM subjects.  | 0                | +149,716                    |
| Initial funding for the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education to support State and local efforts to develop and expand innovative practices to improve teaching and learning in the arts, health education, physical education, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, environmental education, economics, financial literacy, and other subjects. | 0                | +90,000                     |
| Initial funding for the proposed College Pathways and Accelerated Learning to support programs that prepare students in high-need school districts to enter and succeed in college.   | <u>0</u>         | <u>+81,282</u>              |
| Subtotal, increases   |                  | +507,890                    |

**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

**Summary of Changes—continued**  
(dollars in thousands)

| <b>Decreases:</b>  | <u>2012 base</u> | <u>Change<br/>from base</u> |
|--|------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u>Program:</u>  |                  |                             |
| Eliminate funding for Striving Readers and Ready-to-Learn Television because these programs are proposed for consolidation into the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program.                         | \$186,892        | -\$186,892                  |
| Eliminate funding for Mathematics and Science Partnerships because it would be replaced by the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics program.            | 149,716          | -149,716                    |
| Eliminate funding for Arts in Education because it is proposed for consolidation into the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education.  | 24,953           | -24,953                     |
| Eliminate funding for the High School Graduation Initiative and Advanced Placement programs because these programs are proposed for consolidation into the proposed College Pathways and Accelerated Learning. | 75,758           | <u>-75,758</u>              |
| Subtotal, decreases  |                  | -437,319                    |
| Net change   |                  | +70,571                     |

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Authorizing Legislation

(dollars in thousands)

| Activity   | 2012<br>Authorized | 2012<br>Estimate | 2013<br>Authorized              | 2013<br>Request |
|--|--------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| Effective teaching and learning for a complete education:  |                    |                  |                                 |                 |
| Effective teaching and learning: literacy (proposed legislation):  | ---                | ---              | To be determined                | \$186,892       |
| Ready-to-learn television (ESEA II-D-3)  | 0                  | \$27,194         | 0 <sup>1</sup>                  | 0               |
| Striving readers (ESEA I-E, section 1502)  | 0                  | 159,698          | 0 <sup>1</sup>                  | 0               |
| Effective teaching and learning: science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (proposed legislation): | ---                | ---              | To be determined                | 149,716         |
| Mathematics and science partnerships (ESEA II, Part B)   | 0                  | 149,716          | 0 <sup>1</sup>                  | 0               |
| Effective teaching and learning for a well-rounded education (proposed legislation):                       | ---                | ---              | To be determined                | 90,000          |
| Arts in education (ESEA V-D, subpart 15)   | 0                  | 24,953           | 0 <sup>1</sup>                  | 0               |
| College pathways and accelerated learning opportunities (proposed legislation):                            | ---                | ---              | To be determined                | 81,282          |
| High school graduation initiative (ESEA I-H)   | 0                  | 48,809           | 0 <sup>1</sup>                  | 0               |
| Advanced placement (ESEA I-G)  | 0                  | 26,949           | 0 <sup>1</sup>                  | 0               |
| Assessing achievement (ESEA VI-A-1)  | ---                | 389,214          | To be determined <sup>1</sup>   | 389,214         |
| Training and advisory services (CRA IV)  | 0                  | 6,962            | 0                               | 6,962           |
| Rural education (ESEA VI-B)  | 0                  | 179,193          | To be determined <sup>1,2</sup> | 179,193         |

D-10

**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

**Authorizing Legislation—continued**

(dollars in thousands)

| Activity  | 2012<br>Authorized    | 2012<br>Estimate | 2013<br>Authorized            | 2013<br>Request |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| Supplemental education grants (Compact of Free Association Act)           | \$20,071 <sup>3</sup> | \$17,619         | \$20,265 <sup>3</sup>         | \$17,619        |
| Comprehensive centers (Educational Technical Assistance Act, Section 203) | 0                     | 51,113           | 0 <sup>4</sup>                | 51,113          |
| Native Hawaiian student education (ESEA VII-B and HEA VIII-Z)             | 0                     | 34,181           | To be determined <sup>1</sup> | 34,181          |
| Alaska Native student education (ESEA VII-C)                              | 0                     | 33,185           | To be determined <sup>1</sup> | 33,185          |
| <u>Unfunded authorizations</u>  |                       |                  |                               |                 |
| Early reading first (ESEA I-B-2)  | 0                     | 0                | 0                             | 0               |
| Special education teacher training (ESEA, Section 2151(d))                | 0                     | 0                | 0                             | 0               |
| Early childhood educator professional development (ESEA, Section 2151(e)) | 0                     | 0                | 0                             | 0               |
| Teacher mobility (ESEA, Section 2151(f))                                  | 0                     | 0                | 0                             | 0               |
| Civic education (ESEA II-C-3)   | 0                     | 0                | 0                             | 0               |
| Teaching American history (ESEA II-C-4)                                   | 0                     | 0                | 0                             | 0               |
| State grants for innovative programs (ESEA V-A)                           | 0                     | 0                | 0                             | 0               |
| Foreign language assistance (ESEA V-D, Subpart 9)                         | 0                     | 0                | 0                             | 0               |
| Excellence in economic education (ESEA V-D, Subpart 13)                   | <u>0</u>              | <u>0</u>         | <u>0</u>                      | <u>0</u>        |
| Total definite authorization  | 20,071                |                  | 20,265                        |                 |
| Total annual appropriation  |                       | 1,148,786        |                               | 1,219,357       |

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Authorizing Legislation—continued

(dollars in thousands)

| Activity                                      | 2012<br>Authorized | 2012<br>Estimate | 2013<br>Authorized | 2013<br>Request |
|---|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Portion of request subject to reauthorization |                    |                  |                    | \$635,773       |
| Portion of request not authorized             |                    |                  |                    | 507,890         |

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2013 under new legislation.

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

<sup>3</sup> The Compact of Free Association Act authorizes \$12,230 thousand for the Federated States of Micronesia and \$6,100 thousand for the Republic of the Marshall Islands for fiscal year 2005 and an equivalent amount, as adjusted for inflation (calculated as two thirds of the percentage change in the U.S. Gross Domestic Product Implicit Price Deflator, or 5 percent, whichever is less in any one year) for each of the succeeding fiscal years through 2023. The 2013 authorization is calculated based on inflation estimates as of February 2011.

<sup>4</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2009. The President's fiscal year 2013 budget proposes authorizing this program through appropriations language.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

| Year   | Budget<br>Estimate<br>to Congress | House<br>Allowance                                 | Senate<br>Allowance                                | Appropriation                                     |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 2004<br>(2004 Advance for 2005)                                  | \$5,042,834<br>(1,435,000)        | \$5,797,637<br>(1,435,000)                         | \$5,731,453<br>(1,435,000)                         | \$5,800,496<br>(1,435,000)                        |
| 2005<br>(2005 Advance for 2006)                                  | 5,940,493<br>(1,435,000)          | 5,661,401<br>(1,435,000)                           | 5,730,632<br>(1,435,000)                           | 5,619,657<br>(1,435,000)                          |
| 2006<br>(2006 Advance for 2007)                                  | 5,332,219<br>(1,435,000)          | 5,393,765<br>(1,435,000)                           | 5,457,953<br>(1,435,000)                           | 5,255,478<br>(1,435,000)                          |
| 2007<br>(2007 Advance for 2008)                                  | 4,973,158<br>(1,435,000)          | N/A <sup>1</sup>                                   | N/A <sup>1</sup>                                   | 5,255,478 <sup>1</sup><br>(1,435,000)             |
| 2008<br>(2008 Advance for 2009)<br>Supp. (PL 110-329)            | 4,698,276<br>(1,435,000)<br>0     | 5,693,668<br>(1,435,000)<br>0                      | 5,198,525<br>(1,435,000)<br>0                      | 5,289,076<br>(1,435,000)<br>15,000                |
| 2009<br>(2009 Advance for 2010)<br>Recovery Act Supp. (PL 111-5) | 4,566,323<br>(1,435,000)<br>0     | 5,399,609 <sup>2</sup><br>(1,435,000)<br>1,066,000 | 5,292,422 <sup>2</sup><br>(1,435,000)<br>1,070,000 | 5,362,016<br>(1,681,441)<br>720,000               |
| 2010<br>(2010 Advance for 2011)                                  | 5,182,181<br>(1,681,441)          | 5,244,644<br>(1,681,441)                           | 5,197,316 <sup>3</sup><br>(1,681,441)              | 5,228,444<br>(1,681,441)                          |
| 2011<br>(2011 Advance for 2012)<br>Rescission (PL 112-74)        | 1,890,779<br>(0)                  | 5,221,444 <sup>4</sup><br>(1,681,441)              | 5,388,173 <sup>3</sup><br>(1,681,441)              | 4,593,841 <sup>5</sup><br>(1,681,441)<br>(-3,178) |
| 2012<br>(2012 Advance for 2013)                                  | 1,664,979<br>(0)                  | 4,332,102 <sup>6</sup><br>(1,681,441)              | 4,570,145 <sup>6</sup><br>(1,681,441)              | 4,544,596<br>(1,681,441)                          |
| 2013   | 1,219,357                         |  |  |   |

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

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

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

<sup>4</sup> The level for the House allowance reflects the House-passed full-year continuing resolution.

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

<sup>6</sup> The level for the House allowance reflects an introduced bill and the level for the Senate allowances reflects Senate Committee action only.

## **EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

### **Significant Items in FY 2012 Appropriation Reports**

#### **21st Century Community Learning Centers**

Senate: The Committee directs the Department to provide guidance and support technical assistance to State educational agencies on how to form and maintain strong community-school partnerships, promote continuous quality improvement and ensure that funded programs meet the needs of individual students.

Conference: The conferees intend that in providing the technical assistance and guidance described in the Senate Report, the Department of Education should not give priority to, show preference for, or provide direction about whether communities use program funds for after school, before school, summer school or extended school day programs, unless specifically requested by a State or local educational agency.

Response: The Department will provide technical assistance and guidance to SEAs, LEAs, and local program staff on how to form and maintain strong community-school partnerships, promote continuous quality improvement and ensure that funded programs meet the needs of individual students. It will not give priority to, show preference for, or provide direction about whether communities use program funds for after school, before school, summer school or extended school day programs, unless specifically requested by an SEA or LEA.

#### **Advanced Placement**

Conference: The conference agreement provides \$27 million for the Advanced Placement program. The conferees intend that \$20 million of these funds be used to continue the Advanced Placement Test Fee program and that \$7 million be used for continuation costs for the Advanced Placement Incentive Program.

Response: The Department will use \$20 million of these funds to continue the Advanced Placement Test Fee program and \$7 million for continuation costs for the Advanced Placement Incentive Program.

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

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

Response: Applications from eligible entities that propose to serve schools in rural areas will undergo the same peer review process as all other applications. Historically, rural applicants have each year received a portion of the funding.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Significant Items in FY 2012 Appropriation Reports—continued

#### Rural Education

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

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

[Click here for accessible version](#)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2013 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

| (in thousands of dollars)   |               |                    |                    |                         | 2013 President's Budget Compared to 2012 Appropriation |           |
|---|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--|-----------|
| Account, Program and Activity   | Category Code | 2011 Appropriation | 2012 Appropriation | 2013 President's Budget | Amount   | Percent   |
| <b>Education Improvement Programs</b>   |               |                    |                    |                         |  |           |
| 1. Effective teaching and learning for a complete education:  |               |                    |                    |                         |  |           |
| (a) Effective teaching and learning: Literacy:  |               |                    |                    |                         |  |           |
| (1) Effective teaching and learning: Literacy (proposed legislation)  | D             | 0                  | 0                  | 186,892                 | 186,892  | ---       |
| (2) Ready-to-learn television (ESEA II-D-3)   | D             | 27,245             | 27,194             | 0                       | (27,194)   | -100.000% |
| (3) Striving readers (ESEA I-E, section 1502)   | D             | 0                  | 159,698            | 0                       | (159,698)  | -100.000% |
| Subtotal  |               | 27,245             | 186,892            | 186,892                 | 0  | 0.000%    |
| (b) Effective teaching and learning: Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics:                       |               |                    |                    |                         |  |           |
| (1) Effective teaching and learning: Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (proposed legislation) | D             | 0                  | 0                  | 149,716                 | 149,716  | ---       |
| (2) Mathematics and science partnerships (ESEA II, Part B)  | D             | 175,127            | 149,716            | 0                       | (149,716)  | -100.000% |
| Subtotal  |               | 175,127            | 149,716            | 149,716                 | 0  | 0.000%    |
| (c) Effective teaching and learning for a well-rounded education:   |               |                    |                    |                         |  |           |
| (1) Effective teaching and learning for a well-rounded education (proposed legislation)                       | D             | 0                  | 0                  | 90,000                  | 90,000   | ---       |
| (2) Excellence in economic education (ESEA V-D, subpart 13)   | D             | 1,444              | 0                  | 0                       | 0  | ---       |
| (3) Teaching American history (ESEA II-C-4)   | D             | 45,908             | 0                  | 0                       | 0  | ---       |
| (4) Arts in education (ESEA V-D, subpart 15)  | D             | 27,447             | 24,953             | 0                       | (24,953)   | -100.000% |
| (5) Foreign language assistance (ESEA V-D, subpart 9)   | D             | 26,874             | 0                  | 0                       | 0  | ---       |
| (6) Civic education: Cooperative education exchange (ESEA II, section 2345)                                   | D             | 1,155              | 0                  | 0                       | 0  | ---       |
| Subtotal  |               | 102,828            | 24,953             | 90,000                  | 65,047   | 260.678%  |
| Subtotal, Effective teaching and learning for a complete education  |               | 305,200            | 361,561            | 426,608                 | 65,047   | 17.991%   |
| 2. College pathways and accelerated learning:   |               |                    |                    |                         |  |           |
| (a) College pathways and accelerated learning (proposed legislation)  | D             | 0                  | 0                  | 81,282                  | 81,282   | ---       |
| (b) High school graduation initiative (ESEA II-H)   | D             | 48,902             | 48,809             | 0                       | (48,809)   | -100.000% |
| (c) Advanced placement (ESEA I-G)   | D             | 43,253             | 26,949             | 0                       | (26,949)   | -100.000% |
| Subtotal  |               | 92,155             | 75,758             | 81,282                  | 5,524  | 7.292%    |

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

-Programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for which funds are requested in 2013 or that are shown as consolidated in 2013 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 2011 and 2012 have been adjusted to be comparable to the fiscal year 2013 request.

-Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2013 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

| (in thousands of dollars)  |               |                    |                    |                         |  |         |
|--|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--|---------|
| Account, Program and Activity                                      | Category Code | 2011 Appropriation | 2012 Appropriation | 2013 President's Budget | 2013 President's Budget Compared to 2012 Appropriation |         |
|  |               |                    |                    |                         | Amount   | Percent |
| <b>Education Improvement Programs (continued)</b>                  |               |                    |                    |                         |  |         |
| 3. Assessing achievement (ESEA VI-A-1)                             | D             | 389,951            | 389,214            | 389,214                 | 0  | 0.000%  |
| 4. Training and advisory services (CRA IV)                         | D             | 6,975              | 6,962              | 6,962                   | 0  | 0.000%  |
| 5. Rural education (ESEA VI-B)                                     | D             | 174,532            | 179,193            | 179,193                 | 0  | 0.000%  |
| 6. Supplemental education grants (Compact of Free Association Act) | D             | 17,652             | 17,619             | 17,619                  | 0  | 0.000%  |
| 7. Comprehensive centers (ETAA section 203)                        | D             | 51,210             | 51,113             | 51,113                  | 0  | 0.000%  |
| 8. Native Hawaiian student education (ESEA VII-B and HEA VIII-Z)   | D             | 34,246             | 34,181             | 34,181                  | 0  | 0.000%  |
| 9. Alaska Native student education (ESEA VII-C)                    | D             | 33,248             | 33,185             | 33,185                  | 0  | 0.000%  |
| Subtotal   |               | 1,105,169          | 1,148,786          | 1,219,357               | 70,571   | 6.143%  |
| Total  | D             | 1,105,169          | 1,148,786          | 1,219,357               | 70,571   | 6.143%  |

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

-Programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for which funds are requested in 2013 or that are shown as consolidated in 2013 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 2011 and 2012 have been adjusted to be comparable to the fiscal year 2013 request.

-Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Summary of Request

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

The fiscal year 2013 appropriation would support the first year of a reauthorized ESEA. The Administration's request for programs in the EIP account (except for three non-ESEA programs) is proposed for later transmittal pending the enactment of the reauthorization. The Administration is requesting a total of approximately \$1.2 billion for programs in this account. This request represents a strengthening and expansion of existing ESEA programs under two broad program authorities: **Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education** and **College Pathways and Accelerated Learning**. The budget also reallocates programs across budget accounts in order to better align the budget presentation with the structure of the ESEA as proposed for reauthorization.

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

- \$187 million for **Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy** to support State and local efforts aimed at implementing and supporting a comprehensive literacy strategy that provides high-quality literacy instruction and support to students from pre-kindergarten through grade 12.
- \$150 million for **Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics** to improve teaching and raise student achievement in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM). The program would support comprehensive efforts to improve STEM education through such activities as professional development for STEM teachers; implementation of high-quality curriculum, assessments, and instructional materials; and creation or improvement of systems for linking student data on assessments with instructional supports such as lesson plans and intervention strategies.
- \$90 million for **Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education** to support States and high-need local educational agencies (LEAs) in developing and expanding innovative practices that improve teaching and learning in the arts, health education, physical education, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, environmental education, economics, financial literacy, and other subjects.

The Administration also is proposing a new \$81 million **College Pathways and Accelerated Learning** program to support competitive grants to States and LEAs for expansion of such activities as Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, dual high school/college enrollment, and "early college high schools" in order to prepare more students for high school graduation and success in college.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

The Administration requests \$389 million for **Assessing Achievement** (State Assessments under current law) to assist States and other entities in developing and implementing assessments that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards. Formula funds would support States' implementation of the assessments currently required under Title I of the ESEA while they transition to new college- and career-ready standards and assessments that capture a fuller picture of what students know and are able to do. Funds for competitive grants would also support targeted projects to advance States' and other entities' efforts to implement new assessment requirements of the reauthorized Title I and to develop additional assessments that support the improvement of teaching and learning. The proposed funding for fiscal year 2013 would support a grant competition to assist consortia of States in developing high-quality assessments in areas of common need.

The 2013 request also includes:

- \$7 million for **Training and Advisory Services** to support regional equity assistance centers that provide technical assistance to school districts in addressing educational equity related to issues of race, gender, and national origin;
- \$179 million for **Rural Education** to provide resources to rural LEAs and schools that often face unique challenges in implementing ESEA;
- \$18 million for **Supplemental Education Grants** program to provide support to the Federated States of Micronesia and to the Republic of the Marshall Islands in place of grant programs in which those Freely Associated States no longer participate pursuant to the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003;
- \$51 million for **Comprehensive Centers** to provide comprehensive technical assistance to grantees under the Education Technical Assistance Act of 2002;
- \$34 million for **Native Hawaiian Student Education** to provide supplemental education programs and services to Native Hawaiian children and adults, in such areas as teacher training, family-based education, gifted and talented education, special education, higher education, and community-based education learning centers; and
- \$33 million for **Alaska Native Student Education** to support the development and operation of supplemental education programs and services for Alaska Native children and adults.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

**Effective teaching and learning for a complete education**  
(Proposed legislation)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: To be determined

Budget Authority:

|   | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u>   | <u>Change</u>  |
|---|-------------|---------------|----------------|
| <i>Effective teaching and learning:<br/>literacy</i>  | 0           | \$186,892     | +\$186,892     |
| <i>Effective teaching and learning:<br/>science, technology,<br/>engineering, and mathematics</i> | 0           | 149,716       | \$149,716      |
| <i>Effective teaching and learning for<br/>a well-rounded education</i>                           | <u>0</u>    | <u>90,000</u> | <u>+90,000</u> |
| <b>Total</b>  | 0           | 426,608       | +426,608       |

---

### **PROGRAM OVERVIEW**

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

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

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

---

continue grants made prior to reauthorization for programs being consolidated as part of the reauthorization.

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

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

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

#### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

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

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education

---

#### **FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Department requests \$187 million in fiscal year 2013 for Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy. This request would support the first year of the program, which would address the need to strengthen and support instruction comprehensively and increase student achievement in literacy in high-need LEAs and schools. This new program would replace the Striving Readers program (and other literacy-related programs currently authorized by the ESEA and funded in previous years) with a single comprehensive and coherent program that supports the improvement of education in reading, writing, and language arts while providing increased flexibility for States and LEAs to develop and implement strategies that best meet local needs. The Department believes that this approach would help ensure that States and high-need LEAs have in place a solid infrastructure across the grade levels to support high-need schools in implementing high-quality, developmentally appropriate, and systematic literacy instruction.

Research and assessment data provide strong justification for continued Federal investment in a large-scale evidence-based literacy program targeted to high-need LEAs and schools. Findings released in October 2009 from the Department's Early Childhood Longitudinal Study indicate that, at kindergarten entry, children from families with incomes below the poverty threshold have significantly lower reading scores than children from families living at or above that threshold. The effects of socioeconomic status persist; on the 2011 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), more than half (53 percent) of fourth-grade students in high-poverty schools scored below the basic reading level, compared with only 15 percent in low-poverty schools. (For the purpose of this analysis, low-poverty schools are defined as those where 25 percent or less of the students were eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch, and high-poverty schools are defined as those where more than 75 percent of the students were eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch.) Forty-three percent of eighth-grade students in high-poverty schools scored below the basic reading level, compared with only 12 percent in low-poverty schools.

The new program would build off congressional action in fiscal years 2010 and 2012, which changed the Striving Readers program from an adolescent literacy program to a comprehensive literacy development and education program that provides support for the improvement of literacy instruction for children from birth through grade 12. The 2010 and 2012 appropriations language, however, also allocated funding by specific age ranges of students, which may perpetuate a tendency in the field to implement segmented improvements to literacy instruction. The Department strongly believes that State and local efforts will be more coherent and more likely to drive improvements in student achievement if they have a comprehensive preschool-grade 12 focus that also provides educators with the flexibility to best meet the needs of their students.

The Department also would use funds allocated for Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy to pay continuation costs for grants made prior to ESEA reauthorization under Striving Readers and Ready-to-Learn Television. In fiscal year 2013, the great majority of program funds would be used for this purpose.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education

---

#### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands)

| <u>Measures</u>                                  | <u>2013</u>      |
|--|------------------|
| Amount for grants                                | \$3,049          |
| Number of grants                                 | 1                |
| Peer review of new award applications            | \$500            |
| Continuations for antecedent programs            | <u>\$183,343</u> |
| Total, Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy | \$186,892        |

---

NOTE: Approximately \$183,343 thousand (\$156,098 thousand for Striving Readers and \$27,245 thousand for Ready to Learn Television) would be provided in FY 2013 to fund continuation awards for grants made prior to enactment of the reauthorization.

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

#### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

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

In awarding State STEM grants, the Department would give priority to States that have adopted and are implementing a set of high-quality K-12 mathematics standards (and, at the Department's discretion, additional standards, such as science standards) that build toward college- and career-readiness and are common to a significant number of States. The Department could also give priority to States that have a robust statewide partnership or network that brings together a variety of organizations with STEM expertise, such as museums, institutions of higher education, and community-based organizations, in order to increase student engagement and achievement.

States receiving grants would be permitted to reserve up to 20 percent of grant funds for State-level activities that support a coherent approach to funding and implementing high-quality, evidence-based STEM instruction in high-need LEAs and schools. States would be required to use their remaining grant funds to make subgrants to high-need LEAs and other entities to improve STEM instruction at the local level through, for example, online curricula and other technology-based approaches to STEM education.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education

---

The Department would be permitted to reserve up to 5 percent of funds for competitive State Capacity-Building grants that support State efforts to strengthen their capacity to improve the teaching and learning of STEM subjects.

### **FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$150 million in fiscal year 2013 for the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM program. This request would support the first year of the program, which would replace the existing Mathematics and Science Partnership program with a more comprehensive, flexible authority and address the need to strengthen instruction comprehensively and increase student achievement in STEM subjects in high-need LEAs and schools.

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

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

Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM would help address these concerns by focusing on teaching and learning of STEM subjects in a manner that is aligned with college- and career-ready standards. This new program would also provide States and LEAs with the flexibility necessary to meet the needs of their students and teachers across STEM subjects while focusing funding on programs that improve student achievement, especially in high-need LEAs.

The Department is working closely with the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy as well as the National Science Foundation (NSF) and other Federal science mission agencies to develop and implement a coordinated STEM education strategy that optimizes

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education

---

delivery of services and minimizes duplication and inefficiency. Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM will be a key element of that strategy and would enable, in particular, better alignment between the Department's and NSF's support for improving STEM education. In addition, as components of the Administration's governmentwide effort to support and improve STEM education, the Department would set aside \$80 million from the fiscal year 2013 appropriation for the new Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program for projects to prepare effective STEM teachers and would use \$30 million in fiscal year 2013 funds from the Fund for the Improvement of Education: Programs of National Significance to support a new evidence-based K-12 mathematics initiative as well as efforts to improve the evidence base for STEM programs across the Federal Government. The Department would also continue to provide support for STEM projects in the Investing in Innovation program.

If the Congress does not reauthorize the ESEA prior to enactment of fiscal year 2013 appropriations, the Administration will request authority to make competitive grants under the Mathematics and Science Partnerships program for activities consistent with those proposed under the Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM program.

### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands)

| <u>Measures</u>                              | <u>2013</u>     |
|--|-----------------|
| Amount for grants                            | \$134,346       |
| Number of grants                             | 5-20            |
| Peer review of new award applications        | \$400           |
| National activities set-aside                | <u>\$14,972</u> |
| Total, Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM | \$149,716       |

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

#### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

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

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

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

---

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

### **FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$90 million in fiscal year 2013 for the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program. The request would support the first year of the program.

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

The Department would use funds allocated for Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education to pay fiscal year 2013 continuation costs for grants made prior to ESEA reauthorization under Arts in Education and possibly under other antecedent programs.

If the Congress does not reauthorize the ESEA prior to enactment of fiscal year 2013 appropriations, the Administration will recommend that funds requested for Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education (excluding funds needed to pay continuation costs under Arts in Education) be provided under the Fund for the Improvement of Education: Programs of National Significance for similar activities to improve instruction across a well-rounded curriculum.

**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

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

---

**PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands)

| <u>Measures</u>   | <u>2013</u>     |
|---|-----------------|
| Amount for grants   | \$60,421        |
| Number of grants  | 10-30           |
| Peer review of new award applications                                   | \$400           |
| National activities set-aside   | \$9,000         |
| Continuations for antecedent programs                                   | <u>\$20,179</u> |
| <br>Total, Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education | <br>\$90,000    |

---

NOTE: Approximately \$20,179 thousand would be provided in FY 2013 to fund continuation awards for grants made under Arts in Education.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Ready-to-learn television

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

| <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| \$27,194    | 0           | -\$27,194     |

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2013 under new legislation.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Ready-to-learn television

---

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

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

- Window to the World Communications (WTTW), which will receive \$32.5 million over the 5-year grant period, is partnering with Wildbrain Entertainment to develop Project UMIGO (“yoU Make It GO”), which is being designed to help children age 2 through 8 learn mathematics. Project UMIGO will use multiple platforms (including the Internet, cell phones, handheld gaming devices, television, DVDs, and books) and a media-based mathematics curriculum to offer child-initiated and creative play opportunities (e.g., digital paint, glue, and blocks) that support mathematics learning, as well as related support materials and digital resources for parents, caregivers, and teachers. The goal is to ensure that children learn the basic principles of mathematics and to think creatively, invent, and work collaboratively. (See <http://umigo.info/>)
- The Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), in partnership with the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS), will receive \$71.4 million over the life of the grant to develop a “transmedia” collection (video content, interactive games, mobile apps, and white board applications) designed to raise the achievement of children ages 2 to 8 in high-needs communities. Project content will be aligned with rigorous mathematics and literacy academic standards, and a progress tracking system will provide feedback on student progress to parents and teachers. (See <http://pbskids.org/readytolearn/commitment.html>)
- The Hispanic Information and Telecommunications Network (HITN), which will receive \$30 million over 5 years, has partnered with Callaway Arts & Entertainment to form the Learning Apps Media Partnership (Project LAMP), which will develop transmedia learning applications that promote essential literacy and mathematics skills in 3-to-8 year olds. Each project will include multiple platforms, including mobile device and phone applications, interactive websites, and television, and will include training materials for families, caregivers, and educators. (See <http://www.hitn.tv/node/380>)

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

|            | (dollars in thousands) |
|------------|------------------------|
| 2008 ..... | \$23,831               |
| 2009 ..... | 25,416                 |
| 2010 ..... | 27,300                 |
| 2011 ..... | 27,245                 |
| 2012 ..... | 27,194                 |

### FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Ready-to-Learn Television (RTL) program for fiscal year 2013. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted,

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Ready-to-learn television

---

programs that seek to promote improvement of instruction for students of various grade spans, the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization, two new broader programs, Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy and Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM). These programs would address the need to comprehensively strengthen instruction and increase student achievement in literacy and STEM subjects in high-need local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools.

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

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

The fiscal year 2013 request for the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program would include funds to pay 2013 continuation costs for Ready-to-Learn Television grants made in 2010.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Ready-to-learn television

---

#### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands)

| <u>Measures</u>                       | <u>2011</u> | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Number of continuation awards         | 3           | 3           | 0           |
| Continuation award funding            | \$27,245    | \$27,170    | 0           |
| Evaluation (review of grant products) | <u>0</u>    | <u>25</u>   | <u>0</u>    |
| Total                                 | 27,245      | 27,194      | 0           |

Note: Continuation costs of approximately \$27,245 thousand for projects awarded in fiscal year 2010 will be provided under the fiscal year 2013 request for Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy.

#### **PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

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

For the 2010 competition, the Department established two invitational priorities: (1) developing educational content in reading or mathematics that is designed to increase the literacy or numeracy skills of low-income children ages 2 to 8, delivering the content through coordinated use of multiple media platforms, and developing effective outreach strategies; and (2) providing for the development and dissemination of products and results through open educational resources and making the products freely available through various media platforms. In addition, applicants could earn up to 20 competitive preference priority points for projects proposing an evaluation plan that was based on rigorous scientifically based research methods to assess effectiveness. The Department made three awards, and the 2010 grantees will produce new materials and strategies that reflect changes in television distribution and production. Initially, the grantees will focus on the creation and launch of digital learning materials (including video), using these to stimulate interest among target children, and then later will pursue the more expensive production of television shows. Because of these changes, the Department is examining whether new measures should be established, and will look at the feasibility of developing measures that assess mathematics and literacy learning, rather than just

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Ready-to-learn television

---

assessing content quality via expert panel review of products. Performance measure data below provide information for the final year of the 2005 grantees, which was 2010.

#### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources in previous years, and those requested in FY 2013 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

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

**Measure:** The percentage of Ready to Learn children’s television programming deemed to be of high quality.

| Year        | Targets | Actual |
|-------------|---------|--------|
| <b>2008</b> |         | 50     |
| <b>2009</b> | 75      | 75     |
| <b>2010</b> | 100     | 86     |

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

| Year        | Targets | Actual |
|-------------|---------|--------|
| <b>2008</b> |         | 72     |
| <b>2009</b> | 82      | 50     |
| <b>2010</b> | 92      | 67     |

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

In 2008, expert panel members considered 50 percent of RTL programs (2 of 4) for which episodes were reviewed to be of “high quality,” and considered 72 percent of RTL outreach

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Ready-to-learn television

---

products and services (8 of 11) to be of “high quality.” Likewise, in 2009, expert panel members considered 75 percent of RTL programs (three of four) for which episodes were reviewed, and 50 percent of RTL outreach products (four of eight), to be of “high quality.” The Department had concerns with one television program for which panel members assigned a score below 4.0 for the second year in a row and worked with the grantee to address issues identified by the panel. In the 2010 review, the program scores improved, and across all projects reviewed in 2010, the Department deemed 86 percent of the programming (six out of seven programs) and 67 percent of the outreach products and services (four out of six) to be of high quality.

### Efficiency Measures

The Department developed a single efficiency measure for the RTL program: dollars leveraged from non-Federal sources over 5 years (the length of each grant award) per Federal dollar dedicated to core non-outreach program activities. Because high-quality children’s television programs are expensive to develop, produce, and distribute, Federal support for new programming through the RTL programs is typically used by grantees to attract additional revenue from the private sector. Program quality is directly affected by the extent to which grantees succeed in using Federal dollars to leverage additional funds from alternate sources. Therefore, the Department will use this measure to compare the relative success of RTL grantees in leveraging non-Federal investments for the development and production of new children’s television programs.

Because the Department does not expect grantees to establish annual leveraging targets, and does not set a schedule for obtaining matching funds, the only truly meaningful unit of analysis for purposes of comparing grantee performance is the entire 5-year award period. During the 5-year period comprising fiscal years 2005 through 2009, the Department provided two grantees with \$98.55 million in funding for programming. These two grantees together contributed a total of \$66.15 million in non-Federal funding to programming activities, or \$0.67 non-Federal dollars for every Federal dollar; the individual grantee amounts were \$0.29 and \$1.03. Initially, the Department had planned to use the \$0.67 figure established by the 2005 grantees as the baseline against which to measure future efficiency. However, because of changes instituted to the program in 2010, grantees will be producing fewer television shows and instead will be focusing, at least initially, on the creation and distribution of digital media products such as apps and online educational games. This makes it easier and less expensive to release content and requires fewer external funds to be leveraged in support of television production. In the first year of the new grants, the three grantees leveraged \$9.8 million of non-Federal support compared to \$19.5 million in Federal dollars spent on production, or \$0.50 of non-Federal dollars for every Federal dollar. Because of the decrease in leveraged funds needed, the Department is reexamining how to assess progress against the efficiency measure.

### Other Performance Information

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Ready-to-learn television

---

content. Research conducted on Ready to Learn outreach activities has examined how families interact with children to support their learning; what barriers impede effective engagement of children, families, and caregivers; how television programming can be used to meet some of the educational needs of low-income families; and the role various technology platforms may play in enhancing learning through targeted programming and outreach.

Both 2005 RTL programming grantees implemented multiple formative studies designed to improve their projects, as well as summative evaluations designed to provide evidence on the extent to which children's television programming contributes to gains in early literacy. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting, with its partner the Public Broadcasting Service, published a summary report entitled *Findings from Ready to Learn, 2005-2010*, available online at <http://www.hitn.tv/node/380>, that provides a complete list of CPB/PBS television shows, materials, and resources as well as a bibliography of studies and other publications. Window to the World Communications will be producing a companion document that will provide not only a summary of their research, but will also frame issues for future academic research.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Striving readers

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

| <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| \$159,698   | 0           | -\$159,698    |

---

<sup>1</sup>The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2013 under new legislation.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Striving Readers program provides grants to eligible entities to support efforts to improve literacy instruction in high-need schools. In fiscal year 2010, Congress enacted appropriations language that changed Striving Readers from an adolescent literacy program to a comprehensive literacy development and education program intended to advance the literacy skills, including pre-literacy, reading, and writing skills, of students from birth through grade 12. The Congress provided additional funding for this new initiative in fiscal year 2012.

From the total fiscal year 2010 appropriation, the Department was required to reserve: (1) one-half of 1 percent for grants to the Department of the Interior/Bureau of Indian Education and one-half of 1 percent for the Outlying Areas; and (2) \$10 million for formula grants to States for the establishment or support of a State Literacy Team with expertise in literacy development and education for children from birth through grade 12 to assist the State in developing a comprehensive literacy plan. In addition, the Department had the authority to reserve up to 5 percent for national activities. The remaining funds were used to make competitive grants to States, which the Department awarded to six States. The fiscal year 2012 appropriations act continued the program but does not include formula grant funding.

Pursuant to the appropriations language for fiscal years 2010 and 2012, each State educational agency (SEA) that receives a competitive grant must award at least 95 percent of its allocation competitively to local educational agencies (LEAs) or, for the purposes of providing early literacy services, to LEAs or other nonprofit providers of early childhood education that partner with a public or provide nonprofit organization or agency with a demonstrated record of effectiveness in improving the early literacy development of children from birth through kindergarten entry and in providing professional development in early literacy. SEAs are required to: (1) give priority to such agencies or other entities serving greater numbers or percentages of disadvantaged children; and (2) ensure that at least 15 percent of the subgranted funds are used to serve children from birth through age 5, 40 percent to serve students in kindergarten through grade 5, and 40 percent to serve students in middle and high school. Further, States must equitably distribute funds between middle and high schools.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Striving readers

---

An SEA may reserve up to 5 percent of its allocation for leadership activities, including technical assistance and training, data collection, reporting, and administration. Eligible entities receiving subgrants must use Striving Readers funds for services and activities that have the characteristics of effective literacy instruction through professional development, screening and assessment, targeted interventions for students reading below grade level, and other research-based methods of improving classroom instruction and practice.

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

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

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Striving readers

---

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

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

|           | (dollars in thousands) |
|-----------|------------------------|
| 2008..... | \$35,371               |
| 2009..... | 35,371                 |
| 2010..... | 200,000 <sup>1</sup>   |
| 2011..... | 0                      |
| 2012..... | 159,698                |

---

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

### FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Striving Readers program for fiscal year 2013. In place of this program (and other literacy-related programs currently authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and funded in previous years), the Administration has proposed to create, through the ESEA reauthorization, a new, more flexible program, Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy. This program would address the need to comprehensively strengthen instruction and increase student achievement in literacy in high-need LEAs and schools.

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

The new program would build off congressional action in fiscal year 2010 and 2012, which changed the Striving Readers program from an adolescent literacy program to a comprehensive literacy development and education program that provides support for the improvement of literacy instruction for children from birth through grade 12. The 2010 and 2012 appropriations language, however, also allocated funding by specific age ranges of students, which may perpetuate a tendency in the field to implement segmented improvements to literacy instruction. The Administration believes that the Federal Government can better support literacy improvement efforts by providing States and LEAs with the flexibility to invest Federal funds

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Striving readers

---

based on their needs within the framework of a comprehensive preschool-through-12<sup>th</sup>-grade literacy plan.

The fiscal year 2013 request for Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy would include funds to pay 2013 continuation costs for the Striving Readers grants made in previous years.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

| <u>Measures</u>                               | <u>2011</u> | <u>2012</u>          | <u>2013</u> |
|---|-------------|----------------------|-------------|
| Amount for competitive grants (continuations) | 0           | \$156,098            | 0           |
| Number of competitive grants                  | 0           | 6 <sup>1</sup>       | 0           |
| Amount for Bureau of Indian Education         | 0           | \$800                | 0           |
| Amount for Outlying Areas                     | 0           | \$800                | 0           |
| National activities (including evaluation)    | 0           | \$2,000 <sup>2</sup> | 0           |

---

NOTE: In fiscal year 2013, continuation costs of approximately \$156,098 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program.

<sup>1</sup>The Department awarded six new competitive grants with fiscal year 2010 funds in September 2011. These six grantees would receive year 2 continuation awards in September 2012. Since the program is forward-funded, fiscal year 2012 funds appropriated for the program are available for obligation on July 1, 2012, which is in time to support year 2 continuation awards for these grantees.

<sup>2</sup>Initial estimate. The Department may use up to \$8,000 thousand for national activities.

## PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

### Performance Measures

This section presents program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2013 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department uses the following measures to evaluate the performance of the grants to improve middle- or high-school students' literacy skills.

**Goal: To enhance the overall level of reading achievement in middle and high schools through intensive literacy interventions for struggling readers and improvements in**

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Striving readers

---

**literacy instruction across the curriculum, and to help build a strong scientific research base on adolescent literacy.**

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

**Measure:** The percentage of adolescent students reading significantly below grade level who demonstrate a gain in their reading achievement at a minimum of one grade level or its equivalent after participating in an intensive literacy intervention over an academic year.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 36.14  | 42.59  |
| 2009 | 44.14  | 44.83  |
| 2010 | 46.14  | 41.18  |
| 2011 | 48.14  |        |
| 2012 | 50.14  |        |

**Additional Information:** At the end of 2009-10 school year, 41.18 percent of adolescent students participating in the targeted literacy intervention component of the program demonstrated a gain of at least one grade level in reading achievement, missing the target for 2010.

**Measure:** The percentage of students in schools participating in the Striving Readers program who score at or above proficient on the State's assessment in reading/language arts.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 61.32  | 62.40  |
| 2009 | 64.40  | 60.22  |
| 2010 | 66.40  | 53.26  |
| 2011 | 68.40  |        |
| 2012 | 68.40  |        |

**Additional Information:** The percentage of students in Striving Readers schools who scored at or above proficient on State reading assessments decreased to 53.26 percent in spring 2010, missing the target.

The fiscal year 2010 and 2012 appropriations for Striving Readers expanded the program to provide support for the improvement of literacy instruction for students from birth through grade 12. The Department has established the following performance measures for the Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy grant program: (1) the percentage of participating 4-year-old children who achieve significant gains in oral language skills; (2) the percentage of participating 5th-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on State reading or language arts assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA; (3) the percentage of participating 8th-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on State reading or language arts assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA; and (4) the percentage of participating high school

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Striving readers

---

students who meet or exceed proficiency on State reading or language arts assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA.

All States are required to report on Performance Measure 1 above. States have the option of either reporting on Performance Measures 2, 3, and 4 above, or reporting on the following growth measures: (1) the percentage of participating 5th-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on State reading or language arts assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA, including those students who demonstrate adequate growth under the State's Department-approved growth model and are counted as meeting or exceeding proficiency for purposes of accountability determinations; (2) the percentage of participating 8th-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on State reading or language arts assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA, including those students who demonstrate adequate growth under the State's Department-approved growth model and are counted as meeting or exceeding proficiency for purposes of accountability determinations; and (3) the percentage of participating high school students who meet or exceed proficiency on the State reading or language arts assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA, including those students who demonstrate adequate growth under the State's Department-approved growth model and are counted as meeting or exceeding proficiency for purposes of accountability determinations.

All of the performance measures described in this section will include data disaggregated for disadvantaged students, including limited-English-proficient students and students with disabilities.

### Other Performance Information

All 16 Striving Readers adolescent literacy grantees are conducting rigorous experimental evaluations of their supplemental literacy interventions for struggling readers. The eight 2006 grantees are also conducting experimental or quasi-experimental evaluations of their whole-school literacy-throughout-the-curriculum models for all students. In fall 2011, the Department released the year-4 evaluation reports for the 2006 grantees, which provided results from 4 years of implementation, including impact findings. The key research questions that the impact studies address are: (1) do the specific supplemental literacy interventions employed by the grantees significantly improve reading proficiency among struggling readers after 1, 2, or 3 years of intervention? (2) do the school-level literacy-throughout-the-curriculum models improve outcomes for all students? Five of the eight evaluations found that 1 year of a targeted intervention had statistically significant positive impacts on achievement for either middle or high school students. None of the four evaluations examining interventions that could serve struggling readers for up to 3 years found positive impacts after 2 or 3 years of the interventions. None of the five evaluations that examined the effectiveness of the whole-school models found a statistically significant impact on student reading achievement. The evaluation reports are available at: <http://www.ed.gov/programs/strivingreaders/performance.html>.

In spring 2012, the Department plans to release the final year-5 evaluation reports covering all 5 years of data collection. In addition, ED will update the cross-site summary tables and project profiles to include the final results of the evaluations of the 2006 grants.

In summer 2012, the Department plans to release the evaluation reports and project profiles from the 2009 grants. The Department originally planned 3 years of implementation for the 2009

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### **Striving readers**

---

grants. However, the grants ended prematurely because the Department did not have the authority to use the fiscal year 2010 appropriation to support the adolescent literacy grantees. As a result, the eight evaluations will be based on only 1 year of implementation and data collection, and will have samples smaller than originally planned. The relatively small samples will limit the studies' ability to reliably detect policy relevant impacts of the grants.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Mathematics and science partnerships

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

| <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| \$149,716   | 0           | -\$149,716    |

---

<sup>1</sup>The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The Administration proposes to consolidate the program in FY 2013 under new legislation.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Mathematics and science partnerships

---

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

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

|            | (dollars in thousands) |
|------------|------------------------|
| 2008 ..... | \$178,978              |
| 2009 ..... | 178,978                |
| 2010 ..... | 180,478                |
| 2011 ..... | 175,127                |
| 2012 ..... | 149,716                |

### FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting fiscal year 2013 funding for the Mathematics and Science Partnerships program. In place of this program, the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization, a new program, Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM). This program would provide competitive grants to SEAs (alone or in partnership with appropriate outside entities) to support State and local efforts to implement a comprehensive strategy for the provision of high-quality STEM instruction and support to students from prekindergarten through grade 12. Grantees and subgrantees would be required to focus on mathematics or science, or both, and could also carry out activities in technology or engineering. In awarding State STEM grants, the Department would give priority to SEAs that have adopted and are implementing a set of K-12 college- and career-ready standards in at least mathematics. States would be permitted to reserve up to 20 percent of grant funds for State-level activities to support the development and implementation of a coherent approach to providing high-quality evidence-based STEM instruction in high-need schools. States would be required to use their remaining grant funds to make subgrants to high-need LEAs and eligible partnerships to improve STEM instruction at the local level, including, for example, through online curriculum and technology-based approaches.

In addition, as components of the Administration's governmentwide effort to support and improve STEM education, the Department would set aside \$80 million from the fiscal year 2013 appropriation for the new Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program for projects to prepare effective STEM teachers and would use \$30 million in fiscal year 2013 funds from the Fund for the Improvement of Education: Programs of National Significance to support a new evidence-based K-12 mathematics initiative as well as efforts to improve the evidence base for STEM programs across the Federal Government. The Department would also continue to provide support for STEM projects in the Investing in Innovation program.

If the Congress does not reauthorize the ESEA prior to enactment of fiscal year 2013 appropriations, the Administration will request authority to make competitive grants under the Mathematics and Science Partnerships program for activities consistent with those proposed under the Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM program.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Mathematics and science partnerships

---

#### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands)

| <u>Measures</u>              | <u>2011</u> | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> |
|------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Amount distributed to States | \$174,251   | \$148,967   | 0           |
| Average State award          | 3,111       | 2,867       | 0           |
| Range of State awards        | 871–20,103  | 745–17,186  | 0           |
| Evaluation                   | 876         | 749         | 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.

Data for these measures for 2011 will be available in the summer of 2012. No targets are shown for 2013 because the program is proposed for consolidation.

