

Department of Education
ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY
Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations language	B-1
Appropriation Adjustments and Transfers	B-2
Summary of Changes	B-3
Authorizing Legislation	B-4
Appropriations History	B-6
Significant Items in FY 2013 Appropriations Reports	B-8
Summary of Request	B-10
Activities:	
College- and career-ready students	B-13
School turnaround grants	B-30
Evaluation	B-41
State agency programs:	
Migrant student education.....	B-45
Neglected and delinquent children and youth education	B-52
Homeless children and youth education.....	B-58
State tables*	

* State tables reflecting final 2013 allocations and 2014 estimates will be posted on the Department's Web page at:
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/statetables/index.html#update>.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

NOTE

No appropriations 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.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Appropriation Adjustments and Transfers
(dollars in thousands)

Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers	2012	2013	2014
Discretionary:			
Appropriation	\$15,750,983	\$15,741,703	\$15,683,649
Across-the board reduction (P.L. 112-74).....	-9,280	0	0
Across-the board increase (P.L. 112-75).....	<u>0</u>	<u>29,991</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, adjusted discretionary appropriation	15,741,703	15,771,694	15,683,649
Comparative transfer to:			
<u>Education Improvement Programs</u> for:.....			
Striving Readers	-159,698	-159,698	0
High School Graduation Initiative	-48,809	-48,809	0
<u>Higher Education</u> for Special Programs for			
Migrant Students	-36,526	-36,526	0
Comparative transfer from: <u>Education</u>			
<u>Improvement Programs</u> for Homeless			
Children and Youth Education:	<u>65,173</u>	<u>65,173</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, comparative discretionary			
appropriation	15,561,843	15,591,834	15,683,649
Advance:			
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	-10,841,177	-10,841,177	-11,681,898
Advance from prior year.....	<u>10,820,686</u>	<u>10,841,177</u>	<u>10,841,177</u>
Total, budget authority.....	15,541,352	15,591,834	14,842,928

NOTE: Transfers exclude the 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided by P.L. 112-175, which would total \$28,890 thousand for this account.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Summary of Changes
(dollars in thousands)

2012.....	15,561,843
2014.....	<u>15,683,649</u>
Net change	121,806

Increases:	<u>2012 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
Program:		
Increase funding for School Turnaround Grants (formerly School Improvement Grants) to support the Administration's commitment to help States and LEAs turn around the Nation's lowest-performing schools. The request would fund a reauthorized program that would require States and LEAs to use most funds to implement one of four school specific intervention models in schools that are in the bottom 5 percent of schools in the State in terms of student achievement or, in the case of secondary schools, have graduation rates below 60 percent. The \$125 million increase would fund a new Supporting and Sustaining Turnaround program that would make competitive grants to support comprehensive, district-level plans and reforms that build local capacity to support school turnaround efforts and sustain successful turnarounds following the end of the three-year STG award period.	\$533,552	+ <u>\$125,000</u>
Subtotal, increases		+125,000
Decreases:		
Program:		
Eliminate separate funding for Evaluation. The ESEA reauthorization proposal includes provisions for funding program evaluations through set-asides from program funds.	3,194	- <u>3,194</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-3,194
Net change		+121,806

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Authorizing Legislation

(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2013 Authorized	2013 Estimate	2014 Authorized	2014 Request
College- and career-ready students (<i>ESEA-1-A</i>):				
LEA grants formulas:	0 ¹		To be determined ¹	
Basic grants (<i>Section 1124</i>)	² \$6,577,904			² \$6,577,904
Concentration grants (<i>Section 1124A</i>)	² 1,362,301			² 1,362,301
Targeted grants (<i>Section 1125</i>)	² 3,288,126			² 3,288,126
Education finance incentive grants (<i>Section 1125A</i>)	² 3,288,126			² 3,288,126
School turnaround grants (<i>ESEA Section 1003(g)</i>)	0 ¹	533,552	To be determined ¹	658,552
Evaluation (<i>ESEA I-E-1501 and 1503</i>)	0 ¹	3,194	To be determined ¹	0
State agency programs:				
Migrant student education (<i>ESEA I-C</i>)	0 ¹	393,236	To be determined ¹	393,236
Neglected and delinquent children and youth education(<i>ESEA I-D</i>)	0 ¹	50,231	To be determined ¹	50,231
Homeless children and youth education (<i>McKinney-Vento Act, Title VII-B</i>)	<u>Indefinite</u>	<u>65,173</u>	<u>Indefinite</u>	<u>65,173</u>
Total definite authorization	0		0	
Total appropriation		15,561,843		15,683,649
Portion of request subject to reauthorization		15,561,843		15,683,649
Total annual appropriation including 0.612 percent ATB increase		15,771,694		

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing language is sought for FY 2014.

² Of the total funds appropriated for Grants to LEAs, an amount equal to the fiscal year 2001 appropriation of \$7,397,690 thousand is to be distributed through the Basic Grants formula. An amount equal to the fiscal year 2001 appropriation of \$1,365,031 thousand is to be distributed through the Concentration

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Authorizing Legislation—continued

Grants formula. Amounts appropriated in excess of the fiscal year 2001 appropriation are to be distributed through the Targeted Grants formula. However, Congress specifies the actual amounts to be distributed through each formula in annual appropriations.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2005	\$15,205,168	\$15,515,735	\$15,500,684	\$14,843,974
2015 Advance for 206	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)
2006	16,431,473	14,728,735	14,532,785	14,481,161
2006 Advance for 2007	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)
2007	16,469,541	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	14,725,593
2007 Advance for 2008	(7,383,301)			(7,383,301)
2008	16,689,090	15,969,818	15,867,778	15,489,476
2008 Advance for 2009	(7,383,301)	(8,136,218)	(8,867,301)	(7,934,756)
2009	16,917,059	15,788,285 ²	15,735,884 ²	15,760,086
2009 Advance for 2010 Recovery Act Supplemental (PL 111-5)	(7,934,756)	(10,841,176)	(8,893,756)	(10,841,176)
		13,000,000	12,400,000	13,000,000
2010	16,431,632	15,938,215	15,891,132 ³	15,914,666
2010 Advance for 2011	(10,841,176)	(10,841,176)	(10,841,176)	(10,841,176)
2011	15,912,193	15,914,666 ⁴	16,726,579 ⁵	15,914,666 ⁶
2011 Advance for 2012 Rescission (P.L. 112-74)	(11,681,897)	(10,841,176)	(10,841,176)	(10,841,176) -(20,490)
2012	16,253,026	15,949,319 ⁷	15,741,703 ⁷	15,741,703
2012 Advance for 2013	(11,681,897)	(13,279,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)
2013	15,558,649	15,208,151 ⁸	15,840,103 ⁸	15,741,703 ⁹
2013 Advance for 2014	(11,681,898)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)	(10,841,177)
2014	15,683,649			
2014 Advance for 2015	(11,681,898)			

¹ This account operated under a full-year continuing resolution (P.L. 110-5). House and Senate allowances 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 appropriation reflects the continuing resolution (P.L. 111-322) passed December 22, 2010.

⁷ The level for the House allowance reflects an introduced bill and the level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Committee action only.

⁸ The Senate allowance reflects action on the regular annual 2013 appropriations bill, which proceeded in the

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Authorizing Legislation—continued

112th Congress only through the House Subcommittee and the Senate Committee.

⁹ The amount shown includes the 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided by P.L. 112-175, in effect through March 27, 2013.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Significant Items in FY 2013 Appropriations Reports

School Improvement Grants

Senate: At the request of three Committee members, the GAO analyzed certain aspects of the SIG program, focusing particularly on challenges for successful SIG implementation, the Department's technical assistance and oversight activities, and State administration of SIG. Interim and final reports released during the past 12 months identified, among other things, that local capacity—such as the ability to attract and retain administrative staff with school turnaround expertise or high-quality teachers— influenced implementation, and that SIG interventions were often challenging for low-capacity districts. Further, the GAO found that third-party contractors rarely were reviewed for contract performance. The Committee believes the Department should implement effective strategies that address the GAO's findings as soon as possible.

Response: The Department is currently taking a number of steps to help build State and local capacity to support effective implementation of School Improvement Grant (SIG) interventions in schools and to hold third-party contractors accountable for performance, both of which have emerged through our monitoring of SIG grantees as areas of need. First, as discussed in more detail in the multi-year plan for SIG national activities submitted to the Committee on October 1, 2012, the Department is using SIG national activities funds to support three primary categories of capacity-building work: peer-to-peer learning activities, collection and dissemination of promising-practice information, and capacity-building grants. Second, the Department is updating, as of March 2013, its SIG non-regulatory guidance to address, among other issues, renewal of SIG funding and review of contractor performance, consistent with the recommendations in GAO's April 2012 report. And most significantly, the Administration's fiscal year 2014 request for School Turnaround Grants (STG) includes \$125 million for a new competitive grant program that would strengthen formula grant implementation by building district-level capacity to support school turnaround efforts and to sustain improvements in schools that have used STG funds to successfully implement a school intervention model.

School Improvement Grants: National Activities

Senate: The Committee believes that the Department needs to take additional steps to support parent engagement and family support through SIG and other programs and activities. The Committee notes that evidence-based parent education and family support models have been shown to increase parent knowledge of child development; provide early detection of developmental delays; and increase children's school readiness and school success. The Committee directs the Department to address this issue through its national activities set-aside and other appropriate actions....

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Significant Items in FY 2013 Appropriations Reports-continued

School Improvement Grants: National Activities

Response: Community and family engagement are key elements to the success of SIG interventions. The Department is using fiscal year 2012 SIG national activities funds to support community and family engagement in SIG projects in several ways in fiscal year 2013. First, the Department is continuing to make resources on community and family engagement available through its Online School Turnaround Learning Community. Second, the Department is producing quick turnaround studies with information on promising district- and school-level practices in community and family engagement in SIG interventions. Lastly, the Department is supporting enhanced efforts to engage parents and the community in SIG projects through grants under the School Turnaround AmeriCorps, a new initiative administered jointly by the Department and the Corporation for National and Community Service that places AmeriCorps members in SIG schools.

[Click here for accessible version](#)

(in thousands of dollars)						
Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	2012 Appropriation	2013 Appropriation	2014 President's Budget	2014 President's Budget Compared to 2012 Appropriation	
					Amount	Percent
Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity						
1. College- and career-ready students (ESEA I-A):						
(a) Basic grants (section 1124)						
Annual appropriation	D	3,615,394	3,615,394	2,834,559	(780,835)	-21.598%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	2,962,510	2,962,510	3,743,345	780,835	26.357%
Subtotal		6,577,904	6,577,904	6,577,904	0	0.000%
(b) Concentration grants (section 1124A)						
Annual appropriation	D	0	0	0	0	---
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	1,362,301	1,362,301	1,362,301	0	0.000%
Subtotal		1,362,301	1,362,301	1,362,301	0	0.000%
(c) Targeted grants (section 1125)						
Annual appropriation	D	29,943	29,943	0	(29,943)	-100.000%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	3,258,183	3,258,183	3,288,126	29,943	0.919%
Subtotal		3,288,126	3,288,126	3,288,126	0	0.000%
(d) Education finance incentive grants (section 1125A)						
Annual appropriation	D	29,943	29,943	0	(29,943)	-100.000%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	3,258,183	3,258,183	3,288,126	29,943	0.919%
Subtotal		3,288,126	3,288,126	3,288,126	0	0.000%
Subtotal, College- and career-ready students		14,516,457	14,516,457	14,516,457	0	0.000%
Annual appropriation	D	3,675,280	3,675,280	2,834,559	(840,721)	-22.875%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	10,841,177	10,841,177	11,681,898	840,721	7.755%
2. School turnaround grants (ESEA section 1003(g))						
3. Evaluation (ESEA sections 1501 and 1503)						
4. State agency programs:						
(a) Migrant student education (ESEA I-C)						
(b) Neglected and delinquent children and youth education (ESEA I-D)						
Subtotal		443,467	443,467	443,467	0	0.000%

NOTES: D = discretionary program, M = mandatory program; FY = fiscal year

- FY 2013 discretionary appropriation amounts are based on P.L. 112-175, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2013, that provided appropriations through March 27, 2013. FY 2013 mandatory amounts are either specifically authorized levels, or are based on FY 2013 President's Budget Policy, updated for more recent estimates of mandatory costs, or FY 2014 President's Budget Policy, as applicable.
- Programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for which funds are requested or that are proposed for consolidation in FY 2014 are proposed under new authorizing legislation.
- Multiple programs affected by the proposed ESEA reauthorization have been renamed and moved among accounts, some of which also have been renamed.
- Account totals and programs shown within accounts in FY 2012 and FY 2013 have been adjusted for comparability with the FY 2014 President's Budget.

Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

(in thousands of dollars)						
Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	2012 Appropriation	2013 Appropriation	2014 President's Budget	2014 President's Budget Compared to 2012 Appropriation	
					Amount	Percent
Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity (continued)						
5. Homeless children and youth education (MVHAA Title VII-B)	D	65,173	65,173	65,173	0	0.000%
Total, Appropriation ¹	D	15,561,843	15,561,843	15,683,649	121,806	0.783%
Total, Budget authority	D	15,541,352	15,561,843	14,842,928	(698,424)	-4.494%
Current ²		4,720,666	4,720,666	4,001,751	(718,915)	-15.229%
Prior year's advance		10,820,686	10,841,177	10,841,177	20,491	0.189%
<i>Across-the-board 0.612% increase applied to discretionary appropriation, provided in P.L. 112-175.</i>			28,890			
Total, Appropriation		15,561,843	15,590,733	15,683,649	121,806	0.783%

NOTES: D = discretionary program, M = mandatory program; FY = fiscal year

- FY 2013 discretionary appropriation amounts are based on P.L. 112-175, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2013, that provided appropriations through March 27, 2013. FY 2013 mandatory amounts are either specifically authorized levels, or are based on FY 2013 President's Budget Policy, updated for more recent estimates of mandatory costs, or FY 2014 President's Budget Policy, as applicable.
- Programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for which funds are requested or that are proposed for consolidation in FY 2014 are proposed under new authorizing legislation.
- Multiple programs affected by the proposed ESEA reauthorization have been renamed and moved among accounts, some of which also have been renamed.
- Account totals and programs shown within accounts in FY 2012 and FY 2013 have been adjusted for comparability with the FY 2014 President's Budget.

Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

¹ Adjusted for comparability. Excludes \$36,526 thousand in FY 2012 and FY 2013 for Special Programs for Migrant Students requested in FY 2014 in the Higher Education account, and includes \$65,173 thousand in FY 2012 and FY 2013 for Homeless Children and Youth Education, which was funded under the Education Improvement Programs account, formerly the School Improvement Programs account.

² Excludes advance appropriations that become available on October 1 of the following fiscal year, which total \$10,841,177 thousand in fiscal years 2012 and 2013, and \$11,681,898 thousand in the FY 2014 President's Budget. In FY 2014, the amount for advances is increased due to the proposed consolidation of Teacher Quality State Grants into the Innovation and Instructional Teams account.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Summary of Request

The programs in the Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity (formerly Education for the Disadvantaged) account provide the foundation for school improvement efforts needed to ensure that all children receive a high-quality education. The Department is requesting a total of \$15.8 billion in fiscal year 2014 for the programs in this account.

Most of the programs in the account are authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and are, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that these programs will be implemented in fiscal year 2014 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal.

The \$14.5 billion request for the reauthorized College- and Career-Ready Students program (under current law, Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)) would support local efforts aimed at helping more than 23 million students in high-poverty schools make progress toward the new college- and career-ready standards that States would implement under the Administration's reauthorization proposal (and that the great majority of States are currently implementing). The reauthorized program also would support a more differentiated approach to measuring school progress and identifying schools in need of improvement, reward highly effective schools and LEAs, require implementation of rigorous school intervention models in the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I schools, strengthen LEA improvement efforts, and help ensure an equitable distribution of effective teachers across high- and low-poverty schools.

The 2014 request also includes \$658.6 million for School Turnaround Grants (STG), of which \$533.6 million would support a reauthorized State grant program (under current law School Improvement Grants) that would require States and LEAs to use most funds to implement one of four school intervention models (Turnaround, Restart, School Closure, and Transformation) in their schools that (1) are in the bottom 5 percent of schools in the State in terms of student achievement or (2) in the case of secondary schools, have graduation rates below 60 percent. The reauthorized program also would include a national activities authority that would allow the Department to build nationwide school turnaround capacity through data collection, technical assistance, and demonstration activities.

In addition to STG State grants, the Administration's STG request includes \$125 million for a new Supporting and Sustaining Turnaround competitive grants program that would fund new competitive grants to support comprehensive, district-level plans and reforms that build local capacity to support school turnaround efforts and sustain successful turnarounds following the end of the three-year STG award period.

The request would fund the other programs in this account as the same level as 2012, providing \$393.2 million for Migrant Student Education, \$50.2 million for Neglected and Delinquent Children and Youth Education, and \$65.2 for Homeless Children and Youth Education.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget authority:

	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
Basic grants	\$6,577,904	\$6,577,904 ²	\$6,577,904	0
Concentration grants	1,362,301	1,362,301 ²	1,362,301	0
Targeted grants	3,288,126	3,288,126 ²	3,288,126	0
Education finance incentive grants	<u>3,288,126</u>	<u>3,288,126²</u>	<u>3,288,126</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	14,516,457	14,516,457 ²	14,516,457	0
Annual appropriation	3,675,280	3,675,280 ²	2,834,559	-\$840,721
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	10,841,177	10,841,177 ²	11,681,898	+840,721

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2014.

² Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) provide supplemental education funding, especially in high-poverty areas, for local programs that provide extra academic support to help raise the achievement of students at risk of educational failure or, in the case of schoolwide programs, to help all students in high-poverty schools meet challenging State academic standards. The program serves an estimated 23 million students in 86 percent of school districts and more than half of all public schools—including 72 percent of the Nation’s elementary schools. Title I Grants to LEAs were first authorized as part of the original Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) and were most recently reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB).

The ESEA gives school districts and schools considerable flexibility in using Title I dollars to support instructional strategies and methods that best meet local needs. Title I schools help students reach challenging State standards through one of two models: “targeted assistance” that supplements the regular education program for individual children deemed most in need of special assistance, or a “schoolwide” approach that allows schools to use Title I funds—in combination with other Federal, State, and local funds—to improve the overall instructional program for all children in a school. Schools in which poor children account for at least

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

40 percent of enrollment are eligible to operate schoolwide programs, and in the 2010-2011 school year approximately 39,700 schools, or 72 percent of all Title I schools, operated these programs, which accounted for approximately 90 percent of participating students.

The ESEA encourages the use of Title I funds for effective educational practices. Both schoolwide and targeted assistance programs must employ effective methods and instructional strategies grounded in scientifically based research. Schools must further ensure that services provided with Title I funds supplement the regular instruction that students would receive in the absence of Title I funds, such as by extending the school day, week, or year. Schools also must provide ongoing professional development for staff working with disadvantaged students and carry out activities designed to increase parental involvement. Additionally, Title I funds may be used to support high-quality preschool programs for eligible children and joint professional development for school staff and other early childhood educators.

Title I Grants to LEAs provides the foundation for the ESEA's accountability system, which, as explained below, emphasizes State and local responsibilities in the areas of standards and assessments, measuring progress, supporting school improvement, and improving teacher quality.

Standards and Assessments

Under Title I, each State was required to create a system of academic standards and aligned assessments, and school districts must integrate these standards into local instruction. The State systems must include challenging content standards that describe what all students should know and be able to do in at least reading (or language arts) and mathematics, and academic achievement standards that describe three levels of proficiency (basic, proficient, and advanced) for meeting the State content standards. In addition, States were required to develop science standards by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

The States also were required to create or adopt academic assessments that measure the achievement of all students against their standards. These assessments must be valid and reliable, include measures that assess higher-order thinking skills and understanding of challenging content, and enable achievement results to be disaggregated by major racial and ethnic group, gender, and poverty, disability, English proficiency, and migrant status. The Department provides dedicated State formula grant support for the development and implementation of required State assessments (see Assessing Achievement in the Education Improvement Programs account).

Beginning with the 2005-2006 school year, States have been required to administer their reading and mathematics assessments annually to all students in grades 3-8 and once in high school in reading and math. States also must assess annually the English proficiency of English learner (EL) students and were required to add science assessments during the 2007-2008 school year (testing once in each of three grade spans specified in the law). Finally, to provide a uniform benchmark for comparing student achievement gains nationwide, the ESEA requires biennial State participation in the reading and mathematics assessments for 4th- and 8th-graders conducted by the National Assessment of Educational Progress.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

Adequate Yearly Progress

State assessments are used to hold LEAs and schools accountable for making adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward State standards for proficiency in reading and math, with the goal of ensuring that all students are proficient in both subjects by the end of the 2013-2014 school year. For a school to make AYP, all students, as well as those in statutorily specified groups—economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and EL students—must meet the same annual statewide measurable objectives for improved achievement. However, the statute includes a “safe harbor” exception under which a school can be considered to have made AYP if the percentage of students in each group not reaching the proficient level decreases by at least 10 percent from the previous year and the school makes progress on the “other academic indicator” included in the State’s AYP definition.

The Department has taken a number of actions, primarily through regulation, to give States additional flexibility in making AYP determinations. For example, in December 2003, the Department announced a final regulation permitting States, school districts, and schools to include in AYP calculations the “proficient” scores of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who take assessments based on alternate achievement standards. The number of those proficient scores included in AYP determinations may not exceed 1 percent of all students in the grades tested (about 9 percent of students with disabilities). Since 2007, the Department also has provided additional flexibility permitting States to count for AYP purposes the “proficient” scores of a limited number of students with disabilities who take assessments based on modified achievement standards. The number of such “proficient” scores is capped at 2 percent of all students tested. These regulations are intended to give schools and teachers credit for raising the achievement of students with disabilities.

In addition, the Department allows States to exclude from AYP calculations the assessment results for EL students in their first year of enrollment in U.S. schools. States also may include in the EL subgroup for up to 2 years those students who were EL but who have attained English proficiency. Finally, the Department has taken steps to allow States to incorporate individual academic growth into their AYP systems, beginning with a pilot growth-model initiative in late 2005 and then in a final regulation published in 2008 permitting all States to apply for approval to add growth models to AYP determinations.

Accountability and School Improvement

Title I accountability and school improvement provisions require escalating improvement measures over time for schools that continue to miss AYP targets. In addition, LEAs must implement specific strategies for students attending schools identified for improvement, including public school choice and supplemental educational services (SES) options.

School Improvement

LEAs must identify for school improvement any school that does not make AYP for 2 consecutive years, and both LEAs and SEAs must include such identification in their annual report cards to parents and the public. Identified schools must develop 2-year improvement plans that incorporate strategies from scientifically based research on how to strengthen

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

instruction in the core academic subjects and address the specific issues that caused the school to be identified for improvement. These plans must include the annual reservation of at least 10 percent of the school's Title I, Part A allocation for professional development that directly addresses the problems that led to identification for improvement.

States must reserve 4 percent of their Title I, Part A allocations to support school improvement activities and are required to distribute 95 percent of these funds to LEAs with schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. In reserving school improvement funds, States are not permitted to reduce an LEA's allocation below its prior-year level, a restriction that may prevent a State from reserving the full 4 percent for school improvement. Additional funding for school improvement is provided through the separately authorized section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants program (see School Turnaround Grants).

Corrective Action

If an identified school does not make AYP for 2 additional years (4 years of not making AYP), the LEA must take corrective action. Corrective actions may include replacing school staff responsible for the continued inability to make AYP, comprehensive implementation of a new curriculum (including professional development), and reorganizing the school internally. LEAs must continue to provide choice and SES options to students in schools identified for corrective action.

Restructuring

If a school does not increase student achievement in response to corrective action, the LEA must begin planning for restructuring, which involves making a fundamental change such as closing the school and reopening it as a public charter school, replacing all or most of the school's staff, turning operation of the school over to a private management company with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, or any other major restructuring of the school's governance arrangement. The LEA must implement the restructuring plan no later than the beginning of the following school year if the school still does not make AYP (i.e., 6 years of not making AYP), and must continue to provide choice and SES options to its students.

Qualifications for Teachers and Paraprofessionals

The ESEA requires LEAs to ensure that all Title I teachers hired after the beginning of the 2002-2003 school year are "highly qualified." For new teachers, this means being certified by the State (which may be through an alternative route to certification), holding at least a bachelor's degree, and passing a rigorous State test on subject knowledge and teaching skills. Veteran teachers also must possess a bachelor's degree and be fully certified or licensed by the State, and must either pass the State test on subject-matter knowledge or demonstrate subject-matter competency through a "high, objective, uniform State standard of evaluation." LEAs must use at least 5 percent of their Part A allocations to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified. States were required to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that would ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects were highly qualified by the end of the 2005-06 school year, and both States and LEAs must report annually on progress toward this goal. In addition, LEAs must annually notify parents of their right to receive information on the professional qualifications of their child's teachers.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

In 2004, the Department provided additional flexibility to States and school districts working to meet the highly qualified teacher (HQT) requirements. First, rural teachers who teach more than one academic subject and who are highly qualified in at least one subject were given 3 more years to become highly qualified in the additional subjects they teach. Second, States may permit science teachers to demonstrate that they are highly qualified either under a general science certification or in an individual field such as biology or chemistry. And, third, States may develop a single, streamlined process for determining that veteran multi-subject teachers are highly qualified.

