

Department of Education
SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS
Fiscal Year 2013 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language	E-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	E-2
Amounts Available for Obligation	E-3
Obligations by Object Classification	E-4
Summary of Changes	E-5
Authorizing Legislation	E-7
Appropriations History.....	E-9
Summary of Request	E-10
Activities:	
Promise neighborhoods	E-13
Successful, safe, and healthy students	E-19
Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities.....	E-24
Elementary and secondary school counseling.....	E-39
Physical education program	E-43
21 st Century community learning centers	E-48
State table.....	E-57

[SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION] SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS¹

[For carrying out activities authorized by part A of title IV and subparts 1, 2, and 10 of part D of title V of the ESEA, \$256,237,000: *Provided*, That \$65,000,000 shall be available for subpart 2 of part A of title IV²: *Provided further*, That \$60,000,000 shall be available for Promise Neighborhoods and shall be available through December 31, 2012³.] (*Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2012.*)

NOTES

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

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.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
¹ [Safe Schools and Citizenship Education] <u>Supporting Student Success</u>	The Administration proposes to rename this account.
² [<i>Provided</i> , That \$65,000,000 shall be available for subpart 2 of part A of title IV...]	This language earmarks funds for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) National Programs (subpart 2 of part A of title IV).
³ [<i>Provided further</i> , That \$60,000,000 shall be available for Promise Neighborhoods and shall be available through December 31, 2012.]	This language earmarks funds for the Promise Neighborhoods program, and gives the Department an additional 3 months beyond the end of fiscal year 2012 to obligate them.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Amounts Available for Obligation
(dollars in thousands)

Appropriation and Adjustments	2011	2012	2013
Discretionary authority:			
Appropriation	\$289,043	\$256,237	\$1,447,539
Across-the-board reduction (P.L.112-10)	-578	0	0
Across-the-board reduction (P.L.112-74)	<u>0</u>	<u>-484</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, appropriation.....	288,485	255,753	1,447,539
Comparative transfer from			
<u>Education Improvement Programs</u> for:			
21 st Century community learning centers	<u>1,153,854</u>	<u>1,151,673</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, comparable appropriation	1,442,319	1,407,426	1,447,539
Unobligated balance, start of year	6,225	37,391	0
Recovery of prior-year obligations	16	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year	-37,391	0	0
Comparative transfers:			
Unobligated balance, start of year from:			
<u>Education Improvement Programs</u> for:			
21 st Century community learning centers	14,890	11,539	11,517
Unobligated balance, expiring, from:			
<u>Education Improvement Programs</u> for:			
21 st Century community learning centers	-26	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year from:			
<u>Education Improvement Programs</u> for:			
21 st Century community learning centers	<u>-11,539</u>	<u>-11,517</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations.....	1,414,478	1,444,839	1,459,056

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Obligations by Object Classification

(dollars in thousands)

Object Class	2011	2012	2013
<hr/>			
Other contractual services:			
Advisory and assistance services	\$2,705	\$2,354	\$3,907
Peer review.....	691	900	6,000
Other services	<u>13,578</u>	<u>11,820</u>	<u>19,613</u>
Subtotal	16,974	15,074	29,250
Grants, subsidies, and contributions.....	<u>1,397,504</u>	<u>1,429,765</u>	<u>1,429,536</u>
Total, direct obligations	1,414,478	1,444,839	1,459,056

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Summary of Changes (dollars in thousands)

2012.....	\$1,407,426
2013.....	<u>1,447,539</u>
Net change	+40,113

Increases:	<u>2012 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
<p>Increase for Promise Neighborhoods to provide additional competitive grants to community-based organizations for the development of comprehensive neighborhood programs designed to combat the effects of poverty and improve educational and life outcomes for children and youth, from birth through college and to career.</p>	\$59,887	+40,113
<p>Increase to initiate the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program to support student achievement to high standards and to help ensure that students are mentally and physically healthy and ready to learn by strengthening efforts to improve school climate and improve students' physical and mental health and well-being.</p>	0	+195,866
Subtotal, increases		+235,979

Decreases:	<u>2012 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
<p>Elimination of funds for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities because the Administration's reauthorization proposal would consolidate this program into the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program.</p>	64,877	-64,877
<p>Elimination of funds for Elementary and Secondary School Counseling because the Administration's reauthorization proposal would consolidate this program into the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program.</p>	52,296	-52,296

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Summary of Changes (dollars in thousands)

Decreases:	<u>2012 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
Elimination of funds for the Physical Education program because the Administration's reauthorization proposal would consolidate this program into the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program.	\$78,693	<u>-\$78,693</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-195,866
Net change		+40.113

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Authorizing Legislation
(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2012 Authorized	2012 Estimate	2013 Authorized	2013 Request
Promise neighborhoods (<i>ESEA-V-D, Subpart 1</i>)	0 ¹	\$59,887	To be determined ¹	\$100,000
Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students (<i>proposed legislation</i>)	0	0	To be determined	195,866
Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities (<i>ESEA IV-A, Subpart 2, Sections 4121 and 4122</i>)	0 ^{2,3}	64,877	0 ²	0
Elementary and secondary school counseling (<i>ESEA-V-D, Subpart 2</i>)	0 ²	52,296	0 ²	0
Physical education program (<i>ESEA-V-D, Subpart 10</i>)	0 ²	78,693	0 ²	0
21 st century community learning centers (<i>ESEA-IV-B</i>)	0 ¹	1,151,673	To be determined ¹	1,151,673
<u>Unfunded authorizations</u>				
Safe and drug-free schools and communities State grants (<i>ESEA IV-A, Subpart 1</i>)	0 ⁴	0	Indefinite ⁴	0
Alcohol abuse reduction (<i>ESEA section 4129</i>)	0 ⁴	0	Indefinite ⁴	0
Mentoring program (<i>ESEA section 4130</i>)	0 ⁴	0	Indefinite ⁴	0
Character education (<i>ESEA V-D, Subpart 3</i>)	0 ⁴	0	0 ⁴	0
Grants directed at preventing and reducing alcohol abuse at institutions of higher education (<i>Section 2(e)(2) of P.L. 109-422</i>)	<u>0⁵</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0⁵</u>	<u>0</u>
Total definite authorization	0		0	
Total appropriation		1,407,426		1,447,539
Portion of the request subject to reauthorization				1,447,539

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Authorizing Legislation—continued

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

² The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2013 under new legislation.

³ Funds appropriated for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs in fiscal year 2012 may not be increased above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2011 unless the amount appropriated for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants in fiscal year 2012 is at least 10 percent greater than the amount appropriated in 2011.

⁴ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The Administration is not seeking reauthorizing legislation.

⁵ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011. The Administration is not seeking reauthorizing legislation.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2004 (2004 Advance for 2005)	\$756,200 (330,000)	\$825,068 (330,000)	\$818,547	\$855,775
2005	838,897	801,369	891,460	860,771
2006	396,767	763,870	697,300	729,517
2007 Supplemental (P.L. 110-28)	266,627	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	729,518 8,594
2008	324,248	760,575	697,112	639,404
2009	281,963	714,481 ²	666,384 ²	690,370
2010	413,608	395,753	438,061 ³	393,053
2011	1,786,166	384,841 ⁴	426,053 ⁵	288,465
2012	1,781,132	65,000 ⁶	270,463 ⁶	255,753
2013	1,447,539			

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

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

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

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

⁵ The level for the Senate allowance reflects Committee action only.

⁶ The level for the House allowance reflects an introduced bill; the level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Committee action only.

[Click here for accessible version](#)

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
Supporting Student Success						
1. Promise Neighborhoods (ESEA V-D, subpart 1)	D	29,940	59,887	100,000	40,113	66.981%
2. Successful, safe, and healthy students:						
(a) Successful, safe, and healthy students (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	195,866	195,866	---
(b) Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities (ESEA IV-A, Subpart 2, sections 4121 and 4122)	D	119,226	64,877	0	(64,877)	-100.000%
(c) Elementary and secondary school counseling (ESEA V-D, subpart 2)	D	52,395	52,296	0	(52,296)	-100.000%
(d) Physical education program (ESEA V-D, subpart 10)	D	78,842	78,693	0	(78,693)	-100.000%
(e) Alcohol abuse reduction (ESEA IV-A, Subpart 2, section 4129)	D	6,907	0	0	0	---
Subtotal		257,370	195,866	195,866	0	0.000%
3. 21st century community learning centers (ESEA IV-B)	D	1,153,854	1,151,673	1,151,673	0	0.000%
Total	D	1,441,164	1,407,426	1,447,539	40,113	2.850%

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.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Summary of Request

The programs in the Supporting Student Success account assist States, local educational agencies, schools, and other organizations in developing and implementing programs and activities that increase the extent to which students are physically and emotionally safe and healthy; students have regular access to adults, either formally or informally, who care about their success and have opportunities to engage with them; schools are environments where students have the opportunity to access comprehensive supports along the birth-through-college-and-to-career continuum that promote social and emotional development and responsible citizenship; and students and teachers have the time and supports they need to focus on teaching and learning.

All of the programs in this account funded in 2012 are authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and are, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that the programs in this account will be implemented in fiscal year 2013 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal. Funding in the account is requested for the following three programs that respond to the concerns described above:

- \$100 million for the Promise Neighborhoods initiative, a \$40 million increase, to provide competitive 1-year planning grants and up to 5-year implementation grants to community-based organizations for the development and implementation of comprehensive neighborhood programs designed to combat the effects of poverty and improve educational and life outcomes for children and youth;
- \$196 million for a new Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program that would support student achievement to high standards and help ensure that students are mentally and physically healthy and ready to learn, by strengthening efforts to: improve school climate by reducing drug use, violence, bullying, and harassment, and by improving school safety; improve students' physical health and well-being through the use of, or provision of access to, comprehensive services that improve student nutrition, physical activity, and fitness; and improve student's mental health and well-being through the use of, or provision of access to, comprehensive services, such as counseling, health, and mental health services, social services, and innovative family engagement programs or supports; and
- \$1.2 billion for the reauthorized 21st Century Community Learning Centers to support State and local efforts to implement in-school and out-of-school strategies for providing students (and, where appropriate, teachers and family members), particularly those in high-need schools, the additional time, support, and enrichment activities needed to improve student achievement. The Administration's reauthorization proposal would continue to allow funds to be used for before- and after-school programs, summer enrichment programs, and summer school programs, and would also permit States and eligible local entities to use funds support expanded-learning-time programs as well as full-service community schools.