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

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

**Measure:** The percentage of Mathematics and Science Partnerships teachers who significantly increase their content knowledge, as reflected on project-level pre- and post-assessments.

| Year        | Target | Actual |
|-------------|--------|--------|
| <b>2008</b> | 79     | 70     |
| <b>2009</b> | 71     | 70     |
| <b>2010</b> | 66     | 66     |
| <b>2011</b> | 65     |        |
| <b>2012</b> | 65     |        |

**Additional Information:** Beginning in 2008, the use of rigorous, nationally normed assessments by subgrantees began to increase. Because we expect more subgrantees to use these assessments, which are often more stringent than assessments previously used, the Department has made downward adjustments to the targets for this measure for subsequent years, using 2008 data as the baseline. In addition, the Department now calculates teacher test score gains on behalf of grantees, thereby eliminating grantee reporting error.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Mathematics and science partnerships

---

Data for this measure are provided only for teachers who completed pre- and post-assessments. In the following table are background data for this measure.

| Year | Number of participating teachers – mathematics | Number of participating teachers with pre- and post-assessments – mathematics | Number of participating teachers – science | Number of participating teachers with pre- and post-assessments – science |
|------|--|---|--|---|
| 2008 | 34,567   | 11,696  | 26,552                                     | 11,546  |
| 2009 | 36,546   | 15,567  | 31,762                                     | 15,041  |
| 2010 | 40,680   | 13,424  | 23,310                                     | 10,956  |

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

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 45     | 46     |
| 2009 | 46     | 58     |
| 2010 | 48     | 64     |
| 2011 | 50     |        |
| 2012 | 52     |        |

**Additional Information:** Student assessment data are available only for subjects and grades that are tested using a statewide assessment. In the table below are background data for this measure.

| Year | Number of students taught by participating teachers – mathematics | Number of students taught by participating teachers with student assessment data – mathematics | Number of students taught by participating teachers – science | Number of students taught by participating teachers with student assessment data – science |
|------|---|--|---|--|
| 2008 | 1,284,911   | 610,868  | 844,749   | 253,216  |
| 2009 | 1,442,254   | 623,950  | 1,252,853   | 325,586  |
| 2010 | 1,476,835   | 753,186  | 1,157,168   | 381,865  |

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Mathematics and science partnerships

---

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

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 38     | 42     |
| 2009 | 39     | 52     |
| 2010 | 40     | 51     |
| 2011 | 41     |        |
| 2012 | 42     |        |

**Measure:** The percentage of Mathematics and Science Partnerships projects that use an experimental or quasi-experimental evaluation design that is conducted successfully and yields scientifically valid results.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 13     | 11     |
| 2009 | 14     | 6      |
| 2010 | 15     | 13     |
| 2011 | 16     |        |
| 2012 | 17     |        |

**Additional Information:** The Department's contractor collects information related to evaluation from annual performance reports and assesses evaluation designs using a rubric developed for the Department in 2007. Included in this measure are only evaluation designs for which sufficient information is provided to enable an assessment.

### Efficiency Measure

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 100    | 96     |
| 2009 | 100    | 100    |
| 2010 | 100    | 100    |
| 2011 | 100    |        |
| 2012 | 100    |        |

**Additional Information:** To help ensure accuracy, the Department requires State program coordinators to review the data before they are submitted to the Department.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Arts in education

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

| <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| \$24,953    | 0           | -\$24,953     |

---

<sup>1</sup>The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2004. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2013 under new legislation.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Arts in education

---

With the fiscal year 2011 appropriation, the Department did not make directed grants to VSA and the Kennedy Center and instead initiated a new National Arts in Education competition to make grants to one or more national nonprofit arts organizations to carry out high-quality arts education programs for children and youth, with particular emphasis on serving students from low-income families and students with disabilities. The Department will conduct a second competition under this authority in fiscal year 2012.

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

|            | (dollars in thousands) |
|------------|------------------------|
| 2008 ..... | \$35,277               |
| 2009 ..... | 37,533                 |
| 2010 ..... | 38,166                 |
| 2011 ..... | 27,447                 |
| 2012 ..... | 24,953                 |

### FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Arts in Education program for fiscal year 2013. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs focused on student achievement in specific subject areas, the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization, a broader program, Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education. This new program would address the need to strengthen instruction and increase student achievement, especially in high-need LEAs, across the subjects that contribute to a well-rounded education, such as arts, health education, physical education, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, environmental education, economics and financial literacy, and other subjects that may be identified by the Department.

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

The fiscal year 2013 request for Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education would include funds to pay 2013 continuation costs for Arts in Education grants made in previous years.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Arts in education

---

#### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands)

##### ***Model Arts Program***

| <u>Measures</u>  | <u>2011</u> | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Total funds available  | \$14,557    | \$11,847    | 0           |
| Amount for continuation awards                                 | \$14,207    | \$11,497    | 0           |
| Number of continuation awards                                  | 52          | 38          | 0           |
| Interagency transfer to support the Arts Education Partnership | \$350       | \$350       | 0           |

##### ***Professional Development for Arts Educators***

| <u>Measures</u>                       | <u>2011</u> | <u>2012</u>    | <u>2013</u> |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| Total funds available                 | \$5,690     | \$5,964        | 0           |
| Amount for new awards                 | \$4,010     | \$1,743        | 0           |
| Amount for continuation awards        | \$1,560     | \$4,221        | 0           |
| Number of new awards                  | 15-16       | 3              | 0           |
| Number of continuation awards         | 5           | 15-16          | 0           |
| Peer review of new award applications | \$120       | 0 <sup>1</sup> | 0           |

##### ***National Arts in Education Program***

| <u>Measures</u>                       | <u>2011</u> | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Total funds available                 | \$6,714     | \$6,700     | 0           |
| Amount for new awards                 | \$6,691     | \$6,633     | 0           |
| Peer review of new award applications | \$23        | \$67        | 0           |

|                          |       |       |   |
|--------------------------|-------|-------|---|
| <b><i>Evaluation</i></b> | \$486 | \$442 | 0 |
|--------------------------|-------|-------|---|

---

NOTE: FY 2013 continuation costs of approximately \$20,179 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program.

<sup>1</sup> The Department expects to fund new applications in FY 2012 from the FY 2011 slate.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Arts in education

---

#### **PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

##### **Performance Measures**

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data, and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2013 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

**Measure:** The total number of students who participate in standards-based arts education sponsored by the JFK Center for the Performing Arts and VSA Arts.

| Year | Target  | Actual    |
|------|---------|-----------|
| 2008 | 772,405 | 1,356,225 |
| 2009 | 786,979 | 1,436,836 |
| 2010 | 801,553 | 1,481,053 |
| 2011 | 816,127 |           |

**Measure:** The number of low-income students who participate in standards-based arts education sponsored by the JFK Center for the Performing Arts.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 52,658 | 34,973 |
| 2009 | 53,671 | 47,112 |
| 2010 | 54,684 | 49,117 |
| 2011 | 55,697 |        |

**Measure:** The number of students with disabilities who participate in standards-based arts education sponsored by VSA Arts.

| Year | Target  | Actual  |
|------|---------|---------|
| 2008 | 127,971 | 190,161 |
| 2009 | 130,432 | 187,540 |
| 2010 | 132,893 | 139,882 |
| 2011 | 135,354 |         |

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Arts in education

---

**Measure:** The percentage of teachers participating in the JFK Center for the Performing Arts program who receive professional development that is sustained and intensive.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 18.4   | 19.0   |
| 2009 | 19.4   | 12.1   |
| 2010 | 20.4   | 19.7   |
| 2011 | 21.4   |        |

**Measure:** The percentage of teachers participating in VSA Arts programs who receive professional development that is sustained and intensive.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 19.5   | 18.0   |
| 2009 | 20.5   | 17.0   |
| 2010 | 21.5   | 34.0   |
| 2011 | 22.5   |        |

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

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

The Department also has established targets for the percentage of teachers participating in Kennedy Center and VSA Arts programs who receive sustained and intensive professional development based on an annual one percentage-point increase from the 2006 baseline. (Sustained and intensive professional development is defined by each grantee in its application.)

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Arts in education

---

In 2010, the Kennedy Center reported a teacher participation rate of 19.7 percent, an increase of more than 7 percentage points over the previous year, but did not meet the Department's performance target. VSA Arts, in 2010, changed its method of collecting data from their affiliates and reported a teacher participation rate of 34 percent, a doubling over the previous year and exceeding the performance target by more than 12 percentage points.

In fiscal year 2011, the Department did not provide non-competitive funding to the Kennedy Center and VSA Arts. The Department expects to have 2011 performance data, representing the final year of the two grants, available in spring 2012.

**Measure:** The percentage of teachers participating in the Professional Development for Arts Educators program who receive professional development that is sustained and intensive.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 89     | 92     |
| 2009 | 90     | 93     |
| 2010 | 91     | 99     |
| 2011 | 92     |        |
| 2012 | 93     |        |
| 2013 | 94     |        |

**Additional Information:** This measure focuses on the Professional Development for Arts Educators (PDAE) program and examines the percentage of teachers who receive instruction that occurs regularly over the course of the school year (including summer) and requires committed participation in order to make a difference in teaching and student learning. Data collected in 2006 represent the baseline for this indicator and are the basis for targets for subsequent years. In 2010, the percentage of teachers who received sustained and intensive professional development increased from 93 to 99 percent and exceeded the performance target of 91 percent. The Department continues to work with grantees to ensure that the same definition of "sustained and intensive" is used consistently across projects. (The Department has defined sustained and intensive professional development for the PDAE program as the completion of 40 hours of professional development and 75 percent of the total number of professional development hours offered by the grantee over a period of six or more months.) The Department expects to have 2011 performance data, representing school year 2010-2011, available in spring 2012.

Beginning with the fiscal year 2011 cohort of grantees, the Department has implemented a second performance measure for the Professional Development for Arts Educators program. The measure examines the percentage of Professional Development for Arts Educators projects whose teachers show a statistically significant increase in content knowledge in the arts. In implementing this measure, the Department expects that grantees will administer a pre-test and a post-test of teacher content knowledge in the arts and include those data in their annual performance reports.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Arts in education

---

**Measure:** The percentage of students participating in Arts Models programs who demonstrate proficiency in mathematics compared to those in control or comparison groups.

| Year   | Control | Treatment |
|--------|---------|-----------|
| 2008   | 60.4    | 80.4      |
| 2009   | 60.0    | 67.0      |
| Change | -0.4    | -13.4     |

**Measure:** The percentage of students participating in Arts Models programs who demonstrate proficiency in reading compared to those in control or comparison groups.

| Year   | Control | Treatment |
|--------|---------|-----------|
| 2008   | 61.4    | 76.1      |
| 2009   | 41.0    | 63.0      |
| Change | -10.4   | -13.1     |

**Additional Information:** The Department developed two measures that focus on the Model Arts program and its impact on student achievement, specifically the percentage of Model Arts students who demonstrate proficient levels of achievement on State assessments in mathematics and in reading, compared to control or comparison groups. For the school year 2008-2009, the students in the treatment groups performed better than those in the control groups on both reading and mathematics measures. Both the treatment and control groups showed declines in performance between school years 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 (although the decline for the control group was very small in mathematics.) The Department expects to have 2010 performance data, representing school year 2009-2010, available in spring 2012.

### Other Performance Information

The fiscal year 2008 appropriation for Arts in Education included funding for a National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) survey on arts education in public elementary and secondary schools. NCES collected principal and teacher survey data nationwide during school year (SY) 2009-10 using the Fast Response Survey System (FRSS).

The report found that in SY 2009-10, 94 percent of elementary schools offered instruction that was designated specifically for music. Ninety-three percent of those schools offered music instruction at least once a week, and 91 percent employed arts specialists to teach the subject. On average, full-time music specialists reported spending 22 hours per week teaching 25 different music classes (i.e., different groups of students), with a class size of 19 students.

In addition, NCES reported that 83 percent of elementary schools offered instruction specifically in visual arts. Eighty-five percent of those schools offered instruction in that subject at least once a week, and 84 percent had arts specialists teaching it. On average, full-time visual arts specialists reported spending 22 hours per week teaching 24 different visual arts classes, with a class size of 22 students.

Only 3 percent of elementary schools offered instruction that was designated specifically for dance (53 percent of those schools offered instruction in that subject at least once a week, and 57 percent employed arts specialists to teach the subject) and 4 percent of elementary schools

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Arts in education

---

offered drama or theatre (58 percent of those schools offered instruction in that subject at least once a week, and 42 percent had arts specialists teaching the subject).

Finally, the report noted that 88 percent of classroom teachers (i.e., teachers of self-contained classrooms) in elementary schools indicated that they included arts instruction in some aspect of their classroom instructional programs in 2009-10. Of these teachers, 6 percent taught music as a separate subject, 14 percent taught visual arts as a separate subject, 3 percent taught dance as a separate subject, and 8 percent taught drama or theatre as a separate subject. In addition, of these classroom teachers who included arts instruction in their classroom instructional programs, 92 percent incorporated music instruction in other subject areas, 97 percent incorporated visual arts instruction in other subject areas, 87 percent incorporated dance instruction in other subject areas, and 53 percent incorporated drama or theatre instruction in other subject areas.

NCES also looked at secondary schools and teachers using data from SY 2008-09. Ninety-one percent of public secondary schools reported offering music in that year. On average, full-time music specialists spent 22 hours per week teaching 8 different music classes with a class size of 24 students. In addition, 89 percent of secondary schools reported offering instruction in visual arts. Full-time visual arts specialists spent, on average, 23 hours per week teaching 7 different visual arts classes with a class size of 22 students. The report also found that 12 percent of secondary schools offered dance and 45 percent offered drama or theatre in SY 2008-09. Public secondary schools reported that arts specialists accounted for 97 percent of the teachers who taught music, 94 percent of the teachers who taught visual arts, 69 percent of the teachers who taught dance, and 73 percent of the teachers who taught drama or theatre in 2008-09.

A second report, planned for spring 2012, will present findings on a broader set of indicators on the status of arts education in 2009–10.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### College pathways and accelerated learning (Proposed legislation)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: To be determined

Budget Authority:

| <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| 0           | \$81,282    | +\$81,282     |

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

### FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$81 million in fiscal year 2013 for the proposed College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program, which would be created through the Administration’s Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization proposal. The request would support the first year of the program, which would replace, with a more comprehensive and

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### College pathways and accelerated learning

---

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

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

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

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

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### College pathways and accelerated learning

---

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

The Department would use funds allocated for College Pathways and Accelerated Learning to pay continuation costs for grants made prior to ESEA reauthorization under the High School Graduation Initiative and Advanced Placement programs.

### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands)

| <u>Measures</u>                             | <u>2013</u> |
|---|-------------|
| Continuation awards for antecedent programs | \$57,182    |
| Grants for advanced course test fee costs   | \$24,100    |

---

NOTE: Approximately \$57,182 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for College Pathways and Accelerated Learning in fiscal year 2013 to fund continuation awards for grants made under the High School Graduation Initiative (\$49,272 thousand) and Advanced Placement Incentive (\$7,910 thousand) programs.

**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

---

**High school graduation initiative**

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

|  | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|--|-------------|-------------|---------------|
|  | \$48,809    | 0           | -\$48,809     |

---

<sup>1</sup>The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The Administration proposes to consolidate the program in FY 2013 under new legislation.

---

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The High School Graduation Initiative awards discretionary grants to State educational agencies and local educational agencies (LEAs) to support the implementation of effective, sustainable, and coordinated dropout prevention and re-entry programs in high schools with annual dropout rates that exceed their State average annual dropout rate. Funds may also be used to support activities at middle schools that feed into such high schools. Grants are awarded for up to 5 years and may be used for such activities as: the early and continued identification of students at risk of not graduating, providing at-risk students with services designed to keep them in school, identifying and encouraging youth who have left school without graduating to reenter and graduate, implementing other comprehensive dropout prevention approaches, and implementing transition programs that help students successfully transition from middle school to high school.