ESEA Flexibility

The ESEA was scheduled for reauthorization in 2007 and has now entered its second decade without modification to reflect State progress in implementing the law or new directions in State and local education reform policies. In addition, the rapidly approaching 2014 deadline under current law for ensuring that 100 percent of students are proficient in reading and mathematics means that States will soon be forced to identify nearly all of their Title I schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. This failure of current law to differentiate among schools that are helping most, but not all, of their students to meet State academic standards and schools in which large majorities of students are not meeting such standards threatens to undermine public support for ESEA accountability requirements. More than 40 States already are engaged in transitioning to “next-generation accountability systems” based on the adoption of State standards linked to college- and career-readiness, new assessments aligned with those standards, differentiated approaches to LEA and school accountability that target improvement resources to the lowest-performing LEAs and schools and those with the largest achievement gaps, and new systems for evaluating and supporting teachers and principals that are based in part on student growth.

In recognition of these changes, in September 2011, the Administration invited all States to request “ESEA flexibility,” which offers waivers of key provisions of current law in exchange for a comprehensive plan to improve educational outcomes for all students, close achievement gaps, and improve the quality of instruction. More specifically, States approved for ESEA flexibility no longer have to meet the 2014 deadline for ensuring that 100 percent of students are proficient in reading and mathematics; no longer have to identify schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and no longer have to carry out the prescriptive improvement, corrective action, or restructuring plans required under current law. States and LEAs also receive greater flexibility in the use of funds in rural schools, in adopting the schoolwide program model regardless of school poverty levels, in meeting teacher qualification requirements, and in transferring funds among ESEA programs.

States seeking ESEA flexibility must submit plans to the Department describing how they will transition to State college- and career-ready standards and aligned assessments capable of measuring student academic growth; implement differentiated recognition, accountability, and support systems that identify and reward high-performing schools, require rigorous interventions in the lowest-performing schools, and target meaningful improvement measures to schools with the largest achievement gaps; and develop and implement high-quality teacher and principal evaluation and support systems that use multiple valid measures, including data on student growth as a significant factor, to determine performance levels.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

All States are eligible to receive ESEA flexibility, and the Department has established a rigorous processing for reviewing and approving State requests, including expert peer review. As of March 2013, 34 States and D.C. are approved for ESEA flexibility. Additionally, as of that same date, 11 States, Puerto Rico, and the Bureau of Indian Education have submitted requests for ESEA flexibility. The approved States began implementing new ESEA accountability systems that are more fair, flexible, and focused on students most at risk beginning in the 2012-2013 school year. In general, the waivers of current law included in ESEA flexibility have been approved through the 2013-2014 school year. The waivers may be revoked if Congress reauthorizes the ESEA, but in the continued absence of reauthorization States would be permitted to seek extension of their waivers through the 2014-2015 school year. Additional information on ESEA flexibility is available at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/index.html>

Allocations

Title I, Part A funds are allocated through four separate formulas. All four formulas are based on the number of children from low-income families in each LEA, and each formula also includes such factors as the LEA's poverty rate and State per-pupil expenditures for education. Other children counted for allocation purposes ("formula children") include children in families above the poverty line receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (the main Federal-State income maintenance program), children in foster homes, and children in local institutions for neglected and delinquent children. Eligible LEAs receive funding under one or more of the formulas, but the final outcome of the Federal-State allocation process is a single Title I, Part A award to each qualifying LEA.

Three formulas are based primarily on the number of formula children in each LEA, weighted by State per-pupil expenditures for education. Basic Grants are awarded to school districts with at least 10 formula children who make up more than 2 percent of their school-age population (defined as children ages 5 to 17) and, thus, spread funds thinly across nearly all LEAs. Concentration Grants provide additional funds to LEAs in which the number of formula children exceeds 6,500 or 15 percent of the total school-age population. The Targeted Grants formula weights child counts to make higher payments to school districts with high numbers or percentages of formula students. To be eligible for Targeted Grants, an LEA must have at least 10 formula children counted for Basic Grant purposes, and the count of formula children must equal at least 5 percent of the school age population.

In addition, the statute includes a separately authorized and funded Education Finance Incentive Grants (EFIG) formula. This formula uses State-level "equity" and "effort" factors to make allocations to States that are intended to encourage States to spend more on education and to improve the equity of State funding systems. Once State allocations are determined, sub-allocations to the LEA level are based on a modified version of the Targeted Grants formula.

In determining allocations under each of the four formulas, the statute requires the use of annually updated Census Bureau estimates of the number of children from low-income families in each LEA. There is roughly a 2-year lag between the income year used for LEA poverty estimates and the fiscal year in which those estimates are used to make Title I allocations. For example, the fiscal year 2012 allocations were based on LEA poverty estimates for 2010. The

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

Department transfers a small amount of funding from the annual Title I appropriation (\$3.9 million in 2012) to the Census Bureau to finance the preparation of these LEA poverty estimates.

LEAs also use poverty data—generally the number of students eligible for free- or reduced-price lunch—to make within-district allocations to schools. LEAs with more than 1,000 students must serve, in rank order by poverty rate, all schools with a poverty rate above 75 percent, including middle and high schools, before serving schools with less needy student populations.

One percent of the total appropriation for Title I Grants to LEAs is reserved for the Department of the Interior’s Bureau of Indian Education and the Outlying Areas (the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands). In addition, States are permitted to reserve up to 1 percent, or \$400,000, whichever is greater, to cover SEA costs of administering Title I programs, except that such amounts may not exceed the level that is provided if the total appropriation for Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA equals \$14 billion, a threshold that has been exceeded each year beginning with fiscal year 2008.

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

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

(dollars in thousands)

	<u>Basic Grants</u>	<u>Concentration Grants</u>	<u>Targeted Grants</u>	<u>Education Finance Incentive Grants</u>
2009	\$6,597,946	\$1,365,031	\$3,264,712	\$3,264,712
Recovery Act	0	0	5,000,000	5,000,000
2010	6,597,946	1,365,031	3,264,712	3,264,712
2011	6,579,151	1,359,726	3,252,025	3,252,025
2012	6,577,904	1,365,031	3,288,126	3,288,126
2013	6,577,904 ¹	1,365,031 ¹	3,288,126 ¹	3,288,126 ¹

¹ Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration's 2014 budget request for the College- and Career-Ready Students (CCRS) program (Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies under current law) is \$14.6 billion, the same as the 2012 level. The request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2014 under a reauthorized ESEA that is consistent with the Administration's reauthorization proposal. This proposal would make key changes in the areas of standards and assessments; accountability and support for schools, LEAs and States; and teacher and leader effectiveness and equity. The reauthorization proposal also would permit the Department to reserve up to 0.5 percent of Title I formula grant funds for ESEA program evaluation and performance measurement.

New College- and Career-Ready Standards and High-Quality Assessments

While the current Title I program has succeeded in firmly establishing standards-based accountability systems in all 50 States, No Child Left Behind's emphasis on punitive sanctions for not making lock-step progress toward meeting the goal of 100 percent proficiency in reading/language arts and mathematics has inadvertently encouraged States to lower the quality of their standards as well as the levels of proficiency needed to meet them. The net result has been wide divergence in most States in student performance on State assessments compared to student performance on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). For example, the August 2011 report from the National Center for Education Statistics, *Mapping State Proficiency Standards Onto NAEP Scales: 2005-2009*, found that 35 States set grade 4 standards for the Proficient level in reading that were lower than the Basic level on NAEP.

In response to this problem, the Administration's Title I reauthorization proposal would ask States to adopt State-developed standards in reading or language arts and in mathematics that build toward college- and career-readiness by the time students graduate from high school, and high-quality statewide assessments aligned with these standards. Forty-five States and the District of Columbia already have adopted a common set of State-developed college- and career-ready standards in reading and math, and the Administration's reauthorization proposal would provide additional incentives and resources for States seeking to implement these standards and aligned assessments.

The proposed new standards and assessments would give families and communities the information they need to determine whether their students are on track to college- and career-readiness and to evaluate the effectiveness of their schools. States would also continue to implement statewide science standards and aligned assessments in specific grade spans, and could include those assessments—as well as statewide assessments in other subjects, such as history—in their Title I accountability system so long as they meet the same “college- and career-ready” requirements as the reading and mathematics standards. Finally, States would develop and adopt statewide English language proficiency standards for English Learners, as well as aligned English language proficiency assessments, that reflect the academic language necessary to master each State's content standards.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

Rigor, Rewards, and Flexibility in State Accountability Systems

Building on these statewide standards and aligned assessments, the Administration's Title I reauthorization proposal would require every State to ensure that its statewide system of accountability rewards schools and districts for progress and success, requires rigorous interventions in the lowest-performing schools and districts and in those with the largest achievement gaps, and gives local officials flexibility to determine the appropriate improvement and support strategies for most schools.

The foundation of these new, more rigorous and fair accountability systems would be comprehensive data systems that gather information that is critical to determining how schools and districts are progressing in preparing students to graduate from high school ready for college and careers. States and districts would collect and publicly report data relating to student academic achievement and growth in reading and mathematics, student academic achievement in science, and, if States choose, student academic achievement and growth in other subjects, such as history. At the high school level, States also would collect and report graduation rates and, over time, college enrollment rates and college persistence rates. All of these data would be disaggregated by race, gender, ethnicity, disability status, English Learner status, status as connected to the active-duty military, and family income. States and districts also would collect other key information about teaching and learning conditions, including information on school climate, such as student, teacher and school leader attendance; disciplinary incidents; or the results from student, parent, or school staff surveys about their school experience.

The reauthorization proposal would replace the AYP measure in current law, which is based primarily on a single, static snapshot of student proficiency on academic assessments, with a broader, more accurate measure of school performance that looks at student achievement, student growth, and school progress. Performance targets would be aligned with the objective of ensuring that, by 2020, all students are graduating (or are on track to graduate) from high school ready for college and a career.

The schools, districts, and States that are successful in reaching performance targets, significantly increasing student performance for all students, closing achievement gaps, or turning around the lowest-performing schools would be eligible for rewards, which could include financial rewards for the staff and students in high-poverty schools and flexibility for LEAs and schools in the use of ESEA funds.

School improvement assistance would be focused on three categories of schools. First, States and LEAs would be required to implement one of four school turnaround models in the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools in each State, based on student academic achievement, student growth, graduation rates, and a lack of progress on these measures. An LEA that has been identified for rewards would have flexibility to implement its own research-based intervention model in those schools.

Second, schools that fall between the fifth and tenth percentiles based on student academic achievement, student growth, and graduation rates would be placed in a warning category, and States and LEAs would implement research-based, locally determined strategies to help them improve. And, third, in schools that are not closing significant, persistent achievement gaps, LEAs would be required to implement data-driven interventions—which could include expanded

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

learning time, supplemental educational services, or other strategies—to support those students who are farthest behind and help close those achievement gaps.

The Administration’s reauthorization proposal also would require identification of and intervention in low-performing States and LEAs. Such interventions could include governance or staffing changes, restrictions on the use of ESEA funds, or partnering with an outside organization to improve student academic achievement.

Equitable Distribution of Effective Teachers and Leaders

Strong teachers and leaders are the heart of educational improvement, yet current law largely ignores the effectiveness of teachers in improving student learning and does little to recognize the importance of or support the development of effective school leaders. The Administration’s reauthorization proposal would require States to develop definitions of “effective” and “highly effective” teachers and principals, based in significant part on student academic growth, which would be used in the development of State and local teacher and principal evaluation systems. In addition, both States and LEAs would be required to develop meaningful plans to achieve the equitable distribution of effective teachers and leaders. As noted below, most LEAs would be allowed to spend Title I, Part A funds on activities to achieve such equitable distribution across their schools.

Resources for Reform

The Administration’s Title I reauthorization proposal also would give States and LEAs greater flexibility in using Title I, Part A funds to build State and local capacity to improve student achievement. For example, States would be permitted to reserve up to 5 percent of their Title I, Part A allocations to carry out such activities as: (1) implementing rigorous standards and high-quality assessments and, in particular, helping teachers teach to the new standards; (2) using data more effectively to identify local needs and improve student outcomes; (3) improving capacity at the State and district levels to use technology to improve instruction; (4) coordinating with early learning programs to improve school readiness; or (5) carrying out effective family engagement strategies. States also would be permitted to set aside up to 1 percent of their Title I, Part A allocations to fund programs that support family engagement and to identify and disseminate best practices in this area.