The fiscal year 2012 appropriation funded several separate, narrowly targeted programs focused on students' safety, health, and drug-prevention with different purposes, requirements, and authorized activities. While each of these programs has worthy goals, the result of these fragmented funding streams has been inefficiencies at the Federal, State, and local levels. To compete for funds, eligible entities have had to deal with numerous small grant competitions with different applications and requirements, rather than focusing on improving outcomes for

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Summary of Request

students. To manage programs, the Department has focused on running separate grant competitions and monitoring compliance, rather than providing strong support and directing funding to the most proven or promising practices. The new Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program constitutes a major consolidation of these existing programs, and would provide increased flexibility to States and districts in designing strategies that best reflect the needs of their students, schools, and communities, and allow the Department to focus funding on strategies that improve student achievement, especially for students in high-need schools. Accordingly, no funds are requested in the fiscal year 2013 budget for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities, Elementary and Secondary School Counseling, and Physical Education programs, all of which would be subsumed under the proposed consolidation.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Promise neighborhoods

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: To be determined ¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$59,887	\$100,000	+\$40,113

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

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Promise Neighborhoods provides competitive grants to support distressed communities in developing or implementing a feasible, sustainable plan for provision of a continuum of effective family and community services, strong family supports, and ambitious, comprehensive education reforms designed to improve the educational and life outcomes for children and youth, from birth through college. The core belief behind this initiative is that providing both effective, achievement-oriented schools and strong systems of support will offer children the best hope for a better life. In fiscal years 2010 through 2012, the Congress funded Promise Neighborhoods under the broad authority of Title V, Part D of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Fund for the Improvement of Education). The Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal includes a specific authorization for Promise Neighborhoods.

The purpose of the Promise Neighborhoods program is to improve significantly the educational and developmental outcomes of children and youth in our most distressed communities and to transform those communities by (1) increasing the capacity of organizations throughout an entire neighborhood that are focused on achieving results for children and youth; (2) building a continuum of academic programs and community supports with great schools at the center; (3) integrating programs so that solutions are implemented effectively and efficiently across agencies; (4) developing the local infrastructure of policies, practices, systems, and resources to sustain and "scale up" proven, effective solutions across the broader region, beyond the initial neighborhood; and (5) learning about the overall impact of the program and the relationship between particular strategies implemented with Promise Neighborhoods grants and student outcomes.

Each Promise Neighborhood grantee serves a geographic area that is "high-need," as demonstrated by multiple signs of distress. Each grantee has as a goal to attain a dramatic increase in the number of children and youth from the service area who successfully enter college, though grantees will pursue a range of comprehensive supports to reach that goal and other, intermediate goals. The Department encourages grantees to coordinate with other Federal agencies, such as the Departments of Housing and Urban Development, Health and

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Promise neighborhoods

Human Services, and Justice, in order to leverage additional resources and address additional community needs that limit the ability of children and youth to succeed educationally. The Department requires grantees to have a demonstrated record in improving outcomes for families in poverty.

Program funds support 1-year planning grants that enable grantees to conduct activities to facilitate the development of a feasible plan for providing a continuum of services and supports appropriate to the needs of children and youth within the target neighborhood. Required activities for planning grantees include: (1) conducting a comprehensive assessment of the needs and assets of children and youth in the neighborhood to be served; (2) developing a plan to deliver a continuum of “solutions” for serving those children and youth; (3) establishing effective partnerships that will provide the solutions and will commit the resources needed to sustain and scale up what works; (4) planning, building, adapting, or expanding a longitudinal data system that will provide information that the grantee will use for learning, improvement, and accountability; and (5) participating in a “community of practice” with the other grantees.

Planning grantees and other eligible entities with a feasible, high-quality plan may apply for implementation grants. The Department awards 3-year implementation grants, with the possibility of extending those grants to 5 years, based on grantee performance. To be successful, applicants for these grants must operate or propose to work with at least one public elementary or secondary school in the geographic area to be served and show the ability to work effectively with a variety of other organizations, such as nonprofit organizations, foundations, local agencies, and State agencies and, through those partnerships, bring a variety of resources to the program, including matching funds. Required activities for implementation grantees include: (1) implementation of a continuum of solutions that addresses neighborhood challenges and that will improve results for children and youth in the neighborhood; (2) continuing to build and strengthen partnerships that will provide solutions along the continuum of solutions and that will commit resources to sustain and scale up what works; (3) collecting data on indicators at least annually, and using and improving a longitudinal data system for learning, continuous improvement, and accountability; (4) demonstrating progress on goals for improving organizations’ internal systems, such as by making changes in policies and organizations, and by leveraging resources to sustain and scale up what works; and (5) participating in a community of practice.

Eligible organizations for both types of grants are non-profit organizations, institutions of higher education, and Indian tribes. In order to be eligible, an organization must also be representative of the geographic area proposed to be served; currently provide at least one of the proposed solutions in the proposed geographic area; and operate or propose to work with at least one public elementary or secondary school located within the proposed geographic area. In the fiscal year 2010 and 2011 competitions, the Department has given priority to applicants proposing to work in rural communities and to those proposing to work in tribal communities. Under the 2011 competition, implementation grantees with plans that propose to address public safety concerns will also have an opportunity to receive additional funds through an interagency agreement between the Department of Education and the Department of Justice.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Promise neighborhoods

The Department reserves up to 5 percent of the Promise Neighborhoods appropriation for national leadership activities such as research, data collection and reporting, outreach, dissemination, technical assistance, and peer review.

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

	(dollars in thousands)
2008	0
2009	0
2010	\$10,000
2011	29,940
2012	59,887

FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$100 million in fiscal year 2013 for Promise Neighborhoods, an increase of approximately \$40.1 million over the fiscal year 2012 level. Fiscal year 2013 funds would support new cohorts of planning grants and implementation grants as well as continuation awards for implementation grants made with the fiscal year 2011 appropriation. The requested increase reflects the priority that the Administration continues to place on this key initiative.

Promise Neighborhoods supports the goal of all children and youth having access to the continuum of ambitious, rigorous, and comprehensive education reforms, effective community services, and strong systems of family and community support—with high-quality schools at the center—necessary to address participants’ fundamental needs so that they succeed in school, college, and beyond. Research studies and data have shown that children in poverty are more likely than their more affluent peers to face mental health and physical health challenges; to have poor nutrition and exercise habits; to move homes and change schools; to attend high-poverty, low-performing schools; and to live in neighborhoods where safety is a concern. These are factors known to lead to negative behaviors and by themselves provide additional challenges for children in attaining a high-quality education. Surmounting these challenges requires a more concentrated and comprehensive approach than Federal, State, and local programs have historically taken.

In developing the Promise Neighborhoods program, the Department has benefited from the experiences of the Harlem Children’s Zone (HCZ) project, a comprehensive, place-based, anti-poverty program, begun in the 1990s, that is achieving impressive results for disadvantaged children and youth who live in a 97-block zone in New York City. The HCZ model espouses five principles for success: (1) serving an entire neighborhood comprehensively and at a large enough scale to have an impact on all children in the region; (2) creating a pipeline of high-quality programs for children, from birth through college, that includes parenting education, early childhood programs, effective schools and after-school programs, and supports before and during college; (3) building community among residents, institutions, and stakeholders, who help to create the environment necessary for children’s healthy development; (4) evaluating program

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Promise neighborhoods

outcomes and using the data for program improvement; and (5) cultivating a culture of success rooted in passion, accountability, leadership, and teamwork.¹

Evidence suggests that students in HCZ schools are achieving at significantly higher levels in reading and math than other, similarly situated students. Harvard University economics professor Roland Fryer, Jr. and Harvard graduate student Will Dobbie's 2009 assessment found that the HCZ produced significant gains for the students in the zone; the "HCZ is enormously successful at boosting achievement in math and ELA [English/Language Arts] in elementary school and math in middle school."² The HCZ reports that its students are also showing success in their college-acceptance and college-going rates, as well as in their ability to obtain financial aid in the form of full scholarships and grants.

Since the President announced the goal of establishing Promise Neighborhoods, the Department has received significant interest in the program. For the fiscal year 2010 planning grant competition, the Department received 339 applications, but was able to fund only 21 1-year planning grant projects, including 1 project that supports a tribal community and 2 projects that support rural communities. In fiscal year 2011, the Department received 199 applications for planning grants and 35 applications for implementation grants. The applicants represented 45 States and outlying areas. The Department awarded 5 implementation grants, averaging \$4.3 million in year one, as well as an additional cohort of 15 planning grants, averaging \$465,000. Of the five new implementation grantees, four are entities that received a planning grant in fiscal year 2010, including one rural entity. Of the 15 new planning grantees, 2 qualified as rural entities and 1 qualified as an Indian tribe. Implementation grantees have an opportunity to apply for additional funds from the Department of Justice to support community efforts to improve safety.

While the demand for grants continues to exceed the available funding, the Department's goal is to make significant investments in a number of communities that are able to demonstrate their capacity to plan and implement comprehensive high-quality education reforms and family and community supports for all children and youth in an identified geographic region, improve academic outcomes, and sustain their efforts and partnerships. Though the grant awards will serve as only part of the funding needed to implement a Promise Neighborhoods project, the Department believes that the Federal investment will help leverage additional financial support from non-Federal sources like philanthropies, private sources, and other governmental entities.

With the 5 percent reservation for technical assistance, the Department would support "communities of practice," the development of a Web site that includes a data dashboard for data management and reporting, direct assistance and coaching for grantees, and an annual project directors' meeting. Some of these activities began in 2011 under current law. The 2011 funds have supported work with grantees on creating definitions and collection strategies for

¹ *Whatever it Takes: A White Paper on the Harlem Children's Zone*, <http://www.hcz.org/images/stories/HCZ%20White%20Paper.pdf>.

² Will Dobbie and Roland G. Fryer, Jr., "Are High-Quality Schools Enough to Close the Achievement Gap? Evidence from a Bold Social Experiment in Harlem" (working paper, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, Massachusetts, April 2009).