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

|            | (dollars in thousands) |
|------------|------------------------|
| 2008 ..... | 0                      |
| 2009 ..... | 0                      |
| 2010 ..... | \$50,000               |
| 2011 ..... | 48,902                 |
| 2012 ..... | 48,809                 |

**FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration is not requesting fiscal year 2013 funding for the High School Graduation Initiative, which under current law is in the Education for the Disadvantaged account. In place of this and several other narrowly targeted programs that seek to improve student achievement in high schools or provide an accelerated curriculum, the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization, a broader program, College Pathways and Accelerated Learning. This program would support efforts to

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### High school graduation initiative

---

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

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

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

Under the Administration's reauthorization proposal, fiscal year 2013 High School Graduation Initiative continuation grant costs would be funded from the appropriation for the new College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program.

### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands)

| <u>Measures</u>   | <u>2011</u> | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Amount for continuation awards  | \$45,552    | \$43,928    | 0           |
| Number of continuation awards   | 29          | 29          | 0           |
| National activities, including technical assistance and dissemination | \$3,350     | \$4,881     | 0           |

---

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$49,272 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for College Pathways and Accelerated Learning in fiscal year 2013.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### High school graduation initiative

---

#### 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 fiscal year 2013 and future years and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department recently established new performance measures for this program. The fiscal year 2010 grantees are the first grantees to collect and report data to the Department that address the new measures. 2011 data are used as the baseline for the targets in subsequent years.

**Goal:** To increase the number of students who graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma.

**Objective:** To increase the average daily attendance of returning high school dropouts.

**Measure:** The average daily attendance of students served by the program who had not attended school for 60 or more instructional days immediately prior to their participation in the program.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2011 |        | 66.2   |
| 2012 | 67.5   |        |
| 2013 | 68.9   |        |

**Additional Information:** Data for this measure are reported for 22 of the 29 fiscal year 2010 grantees and represent the average daily rate of school attendance by applicable students.

**Objective:** To accelerate the credit accumulation of under-credited high school students.

**Measure:** The percentage of participating students who were two or more years behind their expected age and credit accumulation in high school who earned one half or more of the credits they needed to graduate with a regular diploma.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2011 |        | 21.6   |
| 2012 | 22.1   |        |
| 2013 | 22.5   |        |

**Additional Information:** Data are reported for 22 of 29 grantees.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### High school graduation initiative

---

**Objective:** *To increase the on-time graduation rate of high schools.*

**Measure:** The percentage of high school students served by the program who, during the most recent school year, earned one quarter of the credits necessary to graduate from high school with a regular diploma.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2011 |        | 33.8   |
| 2012 | 35.5   |        |
| 2013 | 37.3   |        |

**Additional Information:** Data are reported for 17 of 29 grantees.

**Measure:** The average on-time graduation rate of high schools served by the program.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2011 |        | 57.4   |
| 2012 | 58.6   |        |
| 2013 | 59.7   |        |

**Additional Information:** Data are reported for 23 of 29 grantees.

**Objective:** *To increase the percentage of eighth grade students who transition successfully to high school.*

**Measure:** The average daily attendance of schools served by the program that include an eighth grade.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2011 |        | 92.5   |
| 2012 | 92.9   |        |
| 2013 | 93.4   |        |

**Additional Information:** Data are reported for 12 of the 15 fiscal year 2010 grantees that serve middle schools and represent the average daily rate of attendance of students enrolled in the applicable school.

**Measure:** The percentage of eighth grade students attending schools served by the project who enrolled in ninth grade at the start of the following school year.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2011 |        | 91.1   |
| 2012 | 91.6   |        |
| 2013 | 92.1   |        |

**Additional Information:** Data are reported for 11 of 15 grantees that serve middle schools.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### High school graduation initiative

---

#### Other Performance Information

Reviews conducted by the Department's Institute of Education Sciences (IES) and published on the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Web site provide examples of the successes and failures of dropout prevention programs. The WWC has reviewed 11 programs that have the goal of students completing school. Of those 11, 4 were determined to have potentially positive effects while the remaining 7 were determined to have no discernible effects. Of 11 dropout prevention programs aimed at helping students progress in school, IES found 5 to have potentially positive effects and 1 to have positive effects or strong evidence of a positive effect with no overriding contrary evidence. IES determined that the remaining five programs had no discernible effects. In October 2008, the Department issued a regulation that established a uniform measure for calculating high school graduation rates that must be used by all States in calculating adequate yearly progress under ESEA Title I, Part A. Having access to data on graduation rates that have been calculated in a uniform manner will allow researchers to make comparisons of performance across States and LEAs.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Advanced placement

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

| <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| \$26,949    | 0           | -\$26,949     |

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The Administration proposes to consolidate the program in FY 2013 under new legislation.

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

The statute requires the Department to give priority to funding the Advanced Placement Test Fee program, with remaining funds allocated to Advanced Placement Incentive grants. In the conference report accompanying the fiscal year 2012 appropriations act, the Congress stated its intention that \$20 million of the program appropriation be used to continue the Advanced Placement Test Fee program and that \$7 million be used for continuation awards under the Advanced Placement Incentive program.

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

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Advanced placement

---

achievement in AP or IB courses, the purchase of books and supplies, and activities to enhance the availability of and expand participation in online AP or IB courses.

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

|            | (dollars in thousands) |
|------------|------------------------|
| 2008 ..... | \$43,540               |
| 2009 ..... | 43,540                 |
| 2010 ..... | 45,840                 |
| 2011 ..... | 43,253                 |
| 2012 ..... | 26,949                 |

### **FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration is not requesting fiscal year 2013 funding for the Advanced Placement programs, which under current law are in the Innovation and Improvement account. In place of these and other narrowly targeted programs that seek to improve student achievement in high schools or provide an accelerated curriculum, the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization, a broader program, College Pathways and Accelerated Learning. This program would support efforts to increase preparation for college matriculation and success through the introduction and expansion of Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) courses in high-poverty middle and high schools as well as other accelerated curriculum options (such as dual-enrollment and early college high school programs) in those schools. It would also provide grants to States for payment of advanced course test fees for students from low-income families.

Under the Administration's reauthorization proposal, fiscal year 2013 Advanced Placement Incentive continuation grant costs would be funded from the appropriation for the new College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program. The fiscal year 2013 request for that program also includes \$24.1 million to pay for advanced course test fees for students from low-income families in school year 2012-2013.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Advanced placement

---

#### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands)

| <u>Measures</u>                       | <u>2011</u> | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>Test Fee program</b>               |             |             |             |
| Amount for new awards                 | \$23,344    | \$19,949    | 0           |
| Number of new awards                  | 43          | 43          | 0           |
| <b>Incentive program</b>              |             |             |             |
| Amount for new awards                 | \$7,406     | 0           | 0           |
| Number of new awards                  | 14          | 0           | 0           |
| Amount for continuation awards        | \$12,140    | \$7,000     | 0           |
| Number of continuation awards         | 20          | 14          | 0           |
| Peer review of new award applications | \$363       | 0           | 0           |

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$7,910 thousand and test fee costs of approximately \$24,100 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for College Pathways and Accelerated Learning in fiscal year 2013.

#### **PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

##### **Performance Measures**

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, indicators, and performance data and targets; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2013 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Advanced placement

---

**Measure:** The number of Advanced Placement tests taken by low-income public school students nationally.

| Year | Target  | Actual  |
|------|---------|---------|
| 2008 | 328,932 | 325,567 |
| 2009 | 378,272 | 399,809 |
| 2010 | 435,013 | 483,624 |
| 2011 | 500,265 | 596,241 |
| 2012 | 600,318 |         |
| 2013 | 720,567 |         |

**Measure:** The number of Advanced Placement tests passed (tests receiving scores of 3-5) by low-income public school students nationally.

| Year | Target  | Actual  |
|------|---------|---------|
| 2008 | 128,941 | 106,586 |
| 2009 | 150,552 | 147,654 |
| 2010 | 174,875 | 172,005 |
| 2011 | 203,108 | 210,870 |
| 2012 | 222,118 |         |
| 2013 | 270,113 |         |

**Measure:** The percentage of Advanced Placement tests passed (tests receiving scores of 3-5) by low-income public school students nationally.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 39.2   | 34.5   |
| 2009 | 39.8   | 37.0   |
| 2010 | 40.2   | 35.6   |
| 2011 | 40.4   | 35.4   |
| 2012 | 37.0   |        |
| 2013 | 37.5   |        |

**Additional Information:** Data for these measures are obtained from the College Board and capture the effects of efforts to increase low-income public school students' participation in AP courses and success on AP exams.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Advanced placement

---

**Measure:** The number of Advanced Placement tests taken by minority (Hispanic, Black, Native American) public school students nationally.

| Year | Target  | Actual  |
|------|---------|---------|
| 2008 | 421,000 | 473,666 |
| 2009 | 544,716 | 538,249 |
| 2010 | 626,423 | 616,992 |
| 2011 | 675,520 | 752,349 |
| 2012 | 721,562 |         |
| 2013 | 771,562 |         |

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

**Measure:** The ratio of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate tests taken in public high schools served by Advanced Placement Incentive grants to the number of seniors enrolled at those schools.

| Year | 2006 Cohort Target | 2006 Cohort Actual | 2008 Cohort Target | 2008 Cohort Actual | 2009 Cohort Target | 2009 Cohort Actual |
|------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 2008 | 0.66               | 0.60               |                    | 0.65               |                    |                    |
| 2009 | 0.79               | 0.62               | 0.78               | 0.79               |                    | 0.97               |
| 2010 |                    |                    | 0.93               | 0.93               | 1.03               | 1.24               |
| 2011 |                    |                    | 1.10               | 0.78               | 1.09               | 1.32               |
| 2012 |                    |                    |                    |                    | 1.15               |                    |

**Additional Information:** This measure is the number of AP and IB tests taken in high schools served by Advanced Placement Incentive grants divided by the total number of seniors enrolled at those schools. 2011 data are reported for 17 of the 20 grantees in the 2008 cohort. The Department did not award new Advanced Placement Incentive grants in 2007 or 2010. Data for this measure for the 2011 cohort of AP Incentive grantees will be available beginning in the fall of 2012.

The Department recently established a new performance measure for the AP Incentive program. Fiscal year 2011 grantees will be the first grantees to collect and report data to the Department that address the new measure. Baseline data are expected to be available in the fall of 2012. The new performance measure is:

The ratio of Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, or other approved advanced placement tests passed by low-income students in public high schools served by API grants to the number of low-income seniors enrolled at those schools.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Advanced placement

---

#### Efficiency Measure

**Measure:** The cost per passage of an Advanced Placement test by a low-income public school student.

| Year | Target  | Actual  |
|------|---------|---------|
| 2008 | \$94.76 | \$91.29 |
| 2009 | 91.29   | 107.32  |
| 2010 | 91.29   | 114.14  |
| 2011 | 91.29   |         |
| 2012 | 91.29   |         |
| 2013 | 91.29   |         |

**Additional Information:** The results for this measure are calculated by dividing the total amount States report spending on AP test fees by the total number of tests passed by low-income students. 2011 data for this measure will be available in January 2013.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Assessing Achievement

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

|  | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|--|-------------|-------------|---------------|
|  | \$389,214   | \$389,214   | 0             |

---

<sup>1</sup> Section The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2013.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Assessing achievement

---

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

Section 6112 of the ESEA authorizes Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments, a competitive grant program under which the Department makes awards to support efforts by States, or consortia of States, to: (1) improve the quality, validity, and reliability of State academic assessments; (2) measure student academic achievement through the use of multiple measures from multiple sources; (3) chart student progress over time; and (4) use comprehensive instruments such as performance- and technology-based assessments. To date, the Department has made 47 awards under the program; those grants have supported projects to increase the accessibility and validity of assessments for students with disabilities or limited English proficiency; develop English language proficiency assessments; use technology to improve State assessments; and provide intensive, high-quality professional development for using assessment data to improve instruction.

In FY 2011 the Department funded a consortium of 24 States to develop a system of English language proficiency assessments aligned with English language proficiency standards that correspond to a common set of college- and career-ready standards in English language arts and mathematics held in common by multiple States. These assessments would complement the English language arts and mathematics assessments that are being developed under the Race to the Top Assessment program and the alternate assessments aligned with alternative achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities being developed under the IDEA General Supervision Enhancement Grants program.

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

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

|            | (dollars in thousands) |
|------------|------------------------|
| 2008 ..... | \$408,732              |
| 2009 ..... | 410,732                |
| 2010 ..... | 410,732                |
| 2011 ..... | 389,951                |
| 2012 ..... | 389,951                |

### FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2013, the Administration requests \$389.2 million for Assessing Achievement (State Assessments under current law), the same as the 2012 appropriation. The request would support one of the major reforms embodied in the Administration's proposal for reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the implementation of college- and career-ready (CCR) standards in order to ensure that all students graduate from high school with the knowledge and skills they need to be successful in college and the workplace. The Department would award \$380 million from the request to States through the same formula as in

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Assessing achievement

---

current statute, and the remaining \$9.2 million requested for fiscal year 2013 would be awarded on a competitive basis to consortia of States or consortia of States and other entities.

Funding for the reauthorized Assessing Achievement program would support the transition to and implementation of common assessments aligned with rigorous college- and career-ready standards in English-language arts and mathematics. A new generation of assessments is needed because existing State assessments generally fail to capture the full spectrum of what students know and can do. They focus on concepts that are easy to measure; rely mainly on multiple-choice items with fill-in-the-blank answers; and provide time-sensitive data and results months later, when their instructional usefulness is largely past. Educators need high-quality assessment systems that more broadly and validly measure student achievement and provide more timely results. They need assessment systems that appropriately assess all students, including students with disabilities and English Learners, and that assess a range of content areas to support a well-rounded curriculum.

Under the Administration's reauthorization proposal, States would be required to adopt college- and career-ready standards and to administer assessments aligned with those standards. These assessments are currently under development; States have begun collaborating to develop common assessments aligned with rigorous college- and career-ready standards in English-language arts and mathematics. The resources provided through the reauthorized Assessing Achievement program would also support the improvement of other assessments and the reporting of assessment data. These resources would increase the number of States implementing assessment systems that measure whether students are on track to being college- and career-ready by the time they graduate from high school, and they also will help States align their standards and high school graduation requirements with college and career expectations.

Under the reauthorization proposal, formula grant funds for fiscal years 2013 and 2014 would flow to all States to support compliance with the current ESEA requirements for reading/language arts, mathematics, and science assessment. Once States have finished implementing the current ESEA assessment requirements, they could use their formula funds to support the transition to English-language arts and mathematics assessments that are held in common by a number of States, to measure student attainment against college- and career-ready standards, or to measure student growth and to inform determinations of individual teacher and principal effectiveness for purposes of evaluation. States could also use formula funds to administer their current assessments; develop and implement assessments that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards in other subjects, including science, engineering, and technology; develop or improve assessments of English language proficiency; develop or improve native language assessments; expand the range of accommodations available to English Learners and students with disabilities; or carry out other activities.

Starting with fiscal year 2015, funds would flow only to States that (1) have adopted college- and career-ready standards that are common to a significant number of States; and (2) are implementing, or have committed to implement, assessments in English-language arts and in mathematics in grades 3-8 and at least once in high school that are aligned with those standards.

The reauthorization proposal would also establish a program to award competitive grants to consortia of States, or partnerships of States and other organizations, for research on, or

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Assessing achievement

---

development, evaluation, and improvement of, assessments that are aligned with college- and career-ready content and achievement standards that are held in common by a significant number of States.