In addition, the Administration’s reauthorization proposal would broaden the requirement in current law for LEAs with schools in improvement to spend an amount equal to 20 percent of their Title I, Part A allocations on public school choice and/or supplemental educational services. LEAs would instead be required to use an identical amount to improve student performance in high-need schools by implementing effective school improvement strategies and carrying out strategies designed to ensure the equitable distribution of effective teachers and school leaders. LEAs would also be required to reserve at least 2 percent of their Title I, Part A allocations to develop and implement comprehensive family engagement plans. LEAs would continue to have flexibility to use Title I, Part A funds to serve eligible pre-K students and, in particular, to support activities designed to improve the school readiness of young children across a range of domains and lay the foundation for success in the early grades.

The ESEA proposal also would encourage increased resource equity by (1) strengthening “comparability” requirements to ensure that the high-poverty schools in each LEA receive State and local funding (for personnel and relevant non-personnel expenditures) comparable to the

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

amount received by the LEA's low-poverty schools; and (2) requiring States to measure and report on resource disparities and to develop a plan to reduce those disparities.

Title I Rewards Program

The Administration also is proposing a new Title I Rewards program that would help ensure that State accountability systems provide meaningful positive incentives and rewards that recognize and encourage improved student outcomes. Encouraging, recognizing, and rewarding outstanding performance by high-poverty schools and LEAs would bring a much-needed corrective balance to the emphasis of current law on what often are perceived as punitive sanctions for low performance. While the reauthorization proposal would create a separately funded State formula grant program for Title I Rewards, for 2014 the Department would work with the appropriators to provide a 2 percent State-level set-aside of funds under Title I Grants for LEAs that would be used to reward high-poverty LEAs and schools that are the highest achieving or are making the most progress in improving student achievement. Such rewards could include: (1) financial rewards for principals, teachers, and other staff; (2) college scholarships for students in high-performing schools; (3) school-level financial rewards; or (4) other innovative rewards and incentives developed by the States.

Evaluation

The Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal also would authorize the Department to reserve up to 0.5 percent of Title I, Part A formula grant funds under a broad ESEA evaluation authority aimed at supporting the comprehensive evaluation of the implementation, outcomes, impact, and cost-effectiveness of ESEA programs, including the Title I, Part A CCRS program. Title I evaluation activities would be included in a biennial evaluation plan that the Department would develop and submit to Congress. The Administration's reauthorization proposal also would permit the Department to use funds reserved for ESEA evaluation to complete evaluations that were initiated before ESEA reauthorization.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands, except per-child amounts)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Allocations by LEA Poverty Rate			
0-15%			
# of LEAs	5,106	4,862	4,862
Dollars	\$1,893,708	\$1,743,246	\$1,760,357
% of Total \$	13.31	12.24	12.36
# of Formula Eligible Children	1,818,348	1,716,694	1,716,694
0-15% \$ Per Formula Child	\$1,041	\$1,015	\$1,025
15-25%			
# of LEAs	4,667	4,627	4,627
Dollars	\$4,475,468	\$4,017,833	\$4,055,847
% of Total \$	31.45	28.22	28.47
# of Formula Eligible Children	3,798,769	3,557,929	3,557,929
\$ Per Formula Child	\$1,178	\$1,129	\$1,140
>25%			
# of LEAs	3,392	3,629	3,629
Dollars	\$7,863,085	\$8,478,122	\$8,428,860
% of Total \$	55.24	59.54	59.17
# of Formula Eligible Children	5,477,351	6,314,220	6,314,220
\$ Per Formula Child	\$1,436	\$1,343	\$1,335
LEA Allocation Subtotal	\$14,232,505	\$14,239,201	\$14,245,064
BIA/Outlying Areas	145,125	145,125	145,124
Part D, Subpart 2	134,843	128,147	122,269
Census Updates	<u>3,984</u>	<u>3,984</u>	<u>4,000</u>
Grants to LEAs Total	14,516,457	14,516,457	14,516,457
Schools receiving Title I funds			
Schoolwide programs	39,700	39,700	39,700
Targeted assistance programs	<u>15,466</u>	<u>15,466</u>	<u>15,466</u>
Total	55,166	55,166	55,166
Students served (in millions)			
In schoolwide programs	21.2	21.2	21.2
In targeted assistance programs	1.7	1.7	1.7
In non-public and N&D programs	<u>0.3</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>0.3</u>
Total	23.2	23.2	23.2

NOTE: 2013 excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents selected program performance information for the Title I Grants to LEAs program, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data, as well as an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested for fiscal year 2014 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The performance measures and targets for the Title I Grants to LEAs program rely on data submitted annually through the ESEA Consolidated State Performance Reports, which include State and local performance information primarily as specified through the annual “report card” requirements described in Section 1111(h) of the ESEA.

These measures are focused on three areas: progress of economically disadvantaged students toward the current statutory goal of ensuring that all students are proficient in reading and mathematics by 2014, closing the achievement gaps in reading and mathematics between economically disadvantaged students and the “all students” group, and improving the efficiency of the Department’s monitoring process for Title I Grants to LEAs.

Goal: At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.

Objective: *The performance of low-income students will increase substantially in reading and mathematics.*

Measure: The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading assessments.

Year	Target Percentage of Students Who Test At or Above Proficiency	Actual Percentage of Students Who Test At or Above Proficiency
2009	72.1	61.1
2010	77.7	61.4
2011	83.2	61.3
2012	88.8	
2013	94.4	
2014	100.0	

Additional information: Assessment data for 2011 show that the average proficiency rate in reading/language arts for economically disadvantaged students was virtually unchanged from the previous year. Unless the rate of improvement picks up in future years, less than two-thirds of economically disadvantaged students will be proficient in reading in 2014, well short of the ESEA’s current goal of 100-percent proficiency.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

Measure: The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State math assessments.

Year	Target Percentage of Students Who Test At or Above Proficiency	Actual Percentage of Students Who Test At or Above Proficiency
2009	70.2	60.7
2010	76.2	61.6
2011	82.1	61.1
2012	88.1	
2013	94.0	
2014	100.0	

Additional information: Assessment data for 2011 show that the average proficiency rate in mathematics for economically disadvantaged students rose less than 1 percentage point from the previous year. Unless the rate of improvement picks up in future years, only two-thirds of economically disadvantaged students will be proficient in mathematics in 2014, well short of the ESEA's current goal of 100-percent proficiency.

Measure: The difference between the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading assessments and the percentage of all students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading assessments.

Year	Target Gap in Proficiency Percentage Between Economically Disadvantaged Students and All Students	Actual Gap in Proficiency Percentage Between Economically Disadvantaged Students and All Students
2009	8.1	11.5
2010	6.5	10.9
2011	4.9	10.7
2012	3.3	
2013	1.6	
2014	0.0	

Additional information: The 2011 results show that the reading achievement gap is closing, but far too slowly to eliminate this gap by 2014, the year by which the current ESEA calls for all student groups to be proficient in reading/language arts (thus reducing the gap to zero).

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

Measure: The difference between the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State math assessments and the percentage of all students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State math assessments.

Year	Target Gap in Proficiency Percentage Between Economically Disadvantaged Students and All Students	Actual Gap in Proficiency Percentage Between Economically Disadvantaged Students and All Students
2009	7.9	10.8
2010	6.4	10.0
2011	4.8	9.9
2012	3.2	
2013	1.6	
2014	0.0	

Additional information: The 2011 results show that the mathematics gap is closing, but far too slowly to eliminate this gap by 2014, the year by which the ESEA calls for all student groups to be proficient in reading/language arts (thus reducing the gap to zero).

Efficiency Measure

Measure: Average time to complete State monitoring reports, in days, following the completion of a site visit.

Year	Target Number of Days	Actual Number of Days
2009	40.0	25.5
2010	40.0	30.9
2011	40.0	35.2
2012	40.0	32.3
2013	40.0	
2014	40.0	

Assessment of progress: In 2012, the Department continued to outperform its target of completing State monitoring reports within 40 days of the conclusion of a site visit. The average time-to-completion for 2012 was 32.3 days.

Other Performance Information

The Title I Program at a Glance

In the 2010-2011 school year, the most recent year for which data are available, the Title I program served nearly 23 million students, or 46 percent of the total student population. More detailed program information, compared to the overall public school population, is displayed in the tables below.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

2010-2011 School Year

Student Group	# of Students, All Schools	# of Students, Title I Schools	% of students served by Title I
All	49,999,878	22,890,789	46
American Indian	607,374	390,930	64
Asian/Pacific Islander	2,457,423	894,086	36
Black	7,912,003	5,161,724	65
Hispanic	11,872,282	8,196,481	69
White	25,907,645	7,733,907	30
Economically disadvantaged	24,021,196	16,666,434	69
English Learners	4,371,553	3,519,624	81
Students with disabilities	6,530,977	2,979,291	46

In addition, data on the concentration of students eligible for free and reduced-price lunch show that Title I funds seem to be reaching the target schools and students. There are 18,240 schools where between 81 and 100 percent of the student population qualify for free or reduced-price lunch; 91 percent of those schools are served by Title I.

2010-2011 School Year

Concentration of free and reduced-price lunch ranges	# of Schools	# of Title I Schools	% Title I Schools
0-20%	16,517	3,948	24
21-40%	19,265	6,639	34
41-60%	22,702	13,528	60
61-80%	19,363	15,299	79
81-100%	18,240	16,642	91

National Assessment of Title I: Final Report

The ESEA required a comprehensive, multi-year national assessment on the implementation and impact of the Title I Grants to LEAs. The most recent data from this assessment are included in two reports. The first, a 2009 report entitled *Title I Implementation: Update on Recent Evaluation Findings*, provides a summary of findings from Title I evaluation studies that have become available after the publication of the National Assessment of Title I final report in 2007. The second report, *State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, Volume IX-Accountability Under NCLB: Final Report*, was published in 2010 and provides updated information on State, district, and school implementation of NCLB provisions concerning accountability and school improvement. Findings from these reports demonstrate the need to address the current accountability provisions under current law. Both reports, as well as other related Title I evaluation reports, are available in full on the Department of Education's Web site at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/opepd/ppss/reports.html#title>.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

Highlights of key findings follow, with updates reflecting more recent ED or State-reported data where noted:

Trends in Student Achievement

- Looking across eight different student groups (low-income, Black, Hispanic, White, English Learner, migrant, students with disabilities, and the “all students” group) and four assessments (reading and mathematics in fourth grade and eighth grade), an average of 16 percent of the student groups within the 30 States would be predicted to reach 100 percent proficiency if recent growth rates were to continue.

Implementation of State Assessment and Accountability Systems

- Overall, three-quarters of the Nation’s schools made AYP in 2005–06, a nearly identical proportion as in 2003–04 and 2004–05. In fact, four-fifths of schools had the same AYP designation from 1 year to the next. Sixty-five percent of schools made AYP in both years, and 16 percent missed AYP in both years. Ten percent of schools’ designations worsened (i.e., moved from making AYP in 2004–05 to missing AYP in 2005–06) and 9 percent of schools’ designations improved. Over the past 3 years, the percentage of schools making AYP has declined each year. In the 2008-2009 school year, 66 percent of all public schools made AYP; in the 2009-2010 school year, the percentage dropped to 61; and in the 2010-2011 school year, just 52 percent of schools made AYP. The significant decline likely reflects the greater difficulty of making AYP as each State’s annual targets rise toward the 100-percent proficiency goal in the 2013-2014 school year. [Updated March 2013]
- The number of Title I schools that were identified for improvement rose to 10,781 in 2006–07, an 11 percent increase over the 9,694 identified Title I schools in 2005–06. Twenty percent of all Title I schools were identified in 2006–07. The number and percentage of schools identified for improvement varied considerably across States: 9 States had identified 5 percent or fewer of their Title I schools, while 12 States had identified more than one-third of their Title I schools. In the 2009-2010 school year, the number of Title I schools identified for improvement was 14,561. That number rose to 15,888 in the 2010-2011 school year and in the 2011-2012 school year, 19,270 schools, or 35 percent of all Title I schools were identified for improvement. [Updated March 2013]
- Schools with high concentrations of poor and minority students were much more likely to be identified than other schools, as were schools located in urban areas. Over one-third of high-poverty schools (37 percent) and schools with high percentages of minority students (38 percent) were identified schools in 2006–07, compared with 4 to 5 percent of schools with low concentrations of these students. Schools in urban areas were more likely to be identified (25 percent) than were suburban and rural schools (12 percent and 9 percent, respectively). Middle schools were more likely to be identified (22 percent of middle schools) than were high schools (13 percent) or elementary schools (14 percent).