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Promise neighborhoods

required indicator data and some implementation data, technical assistance to grantees on collecting those data, and work on a database that will house and record the data. In addition, the Department plans to collect indicator and implementation data from grantees, and create a restricted-use data file that can be made available to researchers for analysis. Fiscal year 2012 and 2013 funds would continue to support the Department's technical assistance efforts. In fiscal year 2012, the Department plans to investigate designs for an impact evaluation of the program, which would begin in fiscal year 2013.

In addition, the Department's participation in the Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative (NRI), part of the Domestic Policy Council's broader urban affairs agenda, may provide grantees and interested communities with an additional approach to technical assistance through the Building Neighborhood Capacity Program (BNCP). The NRI is executing the Administration's place-based strategy¹ for providing local communities with the tools they need to change neighborhoods of concentrated poverty into neighborhoods of opportunity. The NRI is comprised of representatives from the Departments of Housing and Urban Development, Health and Human Services, Justice, Treasury, and Education. The group is working jointly to fund integrated technical assistance to help high-need neighborhoods develop comprehensive, collaborative approaches to neighborhood revitalization. Fiscal year 2011 funds supported a training and technical assistance coordinator in the first year of a BNCP project to build the capacity of five high-need communities in order to improve individual and community outcomes and put the communities in a better position to compete for future funding opportunities. Fiscal year 2012 and 2013 funds would continue support for the BNCP.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
<u>Planning Grants</u>			
Number of new awards	15	15	15
Funding for new awards	\$6,971	\$7,000	\$7,000
<u>Implementation Grants</u>			
Number of new awards	5	6-7	8-10
Funding for new awards	\$21,486	\$27,790	\$37,285
Number of continuing awards	0	5	12
Funding for continuing awards	0	\$22,433	\$50,934

¹ See also Memorandum from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), *Developing Place-Based Policies for the FY 2011 Budget*, August 11, 2009, available online at http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/memoranda_fy2009/m09-28.pdf

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Promise neighborhoods

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
<u>National Activities</u>			
Technical assistance	\$586	\$999	\$713
BNCP	\$100	\$200	\$300
Data and evaluation assistance	\$506	\$1,065	\$868
Evaluation	0	0	\$2,500
Peer review of new award applications	\$291	\$400	\$400

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

The Department has established the following performance measure for planning grantees: the percentage of planning grantees that produce a high-quality plan as measured by their receiving at least 90 percent of 100 possible points in the subsequent competition for an implementation grant. Of the 21 fiscal year 2010 planning grantees, 19 applied for an implementation grant and 19 percent received a score of 90 percent or more in the final review of the fiscal year 2011 implementation competition. Four of the five implementation grantees also received a planning grant in fiscal year 2010.

The Department has established the following performance measure for implementation grantees: the percentage of implementation grantees that attain or exceed the annual goals that they establish and that are approved by the Department for (a) project indicators; (b) improving systems; and (c) leveraging resources.

Through the data and evaluation assistance contract, the Department will provide assistance to grantees on data collection and reporting, as well as on the production of a restricted use data set, to ensure consistency across grantees in how they collect and report data. Assistance will include refining and improving grantee performance measures, data collection strategies, data analyses, and meeting reporting requirements.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Successful, safe, and healthy students (Proposed legislation)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: To be determined

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>Change</u>
0	\$195,866	+\$195,866

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Under the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students (SSHS) program, the Department would award competitive grants to increase the capacity of State educational agencies (SEAs), high-need local educational agencies (LEAs), and their partners to develop and implement programs and activities that improve conditions for learning so that students are safe, healthy, and successful. Programs and activities supported by this program would include those that reduce or prevent drug use, alcohol use, bullying, harassment, or violence and promote and support the physical and mental well-being of students.

From the SSHS appropriation, the Department would be authorized to fund continuation awards for grants and contracts made under the following programs prior to enactment of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs; Elementary and Secondary School Counseling; and Physical Education. The Department would also be authorized to reserve up to 1.5 percent of the SSHS appropriation for program evaluation. From the remainder, the Department would: (1) set aside up to 1 percent for programs for Indian youth administered by the Department of the Interior; (2) set aside up to 1 percent for the Outlying Areas; (3) reserve the amount the Secretary determines is needed for National Activities; and (4) allocate the remainder to State and local grants.

Under the State and Local Grants portion of the program the Department would award competitive grants to SEAs, high-need LEAs, and their partners for development and implementation of comprehensive strategies designed to continuously improve conditions for learning and student outcomes, including activities aimed at preventing and reducing substance use, violence, harassment or bullying; promoting student mental, behavioral, and emotional health; strengthening family and student engagement in school; reducing out-of-school suspensions; implementing positive behavioral interventions and supports; and implementing programs designed to improve students' physical health and well-being, including their physical activity, nutrition, and fitness.

Grantees would be required to develop, adapt, or adopt and implement a State- or district-wide school climate measurement system that would consist of incident data (such as data on

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Successful, safe, and healthy students

suspensions and expulsions) and information on the conditions for learning collected through a comprehensive needs assessment (which may include surveys) of students, staff, and families. The school climate measurement system would be used to identify school and student needs and to implement activities that meet those needs. Additionally, this information would be aggregated at the school-building level and reported to the public, including parents, in a timely and accessible manner.

States would be permitted to reserve a portion of their funds for State activities and would be required to subgrant the remainder of their grant funds to high-need LEAs and their partners. Priority for grants and subgrants would be provided to (1) grantees that would focus the use of funds on high-need schools or on schools with the greatest needs as identified by the school climate measurement system, (2) partnerships between LEAs and other eligible entities, and (3) applicants proposing a comprehensive strategy to ensure that schools provide the appropriate conditions for learning.

The Department would be authorized to use funds reserved for National Activities to carry out national leadership activities that support safe, healthy, and drug-free students, including research, dissemination and outreach, and technical assistance, as well as for activities to help ensure that college campuses are safe and healthy environments.

FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$195.9 million in 2013 for the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program. The program is included in the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal and would consolidate several existing, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that seek to help schools provide the programs and activities that support student success (including programs that support alcohol and other drug and violence prevention, physical education, and school counseling).

The new program, which builds on the Safe and Supportive Schools grant competition that the Department created in 2010 under Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities, would increase the capacity of States, high-need districts, and their partners to provide the resources and supports necessary to ensure that students are safe, healthy, and successful. Further, the program would also provide increased flexibility for States and districts to design and implement strategies that best reflect the needs of their students and communities.

The Administration's reauthorization proposal recognizes the need for continued support of efforts to ensure that schools provide a safe and supportive environment. However, the existing array of authorized programs in this area is too fragmented to provide school officials with the tools they need to provide the conditions for learning. Nor are the current programs well-structured to enable educators and policymakers to identify the districts with the greatest needs or to determine the most effective practices and "scale them up" through wider replication. The Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students State and Local Grants program would address these problems by consolidating the existing authorizations into a single comprehensive program that generates information to drive resources to where they are most needed and in a manner that

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Successful, safe, and healthy students

will address local needs more effectively, encourage continuous improvement, and generate information on what works.

Within the \$195.9 million requested for the first year of this program, the Department would use \$37.3 million for State and Local Grants and would reserve \$74.6 million (\$48.6 million in continuation costs and \$26.0 million in new awards) for the following National Activities:

- \$48.6 million for Safe and Supportive Schools continuation grant awards to SEAs to support statewide measurement of, and targeted programmatic interventions to improve, conditions for learning in order to help schools improve student safety and reduce drug abuse.
- \$17 million for Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant awards for comprehensive projects to help LEAs and communities create safe, disciplined, and drug-free learning environments, promote healthy childhood development, and provide needed mental health services for youth. The Department of Education funds this initiative jointly with the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and administers it in collaboration with both HHS and the Department of Justice (DOJ). To be eligible for Safe Schools/Healthy Students funding, an LEA must demonstrate agreement in the form of a partnership among the major community systems serving students – schools, an early childhood agency, the local public mental health authority, law enforcement, and juvenile justice – to work collaboratively in assessing needs and providing programs and services in the following five areas: (1) promoting early childhood social and emotional learning and development; (2) promoting mental, emotional, and behavioral health; (3) connecting families, schools, and communities; (4) preventing and reducing alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use; and (5) creating safe and violence-free schools. Education, HHS, and DOJ plan to redesign the 2013 competition based on their experience implementing this initiative, the results of an ongoing evaluation of Safe Schools/Healthy Students projects, and input from grantee focus groups.
- \$6 million for grants to SEAs and related technical assistance for helping LEAs prevent and mitigate, prepare for, respond to, and recover from emergencies and crisis events.
- \$3 million for other activities that promote safe and healthy students, such as data collection, dissemination, outreach, and related forms of technical and financial assistance to States, LEAs, non-profit organizations, and institutions of higher education (IHEs), including technical assistance on bullying prevention and other means of improving school climates for learning, as well as technical assistance to IHEs to help support drug and violence prevention programs, including alcohol and other drug recovery and relapse prevention programs, and other efforts to prevent under-age, binge, and high-risk drinking, drug use, and violent behavior by college students.

The fiscal year 2013 request for Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students also would provide: approximately \$81.6 million for continuation awards for projects originally funded under Elementary and Secondary School Counseling (\$36.6 million), and Physical Education programs (\$45.0 million); \$1.3 million for set-asides for Department of the Interior/Bureau of Indian Education schools and the Outlying Areas; and \$1 million for program evaluation.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Successful, safe, and healthy students

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>
State and Local Grants	
Grant award funds (new)	\$37,227
Peer review of new award applications	<u>100</u>
Total budget authority	37,327
Number of SEA awards	7
Average SEA award	\$5,318
National Activities	
<u>Safe and Supportive Schools</u>	
Grant award funds (continuations)	\$48,610
Number of continuation awards	11
Average continuation award	\$4,419
<u>Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative</u>	
Grant award funding (new)	\$16,600
Peer review of new award applications	<u>400</u>
Total budget authority	17,000
Number of new awards	28
Average award	\$593 ¹
<u>School Emergency Preparedness</u>	
Grant award funds (new)	\$4,400
Peer review of new award applications	100
Technical assistance contract (new)	<u>1,500</u>
Total budget authority	6,000
Number of new awards	9
Average award	\$489
<u>Other Activities</u>	
Technical assistance contract (new)	\$1,500
Other activities (new)	<u>1,500</u>
Total	3,000

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Successful, safe, and healthy students

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>
Continuation Awards for Other Programs Consolidated into Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students:	
Elementary and Secondary School Counseling	\$36,599
Physical Education	<u>45,017</u>
Total	81,616
Set-Asides for DOI Schools and Outlying Areas	\$1,313
Evaluation	\$1,000

¹ Reflects Department of Education share of grant award funds only. Inclusive of the Department of Health and Human Services share of these grants, the average award is estimated as being closer to \$1,164 thousand.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Department has not yet developed performance measures for this proposed program, but they will likely resemble the following measures that the Department is using for the Safe and Supportive Schools Grants initially funded under SDFSC National Programs in 2010. The 2010 Safe and Supportive Schools grants performance measures are:

- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience a decrease in the percentage of students who report current (30-day) alcohol use;
- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience a decrease in the percentage of students who report personal harassment or bullying on school property during the current school year;
- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience an improvement in their school safety score; and
- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience a decrease in the number of suspensions for violent incidents without physical injury.