The Department would set aside approximately \$9 million of the fiscal year 2013 request to support a grant competition to assist consortia of States in developing high-quality assessments in areas of common need, in particular in strategic areas that may need additional resources for full development. Such areas might include developing kindergarten-entry assessments, developing or improving assessments in subjects other than English-language arts and mathematics, developing high school end-of-course assessments, developing formative or diagnostic assessments, or improving the reliability and validity of assessments for English Learners and students with disabilities.

### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands)

| <u>Measures</u>                             | <u>2011</u>         | <u>2012</u>     | <u>2013</u>     |
|---|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Grants for State Assessments:               |                     |                 |                 |
| Amount for State Grants                     | \$379,971           | \$376,200       | \$376,200       |
| Estimated number of awards                  | 52                  | 52              | 52              |
| Range of awards                             | \$243-<br>\$30,245  | \$243-\$30,249  | \$243-\$30,249  |
| Average award                               | \$6,752             | \$6,752         | \$6,752         |
| BIE and Outlying Areas                      | \$3,800             | \$3,800         | \$3,800         |
| Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments: |                     |                 |                 |
| Amount for new awards                       | \$9,980             | \$9,214         | \$9,214         |
| Number of new awards                        | 1-2                 | 1-2             | 1-2             |
| Range of new awards                         | \$5,000-<br>\$9,940 | \$5,000-\$9,174 | \$5,000-\$9,174 |
| Peer review of new award applications       | \$40                | \$40            | \$40            |

### **PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

This section presents selected program information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2013 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Currently, 27 States have reading or language arts, mathematics, and science assessments that have received full approval from the Department. Ten States have received approval of their reading or language arts assessments and mathematics assessments, but have not yet received approval for science. (The number of States that have received approval of their reading or

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Assessing achievement

---

language arts, mathematics, or science assessments has changed over time because some States have made revisions to their assessment systems and have had to re-submit evidence that their assessments still comply with the Title I requirements.) Eleven States have never received approval; of those, six States entered into compliance agreements with the Department because it would take them additional time to come into compliance, and the remaining five were placed in “mandatory oversight” status. All compliance agreements ended on December 31, 2011. All States that were in mandatory oversight status have submitted evidence to the Department for determination of whether their assessments systems meet the Title I requirements, and all compliance agreement States will do the same, now that their compliance agreements have expired.

In addition, under the regulations pertaining to State assessment systems under Title I issued on April 9, 2007, States have the option of developing alternate assessments based on modified standards for students with disabilities that meet certain criteria. One of the criteria is that there must be objective evidence demonstrating that a student’s disability has precluded the student from achieving grade-level proficiency. To date, 14 States have submitted evidence to the Department to demonstrate that their alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards meet the requirements established under the regulations. Of those, 4 States have received approval of their alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, and the remaining 10 States are in the process of submitting additional evidence regarding compliance with the regulatory requirements, or are waiting for the Department to make a determination of their status.

The Department conducted a pilot review of products from grantees that received fiscal year 2005 funding in order to obtain baseline data for the performance measures for the Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments program. These measures assess the extent to which funded projects produce significant research on assessments, in particular regarding accommodations and alternate assessments for students with disabilities, and whether grantees disseminate information on the advances in assessment that result from their grants. The grantee’s final products were reviewed by expert panels. The review found that five of the eight grants funded in fiscal year 2005 produced significant research, methodologies, products, or tools relating to assessment systems or assessments, and five of the eight grants also produced significant research, methodologies, products, or tools specifically relating to accommodations and alternate assessments for students with disabilities and limited English proficient students. The Department will conduct reviews for products from the fiscal year 2006 and 2007 cohorts in the spring of 2011.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Assessing achievement

---

#### Efficiency Measures

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 90     | 78.23  |
| 2009 | 90     | 100.9  |
| 2010 | 90     | 183.4  |
| 2011 | 90     | 127.3  |
| 2012 | 90     |        |
| 2013 | 90     |        |

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

**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

---

**Training and advisory services**  
(Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IV)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: Indefinite

Budget Authority:

|  | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|--|-------------|-------------|---------------|
|  | \$6,962     | \$6,962     | 0             |

---

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

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

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

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

|            | (dollars in thousands) |
|------------|------------------------|
| 2008 ..... | \$6,989                |
| 2009 ..... | 9,489 <sup>1</sup>     |
| 2010 ..... | 6,989                  |
| 2011 ..... | 6,975                  |
| 2012 ..... | 6,962                  |

---

<sup>1</sup> The appropriation included \$2.5 million for one-time grants to local educational agencies for implementation of desegregation plans that comply with a 2007 Supreme Court decision.

**FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST**

For fiscal year 2013, the Administration requests \$7.0 million for the Training and Advisory Services program, the same as the fiscal year 2012 appropriation. The fiscal year 2013 funds would support the third year of 3-year grants to 10 regional Equity Assistance Centers.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Training and advisory services

---

The fiscal year 2011 Training and Advisory Services program competition included four priorities intended to encourage applications for projects that would support the goal of equal access to a high-quality education for all students. The competition included two competitive preference priorities and two invitational priorities. The first competitive preference priority was for applications proposing strategies to improve the effectiveness and distribution of teachers or principals. The second competitive preference priority was for applications proposing strategies to improve school engagement, school environment, and school safety and to improve family and community engagement. The two invitational priorities included in the competition were (1) enabling more data-based decision-making; and (2) promoting science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education.

The requested funds for fiscal year 2013 would provide continued support to the EACs for activities that support the aforementioned priorities and for such activities as instructing school officials on how to prevent sexual harassment and combat biases that can lead to hate crimes and bullying, helping educators select appropriate educational programs to meet the needs of English learners, increasing participation by minorities and females in advanced mathematics and science courses, and working with local educational agencies (LEAs) to ensure that their systemic reform and educational restructuring plans consider the needs of all students.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

| <u>Measures</u>                       | <u>2011</u> | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Amount for continuation awards        | 0           | \$6,939     | \$6,939     |
| Number of continuation awards         | 0           | 10          | 10          |
| Amount for new awards                 | \$6,883     | 0           | 0           |
| Peer review of new award applications | \$69        | 0           | 0           |
| Number of new awards                  | 10          | 0           | 0           |
| Data collection                       | \$23        | \$23        | \$23        |

### 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 2013 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department gathers data to inform the program's performance measures through customer surveys administered by the Library of Congress's Federal Research Division. About 48 percent

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Training and advisory services

---

of the targeted customer group responded to the 2006 survey. With assistance from the Department's Data Quality Initiative contractor, the Department made revisions to the survey and took steps to increase the response rate, and in 2007 and 2008 the rate increased to almost 76 percent. The response rate dropped slightly to 71 percent (135 out of 205 in the targeted customer group responded) in 2009 and was 69 percent (193 out of the 279 targeted customer group) in 2010 and 65 percent (176 out of the 269 targeted customer group) in 2011. Data for 2009 are for grants awarded in 2008, the first year of a 3-year grant cycle, which may explain why the centers identified fewer clients in that year.

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

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

**Measure:** The percentage of customers of Equity Assistance Centers who develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices in eliminating, reducing, or preventing harassment, conflict, and school violence.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 68     | 56     |
| 2009 | 69     | 52     |
| 2010 | 70     | 36     |
| 2011 | 71     | 42     |
| 2012 | 72     |        |
| 2013 | 73     |        |

**Additional information:** Actual data reflect results from the prior program year. The drop in positive responses for this measure since 2008 could be explained by fewer customers seeking this type of assistance. Also, the percentages for individual EACs ranged from 8 percent to 83 percent. The Department will look at the EACs with the lowest percentages to determine what kind of action may be warranted.

**Measure:** The percentage of customers of Equity Assistance Centers who develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices, or both, in ensuring that students of different race, sex, and national origin have equitable opportunity for high-quality instruction.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 73     | 89     |
| 2009 | 74     | 85     |
| 2010 | 75     | 77     |
| 2011 | 76     | 82     |
| 2012 | 77     |        |
| 2013 | 78     |        |

**Additional information:** Results have improved for this measure. The results for 2010 and 2011, even though a decline from previous years, still exceed the targets. The percentages for individual EACs ranged from 69 percent to 100 percent.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Training and advisory services

---

**Measure:** The percentage of customers who report that the products and services they received from the Equity Assistance Centers are of high quality.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 90     | 95     |
| 2009 | 90     | 95     |
| 2010 | 90     | 90     |
| 2011 | 90     | 96     |
| 2012 | 90     |        |
| 2013 | 90     |        |

**Additional information:** Customers have responded very positively on the quality of the products and services they have received, and 96 percent of the respondents gave the products and services a “very high” or “high” rating of quality in 2011. The percentages for individual EACs receiving a rating of “high” or “very high” ranged from 85 percent to 100 percent.

**Measure:** The percentage of customers who report that the products and services they received from the Equity Assistance Centers are of high usefulness to their policies and practices.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 87     | 94     |
| 2009 | 88     | 92     |
| 2010 | 89     | 85     |
| 2011 | 90     | 90     |
| 2012 | 90     |        |
| 2013 | 90     |        |

**Additional information:** Customers have responded positively to this measure for 6 years in a row, and the program has generally met or exceeded its targets. In 2011, 90 percent of the respondents gave the products and services a “very high” or “high” rating of usefulness. The percentages for individual EACs receiving a rating of “high” or “very high” ranged from 75 percent to 100 percent.

### Efficiency Measures

The Department has implemented a measure of administrative efficiency to assess the Training and Advisory Services program and other technical assistance programs. A second efficiency measure was established specifically for Training and Advisory Services.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Training and advisory services

---

**Measure:** The percentage of Equity Assistance Center grant funds carried over in each year of the project.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 10     | <1     |
| 2009 | 10     | 4      |
| 2010 | 10     | 2      |
| 2011 | 10     | 5      |
| 2012 | 10     |        |
| 2013 | 10     |        |

**Additional information:** The EACs carried over less than 1 percent of their grant funds on average for 2008, 4 percent in 2009, and 2 percent in 2010, falling within the target of 10 percent. Fiscal year 2011 was the last year of the grant cycle for the grantees that received funds in fiscal year 2008. The percentage of funds available at the close of fiscal year 2011 (5 percent) is likely higher than the actual amount of funds that grantees will not expend since the grantees have 3 months after the close of the fiscal year to draw down grant funds.

**Measure:** The number of working days it takes the Department to send a monitoring report to grantees after monitoring visits.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2010 | 45     | 184    |
| 2011 | 45     | 60     |
| 2012 | 45     |        |
| 2013 | 45     |        |

**Additional information:** The Department conducted two monitoring visits for the EACs in September 2009. The Department sent monitoring reports to the grantees within 73 days and 296 days, with the 45-day target thus falling within fiscal year 2011. The Department conducted three monitoring visits in 2010, all with a 45-day target due date in 2011. The Department issued one report within 96 days and a second report within 25 days. The third report was not sent since the grant period for that grantee had ended and a new organization was awarded the grant in the fiscal year 2011 competition. New program staff has helped to focus on monitoring, which has already helped to reduce delays.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Rural education

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1,2</sup>

Budget Authority:

|  | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|--|-------------|-------------|---------------|
|  | \$179,193   | \$179,193   | 0             |

---

<sup>1</sup>The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2013.

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

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

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

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

## **EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

### **Rural education**

---

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

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

Eligible LEAs also may (under the "REAP-Flex" authority) consolidate funds they receive from these sources (except for Title I, Part A) to carry out effective activities under any of the authorized programs including under Title I, Part A.

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

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

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

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

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

|            | (dollars in thousands) |
|------------|------------------------|
| 2008 ..... | \$171,854              |
| 2009 ..... | 173,382                |
| 2010 ..... | 174,882                |
| 2011 ..... | 174,532                |
| 2012 ..... | 179,193                |

### FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2013, the Administration is requesting \$179.2 million for REAP, the same amount as fiscal year 2012. The request would provide an average LEA award of approximately \$21,000 under SRSA and an average LEA subgrant of approximately \$53,000 under RLIS.

REAP is authorized by ESEA and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2013 under reauthorized legislation.

The Administration's reauthorization proposal would update the criteria by which a district is designated as rural to align with the most recent criteria developed by the Office of Management and Budget and the Census Bureau, extend REAP-Flex authority to RLIS subgrantees (to allow them to target funds to the most effective activities), and authorize national support for technical assistance, research, and other activities, including demonstration grants to help rural districts overcome the unique challenges they face. In fiscal year 2013, all funds would be used for SRSA and RLIS formula grants.

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

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), in school year 2008-09, 32 percent of the Nation's public schools were located in rural areas, with 24 percent of all public school students enrolled at these schools. The small size of many rural schools and districts creates a different set of challenges from those of urban schools and districts. For example, rural schools and districts generally cannot derive the benefits of economies of scale and, thus, can face greater per-pupil costs in providing staff or transportation services. According to the report *Status of Education in Rural America*, released by the NCES in July 2007, operating expenditures per student in 2003-04, adjusted for geographic cost differences, were higher in rural districts than in city and suburban districts.

According to the NCES report, schools in rural communities have a number of unique opportunities and challenges. Some positive phenomena that exist in rural communities include strong parental engagement in certain areas, higher teacher satisfaction, and better overall academic achievement. For example, in 2003, 74 percent of students in rural areas had a parent who attended a school event or served as a volunteer, compared to 65 percent in cities. Teachers in rural schools reported higher satisfaction, on most indicators of satisfaction, and fewer problems in their school than did their counterparts in city and town schools. Data from 2009 show that a greater percentage of rural students in 8<sup>th</sup> grade scored at or above the

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

*Proficient* level on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in reading and mathematics assessments than did their peers in cities and towns.

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

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

The Administration’s reauthorization proposal is designed to support the unique needs of rural communities. It would make it easier for teachers to teach multiple subjects because it would define teacher quality not based exclusively on paper credentials, but on how well a teacher performs in the classroom, and would thus help rural schools keep effective teachers in the classrooms in which they are needed most. It would also provide greater local flexibility in designing interventions in schools that are not meeting their performance targets, so that rural communities can decide what works best for their schools. The proposal would also eliminate Federal mandates to provide supplemental educational services and public school choice – interventions that are often not feasible in rural communities.