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

School turnaround grants

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Section 1003(g))

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget authority:

	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change</u> <u>from 2012</u>
	\$533,552	\$533,552 ²	\$658,552	+\$125,000

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2014.

² Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) authorizes the Department to award School Improvement Grants (SIGs) to each State educational agency (SEA) based on the SEA's proportionate share of funds under ESEA Title I, Parts A, C, and D. Each SEA must use at least 95 percent of its allocation to make competitive subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to assist their Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under ESEA section 1116. SEAs may use up to 5 percent of their SIG allocations for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance activities.

The statute requires States to give priority in making subgrants to LEAs demonstrating the greatest need for school improvement funding and the strongest commitment to providing the resources needed to help their lowest-performing schools successfully implement improvement plans. Subgrants to LEAs must be of sufficient size and scope to support the activities required under section 1116 of the ESEA and are renewable for two additional 1-year periods.

The 2012 appropriations act authorized the Department to reserve up to 5 percent of SIG funds to carry out activities to build SEA and LEA capacity to implement effectively the SIG program.

Rapid Funding Growth

Congress first funded the School Improvement Grants program in fiscal year 2007 with an initial appropriation of \$125 million, followed by a large increase to \$491 million in fiscal year 2008 and \$546.6 million in the regular 2009 appropriation. In addition, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act) provided \$3 billion for the SIG program, for a 2009 total of just over \$3.5 billion. In response to this unprecedented increase in SIG funding, and as part of a comprehensive effort to maximize the impact of one-time Recovery Act funding, the Administration developed and issued new regulations governing the SIG program. These regulations, which were coordinated with regulations published for two other major education programs in the Recovery Act, the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund and the Race to the Top

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

School turnaround grants

program, were aimed primarily at ensuring that the historic Recovery Act investment in the SIG program was used to implement rigorous school intervention models in the Nation's persistently struggling schools, including many of the high school "dropout factories" with graduation rates below 60 percent.

New Regulations

The new SIG regulations were issued in two parts. First, the Department published SIG final requirements in the Federal Register on December 10, 2009 (74 FR 65618). Second, in response to the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010, which was signed into law on December 16, 2009, and which included new provisions applicable to the SIG program for fiscal years 2009 and 2010, the Department published additional interim final regulations in January 2010. The January 2010 interim final regulations incorporated language in the Consolidated Appropriations Act that expanded school eligibility for the SIG program, while continuing to target funds on the lowest-performing schools. Under these regulations, SEAs and LEAs have the option of serving certain Title I schools that are not in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring and certain schools that are eligible for, but that do not receive, Title I, Part A funds. The interim final regulations also raised the maximum annual amount an LEA may receive under the SIG program from \$500,000 to \$2 million per participating school. The December 2009 and January 2010 regulations were consolidated in a final rule published in the Federal Register on October 8, 2010 (75 FR 66363).

Defining Greatest Need

A key purpose of the SIG regulations was to define more closely the statutory priorities on awarding SIG funds to LEAs that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to ensuring that the funds are used to provide resources that enable the lowest-performing schools to raise substantially the achievement of their students. To drive school improvement funds to LEAs with the greatest need for those funds, the SIG regulations incorporate the common definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools developed for use in the reporting required by the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund and in State plans for turning around their lowest-performing schools under Race to the Top. Persistently lowest-achieving schools are defined generally as: (1) the State's bottom 5 percent, in terms of academic achievement, of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; (2) the bottom 5 percent, in terms of academic achievement, of secondary schools in each State that are eligible for, but that do not receive, Title I, Part A funds; and (3) Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with graduation rates below 60 percent and other Title I-eligible secondary schools with graduation rates below 60 percent. In identifying schools in categories (1) and (2), States must take into account the academic achievement of the "all students" group in each school in terms of proficiency on ESEA reading/language arts and mathematics assessments combined, as well as that group's lack of progress on those assessments. The "bottom 5 percent," as used in the definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools, must include at least five schools.

To determine greatest need for the purposes of the SIG program, the SIG regulations established three tiers of schools based on the definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools and the eligibility requirements of ESEA section 1003(g). Under the regulations, States have

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

School turnaround grants

some flexibility in assigning schools to the three tiers, but in general must adhere to the following guidelines:

- Tier I schools are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that (1) are in the bottom 5 percent of such schools in achievement and are not improving or (2) have graduation rates below 60 percent.
- Tier II schools are secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds and that either (1) are in the State's bottom 5 percent of such schools in terms of achievement and are not improving or (2) have graduation rates below 60 percent.
- Tier III schools are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I.

As discussed above, the final regulations also incorporate the optional expanded eligibility provisions included in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. That Act allows SEAs and LEAs to use SIG funds to serve, in addition to Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, schools that are eligible for (but might or might not receive) Title I, Part A funds and that either: (1) have not made AYP for at least 2 years, or (2) are in the State's lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates. States that choose to add schools that are eligible for SIG funds under these expanded eligibility provisions must ensure that the school is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school in the tier to which it is added. The Department also has provided flexibility, available through a waiver, for States to include low-achieving Title I secondary schools in their lists of Tier II schools (which, absent this waiver, would include only secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds).

Defining Strongest Commitment

States also must determine which LEAs have the strongest commitment to using SIG funds for interventions that are most likely to turn around their lowest-performing schools and produce improved student outcomes. The regulations define "strongest commitment" by an LEA as a commitment to use SIG funds to implement fully and effectively one of the following four school intervention models in each of its Tier I and Tier II schools:

- The Turnaround model, which involves, among other things, replacing the principal and retaining no more than 50 percent of a school's staff, adopting a new governance structure, and implementing an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next, as well as aligned with a State's academic standards.
- The Restart model, which requires an LEA to convert a school to a charter school or close and reopen it under the management of a charter school operator, a charter management organization, or an education management organization that has been selected through a rigorous review process.
- School Closure, which involves closing a school and enrolling its students in other, higher-achieving schools in the LEA.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

School turnaround grants

- The Transformation model, which addresses four specific areas critical to transforming the lowest-performing schools, including replacing the principal and ineffective teachers, comprehensive instructional reform, increasing learning time, and expanding operational flexibility.

LEAs must serve each of their Tier I schools unless they lack the capacity to implement fully and effectively one of these 4 models. They may serve Tier I and Tier II schools only by implementing one of the models. LEAs with 9 or more Tier I or Tier II schools may not implement the Transformation model in more than half of those schools.

Awarding School Improvement Grants to LEAs

In awarding School Improvement Grants to an eligible LEA, an SEA must provide sufficient funding to the LEA to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA applies to serve and to serve participating Tier III schools. More broadly, an SEA must award funds to serve each Tier I and Tier II school that its LEAs apply to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have the capacity to serve, before it awards funding to LEAs to serve Tier III schools. SEAs that did not serve all of their Tier I schools in fiscal year 2009 were required, absent a waiver, to carry over at least 25 percent of their fiscal year 2009 SIG allocations and award these funds through their fiscal year 2010 SIG competitions.

LEAs may receive up to \$2 million annually over 3 years to implement the Turnaround, Restart, or Transformation model in a school; School Closure generally requires only modest funding (e.g., \$50,000 to \$100,000) and is implemented in just 1 year. Beginning in fiscal year 2010, LEAs were permitted to request funding in their first-year budgets for pre-implementation activities conducted in the spring and summer prior to the beginning of the school year in which the LEA will fully implement an intervention model in a Tier I or Tier II school. The Department encourages LEAs that serve high-need Tier III schools to use SIG funds to implement 1 of the 4 models, but they may also use SIG funds to carry out the school improvement activities described in section 1116 of the ESEA.

LEAs must establish annual goals, subject to SEA approval, for student achievement and must report progress on certain leading indicators for their Tier I and Tier II schools. Tier III schools must meet goals established by the LEA and approved by the SEA; for Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, these may be the goals in their improvement plans required by section 1116 of the ESEA. SEAs must review progress toward these goals prior to renewing the second and third years of an LEA's SIG award.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

School turnaround grants

Maximizing the Number of SIG-Eligible Schools Served

In fiscal year 2009, the Department offered a waiver (which all States applied for and were approved to implement) of the period of availability of fiscal year 2009 SIG funds beyond September 30, 2011, the statutory deadline for obligation. These waivers allowed SEAs to use fiscal year 2009 funds to make front-loaded awards to eligible LEAs that provided the full amount of an LEA's 3-year SIG award and thus do not entail continuation costs in subsequent years. For their fiscal year 2010 competitions, the Department encouraged SEAs, after front-loading any awards made with fiscal year 2009 carryover funds, to provide only the first year of 3-year SIG awards made with fiscal year 2010 SIG funds; fiscal year 2011 and 2012 funds would then support the second and third years of these projects. This hybrid funding model reflects the goal of serving the maximum number of Tier I and Tier II schools with the smaller allocations available from the fiscal year 2010 and subsequent SIG appropriations.

SIG under ESEA Flexibility

The SIG program is playing a key role in the differentiated recognition, accountability, and support systems that States are creating and implementing under ESEA flexibility. More specifically, the Department has permitted States receiving ESEA flexibility and submitting applications to make new SIG awards with fiscal year 2012 funds to replace their lists of SIG Tier I, II, and III schools with their lists of priority schools under ESEA flexibility and to provide those funds to LEAs to carry out one of the four SIG school intervention models in those schools. (The priority school definition used in ESEA flexibility is based largely on the definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools in the regulations governing the SIG program.)

New SIG Awards in Fiscal Year 2013

The Department anticipates that States generally will use fiscal year 2013 SIG funds to make new, 3-year front-loaded awards. Assuming an average 3-year award of \$3 million per school, States would support SIG interventions in up to an additional 170 persistently low-performing schools through their fiscal year 2013 competitions, which will be conducted in the spring and summer of 2014.

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

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

School turnaround grants

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

	(dollars in thousands)
2009	\$545,633
Recovery Act.....	3,000,000
2010	545,633
2011	534,552
2012	533,552
2013	533,552 ¹

¹ Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is requesting \$658.6 million for the School Turnaround Grants (under current law School Improvement Grants) program in fiscal year 2014, an increase of \$125 million over the 2012 level. The proposed increase for School Turnaround Grants (STG) would fund a new competitive grant program that would strengthen formula grant implementation by building district-level capacity to support school turnaround efforts and to sustain improvements in schools that have used STG funds to successfully implement a school intervention model. The Department could use a portion of the funds for this program, not to exceed \$25 million, to support district capacity for successful school turnaround by expanding the School Turnaround AmeriCorps initiative, which is administered collaboratively by the Department and the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS). This initiative, currently funded with fiscal year 2012 SIG national activities funds as well as funding from CNCS and other sources, provides grants to place AmeriCorps members in SIG and priority schools to support and enhance school turnaround efforts.

State Formula Grants

The request includes \$533.6 million, the same as the 2012 level, for the State formula grant program. Under the Administration's proposal to reauthorize the ESEA, these formula grants would play a critical role in efforts to implement rigorous interventions in persistently lowest-performing schools, which would be identified through the reauthorized Title I accountability system rather than the three-tiered system established in the SIG final regulations under current law. In general, these would be schools that are in the bottom 5 percent of schools in each State based on student achievement and, at the high school level, graduation rates, and that are not improving.

Under the reauthorization proposal, States would be permitted to reserve funds to build their capacity to improve low-performing schools, including by developing and implementing school quality review teams to assist schools in identifying school needs and in supporting school improvement, and by reviewing and ensuring the effectiveness of external partners. States would subgrant most funds through competitive awards to LEAs (or partnerships of LEAs and nonprofit organizations) to implement one of the locally selected intervention models: turnaround, restart, school closure, or transformation. LEAs and their partners would receive

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

School turnaround grants

3-year awards to implement fully and effectively one of these intervention models, and would be eligible for 2 additional years of funding to support a school's ongoing improvement if the school is showing progress. With the exception of the closure model, each of these models allows flexibility for locally designed plans that recognize and meet a broad range of student needs from preschool through grade 12 and that support investments across the age continuum, from improving the school readiness of young children to helping dropouts return to school and graduate ready for college or a career.

In addition to providing State and local funding, the Department would be authorized to reserve funds to carry out activities designed to enhance the capacity of States, LEAs, and nonprofit organizations to improve schools, such as by investing in model school quality review teams to identify school needs and support school improvement.

Supporting and Sustaining Turnaround Competitive Grants

The \$125 million increase proposed for the STG program in 2014 would fund new competitive grants that build local capacity to support school turnaround efforts and to sustain successful turnarounds following the end of the three-year STG award period. Information gathered through the Department's monitoring and technical assistance efforts consistently shows that local capacity to support and sustain school turnarounds is a major concern for State and local leaders. Indeed, in some cases, concerns about local capacity present a significant barrier to the initial implementation of SIG awards, preventing the "buy in" from school and community leaders that is essential to long-term, sustainable success in turning around low-performing schools. Such concerns are exacerbated in LEAs that face the challenge of implementing school intervention models in an increasing number of schools as well as in rural areas that often face a wide range of capacity constraints.