Data for the above measures would come from grantee annual performance reports.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$64,877	0	-\$64,877

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

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) National Programs statute authorizes the Department to carry out a wide variety of discretionary activities designed to prevent the illegal use of drugs and violence among, and promote safety and discipline for, students. These activities may be carried out through grants to or contracts with public and private organizations and individuals, or through agreements with other Federal agencies, and may include, but are not limited to:

- The development, demonstration, scientifically based evaluation, and dissemination of innovative and high-quality drug and violence prevention programs and activities;
- The provision of information on drug abuse education and prevention to the Department of Health and Human Services for dissemination;
- The provision of information on violence prevention and education and on school safety to the Department of Justice for dissemination;
- Technical assistance to Governors, State agencies, local educational agencies, and other recipients of SDFSC funding to build capacity to develop and implement high-quality, effective drug and violence prevention programs;
- Assistance to school systems that have particularly severe drug and violence problems, including hiring drug prevention and school safety coordinators, or assistance to support appropriate responses to crisis situations;
- The development and demonstration of innovative strategies for the training of school personnel, parents, and members of the community;

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

- The development of education and training programs, curricula, instructional materials, and professional training and development for preventing and reducing the incidence of crimes and conflicts motivated by hate in localities most directly affected by hate crimes;
- Activities in communities designated as empowerment zones or enterprise communities that connect schools to community-wide efforts to reduce drug and violence problems; and
- The collection of data on the incidence and prevalence of drug use and violence in elementary and secondary schools and in institutions of higher education.

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

	(dollars in thousands)
2008	\$137,665
2009	139,912
2010	191,341
2011	119,226
2012	64,877

FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities program for fiscal year 2013. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that address students' safety, health, and drug-prevention, the Administration has proposed to create, through the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), a broader Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program that would increase the capacity of States, districts, and their partners to provide the resources and supports necessary for safe, healthy, and successful students. This new program, which builds on the Safe and Supportive Schools grant competition the Department created in 2010 under SDFSC National Activities, would help schools improve conditions for learning by implementing activities that reduce or prevent drug use, alcohol use, bullying, harassment, or violence, and promote and support the physical and mental well-being of students.

The Administration's reauthorization proposal recognizes the challenge of attaining high student achievement in schools where students are threatened by drugs, violence, crime, bullying, harassment, or intimidation, all of which continue to be serious problems affecting students. The public also continues to be extremely concerned about school safety, whether because of school shootings, natural disasters such as Hurricane Katrina, or the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States. The reauthorization proposal would address these and related issues, but in a much more comprehensive and flexible manner than can be attempted through the current portfolio of fragmented programs.

Under the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program, State educational agencies (SEAs), high-need local educational agencies (LEAs), and their partners would be eligible to apply for competitive grants to develop and implement programs that measure and

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

improve conditions for learning based on local needs. The new program would provide grantees and their partners with the resources necessary to design and implement strategies necessary for safe, healthy, and successful students, which the Administration believes will support improved student academic achievement. Further, this new program would provide increased flexibility for States and districts to design and implement strategies that best reflect the needs of their students and communities (which may include programs that support drug and violence prevention and other aspects of school safety).

The reauthorization proposal would include a National Activities authority under which the Department would carry out activities similar to some of the current Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (such as Project SERV, emergency preparedness grants, the Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative, and assistance to institutions of higher education). In addition, the fiscal year 2013 budget request for Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students includes funds to pay 2013 continuation costs for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities grants and contracts awarded in previous years.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
<u>Safe and Supportive Schools</u>			
Grant award funds (continuations)	\$46,187	\$47,543	0
Technical assistance contract	<u>1,564</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total budget authority	47,751	47,543	0
Number of continuation awards	11	11	0
Average award	\$4,199	\$4,322	0
<u>School Preparedness Initiative</u>			
Grant award funds (new)	\$873	0	0
Technical assistance activities	<u>1,372</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total budget authority	2,245	0	0
Number of new awards	3	0	0
Average award	\$291	0	0
<u>Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative</u>			
Grant award funds (continuations)	\$63,487	\$17,334	0
Number of continuation awards	89	29	0
Average award	\$713	\$598	0

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
<u>Healthy College Campuses</u>			
Training and technical assistance center	\$1,875	0	0
<u>Other Activities</u>	\$3,868	0	0

NOTE: FY 2013 Safe and Supportive Schools continuation costs of approximately \$48,610 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

Safe and Supportive Schools

Goal: To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug-free by developing rigorous measurement systems and using data to implement high-quality drug- and violence-prevention strategies.

Objective: *Safe and Supportive Schools grantees will demonstrate substantial progress in improving conditions for learning in targeted schools.*

The Department will have baseline data by 2013 on the following measures for the 2010 cohort of Safe and Supportive Schools grants:

- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience a decrease in the percentage of students who report current (30-day) alcohol use;
- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience a decrease in the percentage of students who report personal harassment or bullying on school property during the current school year;

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience an improvement in their school safety score; and
- Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience a decrease in the number of suspensions for violent incidents without physical injury.

Safe Schools/Healthy Students

Goal: To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high-quality drug- and violence-prevention strategies.

Objective: Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative grantees will demonstrate substantial progress in improving student behaviors and school environments.

The following performance information is for the most recent (2007, 2008, and 2009) cohorts of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grants. (Since 2010, the program has funded continuation awards only.)

Measure: The percentage of grantees that experience a decrease in the percentage of their students who did not go to school on one or more days during the past 30 days because they felt unsafe at school, or on their way to and from school.

Year	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2008		75				
2009	76.5	37.5		30		
2010	78.8	55.7	50	62.8		37.5
2011	83.5	40.7	64.7	55	50	55.2
2012			68.6		56.9	
2013					60.3	

Measure: The percentage of grantees that experience a decrease in the percentage of their students who have been in a physical fight on school property in the 12 months prior to the survey.

Year	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2008		75.5				
2009	77	54.5		66.7		
2010	79.3	66.7	68	65.9		25
2011	84.1	29.6	70.1	51.6	50	55.2
2012			74.3		56.9	
2013					60.3	

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

Measure: The percentage of grantees that report a decrease in the percentage of their students who report current (30-day) marijuana use.

Year	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2008		53.8				
2009	54.9	42.9		50		
2010	56.5	37.5	51	43.6		0
2011	59.9	51.9	52.5	58.3	50	55.2
2012			61.8		56.9	
2013					60.3	

Measure: The percentage of grantees that report a decrease in students who report current (30-day) alcohol use.

Year	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2008		71.4				
2009	72.8	47.8		56		
2010	75	66.7	57.1	60		0
2011	79.5	70.4	61.8	75	50	58.6
2012			79.5		60.4	
2013					64	

Measure: The percentage of grantees that report an increase in the number of students receiving school-based mental health services.

Year	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2008		66.7				
2009	70	90		83.3		
2010	90	87.5	87.5	81.4		80
2011	90	51.9	90	56.7	84	62.1
2012			90		90	
2013					90	

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

Measure: The percentage of grantees that report an increase in the percentage of mental health referrals for students that result in mental health services being provided in the community.

Year	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2008		75				
2009	78.8	75		60		
2010	86.6	50	63	71.8		80
2011	90	11.1	79	51.7	84	34.5
2012			90		90	
2013					90	

Additional information: For the second measure above (the percentage of grantees that experience a decrease in the percentage of their students who have been in a physical fight on school property in the 12 months prior to the survey), data for the 2007 cohort are a mixture of survey data and incident data. For the 2008 and 2009 cohorts, data for that measure are exclusively survey data.

The data present a mixed picture. Generally they show improvement within cohorts on individual measures across years; but of the 36 targets for which data are available, only 10 targets were met. For the 2007 cohort for the last measure (the percentage of grantees that report an increase in the percentage of mental health referrals for students that result in mental health services being provided in the community), the 2011 actual data of 11 percent warrant some explanation. While only 11 percent reported such an increase, only 48 percent (rather than the balance of 89 percent) reported a decrease on this metric. The remaining 41 percent either reported they had no change, or did not report both of the 2 years of data needed to determine how they performed on this measure.

The following performance information is for the three cohorts of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grants preceding the 2007-2009 cohorts that are displayed above.

Measure: The percentage of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites that experience a decrease in the number of violent incidents at schools during the 3-year grant period.

Year	2004 Cohort Target	2004 Cohort Actual	2005 Cohort Target	2005 Cohort Actual	2006 Cohort Target	2006 Cohort Actual
2007	90	55		54.3		50
2008	90	76.5	62.4	61.5	57.5	68.8
2009			65.2		60.0	58.8

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

Measure: The percentage of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites that experience a decrease in substance abuse during the 3-year grant period.

Year	2004 Cohort Target	2004 Cohort Actual	2005 Cohort Target	2005 Cohort Actual	2006 Cohort Target	2006 Cohort Actual
2007	90	66.7		43.8		66.7
2008	90	83.3	48.1	34.2	73.4	66.7
2009			50.3		76.7	66.7

Measure: The percentage of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites that improve school attendance during the 3-year grant period.