Rural districts frequently receive allocations under State formula grant programs that are too small to allow the LEA to address effectively the purposes for which the funds are appropriated. For example, among districts currently eligible for SRSA in fiscal year 2011, the fiscal year 2010 median sum of allocations under two Federal formula grant programs (Improving Teacher Quality State Grants and Educational Technology State Grants) was \$15,247. Recognizing that rural districts frequently receive small allocations from Federal formula grants, the REAP-Flex authority gives SRSA-eligible LEAs the flexibility to make more effective use of their small Federal formula allocations. An eligible LEA may use its formula allocations under the two programs noted to carry out authorized activities or for activities authorized under Part A of Title I, Part D of Title II (Educational Technology), Title III (English Language Acquisition), Part A of Title IV (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities), Part B of Title IV (21st Century

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

Community Learning Centers), or Part A of Title V (Innovative Programs). Fifty-six percent of eligible districts notified their respective State of their intention to take advantage of this authority in school year 2009-10. Yet even when the eligible LEAs consolidate their allocations under these programs, they typically do not have enough money to provide effective educator professional development, strengthen school safety, or address the other statutory objectives in a meaningful manner. REAP funds help to make up the difference and assist rural LEAs in financing and implementing approaches to meeting ESEA requirements and addressing the other challenges they face.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

| <u>Measures</u>                           | <u>2011</u>  | <u>2012</u>  | <u>2013</u>  |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| <b>Small, rural school achievement</b>    |              |              |              |
| Total funding                             | \$87,266     | \$89,597     | \$89,597     |
| Estimated number of LEAs receiving grants | 4,195        | 4,195        | 4,304        |
| Average LEA grant                         | \$21         | \$21         | \$21         |
| Average award per student (whole \$)      | \$80         | \$82         | \$80         |
| Range of awards to LEAs                   | 0-\$60       | 0-\$60       | 0-\$60       |
| <b>Rural and low-income schools</b>       |              |              |              |
| Total funding                             | \$87,266     | \$89,597     | \$89,597     |
| Amount for State grants                   | \$86,393     | \$88,701     | \$88,701     |
| Amount for BIE                            | \$436        | \$448        | \$448        |
| Amount for outlying areas                 | \$436        | \$448        | \$448        |
| Number of States receiving grants         | 43           | 43           | 41           |
| Number of LEAs receiving subgrants        | 1,797        | 1,797        | 1,662        |
| Average State grant                       | \$2,009      | \$2,063      | \$2,163      |
| Average LEA subgrant                      | \$48         | \$49         | \$53         |
| Average award per student (whole \$)      | \$24         | \$24         | \$27         |
| Range of awards to States                 | \$15-\$7,041 | \$15-\$7,229 | \$41-\$8,329 |
| Estimated range of subgrants to LEAs      | \$1-\$524    | \$1-\$538    | \$1-\$464    |

---

Note: The fiscal year 2013 data assume the introduction of new locale codes, as provided for in the ESEA reauthorization proposal.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data, and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2013 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

**Measure:** The percentage of SRSA-participating LEAs that make adequate yearly progress after 3 years.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 96     | 85     |
| 2009 | 97     | 95     |
| 2010 | 97     | 78     |
| 2011 | 98     |        |
| 2012 | 98     |        |
| 2013 | 99     |        |

**Measure:** The percentage of RLIS-participating LEAs that make adequate yearly progress after 3 years.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 76     | 51     |
| 2009 | 82     | 49     |
| 2010 | 88     | 43     |
| 2011 | 94     |        |
| 2012 | 96     |        |
| 2013 | 98     |        |

**Additional information:** When LEAs reported baseline data for 2005, the Department found that 95 percent of LEAs participating in SRSA and 58 percent of LEAs participating in RLIS made AYP. With the baseline data in place, the Department established performance targets to reflect a yearly increase of 1 percentage point every 2 years over the baseline in the number of SRSA LEAs that make AYP, in order to reach 100 percent by the year 2014. Similarly, the Department also adjusted the performance targets for the RLIS program to reflect an annual increase of 6 percentage points over the baseline in the number of LEAs that make

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

AYP. After a significant increase in 2009, SRSA grantees with 3 or more years in the program showed a significant decrease in meeting AYP in 2010. RLIS grantees with 3 or more years in the program dropped to 43 percent meeting AYP in 2010. SRSA has consistently had a greater proportion of grantees making AYP than RLIS, perhaps reflecting the fact that RLIS districts are larger and, thus, may have more subgroups that are counted in AYP determinations. (Note that, as shown in the tables that follow, the gap in proficiency rates for SRSA compared to RLIS districts is not as wide.) The declines for both programs in 2010 are likely attributable to increases in States' "annual measurable objectives" (the percentage of children achieving proficiency that an LEA must attain in order to make AYP). Data for 2011 are expected in October 2012.

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

**Measure:** The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in reading/language arts in each year through the 2013-2014 academic year.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 74     | 74     |
| 2009 | 78     | 75     |
| 2010 | 82     | 74     |
| 2011 | 86     |        |
| 2012 | 90     |        |
| 2013 | 94     |        |

**Measure:** The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in mathematics in each year through the 2013-2014 academic year.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 71     | 71     |
| 2009 | 76     | 71     |
| 2010 | 81     | 72     |
| 2011 | 86     |        |
| 2012 | 91     |        |
| 2013 | 96     |        |

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

**Measure:** The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in reading/language arts in each year through the 2013-2014 academic year.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 74     | 64     |
| 2009 | 79     | 68     |
| 2010 | 84     | 67     |
| 2011 | 88     |        |
| 2012 | 92     |        |
| 2013 | 96     |        |

**Measure:** The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in mathematics in each year through the 2013-2014 academic year.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 70     | 62     |
| 2009 | 75     | 67     |
| 2010 | 80     | 63     |
| 2011 | 85     |        |
| 2012 | 90     |        |
| 2013 | 95     |        |

**Additional information:** The Department established baselines for student proficiency in both programs using data from the 2006-07 school year. Among SRSA districts, the percentage of students who scored proficient or better on their State assessments decreased slightly in reading and increased slightly in mathematics from 2009 to 2010, and both did not meet the targets. RLIS districts showed decreases in the percentage of students who score proficient or better on both reading and mathematics assessments, and remained below the targets for both measures. The performance targets for these measures reflect the ESEA goal that 100 percent of students enrolled in districts participating in both the SRSA and RLIS programs will be proficient by 2014. Data for fiscal year 2011 are expected in October 2012.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

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

**Measure:** The percentage of eligible school districts using the REAP flexibility authority.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 65     | 51     |
| 2009 | 65     | 50     |
| 2010 | 65     | 56     |
| 2011 | 65     |        |
| 2012 | 65     |        |
| 2013 | 65     |        |

**Additional information:** While this measure was developed to capture the percentage of eligible districts actually using the flexibility authority, the best available information is on the number of districts reporting to the State their intent to use this authority. (Since there is little reason to believe that LEAs would provide this notification and not use the authority, reported intent serves as a reasonable proxy.) In fiscal year 2010, 56 percent of eligible districts reported their intent to use the flexibility authority. Data for 2011 are expected in October 2012.

### Program Efficiency Measure

**Measure:** The percentage of SRSA program grants awarded by August 30 of each fiscal year.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 80     | 100    |
| 2009 | 80     | 100    |
| 2010 | 80     | 100    |
| 2011 | 80     | 100    |
| 2012 | 80     |        |
| 2013 | 80     |        |

**Additional information:** Due to difficulty in processing over 4,000 SRSA grants to LEAs in a timely manner in the early years of the program, the Department established a measure to track the efficiency of this task. The Department has had great success since creating the measure, not only exceeding its target of awarding 80 percent of SRSA awards by August 30, but awarding 100 percent each year. Data for 2012 are expected in October 2012.

### Other Performance Information

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

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

Section 6224(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act requires the Department to prepare a biennial report to Congress on the RLIS program. The report must describe the methods SEAs have used to award grants and provide technical assistance, how LEAs and schools have used RLIS funds, and the progress made toward meeting the goals and objectives outlined in the SEA applications. In 2011, the Department submitted to Congress its biennial report for school years 2008-09 and 2009-10. The report includes the finding that of the 41 States receiving fiscal year 2009 funds, all but 5 awarded funds to eligible LEAs by formula based on each eligible LEA's share of students in average daily attendance. One State used a modified formula that targeted a greater share of program funds to LEAs with poverty rates greater than 40 percent, and four States awarded funds on a competitive basis. The report had findings that were consistent with the evaluation report, in that technology, professional development, and Title I, Part A activities were the most frequently reported uses of funds. Finally, it is difficult to link LEA progress toward goals to activities specifically supported with RLIS funds, but the report does include examples provided by the States of LEA progress toward program goals.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Supplemental education grants

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: \$20,265<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

| <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| \$17,619    | \$17,619    | 0             |

---

<sup>1</sup> The Act authorizes \$12,230 thousand for the Federated States of Micronesia and \$6,100 thousand for the Republic of the Marshall Islands for fiscal year 2005 and an equivalent amount, as adjusted for inflation (calculated as two thirds of the percentage change in the U.S. Gross Domestic Product Implicit Price Deflator, or 5 percent, whichever is less in any 1 year), for each of the succeeding fiscal years through 2023. The 2013 authorization is calculated based on inflation estimates as of February 2011.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Supplemental education grants

---

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

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

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

|            | (dollars in thousands) |
|------------|------------------------|
| 2008 ..... | \$17,687               |
| 2009 ..... | 17,687                 |
| 2010 ..... | 17,687                 |
| 2011 ..... | 17,652                 |
| 2012 ..... | 17,619                 |

### FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$17.6 million, the same as the 2012 level, to maintain funding for Supplemental Education Grants to the RMI and FSM. The request would ensure the continuation of services for residents of the RMI and the FSM.

A majority of the funding in fiscal years 2005 through 2009 was used to support early childhood education. The RMI and FSM have also used Supplemental Education Grants for education improvement programs, vocational and skills training, and professional development. Both the RMI and FSM are also using funds to prepare students for jobs that may result from the Guam military build-up. For example, funds to the RMI have supported an Accelerated Boot Camp Trades Academy in collaboration with the College of the Marshall Islands while funds to the FSM have supported projects developed in partnership with the Guam Trades Academy.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Supplemental education grants

---

#### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands)

| <u>Measures</u>                              | <u>2011</u> | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Grant to Federated States of<br>Micronesia   | \$11,774    | \$11,752    | \$11,752    |
| Grant to Republic of the Marshall<br>Islands | 5,878       | 5,867       | 5,867       |

#### **PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

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

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

Additional information from the Department of the Interior covering the 5-year period between 2004 and 2009 highlights the continuing challenges faced by both entities in improving the quality of education due to a lack of qualified teachers, poor facilities, and a high absentee rate among students and teachers. While access to elementary and secondary education has increased in the RMI and student enrollment has also increased despite significant out-migration, the RMI continues to have few standardized tests for assessing student achievement, a high dropout rate, and a high percentage of poorly qualified teachers. The FSM has made steady progress toward building the capacity to collect and report annually on a set of 20 indicators of educational progress but continues to struggle with low student achievement, discouraging student drop-out rates, and problematic teacher attendance. One area of improvement for the FSM was a slight increase, between 2005 and 2009, in the number and percentage of teachers holding an Associates of Arts degree for certification.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Comprehensive centers

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

| <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| \$51,113    | \$51,113    | 0             |

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2009. The Department proposes to continue funding this program in FY 2013 through appropriations language.

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

Each center developed a 5-year plan for carrying out authorized activities. The plan of each regional center addresses the needs of the SEAs in its region in meeting the student achievement goals of the ESEA. The content centers' plans address the priorities established

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

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

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

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

|            | (dollars in thousands) |
|------------|------------------------|
| 2008 ..... | \$57,113               |
| 2009 ..... | 57,113                 |
| 2010 ..... | 56,313                 |
| 2011 ..... | 51,210                 |
| 2012 ..... | 51,113                 |

### FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2013, the Administration requests \$51.1 million, the same as the fiscal year 2012 appropriation, to support the second year of funding for the second cohort of comprehensive centers funded under the Educational Technical Assistance Act.

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

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

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

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

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

In fiscal year 2011, the Department extended the project period of the existing grantees for a second time and awarded a seventh year of funding. The Department also negotiated new cooperative agreements with the existing centers to include newly defined priorities. The purpose of the regional centers continues to be helping States build their capacity to support districts and schools in meeting their student achievement goals. Content centers supply much of the research-based information, products, guidance, analyses, and knowledge that regional centers will use when working with States. Under the new cooperative agreements, the regional centers are working with States to address such priority areas as: (1) improving school readiness and success, (2) implementing internationally benchmarked college- and career-ready elementary and secondary school academic standards with aligned assessments and instructional materials, (3) turning around persistently lowest-achieving schools, (4) improving postsecondary success, (5) improving achievement and high school graduation rates in rural and high-need schools, (6) strengthening science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) education, (7) meeting the needs of diverse learners, (8) improving the achievement of English learners, (9) recruiting, hiring, and retaining effective teachers and leaders, and (10) enabling data-based and evidence-based decision-making.

The additional year of funding also allowed for the establishment of the Regional Advisory Committees (RACs) that, under the law, the Department is required to create before holding a Comprehensive Centers competition. The RACs provided advice, through reports, on the educational needs of the regions to be served by the next group of centers. The Department is using the results of findings from the regional advisory committees, the current national evaluation findings, grantee monitoring, and other outreach to States and other stakeholders to inform the development of the notice of proposed priorities and the notice inviting applications for the fiscal year 2012 competition. The fiscal year 2013 appropriation would provide the second year of funding for the new centers.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

The Department has not yet made final decisions on the structure of the competition, but is working to ensure alignment of the Comprehensive Centers' competition with other Department technical assistance investments. Currently, the Department envisions that the new centers will help States increase their capacity to support their districts and schools by providing technical assistance in at least the following areas:

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

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

### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands)

| <u>Measures</u>  | <u>2011</u> | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>Comprehensive centers</b>   |             |             |             |
| Number of centers  | 21          | 22-23       | 22-23       |
| Center awards  | \$50,448    | \$50,102    | \$49,613    |
| Average award  | \$2,402     | \$2,277     | \$2,255     |
| Evaluation   | 0           | \$500       | \$1,500     |
| Regional advisory committees and peer review of new award applications | \$762       | \$511       | 0           |

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

## PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data, and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2013 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

In response to deficiencies identified in the antecedent comprehensive centers, the Department placed strong emphasis on creating a performance-based framework for the current centers that includes, among other things, annual performance measures. These measures were created as part of a Department-wide effort to bring consistency to the assessment of performance across technical assistance programs through the creation of common performance measures. The measures are designed to analyze the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the services provided by the centers, the extent to which each of the centers meets the objectives of its respective plan, and whether their services meet the educational needs of the SEAs, LEAs, and schools.

As part of the Department's national evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers, initiated in 2006, the contractor led panel reviews and conducted surveys annually beginning in 2007. An analysis of the results of those reviews and surveys informed the performance measures for the current centers for three years, 2007 - 2009. Grantees reported data for 2010 through their individual performance reports. Data for 2010 represent work done by the centers during their fifth year of operation.

**Goal: To improve student achievement in low-performing schools under the ESEA.**

**Objective:** *Improve the quality of technical assistance.*

**Measure:** The percentage of all Comprehensive Centers' products and services that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products and services.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 40     | 39     |
| 2009 | 46     | 45     |
| 2010 | 52     |        |
| 2011 | 59     |        |
| 2012 | 66     |        |
| 2013 | 73     |        |

**Additional information:** In 2008 and 2009, independent panels reviewed the substantive content of sample products and services provided by the centers and made an assessment of their technical quality on the following dimensions: demonstrated use of the appropriate documented knowledge base; fidelity of application of the knowledge base to the products and

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

services provided; and clear and effective delivery. The Department distributed and discussed with each individual center the panelists' comments about its projects in order to help centers consider areas for improvement. Since the evaluation included only 2 years of data collection, data for 2010 were collected and reported using client surveys developed by the centers in conjunction with their evaluators. The centers reported 91 percent of all products and services to be of high quality. The designs of client surveys used to collect data for these measures varied widely by center.

**Measure:** The percentage of all Comprehensive Centers' products and services that are deemed to be of high relevance to educational policy or practice by target audiences.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 75     | 83     |
| 2009 | 76     | 85     |
| 2010 | 77     | 84     |
| 2011 | 78     |        |
| 2012 | 79     |        |
| 2013 | 80     |        |

**Additional information:** In 2008 and 2009, as part of the national evaluation, an independent firm collected survey data from a random sample of SEA and intermediate education agency staff who participated in regional centers' projects and also from regional center staff who participated in content centers' projects. Projects were defined as a group of closely related activities or deliverables designed to achieve specific outcomes for a specific audience. Since the evaluation included only 2 years of data collection, data for 2010 were collected and reported using client surveys developed by the centers in conjunction with their evaluators. The designs of client surveys used to collect data for these measures varied widely by center.