Under the proposed STG competitive grant program, applicants would seek funding to implement comprehensive plans to support their turnaround schools and to sustain specific interventions in their successful STG-awarded schools. Applicants would include LEAs, consortia of LEAs, and non-profit organizations in partnership with LEAs that serve a minimum of 5 STG-funded schools or non-STG-funded Priority Schools. The Department would give priority to applicants that propose partnerships with entities that have demonstrated effectiveness in turning around low-performing schools or applicants that submit plans for building turnaround capacity in rural areas. Applicants also would be required to demonstrate that their plans are supported by local teachers' unions or associations.

Local plans would include strategies such as adopting district-wide policies for teacher and leader assignment in support of school-level reforms; recruiting and training turnaround leaders; implementing data-based accountability and performance-management tools; creating networks of low-performing schools or pairing low-performing schools with high-performing schools to share turnaround strategies and improve oversight; and increasing parent and community involvement in turnaround planning and implementation. Applicants could also use a portion of any grant award to sustain progress in their successful STG-funded schools by continuing to fund specific interventions after the three-year grant period ends.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

School turnaround grants

The Department also could use a portion of the requested funds to build district capacity for school turnaround by expanding the School Turnaround AmeriCorps initiative. This initiative supports the national effort to turn around the country's lowest-performing schools by leveraging AmeriCorps' pre-existing national service infrastructure, local and national non-profit and private organizations, and community partners. The program provides SIG-awarded and priority schools served under States' ESEA flexibility plans with AmeriCorps members who will support critical interventions aligned to the local turnaround plans of schools and districts. These funds would support AmeriCorps members trained to implement interventions that are evidence-based or evidence-informed, including in specific areas that districts have had challenges addressing on their own, such as increased learning time, social/emotional supports, and community engagement. The School Turnaround AmeriCorps initiative would also help districts build their capacity to sustain successful practices by using AmeriCorps members to carry out activities that have been identified as effective in schools that are finishing their last year of SIG funding. Department funds would be matched by contributions from CNCS, school districts, and private sources. The use of a portion of the requested funds to expand the School Turnaround AmeriCorps initiative would leverage the expertise of the Department and CNCS to help provide personalized supports for struggling students and communities that would make dramatic changes in many of the Nation's lowest-performing schools.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
State Formula Grants			
Amount to States	\$502,120	\$502,120	\$502,120
Range of State awards	\$1,171-\$61,846	\$1,172-\$60,515	\$1,172-\$60,515
Average State award	\$9,656	\$9,656	\$9,656
Amount to BIE	\$3,332	\$3,324	\$3,324
Amount to Outlying Areas	\$1,422	\$1,430	\$1,430
Supporting School Turnaround Grants			
Amount for awards	0	0	\$125,000
Number of awards	0	0	20-25
Range of awards	0	0	\$2,000-20,000
Average award	0	0	\$5,000
National activities	\$26,678	\$26,678	\$26,678

NOTES: The 2012 appropriations act authorizes the Department to use up to 5 percent, or \$26,678 thousand, of SIG funds for activities to build SEA and LEA capacity to effectively implement the SIG program. As of March 2013, the Department planned to use approximately \$15,000 thousand under this authority, or roughly 3 percent of the fiscal year 2012 appropriation. The Department has not yet determined the specific amount that it would use for national activities in fiscal years 2013 or 2014.

2013 excludes 0.612 percent cross-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

School turnaround grants

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The final requirements for the School Improvement Grants (SIG) program include reporting metrics intended to help the Department, States, and LEAs evaluate the effectiveness of the required interventions and to inform technical assistance activities. States must report to the Department on the LEAs that received SIG awards, the size of the awards, and the schools served by each LEA with SIG funds (including the level of support provided to each participating school). States also must report school-level information, such as the type of intervention, student achievement levels, graduation and dropout rates, and data on teacher performance and school climate. The Department collects these data through its *EDFacts* system. The Department also will develop indicators to measure its own performance in administering the SIG program.

Schools Eligible for and Receiving SIG Grants

In May 2011, the Department published *Baseline Analyses of SIG Applications and SIG-Eligible and SIG-Awarded Schools* (SIG Baseline Study), which provides descriptive analyses of States' fiscal year 2009 SIG competitions and is available at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20114019/>. The SIG Baseline Study showed that States identified a total of 1,107 Tier I schools, 1,034 Tier II schools, and 13,136 Tier III schools that were eligible to receive SIG funds in the fiscal year 2009 competitions. Of the total of 15,277 eligible schools identified, 55 percent were elementary schools, 20 percent were middle schools, 19 percent were high schools, and 6 percent were "non-standard."

According to the study, States funded in the fiscal year 2009 SIG competitions 514 Tier I schools, 312 Tier II schools, and 402 Tier III schools. Of the total of 1,228 schools served, 32 percent were elementary schools, 22 percent were middle schools, 40 percent were high schools, and 5 percent were "non-standard." States made just over half of SIG awards to urban schools, about one-quarter to suburban schools, and about one-quarter to rural schools. High schools were particularly likely to be funded, receiving 40 percent of SIG awards while constituting just 19 percent of eligible schools. Rural schools also competed successfully, receiving almost a quarter of awards despite constituting only one-fifth of eligible schools. The following table compares SIG-eligible and SIG-awarded schools by grade range and school locale:

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

School turnaround grants

Comparison of FY 2009 SIG-Eligible and SIG-Awarded Schools by School Level and Locale

Grade range	SIG-eligible schools	SIG-awarded schools
Elementary	55.3%	32.2%
Middle	20.1%	22.1%
High	19.1%	40.4%
Non-standard	5.5%	5.2%
Locale Type		
Central City	44.9%	52.5%
Urban Fringe	35.2%	24.3%
Rural	19.9%	23.2%

Other key findings of the SIG Baseline Study include the following:

- Nearly three-quarters (603 schools, or 74 percent) of SIG-awarded Tier I and Tier II schools are implementing the transformation model, while 20 percent (168 schools) are implementing the turnaround model. Just 33 schools, or 4 percent, are implementing the restart model and 16 schools, or 2 percent, are implementing school closure.
- Award amounts varied by tier and by State. The average 3-year award among Tier I and Tier II schools was \$2.54 million, compared to \$520,000 among Tier III schools.
- The percentage increase in overall per-pupil funding associated with SIG varied across States. The highest State average increase in per-pupil funding in Tier I and Tier II schools receiving SIG awards was 58 percent (in Montana) while the lowest was 3 percent (in Vermont).

In October 2012, the Department published *School Improvement Grants: Analyses of State Applications and Eligible and Awarded Schools*, which analyzes States' fiscal year 2010 SIG competitions and compares them to the fiscal year 2009 competitions, and is available at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20124060/>. The study shows that in their 2010 competitions States made SIG awards to an additional 315 Tier I schools, 174 Tier II schools, and 111 Tier III schools, a total of 600 schools. According to the study, this second SIG cohort largely mirrors the first cohort in distribution of schools by grade range, locale type, and intervention model implemented. The average 3-year award among Tier I and Tier II schools in fiscal year 2010 competitions was \$2.84 million, an increase of \$300,000 over that for the first cohort; the average award among Tier III schools saw a similar increase, from \$520,000 for the first cohort to \$810,000 for the second.

Implementation and Outcomes of SIG Grants

In January 2013, the Department initiated a set of quick-turnaround studies designed to accelerate collection and dissemination of promising practices in the school turnaround field. These studies will be informed by interviews of selected States, LEAs, and schools receiving SIG funds and analyses of implementation data and will address topics such as turnaround

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

School turnaround grants

leadership, data-based decision-making, school climate, community engagement, and capacity building. The results of these studies are expected to be released in phases beginning in summer 2013.

The Department is also evaluating the implementation and impact of school turnaround efforts in both the Race to the Top (RTT) and SIG programs. This evaluation will involve collecting data from all 50 States and DC, as well as roughly 60 LEAs and 525 schools. The study will focus on (1) the implementation of RTT and SIG; (2) the relationship between receipt of RTT funds and student outcomes; (3) the impact of the receipt of SIG funds on student outcomes in the lowest-achieving schools; and (4) the relationship between the four school turnaround models (and related improvement strategies) and student outcomes and school performance. Data collection for this study will continue through the 2013-14 school year. The Department expects to begin releasing evaluation briefs on specific topics in mid-2013, with the first full report scheduled for release in early 2014.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Evaluation

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Sections 1501 and 1503)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	Change <u>from 2012</u>
\$3,194	\$3,194 ²	0	-\$3,194

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

² Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) authorizes a separate appropriation for the evaluation of Title I programs. The Department uses these funds to carry out objective measurement and systematic analyses of the Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program, the Federal Government's largest investment in elementary and secondary education. These evaluations compare actual results with program objectives and provide the data needed to make sound decisions on program policies and resources and to guide program improvement in the field.

The ESEA required a comprehensive, multi-year national assessment on the implementation and impact of the Title I Grants to LEAs. Data from the multi-year national assessment are included in two reports. The first, a 2009 report entitled *Title I Implementation: Update on Recent Evaluation Findings*, provides a summary of findings from Title I evaluation studies that have become available after the publication of the National Assessment of Title I final report in 2007. The second report, *State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, Volume IX-Accountability Under NCLB: Final Report*, was published in 2010 and provides updated information on State, district, and school implementation of NCLB provisions concerning accountability and school improvement. Funding under this program has also supported 9 volumes of reports on the *State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)* as well as a series of reports on specialized topics. Some of those specialized topics include analyses of States' accountability provisions; implementation and outcome findings in districts that received waivers to serve as supplemental educational services providers, despite being districts identified for improvement; an evaluation of the growth model pilot project, a project initiated to allow States to experiment with adjustments to the NCLB status accountability system, which informed the Administration's future decisions on accountability under ESEA Flexibility; and an examination of the Title I comparability requirement, which included the first national data collection on school-level expenditures. These reports, as well as

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Evaluation

other related Title I evaluation reports, are available in full on the Department of Education's Web site at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/opepd/ppss/reports.html#title>.

Ongoing studies under way in fiscal year 2013 include the following:

- The implementation of ESEA Title I and Title II program initiatives. This study will examine the implementation of policies promoted through the ESEA at the State, district and school levels in four core areas: State content standards, aligned assessments, accountability and school turnaround, and developing effective teachers and leaders. The study will address changes since the previous national assessment of Title I (in 2006) as well as ESEA flexibility. The study will include a survey of all 50 States and DC, as well as a nationally representative sample of 570 school districts, 1,300 schools, and 9,100 teachers.
- Early childhood language development. Data from 83 Title I schools, collected during the 2011-2012 school year, will be analyzed to estimate the associations between instructional programs and programs for students in preschool through grade 3 and the outcomes for those students.
- Case studies of the implementation of school turnaround models. These case studies, involving approximately 60 schools in 6 States, will focus on the change process in schools implementing school turnaround models and examine leading indicators of successful implementation of the models to provide information useful to both policy-makers and practitioners.
- Early implementation of ESEA flexibility. This study of 12 States and 24 school districts that have begun the first full year of implementing provisions under ESEA flexibility will provide reports of early implementation of ESEA flexibility to policy-makers as they continue to refine policy and technical assistance to States on issues related to the flexibility provisions.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009	\$9,167
2010	9,167
2011	8,151
2012	3,194
2013	3,194 ¹

¹ Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for Title I Evaluation in fiscal year 2014. The Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal would consolidate this activity into a broader evaluation authority aimed at supporting comprehensive evaluation of the

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Evaluation

implementation, outcomes, impact, and cost-effectiveness of ESEA programs. Funding would be made available through a reservation of up to 0.5 percent of the funds appropriated each year for programs authorized by Title I of the ESEA and up to 1.5 percent of the funds appropriated each year for all other ESEA programs.

Education improvement is an on-going process of building our knowledge about what is working in improving practice and results for students. Understanding how ESEA programs are being implemented and whether they are achieving their intended outcomes is essential for improvement. However, the current fragmentation of evaluation authorities and funding hampers effective evaluation and the development of effective performance management strategies. The proposed cross-cutting reservation of funds would provide resources to conduct rigorous, objective evaluations of ESEA programs, policies, and practices, while also supporting performance measurement essential for management improvement. In addition, the new authority would enable the Department to provide increased technical assistance on evaluation to States and LEAs in order to promote quality and comparability of evaluation results.