Year	2004 Cohort Target	2004 Cohort Actual	2005 Cohort Target	2005 Cohort Actual	2006 Cohort Target	2006 Cohort Actual
2007	90	64.7		40.5		62.5
2008	90	66.7	44.6	44.7	68.8	68.4
2009			46.6		71.9	42.1

Additional information: Data present a mixed picture. Generally they show improvement within cohorts on individual measures across years; but of the 15 targets for which data are available, only 2 targets were met. The data generally show an improvement on the measures for the 2006 cohort compared to the prior cohorts.

Student Drug Testing

Goal: To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high-quality drug- and violence-prevention strategies.

Objective: *Student drug testing grantees will make substantial progress in reducing substance abuse incidence among target students.*

The Department last funded Student Drug Testing grants in 2010, which was the final year of the 2008 cohort.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

Measure: The percentage of Student Drug Testing grantees that experience a 5 percent annual reduction in the incidence of past-month drug use by students in the target population.

Year	2003 Cohort Target	2003 Cohort Actual	2005 Cohort Target	2005 Cohort Actual	2006 Cohort Target	2006 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual
2007	50	25	33							
2008			50		50	67	33	33		
2009					70	13	50	42	33	49
2010					70	57	60	50	50	65
2011									70	

Measure: The percentage of Student Drug Testing grantees that experience a 5 percent annual reduction in the incidence of past-year drug use by students in the target population.

Year	2003 Cohort Target	2003 Cohort Actual	2005 Cohort Target	2005 Cohort Actual	2006 Cohort Target	2006 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual
2007	50	0	25							
2008			50		50	56	33	33		
2009					60	13	50	33	33	58
2010					60	57	60	54	60	58
2011									65	

Additional information: Data for the 2006 cohort were collected as part of the Institute for Education Sciences evaluation of the 2006 cohort of student drug testing projects. The survey instrument for the evaluation collected data about student drug use for the past 6 months, rather than for the past year. Data for the 2005 cohort of grantees are not provided because the data reported by grantees were not sufficiently comparable across sites to be aggregated meaningfully for the cohort. The last of the data for these measures, for the 2011 performance year for the 2008 cohort, will be available later in 2012.

Readiness and Emergency Management for Schools (REMS)

Goal: To help develop and implement comprehensive emergency management processes for schools.

Objective: *REMS grantees will demonstrate substantial progress in improving emergency mitigation/prevention, preparedness, response and recovery efforts at their schools.*

The Department last funded REMS grants (subsequently renamed school emergency management grants) in 2011.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

Measure: The percentage of grant sites that demonstrate they have increased the number of hazards addressed by the improved school emergency response plan as compared to the baseline plan.

Year	2006 Cohort Target	2006 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual
2009		97.6				
2010			98	88.5		
2011					98	94.4

Measure: The percentage of grant sites that have a plan for, and commitment to, the sustainability and continuous improvement of a school emergency management plan by the district and community partners beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

Year	2006 Cohort Target	2006 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual
2009		100				
2010			98	93.8		
2011					98	100

Measure: The percentage of grant sites that demonstrate improved knowledge of school or district (or both) emergency management policies and procedures by school staff with responsibility for emergency management functions.

Year	2006 Cohort Target	2006 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual
2009		97.6				
2010			98	91.6		
2011					98	100

Additional information: For the 2006 cohort only, this last measure was a replacement for the percentage of grant sites that demonstrate improved response time and quality of response to practice drills and simulated crises. For the 2007 and 2008 cohorts that measure was dropped in lieu of the measure described above.

Beginning with the 2009 cohort of grants, the Department discontinued all three of the above measures and replaced them with the following new measure, for which baseline data will become available beginning in 2012: the average number of National Incident Management System (NIMS) course completions by key personnel at the start of the grant compared to the average number of NIMS course completions by key personnel at the end of the grant.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

Emergency Management for Higher Education (EMHE)

The Department last funded EMHE grants in 2010.

Goal: To help develop and implement comprehensive emergency management and violence prevention processes for institutions of higher education.

Objective: *EMHE grantees will demonstrate substantial progress in improving emergency mitigation/prevention, preparedness, response and recovery efforts on their campuses.*

Measure: Demonstration of a 50 percent increase at the end of the project period in the number of course completions by their higher education institution key personnel in key National Incident Management System (NIMS) courses compared to the number of such courses completed at the start of the grant project period.

Year	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2011		93.3		
2012			98	

Additional information: Data for the 2009 cohort are expected later in 2012. For the 2010 cohort, the Department discontinued the above measure and replaced it with the following, for which data will become available beginning in 2013: the average number of NIMS training course completions by key personnel at the start of the grant compared to the average number of NIMS course completions by key personnel at the end of the grant.

Postsecondary Prevention: Grants to Prevent High-Risk Drinking or Violent Behavior Among College Students

The Department last funded Grants to Prevent High-Risking Drinking or Violent Behavior Among College Students in 2010 (the final year of the 2009 cohort).

Goal: To reduce alcohol abuse and violent behavior among postsecondary students at institutions of higher education, on campuses, and/or in surrounding communities.

Objective: *Support the implementation of research-based alcohol abuse and violence prevention programs at institutions of higher education.*

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

Measure: At the end of these 2-year projects, the percentage of grantees that achieve a 5 percent decrease in high-risk drinking among students served by the project.

Year	2005 Cohort Target	2005 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2007		81				
2009			85	73.3		
2011					85	

Measure: At the end of these 2-year projects, the percentage of grantees that achieve a 5 percent decrease in violent behavior among students served by the project.

Year	2005 Cohort Target	2005 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2007		67				
2009			70.4	100		
2011					75	

Additional information: A further assessment of progress can be made in 2012 after the Department compiles 2011 data from the 2009 cohort of grantees.

Postsecondary Prevention: Grants for Coalitions to Prevent and Reduce Alcohol Abuse at Institutions of Higher Education

The Department last funded Grants for Coalitions to Prevent and Reduce Alcohol Abuse at Institutions of Higher Education in 2010.

Goal: To prevent and reduce the rate of under-age alcohol consumption, including binge drinking, among students.

Objective: *Support statewide coalitions that implement underage drinking prevention programs at institutions of higher education and in surrounding communities*

The Department will have baseline data in 2012 on the following performance measures for the fiscal year 2009 cohort of Grants for Coalitions to Prevent and Reduce Alcohol Abuse at IHEs: (1) the percentage of grantees that demonstrate a reduction in 30-day alcohol use among under-age students at participating IHEs; and (2) the percentage of grantees that demonstrate a reduction in 30-day binge drinking among under-age students at participating IHEs.

Building State Capacity for Preventing Youth Drug Use and Violence

Goal: To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high-quality drug- and violence-prevention strategies.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

Objective: *Building State Capacity grantees will enhance the capacity of State agencies to support LEAs in their efforts to create and sustain a safe and drug-free school environment.*

The Department funded Building State Capacity for Preventing Youth Drug Use and Violence for 1 year only, in fiscal year 2010. The Department will have baseline data in 2012 on the following performance measure for those grants: the percentage of grantees that submit a high-quality plan to create and sustain an effective infrastructure to support the implementation of effective drug and violence prevention activities.

Other Performance Information

In addition to collecting data on the above performance measures directly from grantees, the Department has conducted (and is conducting) several evaluations to assess the impact of programs and interventions supported with SDFSC National Activities funds. Each of the following evaluations has been funded by SDFSC National Activities, except for the Safe Schools/Healthy Students evaluation, which is being funded by the Department of Health and Human Services.

Safe Schools/Healthy Students Evaluation

Two national evaluations of the Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative have been conducted, the first under a cooperative agreement with the Department of Justice and the second under contract with the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration in the Department of Health and Human Services. Both were jointly managed by the Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, and Justice. The evaluations sought, overall, to document the effectiveness of collaborative community efforts to promote safe schools and provide opportunities for healthy childhood development.

The first evaluation focused on the fiscal year 1999, 2000, and 2001 cohorts under the initiative, a total of 97 sites. Three waves of data were collected from each of the sites, with data collection spanning 2001-2004. (Data collection was conducted three times over the life of each 3-year grant cohort.) The evaluation collected data from principals and teachers in schools served by these sites, as well as from middle and high school students in a more limited subset of "sentinel" sites representing various regions of the country and a variety of population densities. The sentinel sites included a total of 410 schools. (Surveying students in all 3,932 schools among the 97 sites would have been cost prohibitive.)

Changes were calculated between wave one and wave three data collection for each of the three grant cohorts. Some statistically significant changes (at the $p < .05$ level) in student outcomes related to alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use and incidents of violence have been identified. For example:

- Student self-report data for high school students indicated decreases in 30-day alcohol and tobacco use, cigarette sales on school property, and disapproval of peer substance use. Current alcohol use was down 10 percent, and current tobacco use declined 13 percent. Middle and high school students also reported feeling less unsafe at school (a 7 percent reduction for middle school students and a 6 percent reduction for high school students).

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

- Teachers in elementary schools reported a 5 percent reduction in classroom bullying, a 21 percent reduction in feeling threatened by a student, and an 11 percent reduction in being verbally abused by a student. Finally, although not statistically significant, elementary school principals reported a 33 percent reduction in current-year tobacco infractions and a 36 percent reduction in total alcohol infractions, and elementary school teachers reported an 8 percent reduction in classroom fighting.

The second evaluation is examining activities implemented by 175 sites in the fiscal years 2005 through 2009 cohorts. Data continue to be collected through site visits, project- and school-level surveys, telephone interviews, and focus groups. Thus far, this evaluation is finding that communities can make effective use of limited funds through high-functioning partnerships that bring together key local agencies to serve children and youth. The results offer substantial evidence of the Initiative's success, including reduced violence and improved school safety, improved access to mental health services, and reduced alcohol and other drug use. By comparison, data for the same period (2005 to 2009) from sources such as the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (CDC, 2010) show no significant improvements in violence, school safety, or current substance use for all youth across the Nation. Findings from the evaluation also demonstrate the effectiveness of the grants with regard to the collaboration among Safe Schools/Healthy Students partners, improved services and systems, and increased use of data to guide policies and procedures. Key findings from the second evaluation for the 2005 to 2007 cohorts of grants (which have completed all grant activities) include the following:

- A 15 percent decrease in the number of students involved in violent incidents during the grant period (from 26,727 in year 1 to 22,342 in year 3).
- A 5 percent decrease in the number of students reporting that they had experienced violence from year 1 of the grant period to year 3.
- Most staff at grantee schools reporting that the initiative had made their schools safer. By year 3 of the grant, 93 percent said the initiative had improved school safety, 90 percent said it had reduced violence on campus, and 76 percent said it had reduced violence in the community.
- Grantees experiencing a dramatic 288 percent increase in the number of students who received school-based mental health services and a 242 percent increase in those receiving community-based services.