**Objective:** *Technical assistance products and services will be used to improve results for children in the target areas.*

**Measure:** The percentage of all Comprehensive Centers' products and services that are deemed to be of high usefulness to educational policy or practice by target audiences.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 52     | 64     |
| 2009 | 56     | 71     |
| 2010 | 60     | 88     |
| 2011 | 65     |        |
| 2012 | 70     |        |
| 2013 | 75     |        |

**Additional information:** In 2008 and 2009, as part of the national evaluation, an independent firm collected survey data from a random sample of SEA and intermediate education agency staff who participated in regional centers' projects and from regional center staff who participated in content centers' projects. Projects were defined as a group of closely related activities or deliverables designed to achieve specific outcomes for a specific audience. Since the evaluation included only 2 years of data collection, data for 2010 were collected and reported

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

using client surveys developed by the centers in conjunction with their evaluators. The designs of client surveys used to collect data for these measures varied widely by center.

#### Efficiency Measures

The Department is implementing a common measure of administrative efficiency to assess the Comprehensive Centers program and other technical assistance programs. The measure is the percentage of grant funds that the centers carry over for each year of operations. Data for the measure are available each year in September, after Department staff have reviewed data for the previous 12-month budget cycle, and are presented in the table below. The Department also established a second efficiency measure for the program: the number of working days following a monitoring visit that it takes the Department to send a monitoring report to grantees. The program office implemented this new measure in 2009 and established a baseline of 81 working days and a goal of reducing that number to 45 working days.

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

**Measure:** The percentage of Comprehensive Center grant funds carried over in each year of the project.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2008 | 20     | 6      |
| 2009 | 10     | 4      |
| 2010 | 10     | 2      |
| 2011 | 10     | 2      |
| 2012 | 10     |        |
| 2013 | 10     |        |

**Additional information:** The centers had 40 percent carryover in 2006, the baseline year, which was likely the result of their receiving initial grant awards several months into the beginning of the first award year. Since then, grantees have reduced the amount of funds they carry over each year.

**Measure:** The number of working days following a monitoring visit that it takes the Department to send a monitoring report to grantees.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2009 |        | 81     |
| 2010 | 45     | 78     |
| 2011 | 45     | 58     |
| 2012 | 45     |        |
| 2013 | 45     |        |

**Additional information:** The Department conducted one monitoring visit in September 2010 and one in July 2011, both of which had report deadlines in fiscal year 2011, based on the 45-day target. The Department has begun to address the delays in issuing reports with the hiring of new staff and increasing staff attention to these reports.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

#### Other Performance Information

In addition to providing data for the performance measures, the national evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers assessed: (1) the extent to which the centers have met the objectives of their respective technical assistance plans and the educational needs of SEAs, and (2) whether the centers' assistance has expanded SEAs' capacity to provide technical assistance to help LEAs and schools meet their statutory requirements. The evaluation also examined the centers' responses to changing SEA technical assistance needs, SEAs' reliance on the centers compared to other technical assistance sources, the overall costs for SEAs in providing ESEA-related technical assistance, and the estimated dollar value of the centers' products and services to SEAs.

In July 2010, the first interim report from the national evaluation provided an analysis of data obtained through surveys of comprehensive center clients and expert reviews of comprehensive center projects, covering the 2006-07 program year, the second year of center operations. In this first round of project ratings, the content centers had higher mean ratings of technical quality for their sampled projects than did the regional centers, while the regional centers had higher mean ratings of relevance than did the content centers. There was no statistically significant relationship between ratings of quality and ratings of relevance or usefulness, which suggests that achieving high technical quality (judged on the basis of expert peer reviews) was unrelated to the delivery of assistance thought by clients to be highly relevant or useful. There was a high correlation between relevance and usefulness. In addition, projects that centers had identified as "major" projects were rated higher on measures of relevance and usefulness.

The final report, covering the 2007-08 and 2008-09 program years, was released August 31, 2011 (see: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20114031/>). The report indicated that both the regional centers and the content centers conducted activities consistent with their design and that, over the 3-year period, the regional centers and content centers were increasingly involved in each other's projects. Similarly, an increasing number of State managers reported each year that center assistance served their purposes, with "statewide systems of support" cited most frequently as a State priority. The proportion of State managers reporting that center assistance had served the State's purposes completely rose from 36 percent in 2006-07 to 56 percent in 2008-09. Statewide systems of support was also the topic most frequently addressed in center projects each year. Among the managers who reported that their State's purposes were not completely served, a larger proportion in each year reported wanting more interaction with the centers. In 2008-09, 43 percent of those State managers said, "center staff are not able to spend as much time working with the State as we would like."

Further, State managers reported that center assistance had expanded State capacity in the area of Statewide systems of support. Among State managers who reported Statewide systems of support or school support teams to be a State priority for assistance in 2008-09, 82 percent credited center assistance with a "great" or "moderate" expansion of State capacity in this area. To a lesser extent, State managers also credited the centers with expanding their States' capacity in other areas during the same year: from 77 percent in the areas of research-based curriculum, instruction, or professional development in academic subjects to 39 percent in ESEA provisions on supplemental educational services and choice.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### **Comprehensive centers**

---

On average, across each of the 3 years, the ratings for quality, relevance, and usefulness increased. The average quality rating was consistently higher for content center projects than for regional center projects while the average relevance ratings were higher for regional centers than content centers in the first two years of the study. There were no consistent differences in the usefulness ratings between regional centers and content centers.

A new national evaluation, as mandated by statute, will be initiated in 2012.

**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

---

**Native Hawaiian student education**

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1,2</sup>

Budget Authority:

|  | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|--|-------------|-------------|---------------|
|  | \$34,181    | \$34,181    | 0             |

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2013.

<sup>2</sup> Under current law, of the amount available to carry out Sections 7204 and 7205 of ESEA, \$500 thousand is to be reserved for a direct grant to the Native Hawaiian Education Council to carry out Section 7204.

---

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The Native Hawaiian Student Education program supports the provision of supplemental education services to the Native Hawaiian population. Competitive grants are awarded to eligible applicants for a variety of authorized activities in such areas as teacher training, family-based education, gifted and talented education, special education, higher education, community-based education learning centers, and early education and care programs. Eligible applicants include Native Hawaiian educational organizations and community-based organizations, public and private nonprofit organizations, agencies, and institutions with experience in developing or operating Native Hawaiian programs or programs of instruction in the Native Hawaiian language, and other entities.

The program also supports the activities of the Native Hawaiian Education Council. The Council uses funds directly and is authorized to make grants to facilitate its coordination of the educational and related services and programs available to Native Hawaiians. It also provides administrative support and financial assistance to island councils authorized by the statute. The Council receives a minimum award of \$500,000 annually.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

|            | (dollars in thousands) |
|------------|------------------------|
| 2008 ..... | \$33,315               |
| 2009 ..... | 33,315                 |
| 2010 ..... | 34,315                 |
| 2011 ..... | 34,246                 |
| 2012 ..... | 34,181                 |

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Native Hawaiian student education

---

#### **FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST**

For FY 2013, the Administration requests \$34.2 million for the Native Hawaiian Student Education program, the same amount as fiscal year 2012. The Native Hawaiian Student Education program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2013 under reauthorized legislation. For the reauthorization, the Administration's proposal would require that grantees ensure that academic projects use evidence-based approaches and report academic achievement data for the students they serve.

Program funds would continue to be used for education-related services to the Native Hawaiian population. Federal support through this program is justified by the educational status and continuing needs of Native Hawaiians. Program grants support projects intended to improve the educational achievement of Native Hawaiian students by developing programs tailored to the unique educational and cultural needs of those students.

Results from Hawaii's statewide assessment for 2011 show that an achievement gap persists between Native Hawaiian students and students in Hawaii in general. Across all assessed grades, 58 percent of Native Hawaiian students (including those self-identified as part-Native Hawaiian) demonstrated grade-level proficiency in reading and 44 percent demonstrated grade-level proficiency in mathematics, compared to 66 percent in reading and 54 percent in mathematics for all Hawaiian students. This gap between Native Hawaiians and their peers remains consistent across grade levels. In the 4<sup>th</sup> grade, 68 percent of all Hawaiian students met or exceeded proficiency in reading and 61 percent met or exceeded proficiency in mathematics, compared to 60 percent in reading and 53 percent in mathematics for Native Hawaiians. In the 8<sup>th</sup> grade, 67 percent of all Hawaiian students met or exceeded proficiency in reading and 54 percent met this level in mathematics, compared to 56 percent in reading and 42 percent in mathematics for Native Hawaiians.

#### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands)

| <u>Measures</u>                       | <u>2011</u> | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Amount for new awards                 | \$13,364    | \$10,784    | \$2,673     |
| Number of new awards                  | 23          | 22          | 5           |
| Amount for continuation awards        | \$20,106    | \$22,555    | \$30,666    |
| Number of continuation awards         | 35          | 35          | 49          |
| Native Hawaiian Education Council     | \$500       | \$500       | \$500       |
| Peer review of new award applications | \$276       | \$342       | \$342       |

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Native Hawaiian student education

---

#### **PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

##### **Performance Measures**

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data, and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2013 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department established new performance measures for this program in 2008, consistent with the GAO recommendation discussed below, that should more accurately and reliably gauge the effectiveness of this program. The new indicators will measure the percentage of Native Hawaiian students in schools served by the program who meet or exceed proficiency standards for reading, mathematics, and science on the State's annual assessments; the percentage of Native Hawaiian children participating in early learning programs who demonstrate school readiness in literacy as measured by the Hawaii School Readiness Assessment (HSRA); the percentage of students in schools served by the program who graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma in 4 years; and the percentage of students receiving Hawaiian language instruction through a grant under the program who meet or exceed proficiency standards in reading on a test of the Hawaiian language. The Department used these measures beginning with the fiscal year 2009 cohort of new grantees and will have baseline data in spring 2012.

##### **Other Performance Information**

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) released a report on the program in March 2008. GAO recommended that the Department, the Native Hawaiian Education Council, and the island councils do more to fulfill their roles and responsibilities under the statute. Regarding the Department specifically, GAO recommended that the Secretary report to Congress on program activities, establish performance measures that cover a greater proportion of the grantees' activities, track grant activities more closely, and provide more guidance and assistance to grantees and the Council. The Department continues to work on each of these recommendations. Most notably, the Department revised the GPRA measures and developed guidance documents for grantees on project implementation.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Alaska Native student education

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1, 2</sup>

Budget Authority:

| <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| \$33,185    | \$33,185    | 0             |

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2013.

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

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Alaska Native Student Education program supports supplemental educational programs and services to Alaska Natives. The program awards competitive grants to eligible applicants for a variety of authorized activities, such as teacher training and student enrichment programs. Eligible applicants include Alaska Native organizations, educational entities with experience in developing or operating Alaska Native programs or programs of instruction conducted in Alaska Native languages, cultural and community-based organizations, and other entities. At least \$1 million must be used for parenting education activities.

Activities supported by these grants include the development and implementation of curricula and educational programs that address needs of the Alaska Native student population, professional development activities for educators, the development and operation of home instruction programs for Alaska Native preschool children that help ensure the active involvement of parents in their children's education, family literacy services, student enrichment programs in science and mathematics, and dropout prevention programs.

Section 7304(d)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requires the following grants to be awarded annually: \$1 million for cultural education programs operated by the Alaska Native Heritage Center; \$1 million for a cultural exchange program operated by the Alaska Humanities Forum; \$2 million for an Alaska Initiative for Community Engagement; and \$2 million for the Cook Inlet Tribal Council's Partners for Success program, a dropout prevention program. However, the fiscal year 2012 appropriations act provides that all program funds must be awarded competitively.

All grantees may use no more than 5 percent of the funding for administrative costs.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Alaska native student education

---

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

|            | (dollars in thousands) |
|------------|------------------------|
| 2008 ..... | \$33,315               |
| 2009 ..... | 33,315                 |
| 2010 ..... | 33,315                 |
| 2011 ..... | 33,248                 |
| 2012 ..... | 33,185                 |

### FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2013, the Administration requests \$33.2 million for the Alaska Native Student Education program, the same amount as fiscal year 2012. The Alaska Native Student Education program is authorized by the ESEA and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2013 under reauthorized legislation. The Administration's reauthorization proposal would require that grantees report academic achievement data for the students they serve. In addition, the proposal would discontinue the funding for earmarks in the current statute because the Administration believes that competing these funds will lead to higher-quality programs and improved student outcomes. The 2013 request would support the continued provision of education-related services to the Alaska Native population and would fund the program's first year of operation under a reauthorized ESEA.

Data on the educational performance of Alaska Native students demonstrate the continuing need for this program. Results from the spring 2011 Alaska Standards-Based Assessment indicated that Alaska Native and American Indian students in the State continue to lag behind their peers in academic performance. (Because Alaska Natives constitute approximately 95 percent of the State's American Indian/Alaska Native (AI/AN) student population, the AI/AN scores are good proxies for Alaska Native achievement.) Fifty percent of AI/AN students demonstrated proficiency on the 4<sup>th</sup>-grade reading assessment, compared to 74 percent of all 4<sup>th</sup>-grade students, and 55 percent of AI/AN students achieved proficiency in mathematics, compared to 75 percent of all 4<sup>th</sup>-grade students. Eighth-grade assessments showed similar results as 65 percent of AI/AN students demonstrated proficiency on the 8<sup>th</sup>-grade reading assessment, compared to 83 percent of all 8<sup>th</sup>-grade students, and 47 percent of AI/AN students achieved proficiency in mathematics, compared to 68 percent of all 8<sup>th</sup>-grade students.

Data from the 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) show a similar achievement gap. In 4<sup>th</sup>-grade reading, AI/AN students in Alaska averaged a score of 175, while the overall national average for all students was 221. There were similar differences in 8<sup>th</sup>-grade reading (234 to 265), 4<sup>th</sup>-grade mathematics (213 to 241), and 8<sup>th</sup>-grade mathematics (258 to 284).

According to the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development, in the 2009-10 school year the "event dropout rate" (the proportion of students who drop out of school during the course of a year) among Alaska Natives and American Indian students in Alaska in grades 7 through 12 was 8.3 percent. This was higher than the rate for any other racial or ethnic group in the State and well above the statewide rate of 5.0 percent. Further, Alaska's *Report Card to the*

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Alaska native student education

---

*Public:* 2009-2010 reported that the American Indian/Alaska Native high school graduation rate was 55 percent, while the statewide figure was 68 percent.

Alaska's geography and population patterns add to the challenge of delivering quality educational services to Alaska Native students. The State has many rural districts, which often house few schools spread out over large remote areas, and Alaska Native students are disproportionately enrolled in small, rural, and isolated schools.

Program grants help address these barriers by developing programs tailored to the educational and cultural needs of Alaska Native students in order to improve their performance in the classroom and increase their chances of graduating from high school.

### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands)

| <u>Measures</u>                       | <u>2011</u> | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Amount for new awards                 | \$9,353     | \$22,051    | \$1,043     |
| Number of new awards                  | 17          | 44          | 2           |
| Amount for continuation awards        | \$17,563    | \$10,802    | \$31,810    |
| Number of continuation awards         | 31          | 19          | 61          |
| Earmarks                              | \$6,000     | 0           | 0           |
| Peer review of new award applications | \$332       | \$332       | \$332       |

### **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 2013 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department established new performance measures (or, for one measure, strengthened data collection methods) in 2008 that should more accurately and reliably gauge the effectiveness of this program. The new indicators will measure the percentage of Alaska Native students in schools served by the program who meet or exceed proficiency standards for reading, mathematics, and science on the State's annual assessments; the percentage of Alaska Native children participating in early learning and preschool programs who consistently demonstrate school readiness in language and literacy as measured by the Revised Alaska Developmental Profile (RADP); and the percentage of students in schools served by the program who graduate from high school with a high school diploma in 4 years. The Department

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### **Alaska native student education**

---

has used these measures beginning with the fiscal year 2009 cohort of new grantees and will have baseline data in spring 2012.