Under the reauthorization proposal, the Department would be required to develop and submit to Congress an evaluation plan every 2 years describing proposed evaluation activities and the reservations required to fund this plan. The evaluation plan would identify the Department's key priorities for evaluations and related knowledge-building activities, such as strengthening performance measures and improving grantee evaluations, within and across program offices. The plan would support appropriate resource allocation and help ensure that evaluations generate usable knowledge that informs program improvement, policy development, and budget decision-making for Federal, State, and local decision-makers. The Department would be required to use at least 30 percent of any funds reserved for evaluation to conduct impact studies that employ experimental designs and other methodologies that support causal inferences.

In addition to evaluation and impact studies, the Department would carry out analyses of data from evaluations and other sources intended to inform policy-making and promote continuous program improvement. A recent example of this kind of activity is the policy brief published in November 2011 entitled: *The Potential Impact of Revising the Title I Comparability Requirement to Focus on School-Level Expenditures*, which was based on a study of school-level expenditures conducted in response to a requirement in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. The currently funded study of ESEA Flexibility will be another example of a quick turnaround study with the same overarching goal of informing policy-making and promoting continuous program improvement.

The Administration's reauthorization proposal also would permit the Department to use funds reserved for ESEA evaluation to complete evaluations that were initiated before ESEA reauthorization.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Evaluation

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Implementation of Title I and Title II Program Initiatives	\$1,662	\$1,947	0
Study of Early Childhood Language Development	0	500	0
School Turnaround Study	1,132	400	0
Data Analysis and Support	<u>400</u>	<u>347</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, Evaluation	3,194	3,194	0

NOTE: 2013 excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Migrant student education

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	Change <u>from 2012</u>
	\$393,236	\$393,236 ²	\$393,236	0

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2014.

² Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Migrant Education program (MEP) provides financial assistance to State educational agencies (SEAs) to establish and improve programs of education for children of migratory farmworkers and fishers. The goal of the MEP is to enable migrant children: (1) to meet the same academic standards as other children; and (2) to graduate from high school or a GED program with an education that prepares them for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment. To help achieve this objective, program services help migratory children overcome the educational disruption and other challenges that result from repeated moves. The program statute encourages activities to promote coordination of needed services across States and encourages greater access for migratory children to services available under the Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) and other programs authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), so that MEP funds can be used for services not already available from those programs to meet the unique needs of migrant students. Migratory children who have made a "qualifying move" within the last 3 years are generally eligible to be counted and served by the program. A move is considered to be a qualifying move if it: (1) is a change of residence due to economic necessity; (2) involves crossing school district boundaries; (3) is made in order to obtain temporary or seasonal work in agriculture or fishing; and (4) was made in the preceding 36 months.

Because the program appropriation has not exceeded the fiscal year 2002 level of \$396 million, State allocations are still based on the amount each State received in fiscal year 2002. Under the statute, all funds in excess of \$396 million would be allocated through a statutory formula based on each State's per-pupil expenditure for education, its count of eligible migratory students aged 3 through 21 residing within the State in the previous year, and its count of students who received services in summer or intersession programs provided by the State.

The Department may set aside up to \$10 million from the annual MEP appropriation for contracts and grants to improve inter- and intra-State migrant coordination activities, including

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Migrant student education

academic credit accrual and exchange programs for migrant students. The Department is required to consult with States receiving allocations of \$1 million or less about whether they can increase the cost-effectiveness of their programs by entering into inter-state consortium arrangements. By law, the Department may reserve up to \$3 million a year from coordination funds for incentive grants of not more than \$250,000 to such consortia.

The statute requires the Department to assist States in developing effective methods for the electronic transfer of migrant student records. The Department developed the Migrant Student Information Exchange System (MSIX) to enable States to exchange migrant student data records efficiently and expeditiously and provide an accurate, unduplicated count of the number of migrant students on a national and Statewide basis.

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009	394,771
2010	394,771
2011	393,981
2012	393,236
2013	393,236 ¹

¹ Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2014, the Department requests \$393.2 million for the Title I Migrant Student Education program, the same amount as the 2012 appropriation. The fiscal year 2014 appropriation would support a reauthorized program that would continue to fund activities that identify highly mobile migratory children and youth, provide them comprehensive services that address their specific needs, and promote coordination of the Federal resources available to serve this population.

The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2014 under reauthorized legislation. The Administration's reauthorization proposal would revise the funding formula to address the problems identified in program reviews and audit findings. The current formula includes provisions that are cumbersome, difficult to interpret, and based on child counts from fiscal year 2001. The reauthorization proposal would simplify the formula and ensure that allocations respond to shifts in State counts of migrant students. The proposal would also improve targeting of services to migrant students by strengthening the program purpose language and sharpening the provisions that determine which students receive priority for program services. State and local recipients would continue to have wide flexibility in how they allocate program funds so long as they track and report on the academic achievement of migratory students in the State.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Migrant student education

Migrant students represent an especially disadvantaged, hard-to-serve group due to a multitude of risk factors present in the population. In particular, the movement of these children across school district and State boundaries means that, in general, no single school district or State has ongoing responsibility for the education of these students, thus creating a need for Federal support to assist in the coordination of services to meet their educational needs.

Moreover, the characteristics of the migrant population create a need for educational services that go well beyond services traditionally supported with State and local education budgets. In addition to being highly mobile, migrant students tend to live in poverty, have limited English proficiency, and belong to families that are likely to experience food and job insecurity and poor health and housing conditions. Almost one-third (29 percent) of the children and youth eligible to receive services under the program in 2010-2011 had moved within the previous 12 months. In addition, 36 percent of eligible children and youth were limited English proficient.

Migrant children and youth may also help their families perform agricultural work, and a growing number of migrant "emancipated youth" travel without a parent or guardian to obtain migratory work in the fields and in processing plants. A significant proportion of migrant individuals eligible for services under the program (15 percent of the eligible population in 2010-2011) are school-aged youth who do not attend school.

Data for 2010-11 indicate that the program provided services to 223,226 migrant students during the regular school year and 130,743 during the summer or intersessions. Program funds supported 4,267 projects that operated during the school day, 961 projects that provided an extended school day during the regular school year, 849 summer or intersession projects, and 1,646 year-round projects. The program served 4,642 children aged birth through 2; 27,920 children aged 3 through 5; 214,110 children and youth in kindergarten through grade 12; and 22,191 out-of-school youth. Services provided included supplemental instruction in reading, math, and other academic areas, family literacy and preschool instruction, and high school credit accrual. Program funds were also used to provide such support services as counseling, health and nutrition services, advocacy and referrals for migrant students with disabilities, and (especially in the summer) transportation.

The Department would reserve approximately \$10 million from the fiscal year 2014 appropriation for migrant coordination and national activities, including \$3 million for consortium incentive grants. The remainder of the funds would be used for activities related to inter- and intra-State coordination, primarily for maintenance and operation of the MSIX, including for technical assistance to States as they continue to implement their systems for collecting and exchanging data on migrant students.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Migrant student education

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Number of eligible children	408,888	385,000	385,000
SEA program:			
Amount for State grants	\$383,236	\$383,236	\$383,236
Range of State awards	\$69-\$134,761	\$69-\$134,761	\$69-\$134,761
Coordination activities:			
Consortium incentive grants	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000
Migrant student information exchange and related coordination activities	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000

NOTE: 2013 excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years, and in FY 2014 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Goal: To assist all migrant students in meeting challenging academic standards and achieving graduation from high school (or a GED program) with an education that prepares them for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.

Objective: *Along with other Federal programs and State and local reform efforts, the Migrant Education Program (MEP) will contribute to improved school performance of migrant children.*

Measure: Number of States (of States reporting) meeting the performance target in reading at the elementary school level for migrant students.

Year	Target Number of States	Number of States
2009	31	27
2010	33	24
2011	35	24
2012	36	
2013	37	
2014	24	

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Migrant student education

Measure: The number of States meeting the performance target in reading at the middle school level for migrant students.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	25	25
2010	27	22
2011	29	26
2012	31	
2013	33	
2014	25	

Measure: The number of States meeting an annually set performance target in mathematics at the elementary school level for migrant students.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	31	36
2010	33	32
2011	35	31
2012	37	
2013	39	
2014	27	

Measure: The number of States meeting an annually set performance target in mathematics for middle school migrant students.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	23	27
2010	25	25
2011	27	25
2012	29	
2013	31	
2014	24	

Additional information: These measures call for States to reach a performance for 50 percent of migrant students performing at the proficient or above level on State reading and mathematics assessments. Data for elementary students include data for grades 3-5; data for middle school students include data for grades 6-8. As more States reach the initial target level, the Department will raise the target accordingly. Forty-eight States reported reading proficiency data in 2011 and 47 reported mathematics proficiency data that year. Forty-eight States participated in the program in 2011. One State did not report mathematics proficiency data because the number of migrant students taking the assessment was too small to yield valid and reliable results for that subgroup. The source of the data is the Consolidated State Performance Reports that States submit to the Department. Data for 2012 will be available in summer 2013.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Migrant student education

Based on State data, 51.4 percent of migrant 4th-grade students were proficient in reading and 59.9 percent in math in 2011, an increase from 49.7 percent in reading and 58.7 percent in math in 2010. For 8th-grade migrant students, 48.3 percent were proficient in reading in 2011 and 45.9 percent in math, an increase from 47.1 percent in reading and 44.6 percent in math in 2010.

Measure: The number of States meeting an annually set performance target for dropout rate for migrant students.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	27	41
2010	29	38
2011	31	
2012	33	
2013	35	
2014	35	

Measure: The number of States meeting an annually set performance target for high school graduation of migrant students.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	18	26
2010	19	33
2011	20	
2012	21	
2013	22	
2014	23	

Additional information: The measures call for States to reach a performance target of 50 percent or fewer migrant students dropping out of school and 50 percent or more migrant students graduating from high school. Thirty-eight out of 47 participating States reported dropout data in 2010, and 39 States reported graduation data. Note that variation in States' calculation of dropout rates limits the validity of comparisons across the States. As nearly all States are now using the 4-year cohort graduate rate calculations required under ESEA Title I regulations, validity and reliability of the data has improved over time. The source of the data is the Consolidated State Performance Reports that States submit to the Department. Data for 2011 will be available in summer 2013.

Efficiency Measures

The Department established an efficiency measure associated with the transfer of migrant student records. This measure assesses annual changes in the percentage of actively migrating students for which the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) system has consolidated records that reflect a complete history of school and health information. The MSIX integrates procedures designed to achieve efficiencies and cost reductions by linking separate State and

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Migrant student education

local efforts to transfer health and education records into a single system that can be used within and across all States.

Measure: The percentage of migrant student records consolidated in MSIX when school enrollment has occurred in more than one State. (Phase I)

Year	Target	Actual
2009	50	26.5
2010	75	87.0
2011	100	
2012	100	
2013	100	
2014	100	

Additional information: The system began collecting data from a number of States in December 2007, but not every State had access to the system at that time. The Department continues to work with States to ensure that their data systems meet the appropriate technical standards needed to connect to MSIX. In addition, the Department has developed a 3-phase plan to ensure that States collect all the required student data elements and make them available to other States through MSIX. The data reported in this table represent the percentage of consolidated records for migrant students entered into MSIX under phase 1. Under phase 1, States are to collect and make available all data elements for basic student information; under phase 2, States would add student assessment data; and under phase 3, States would add credit accrual information for secondary students. The Department plans to issue regulations to establish deadlines for collecting and transmitting data to MSIX under each phase. This measure will have greater validity and reliability over time as State procedures for collecting and providing the data elements improve. Data for 2011 will be available in summer 2013

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Neglected and delinquent children and youth education

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	Change <u>from 2012</u>
	\$50,231	\$50,231 ²	\$50,231	0

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2014.

² Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Title I Neglected and Delinquent (N and D) program provides financial assistance to State educational agencies (SEAs) for provision of education services to neglected and delinquent children and youth in State-run institutions, attending community day programs, and in correctional facilities. Funds are allocated to States through a formula based on the number of children in State-operated institutions and per-pupil education expenditures for the State. Each State's N and D allocation is generated by child counts in State institutions that provide at least 20 hours of instruction a week from non-Federal funds; adult correctional institutions must provide 15 hours a week. State institutions serving children with an average length of stay of at least 30 days are eligible to receive funds. Adult correctional institutions must give priority for services to youth who are likely to be released within a 2-year period.

Like other Title I programs, the N and D program requires institutions receiving funds to gear their services to the State academic content and achievement standards that all children are expected to meet. Similar to the school-wide program option under the Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program, all juvenile facilities may operate institution-wide education programs in which they use Title I funds in combination with other available Federal and State funds; this option allows juvenile institutions to serve a larger proportion of their eligible population and to align their programs more closely with other education services in order to meet participants' educational and occupational training needs. States are required to reserve between 15 and 30 percent of their allocations for projects to help N and D participants make the transition from State institutions to locally operated programs or to support the successful entry of youth offenders into postsecondary and career and technical education programs.