Data collection continues on the cohorts awarded in fiscal years 2008 and 2009 and will become available as those cohorts complete all of their grant project activities in 2012 and 2013, respectively.

Drug Testing Evaluation

In 2006, the Department launched an impact evaluation to assess the effectiveness of random mandatory student drug testing. The evaluation was designed to address the following research questions: (1) Do high school students who are subject to mandatory-random drug testing (e.g., athletes, participants in competitive extra-curricular activities) report less use of tobacco,

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

alcohol, and illicit substances compared to students in high schools without drug testing policies?; (2) Do students in high schools with mandatory-random drug testing policies, but who are not subject to drug testing, report less use of tobacco, alcohol, and illicit substances compared to students in high schools without drug testing policies?; and (3) What are the characteristics of the drug testing policies implemented by participating treatment schools, and what types of other strategies are treatment or control schools using to reduce substance use among students?

This 4-year evaluation involved 36 schools from 7 grantees that received awards under the Department's student drug testing grant competition in 2006. (Because these districts committed to adopting drug testing programs and they were clustered in mostly southern States, the study results cannot be generalized to all high schools nationally.) About half of the schools were randomly assigned to begin implementing drug testing immediately (treatment schools), and the other half were assigned to implement drug testing only at the conclusion of the 1-year experimental period (control schools). Data collection included student surveys of reported drug use, interviews with staff at grantee schools, and school records.

Results of the evaluation include the following:

- Students involved in extracurricular activities and subject to in-school drug testing reported less substance use than comparable students in high schools without drug testing, but for certain of these drugs the differences were not statistically significant.
- There was no statistically significant evidence of any "spillover effects" to students who were not subject to testing – the percentage of nonparticipating students who reported using substances in the past month was effectively the same at both treatment and control schools.

Violence Prevention Program Evaluation

The Department also conducted a longitudinal impact evaluation of a school-based violence prevention program. Specifically, the evaluation assessed the overall impact of combining "Responding in Peaceful and Positive Ways," a curriculum-based (instructional) program, with "Best Behavior," a whole-school program that aims to increase the clarity, fairness, and consistency of school enforcement policies and to improve teachers' classroom management skills. Thirty-six middle schools took part in this evaluation, half of which were randomly assigned to receive the hybrid program, which was implemented over 3 consecutive school years (2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09). Within each middle school, students were sampled and their violent and aggressive behaviors measured. Student and teacher surveys, observations of intervention activities, interviews with school administrators, and school records were used to assess student outcomes in both treatment and control schools as well as to assess the quality of program implementation.

After 1 year of implementation, and again after 3 years of implementation, there were no statistically significant differences in how often students reported that they were victimized by or committed violence against their peers. In addition, there were no statistically significant impacts of the program on a number of other outcomes such as how often students reported positive behavior toward their peers or on their perceptions of school safety.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Elementary and secondary school counseling

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$52,296	0	-\$52,296

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

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Elementary and Secondary School Counseling (ESSC) program provides grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to establish or expand elementary school and secondary school counseling programs. In awarding grants, the Department must give consideration to applications that demonstrate the greatest need for services, propose the most promising and innovative approaches, and show the greatest potential for replication and dissemination. The Department awards grants for up to 3 years that may not exceed \$400,000 and must be used to supplement, not supplant, existing counseling and mental health services. The statute requires that any amount appropriated up to \$40 million for this program in any fiscal year be used for elementary school counseling programs. If the appropriation exceeds \$40 million, the Department must use at least \$40 million to support elementary school counseling programs.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2008	\$48,617
2009	52,000
2010	55,000
2011	52,395
2012	52,296

FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling program for fiscal year 2013. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that address students' safety, health, and drug-prevention, the Administration has proposed to create, through the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), a broader Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Elementary and secondary school counseling

that would increase the capacity of States, districts, and their partners to provide the resources and supports necessary for safe, healthy, and successful students. This new program would help schools provide conditions for learning, including by implementing activities that reduce or prevent drug use, alcohol use, bullying, harassment, or violence, and promote and support the physical and mental well-being of students.

Under the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program, State educational agencies (SEAs), high-need local educational agencies (LEAs), and their partners would be eligible to apply for competitive grants to develop and implement programs that measure and improve conditions for learning based on local needs. The new program would provide grantees and their partners with the resources necessary to design and implement strategies necessary for safe, healthy, and successful students, which the Administration believes will support improved student academic achievement. Further, this new program would provide increased flexibility for States and districts to design and implement strategies that best reflect the needs of their students and communities (which may include programs that support school counseling).

The Administration recognizes the importance of and need for continued support of efforts to address student mental health issues. Recent estimates in *Mental Health: A Report of the Surgeon General* (1999) show that more than 20 percent of American children and adolescents between the ages of 9 and 17 years experience mental health problems or addictive disorders severe enough to impair their daily functioning and that only 25 percent of these children receive appropriate treatment.

The presence of counselors in schools provides benefits for both students and teachers by helping to create a safe school environment, improve teacher effectiveness and classroom management, increase academic achievement, and promote student well-being and healthy development. In a recent review of school counseling research, Whiston and Quinby (2009) found that students who participated in school counseling interventions tended to score on various outcome measures about one-third of a standard deviation above those students who did not receive interventions. These interventions were also shown to have a large effect in reducing student disciplinary problems, enhancing problem-solving skills, and increasing career knowledge. Counseling interventions were also found to have a small but significant impact on improving students' academic achievement. For these reasons, the Administration's reauthorization proposal supports efforts to ensure that schools are safe and supportive learning environments, which may include providing funding for school counseling services. The reauthorization proposal is based on the belief that school-based counseling programs offer great promise for improving prevention, diagnosis, and access to treatment for children and adolescent.

The fiscal year 2013 request for the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program would include funds to pay 2013 continuation costs for ESSC grants made in previous years.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Elementary and secondary school counseling

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
Grant award funding (new)	\$15,209	\$21,305	0
Grant award funding (continuations)	\$37,186	\$30,491	0
Number of new awards	43	59	0
Number of continuations	106	84	0
Average grant award	\$352	\$362	0
Peer review of new award applications	0 ¹	\$500	0

NOTE: FY 2013 continuation costs of approximately \$36,599 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program.

¹The Department funded new applications in FY 2011 from the FY 2010 slate.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

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

Goal: To increase the availability of counseling programs and services in elementary schools.

Objective: Support the hiring of qualified personnel to expand available counseling services for elementary school students.

Measure: the percentage of grantees closing the gap between their student/mental health professional ratios and the student/mental health professional ratios recommended by the statute.

Year	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual	2010 Cohort Target	2010 Cohort Actual
2008		100						
2009	100	100		100				
2010	100	100	100	94		100		
2011			100		100	91	100	90
2012					100		100	
2013							100	

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Elementary and secondary school counseling

Measure: The average number of referrals per grant site for disciplinary reasons in schools participating in the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling program.

Year	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual	2010 Cohort Target	2010 Cohort Actual
2008	1,132	1,192						
2009	781	822		1,720				
2010	740	790	1,634	1,403		1,220		
2011			1,548		1,159	1,205		1,648
2012					1,037		1,400	
2013							1,318	

Additional information: Performance data are collected through annual grantee reports. 2011 data for the 2008 cohort will be available later in 2012. For the 2011 and 2012 cohorts, the Department plans to establish performance targets once grantees submit baseline data.

Additionally, the Department has posted grantee-level data on its website at www.ed.gov/programs/elseccounseling/performance.html.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Physical education program

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 10)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$78,693	0	-\$78,693

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

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Physical Education program (PEP) provides grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) and community-based organizations to pay the Federal share of the costs of initiating, expanding, and improving physical education (PE) programs, including after-school programs, for students in kindergarten through 12th grade in order to help those entities make progress toward meeting State standards for physical education. Funds may be used to provide equipment and support to enable students to participate actively in PE activities and for training and education for teachers and staff. Awards are competitive, typically run for 3 years, and the Federal share of the total program cost may not exceed 90 percent for the first year of the project and 75 percent for each subsequent year. Funds must be used to supplement, and may not supplant, other Federal, State, and local funding for PE activities.

For the fiscal year 2010 competition, the Department developed priorities and requirements that should enhance the impact of PEP and support a broader, strategic vision for encouraging the development of lifelong healthy habits and improving physical and nutrition education programming and policies in schools and communities. Historically, the program has funded projects that often focused heavily on the purchase of equipment without strong integration of that equipment into curriculum; did not take a comprehensive approach that recognizes the interdependency of physical, nutrition, and health education; did not use research-based curricula; or did not take into account local wellness policies or other community efforts supporting physical education and activity. The priorities and requirements established in 2010 address these deficiencies by, for example, (1) requiring that grantees include a nutrition component in their projects, undertake a local needs assessment, update nutrition- and physical activity-related policies and link them with local wellness policies, and update physical education and nutrition instruction curricula, and (2) encouraging grantees to take a multi-sector, comprehensive approach by working with community partners.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Physical education program

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

	(dollars in thousands)
2008.....	\$75,655
2009.....	78,000
2010.....	79,000
2011.....	78,842
2012.....	78,693

FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Physical Education program (PEP) for fiscal year 2013. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that address students' safety, health, and drug-prevention, the Administration has proposed to create, through the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a broader Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program that would increase the capacity of States, districts, and their partners to provide the resources and supports necessary for safe, healthy, and successful students. This new program would help schools improve conditions for learning, including by implementing activities that reduce or prevent drug use, alcohol use, bullying, harassment, or violence, and promote and support the physical and mental well-being of students.

Under the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program, State educational agencies (SEAs), high-need local educational agencies (LEAs), and their partners would be eligible to apply for competitive grants to develop and implement approaches for measuring and improving conditions for learning based on local needs. The overall result is that the new program would provide grantees and their partners with the resources necessary to design and implement strategies necessary for safe, healthy, and successful students, which the Administration believes will support improved student academic achievement. Further, this new program would provide increased flexibility for States and districts to design and implement strategies that best reflect the needs of their students and communities (which may include programs that support PE). Additionally, the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program in the Education Improvement Programs account would address the need to strengthen instruction and increase student achievement, across content areas, which would include, but not be limited to, health education and PE.

The Administration recognizes the importance of and need for continued support of PE, improved nutrition, and fitness. The need for continued and improved efforts in this area is clear. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), in the past 30 years, the prevalence of unhealthy body weight among children has nearly tripled. As of the 2007-2008 data collection period for the CDC's *National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey* (NHANES), approximately 17 percent of children and adolescents ages 2 through 19 are obese. This has, in part, resulted from a lack of physical activity among youth. According to the 2007 National Survey of Children's Health conducted by CDC, 36 percent of children ages 6-17 were engaged in vigorous physical activity 3 or fewer days per week.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Physical education program

The fiscal year 2013 request for the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program would include funds to pay 2013 continuation costs for PEP grants made in previous years.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
Grant award funding (new)	\$35,144	\$31,703	0
Grant award funding (continuations)	42,904	46,597	0
Peer review of new award applications	400	0	0
Evaluation	394	393	0
Number of new grant awards	73	66	0
Number of continuation grant awards	144	145	0
Average grant award	\$360	\$372	0

NOTE: FY 2013 continuation costs of approximately \$45,017 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

As part of a multi-agency effort to improve the effectiveness of programs supporting child health and fitness, the Department reviewed the performance measures for this program. The Department published revised performance measures in the Notice Inviting Applications for fiscal year 2010. These measures are: (1) the percentage of students served by the grant who engage in at least 60 minutes of daily physical activity; (2) the percentage of students served by the grant who achieve age-appropriate cardiovascular fitness levels; (3) the percentage of students served by the grant who consume fruit two or more times per day and vegetables three or more times per day; and (4) the cost (based on the amount of the grant award) per student who achieves the level of physical activity required to meet the physical activity measures above (percentage of students who engage in 60 minutes of daily physical activity). Baseline and year 1 data for these measures will be available for the 2010 cohort in spring 2012. Existing grantees from cohorts first funded prior to fiscal year 2010 still report on the previous performance measures shown on the tables that follow. The Department adopted these standards based on input from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Physical education program

Goal: To promote physical activity and healthy lifestyles for students.

Objective: Support the implementation of effective physical education programs and strategies.

Measure: The percentage of elementary students served by the grant who engage in 150 minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity per week.

Year	2006 Cohort Target	2006 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2008	55	69		43				
2009	72		45	72		61		57
2010			76		64	63		64
2011					67		67	
2012							71	

Measure: The percentage of secondary students served by the grant who engage in 225 minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity per week.

Year	2006 Cohort Target	2006 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2008	55	59		55				
2009	60		58	57		54		43
2010			61		57	55		50
2011					59		53	
2012							55	

Additional information: Grantees from the 2007 and 2008 cohorts reported an increase in student physical activity at both the elementary and secondary levels in their second project year. The 2007 cohort does not yet have 2010 data because many of grantees received a 1-year, no-cost extension to complete the implementation of their projects. The data from the baseline and year 1 data of the 2009 cohort also show an increase in student physical activity at the elementary and secondary levels.

The measures will have only three data points for each of the 2006, 2007, and 2008 cohorts, corresponding with the end of each project year. Beginning with the 2009 cohort, grantees are conducting an additional data collection at the start of the grant in order to establish a baseline that more accurately reflects the participants' initial activity levels. However, this will still only result in two targets because both the baseline and year one data are reported at the end of year one. The Department will have baseline and year 1 data for the 2010 cohort in spring 2012. Therefore, as there are no data yet available for the 2010 cohort, no targets exist for 2013.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Physical education program

Efficiency Measure

The Department developed and is implementing the following efficiency measure (which includes both Federal and the mandatory non-federal expenditures).

Measure: The cost per student who achieves the level of physical activity required to meet the physical activity measures for the program (150 minutes of moderate to vigorous activity for elementary students and 225 minutes of moderate to vigorous activity for middle and high school students).

Year	2006 Cohort Target	2006 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2008	\$272	190		\$191				
2009	181		\$181	168		\$560		
2010			160		\$532	638		\$640
2011					504		\$608	
2012							578	

Additional information: The efficiency measure for the program is the cost per successful outcome, as measured by the outcome measures above. The 2007 cohort showed an improvement in its second year of reporting. However, the 2008 cohort showed an increase in the cost per successful outcome in the second year. Unlike the measures above, there is no baseline for the 2009 cohort because cost per successful outcome is not meaningful at the start of the grant period. The Department will have data for 2011, including the 2010 cohort, in spring 2012.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

21st Century community learning centers

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$1,151,673	\$1,151,673	0

¹The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing language is sought for fiscal year 2013.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) program enables communities to establish or expand centers that provide additional student learning opportunities, such as before- and after-school programs and summer school programs, and provide related services to their families. Centers must target their services primarily to students who attend schools eligible to operate a schoolwide program under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (which are schools with at least a 40 percent child poverty rate) or other schools that serve a high percentage of students from low-income families. In addition to activities designed to help students meet State and local student academic achievement standards, program funds may be used to provide other activities that complement and reinforce the regular school-day program of participating students, such as art and music education activities, recreational activities, telecommunications and technology education programs, expanded library service hours, family engagement and literacy programs, and drug and violence prevention activities.

Program funds are allocated by formula to States. Of the total appropriation, the Department reserves: (1) up to 1 percent to carry out national activities; and (2) up to 1 percent for grants to the Department of the Interior/Bureau of Indian Education and to the Outlying Areas. The Department allocates the remaining funds to States in proportion to each State's share of funds in the previous fiscal year under Part A of ESEA Title I. However, no State may receive less than one-half of 1 percent of the total amount available for States.

Each State educational agency (SEA) must award at least 95 percent of its allocation competitively to local educational agencies (LEAs), community-based organizations, faith-based organizations, or other public or private entities that can demonstrate experience, or the promise of success, in providing educational and related activities. In making awards, States give priority to applications that: (1) propose to target services to students who attend schools identified as in need of improvement under Title I; and (2) are submitted jointly by at least one LEA that receives funds under Part A of Title I and at least one community-based organization

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

21st Century community learning centers

or other public or private entity. States must make awards of at least \$50,000 per year and for a period of 3 to 5 years.

An SEA may reserve up to 2 percent of its allocation for administrative expenses, including the costs of conducting its grants competition. In addition, an SEA may reserve up to 3 percent of its allocation for: (1) monitoring of programs; (2) providing technical assistance and training; and (3) evaluating the effectiveness of the State's program.

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

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

	(dollars in thousands)
2008	\$1,081,166
2009	1,131,166
2010	1,166,166
2011	1,153,854
2012	1,151,673

FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$1.15 billion in fiscal year 2013 funding for the 21st CCLC program, the same as the 2012 appropriation. The 21st CCLC program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization. The request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2013 under reauthorized legislation and is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal.

Under this proposal, the Department would make competitive grants to eligible entities (SEAs and LEAs) by themselves or in partnership with nonprofit organizations and local governmental entities) for projects that implement in-school and out-of-school strategies for providing students (and, where appropriate, teachers and family members), particularly those in high-need schools, the additional time, support, and enrichment activities needed to improve student achievement. States that receive awards would subgrant funds to (1) high-need LEAs alone or in partnership with one or more nonprofit organizations or local governmental entities or (2) nonprofit organizations.

The fiscal year 2013 request for the 21st CCLC program would allow local recipients to use program funds to expand learning time by significantly increasing the number of hours in a regular school schedule and comprehensively redesigning the school schedule for all students in a school. The Administration's reauthorization proposal would continue to allow funds to be used for before- and after-school programs, summer enrichment programs, and summer school programs, and would additionally permit States and eligible local entities to use funds to support expanded-learning-time programs and full-service community schools. This enhanced flexibility would allow communities to determine the best strategies for providing their students and

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

21st Century community learning centers

teachers the time and support they need. The funding requested for fiscal year 2013 would enable grantees to support this expanded menu of programs and strategies and to provide high-quality programming for students and their families.

All local projects would provide additional time for students, including students with the greatest academic needs and those who are meeting State academic achievement standards, to participate in (1) academic activities that are aligned with the instruction those students receive during the regular school day and are targeted to their academic needs; and (2) enrichment and other activities that complement the academic program. Projects could also provide teachers the time they need to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development within and across grades and subjects. In making awards to eligible local entities, the Department or the SEA would give priority to applications from partnerships between districts and other eligible entities (such as nonprofit organizations and local governmental entities), to applicants that focus the use of grant funds on the lowest-performing schools in the State, and to applicants that propose to develop and implement expanded-learning-time programs or full-service community schools.

The Administration believes that the reauthorized 21st CCLC program would increase the likelihood for positive student outcomes. Research suggests that programs that significantly increase the total number of hours in a regular school schedule can lead to gains in student academic achievement.¹ Moreover, an emerging field of research suggests that particularly high-quality after-school programs may have a positive impact on desirable student outcomes, such as higher attendance during the regular school day and increased student academic achievement.² Regular participation in high-quality, enriching programs appears to be one factor that has an impact on student outcomes, but data from the current 21st CCLC program demonstrate that student participation rates may be a program quality concern; in 2011, States reported that only about half of the total number of students served (about 800,000 of over 1.5 million) attended programs for 30 days or more over the course of the 2009-10 program year. By lengthening the school day or year for all students, expanded-learning-time programs could improve 21st CCLC program attendance by reaching beyond the students who are inclined to regularly attend voluntary after-school programs.

Program quality would also be improved by transforming the program from a formula to a competitive grant program. Within this framework, a new emphasis on increasing the number of instructional hours, together with support for increased attendance in high-quality before- and after-school programs, expanded-learning-time programs, and full-service community schools, should lead to improved results for students, including improved academic outcomes. Among other changes, the reauthorized statute would specify that activities funded under the program should promote a range of improved academic outcomes and that the academic content in 21st CCLC programs should be targeted to students' academic needs.