The Department may reserve up to 2.5 percent of the appropriation for national activities, including the development of a uniform model to evaluate Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs, and technical assistance to help build the capacity of State agency programs.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Neglected and delinquent children and youth education

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009	\$50,427
2010	50,427
2011	50,326
2012	50,231
2013	50,231 ¹

¹ Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2014, the Administration requests \$50.2 million, the same as the 2012 level, for the Neglected and Delinquent (N and D) program. The activities supported with this funding would help an estimated 107,000 N and D students return to and complete school and obtain employment after they are released from State institutions.

The N and D program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2014 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal. The reauthorized program would support States in helping neglected and delinquent children and youth receive instruction aligned with the State's college- and career-ready standards and in helping them transition into locally operated programs and postsecondary and career and technical education programs.

The Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal would also amend ESEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, under which SEAs currently use funding from the Title I, Part A program to make subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to support the provision of educational services for children and youth in local institutions and schools who are neglected, delinquent, or at risk of dropping out. The reauthorization proposal would target the Subpart 2 program on institutionalized children and youth, who may not be served adequately by the Title I, Part A program.

The population served by the Subpart 1 program is extremely disadvantaged and isolated, and research has shown that the youth served are up to 3 years behind in grade level and generally lack job skills. A study by Harris, Baltodano, Bal, Jolivette, and Malcahy (2009) of youth incarcerated in three long-term correctional facilities found low levels of reading achievement among this population, with significantly lower levels for certain ethnic and racial groups and for students in special education. Another study, by Balfanz, Spiridakis, Neild, and Legters (2003), noted that incarcerated youths in a large mid-Atlantic city tended to have failed at least half of their classes and had extremely low attendance rates in the year prior to incarceration.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Neglected and delinquent children and youth education

Moreover, a study by Keith and McCray (2002) reported on the special and underserved needs of incarcerated youth offenders with reading disabilities. The longstanding nature of this problem is demonstrated by a 1996 study from the Educational Testing Service showing that while most of the inmates in America's prisons would eventually be paroled, two-thirds did not have the literacy skills needed to function in society. The findings of these reports show the importance of programs focused on improving outcomes for neglected and delinquent youth and preparing these students for further education or to enter the workforce.

The Department has some evidence that the program is producing positive outcomes. Data reported by States in ESEA Consolidated State Performance Reports for 2011 indicate that approximately 70 percent of students enrolled in an N and D program or facility for 90 or more consecutive calendar days showed improved performance on assessments in reading and math. In addition, the percentage of participating students earning high school course credits while in an N and D program has increased. The Department is continuing to provide technical assistance to States to help ensure that they are providing effective transition services to enable students leaving State institutions to continue their schooling or seek employment. The Department is also continuing to develop better means of tracking data on achievement once students leave institutions, including data on high school graduation rates for program participants.

From the 2014 request, the Department would reserve approximately \$1.3 million to continue to provide technical assistance and other services through the National Evaluation and Technical Assistance Center for Children who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk. Some of the center's activities include: (1) developing a national model for evaluating the effectiveness of N and D programs; (2) collecting and disseminating information on tools and effective practices that can be used to support N and D youth; and (3) providing technical assistance, using experts and practitioners, to State agencies.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Number of participating institutions	861	861	861
Estimated number of students served	106,747	106,747	106,747
Average Federal contribution per child (whole dollars)	\$470	\$470	\$470
Range of awards to States	\$84-\$3,003	\$84-\$3,003	\$84-\$3,003
Average State award	\$942	\$942	\$942
National activities	\$1,256	\$1,256	\$1,256

NOTE: 2013 excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Neglected and delinquent children and youth education

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2014 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Goal: To ensure that neglected and delinquent children and youth will have the opportunity to meet the challenging State standards needed to further their education and become productive members of society.

Objective: *Neglected or delinquent (N or D) students will improve academic and vocational skills needed to further their education.*

Measure: The percentage of students supported through the N and D program who obtain a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	12.8	10.6
2010	13.4	11.2
2011	14.1	12.8
2012	13.8	
2013	14.8	
2014	15.8	

Additional information: The Department revised its performance targets in 2013 to better align with recent performance.

Measure: The percentage of students supported through the N and D program earning high school course credits.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	55.2	47.9
2010	58.0	52.0
2011	60.9	55.6
2012	56.6	
2013	57.6	
2014	58.6	

Additional information: This measure includes students between the ages of 13 and 21 in neglected, juvenile detention, and juvenile correctional institutions, and not students in adult

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Neglected and delinquent children and youth education

corrections. The Department revised its performance targets in 2013 to better align with recent performance.

Measure: The percentage of long-term students supported through the N and D program who improve reading skills as measured through State-approved assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	88.2	68.3
2010	92.6	69.9
2011	97.2	70.4
2012	71.4	
2013	72.4	
2014	73.4	

Measure: The percentage of long-term students supported through the N and D program who improve mathematics skills as measured through State-approved assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	80.2	70.7
2010	84.2	71.3
2011	88.4	71.9
2012	72.9	
2013	73.9	
2014	74.9	

Additional information: Student counts are based on the number of long-term students (those enrolled in a participating program or facility for 90 or more consecutive calendar days) who are in N and D institutions and complete pre- and post-testing in reading and mathematics. These are not the same as the State assessments required under ESEA Title I and do not necessarily reflect State proficiency levels. The Department revised its performance targets in 2013 to better align with recent performance.

Efficiency Measure

Measure: The cost per high school diploma or equivalent.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	\$3,978	\$5,013
2010	3,739	5,256
2011	3,515	4,566
2012	4,520	
2013	4,475	
2014	4,430	

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Neglected and delinquent children and youth education

Additional information: This measure attempts to determine program cost efficiency by tracking the ratio of the number of participating students achieving a high school diploma or its equivalent to the cost of the program. The Department revised its performance targets in 2013 to better align with recent performance.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Homeless children and youth education

(McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Title VII, Subtitle B)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: Indefinite

Budget Authority:

	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change</u> <u>from 2012</u>
	\$65,173	\$65,173 ¹	\$65,173	0

¹ Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Homeless Children and Youth program helps ensure that all homeless children and youth have equal access to the same free, appropriate public education available to other children through grants to States to: (1) establish or designate an Office of Coordinator of Education of Homeless Children and Youth; (2) develop and carry out a State plan for the education of homeless children; and (3) make subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to support the education of those children.

The Department allocates program funds to States through a formula based on each State's share of funds under Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), with each State guaranteed the greater of \$150,000, 0.25 percent of the total program appropriation for the fiscal year, or the amount of the State's fiscal year 2001 allocation. Program funds are also reserved for the outlying areas (0.1 percent of a fiscal year's appropriation) and the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) of the Department of the Interior (1 percent). In addition, the Department is authorized to reserve funds to provide technical assistance (if requested by a State) and conduct evaluation and dissemination activities.

A State may reserve up to 25 percent (or in the case of a State receiving the minimum award, 50 percent) of its allocation for State-level activities and must use remaining funds to make subgrants to LEAs. LEAs may use subgrant funds for such activities as providing enriched supplemental instruction, transportation, professional development, referrals to health care, and other services to facilitate the enrollment, attendance, and success in school of homeless children, including preschool-aged children, and youth.

The McKinney-Vento Act explicitly prohibits States that receive program funds from segregating homeless students in separate schools, except for short periods of time for health and safety emergencies or to provide temporary, special, and supplementary services. This prohibition does not apply separate schools for homeless children or youth that were operating in fiscal

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Homeless children and youth education

year 2000 in four counties (San Joaquin, Orange, and San Diego counties in California, and Maricopa County in Arizona) if those schools and their LEAs meet certain requirements.

The Homeless Children and Youth Education program is a forward-funded program. Funds become available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year for which they are appropriated and remain available through September 30 of the following year.

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

	(dollars in thousands)
2009	\$65,427
Recovery Act.....	70,000
2010	65,427
2011	65,296
2012	65,173
2013	65,173 ¹

¹ Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2014, the Administration requests \$65.2 million for the Homeless Children and Youth Education program (which under current law is named the Education for Homeless Children and Youths program and is in the School Improvement Programs account), the same amount as the fiscal year 2012 level. The Administration is proposing to strengthen this program through the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The fiscal year 2014 appropriation would fund the first year of operations of a reauthorized program, which would more directly target resources to homeless children and remove barriers to serving them effectively. Under the reauthorization proposal, program funds would be allocated to States based on the most recent State-reported data on the number of homeless children and youth rather than on State shares of ESEA Title I, Part A funds, a change that would help ensure that program funds flow to States on the basis of need. The proposal also would eliminate the exemption to the prohibition against operating separate schools for homeless youth; this change is needed because homeless students are unlikely to receive a high-quality education in a segregated environment and because of the stigma attached to groups of students placed in segregated schools. The proposal would also support efforts to improve and accelerate the identification of homeless students and would increase transparency by requiring States to report on academic outcomes for homeless students served by the program, including high school graduation and college enrollment rates.

This program is an important component of the national effort to end the cycle of homelessness. Homeless children face many barriers that impede their educational access and success, such as immunization, transportation, and guardianship needs. This program helps reduce and eliminate those barriers while providing homeless children access to academic services available to other children, including preschool programs, special education, gifted and talented programs, and career and technical education.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Homeless children and youth education

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Amount for State grants	\$63,604	\$63,562	\$63,562
Average State award	1,223	1,222	1,222
Amount to Outlying Areas	65	65	65
Amount to BIE	652	652	652
National activities	852	894	894

NOTE: 2013 excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

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 2014 and future years as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Goal: To ensure access of homeless children and youth to the same free, appropriate public education as is provided to other children and youth.

Objective: Homeless children and youth will have greater access to a free and appropriate public education.

Measure: The percentage of homeless children and youth, grades three through eight, included in statewide assessments in reading and mathematics, as reported by LEA subgrantees.

In 2011, 98.5 percent of students identified as homeless at the time of State assessments were included in State assessments in reading, and 98.6 percent of such students were included in State assessments in mathematics.

Additional Information: For 2011, the Department developed a new method of calculating assessment participation rates of homeless students using different data elements in the Education Data Exchange Network. We believe this method produces more accurate and reliable results than the method used in prior years. Because, with this change, results are not comparable across years, we are providing participation rate data for 2011 only.

Data for this measure for 2012 will be available in the summer of 2013.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Homeless children and youth education

Measure: The percentage of assessed homeless students, grades three through eight, who meet or exceed proficiency on State assessments in reading and mathematics.

Year	Target – Reading	Actual – Reading	Target – Math	Actual – Math
2009	55	50	55	50
2010	57	53	57	52
2011	60	51	60	51
2012	63		63	
2013	66		66	
2014	69		69	

Source of data: Consolidated State Performance Reports

Additional Information: Data for this measure are reported only for LEAs receiving subgrants under the program. Beginning in 2009, the Department has directed States to report data based on whether homeless students were enrolled in LEAs with subgrants rather than whether the students were served by (but not necessarily enrolled in) such LEAs. Because student enrollment data are available for verification in State data systems, the Department believes that these data are the more reliable.

Data for this measure for 2012 will be available in the summer of 2013.

The Department has worked to improve performance and reporting for this and the preceding measure by requiring States to report on the measures through the Consolidated State Performance Report and the Education Data Exchange Network and by providing, together with the National Center for Homeless Education (the Department’s technical assistance contractor), a variety of guidance and technical assistance, including an annually updated Federal data collection guide for the program. The Department is also currently working with its Data Quality Initiative contractor to assess the reliability of State-reported data on homeless students.

Efficiency Measure

The Department has established the following efficiency measure for the program:

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009	40	26
2010	40	31
2011	40	35
2012	40	32
2013	40	
2014	40	

Additional Information: This measure provides information on monitoring visits to States conducted by the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. These visits cover the following Department formula grant programs: College- and Career-Ready Students, Neglected

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Homeless children and youth education

and Delinquent Children and Youth Education, Homeless Children and Youth Education, and Language Acquisition State Grants. In 2011, the Department's monitoring effort focused on the School Turnaround Grants program in selecting States for monitoring and used different monitoring protocols.

Other Information

The Department initiated a national study of implementation of the Homeless Children and Youth Education program in the fall of 2010. The study will examine, at the State and local levels, program administration and use of funds, efforts to collect data on homeless students, policies to remove barriers faced by homeless students, and coordination of services to homeless students. Results from the study are expected to be available in the summer of 2013.

State tables