¹For example, see Frazier, Julie A.; Morrison, Frederick J. *The Influence of Extended-year Schooling on Growth of Achievement and Perceived Competence in Early Elementary School*. Child Development. Vol. 69 (2), April 1998, pp.495-517. Note that this study evaluated the impact of lengthening the school year.

²For example, see Reisner, Elizabeth R.; White, Richard N.; Russell, Christina A.; Birmingham, Jennifer. 2004. *Building Quality, Scale, and Effectiveness in After-School Programs: Summary Report of the TASC Evaluation*.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

21st Century community learning centers

At the request level, the Department would reserve a portion of the funds for national activities, including research, data collection, technical assistance, outreach, and dissemination. These activities would focus on the identification and promotion of effective efforts to expand learning time, provide comprehensive services, and increase community and parental involvement. In addition, fiscal year 2013 funds would be used to pay the 2013 continuation costs of Full-Service Community Schools grants made (under the Fund for the Improvement of Education in the Innovation and Improvement account) in prior fiscal years.

The reauthorized 21st CCLC program would build upon the progress made by States that, as part of the Department's ESEA flexibility initiative, request the flexibility and receive the authority to use 21st CCLC funds to support expanded learning time during the school day in addition to activities during non-school hours or periods when school is not in session (i.e., before and after school or during summer recess).

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
<u>Formula Grant Program</u>			
Amount distributed to States	\$1,130,777	\$1,128,640	0
Average State award	\$21,746	\$21,705	0
Range of awards to States	\$5,654-\$134,123	\$5,643-\$124,077	0
Reservation for State activities and Administration (maximum)	\$56,539	\$56,432	0
National activities and evaluation	\$11,539	\$11,517	0
Amount for Bureau of Indian Education and the Outlying Areas	\$11,539	\$11,517	0
<u>Competitive Grant Program:</u>			
Amount awarded to States and eligible local entities	0	0	\$1,118,295
Amount for Bureau of Indian Education and the Outlying Areas	0	0	\$11,517
National Activities	0	0	\$11,517
Peer Review of New Award Applications			\$5,000
Continuation Costs for the Full- Service Community Schools program	0	0	\$5,344

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

21st Century community learning centers

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
<u>Data on Centers</u>			
Number of centers supported	9,300 ¹	9,280 ¹	9,200 ¹
Total students served	1,694,300 ¹	1,691,100 ¹	1,675,600 ¹
Students attending 30 days or more	825,000	823,400	897,500
Total adult family members served	258,400	257,900	255,500

¹ Estimates are based on the number of participants and centers in operation during 2009-10 as reported by States in 2011, which are the most recent data available. For the purpose of these estimates, we assume that the cost per center and student served will be the same in 2011, 2012, and 2013 as it was in 2009-10, but that there will be a 10 percent increase in the number of students attending 21st CCLC programs for 30 days or more. For FY 2013, the estimated number of centers, students served, and the number of those students who attend programs for 30 days or more may be higher or lower due to various factors, such as the implementation of programs that expand the regular school day for all students in participating school; the award of direct grants to local eligible entities as well as to States; and the award of 1-year planning grants (or subgrants) to local eligible entities that intend to implement expanded-learning-time-programs or full-service community schools as part of a community learning center.

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: To establish community learning centers that help students in high-poverty, low-performing schools meet academic achievement standards, that offer a broad array of additional services designed to complement the regular academic program, and that offer families of students opportunities for educational development.

Objective: *Participants in 21st Century Community Learning Center programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.*

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

21st Century community learning centers

Measure: The percentage of regular program participants whose mathematics grades improve from fall to spring.

Year	Target Elementary School Participants	Target Middle and High School Participants	Target All Participants	Actual Elementary Participants	Actual Middle and High School Participants	Actual All Participants
2008	47.5	47.5	47.5	38.7	38.0	40.3
2009	48.0	48.0	48.0	37.0	34.2	36.6
2010	48.5	48.5	48.5	38.4	33.8	36.7
2011	48.5	48.5	48.5			
2012	48.5	48.5	48.5			
2013	48.5	48.5	48.5			

Measure: The percentage of regular program participants whose English grades improve from fall to spring.

Year	Target Elementary School Participants	Target Middle and High School Participants	Target All Participants	Actual Elementary Participants	Actual Middle and High School Participants	Actual All Participants
2008	47.5	47.5	47.5	40.6	39.2	41.8
2009	48.0	48.0	48.0	39.1	35.3	38.2
2010	48.5	48.5	48.5	40.2	34.6	38.0
2011	48.5	48.5	48.5			
2012	48.5	48.5	48.5			
2013	48.5	48.5	48.5			

Additional information: According to data States submitted to the Department, performance in both subjects increased for elementary school participants and decreased for middle and high school participants, and the program did not meet the targets for both groups and for participants as a whole. A regular participant is defined as a student who attends the program for 30 days or more during the course of the school year. To report data by grade span for this measure, the data system sorts program performance data by analyzing participant demographic information at the center level (as opposed to the individual student level). For this reason, programs that serve youth of all ages are not included in the columns disaggregated by participant age. The methodology used to report for this measure, therefore, partially explains why figures for “Total English” are, in some years, higher than those figures disaggregated by grade level.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

21st Century community learning centers

Measure: The percentage of regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above on State assessments.

Year	Target Elementary Reading	Target Middle and High School Math	Actual Elementary Reading	Actual Middle and High School Math
2008	24.0	16.0	22.8	15.9
2009	26.0	16.0	25.6	16.9
2010	35.0	20.0	26.5	17.8
2011	40.0	25.0		
2012	40.0	25.0		
2013	45.0	25.0		

Additional information: In 2010, 26.5 percent of regular elementary school-aged participants improved from not proficient to proficient or above on State assessments in reading, while 17.8 percent of regular participants who were in middle or high school improved from not proficient to proficient or above on State assessments in math. These data are for 535,386 regular elementary school-aged attendees and 249,290 middle- and high-school-aged attendees. Targets for 2007 through 2010 were set based on actual performance in 2006. The program made progress in 2010 but did not meet the targets of 35 percent for elementary school reading or 20 percent for middle or high school math. The Department calculates data for this measure by dividing the number of regular participants who scored proficient or better in spring of the reporting year (but were not proficient in the previous year) by the total number of current-year regular participants who scored below proficient the previous spring. For a regular participant to be included in the data for this measure, the center has to have data on the student's prior-year and current-year State assessment results.

Measure: The percentage of students with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior.

Year	Target Elementary School Participants	Target Middle and High School Participants	Target All Participants	Actual Elementary Participants	Actual Middle and High School Participants	Actual All Participants
2008	75	75	75	70.4	68.5	72.5
2009	75	75	75	68.7	67.6	68.6
2010	75	75	75	68.7	65.0	67.8
2011	75	75	75			
2012	75	75	75			
2013	75	75	75			

Additional information: According to data that grantees submitted to the 21st CCLC Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS), program performance in the area of student behavior decreased slightly for all three categories of students for this measure, and the program did not meet the 2010 targets. As with the measures for reading and math grades and proficiency, to report data by grade span for this measure the data system sorts program performance data by analyzing participant demographic information at the center level (as opposed to the individual student level). For this reason, programs that serve youth of all ages are not included in the columns disaggregated by grade level. The methodology used to report

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

21st Century community learning centers

for this measure, therefore, partially explains why the 2008 figure for “Overall” is higher than those figures disaggregated by grade level.

Efficiency Measures

The Department has developed three operational efficiency measures for the 21st CCLC program.

Measure: The percentage of SEAs that submit complete data on 21st Century Community Centers program performance measures by the deadline.

Year	Target	Actual
2008		80
2009	80	80
2010	85	86
2011	90	94
2012	95	
2013	95	

Additional information: States took an average of 94 days to submit complete data on performance measures, more than achieving the target.

Measure: The average number of days it takes the Department to submit a final monitoring report to an SEA after the conclusion of a site visit.

Year	Target	Actual
2008		55
2009	45	60
2010	40	45
2011	35	55
2012	35	
2013	30	

Additional information: The Department took an average of 55 days to submit a final monitoring report to an SEA after the conclusion of a site visit, and thus did not meet the target.

Measure: The average number of weeks a State takes to resolve compliance findings in a monitoring visit report.

Year	Target	Actual
2009		5
2010	4	4
2011	4	3
2012	4	
2013	4	

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

21st Century community learning centers

Additional information: This measure tracks States' timeliness in responding to the Department's fiscal management monitoring findings that require States to take corrective action within 30 days. Examples of such fiscal management findings include: drawing down funds in a manner that is not consistent with State and Federal policies; awarding funds for periods other than between 3 and 5 years (the subgrant length required by the statute); and improperly limiting entities eligible for subgrants. States took an average of 3 weeks to resolve compliance findings in 2011, more than achieving the target.

Other Performance Information

In 2003, the Department's Institute of Education Sciences began a rigorous study that developed and tested the effectiveness of two after-school interventions (one each in math and reading) that were adapted from materials from existing school-day curricula that are based on sound theory or that have scientific evidence of effectiveness. The final report for this study, *The Evaluation of Enhanced Academic Instruction in After-School Programs*, was released in September 2009. The evaluation found a statistically significant difference in student achievement between students in the math after-school program and those in the regular after-school activities after 1 year of enhanced instruction and no additional achievement benefit beyond the 1-year impact after 2 years of the program. In study sites implementing the reading program, there was no statistically significant difference in reading achievement between students in the reading after-school program and those in the regular after-school activities after 1 year of the program; after 2 years of the program, there was a statistically significant negative impact on reading achievement. It is important to note that the sample of centers was not nationally representative and that findings from this study cannot, therefore, be generalized to the 21st CCLC program.

In addition, the Department's Policy and Program Studies Service analyzed data from a nationally representative sample of 21st CCLC programs to evaluate State and local program implementation. The resulting report, *21st Century Community Learning Center: Descriptive Study of Program Practices*, was released in July 2010. The evaluation focused on how, and to what extent, funds support high-quality programs that emphasize academic content, as well as staffing patterns and other features of after-school program implementation that may have an impact on the quality of the programming offered. Centers reported that about half of their students attended roughly 2 days a week or more. In addition, three-quarters of the centers reported that a typical student participated in reading activities (75 percent) and mathematics activities (81 percent) for less than 4 hours per week. About half of centers reported offering professional development opportunities to staff through training courses or conferences.