

**Department of Education**  
**INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS**

**Fiscal Year 2014 Request**

**CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Appropriations Language .....	H-1
Appropriation Adjustments and Transfers .....	H-2
Summary of Changes .....	H-4
Authorizing Legislation .....	H-7
Appropriations History .....	H-10
Significant Items in FY 2013 Appropriations Reports.....	H-11
Summary of Request .....	H-13
Activities:	
Race to the top.....	H-19
Investing in innovation.....	H-25
STEM Innovation:	
STEM innovation networks.....	H-32
Mathematics and science partnerships.....	H-41
High school redesign.....	H-47
Excellent instructional teams.....	H-51
Excellent instructional teams consolidations:	
Improving teacher quality State grants.....	H-57
Teacher incentive fund .....	H-67
Transition to teaching .....	H-73
Teacher quality partnership .....	H-79
School leadership.....	H-86
Expanding educational options.....	H-91
Expanding educational options consolidations:	
Charter schools grants .....	H-94
Credit enhancement for charter school facilities .....	H-103
Magnet schools assistance .....	H-108
Fund for the improvement of education: programs of national significance.....	H-114
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>.

## **INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS**

### **NOTE**

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

**INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS**

**Appropriation Adjustments and Transfers**  
(dollars in thousands)

Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers	2012	2013	2014
<b>Discretionary:</b>			
Appropriation.....	\$1,530,429	\$1,527,536	\$5,335,000
Across-the board reduction (P.L. 112-74).....	-2,893	0	0
Across-the board increase (P.L. 112-175).....	0	9,349	0
Total, adjusted discretionary appropriation .....	1,527,536	1,536,885	5,335,000
Comparative transfer to:			
<u>Education Improvement Programs</u> for:			
Advanced placement.....	-26,949	-26,949	0
Ready-to-learn television.....	-27,194	-27,194	0
Arts in education .....	-24,953	-24,953	0
Comparative transfer from:			
<u>Education Improvement Programs</u> for:			
Improving teacher quality State grants .....	2,466,567	2,466,567	0
Mathematics and science partnerships.....	149,717	149,717	0
<u>Higher Education</u> for:			
Teacher quality partnership .....	42,833	42,833	0
Reprogramming transfer to:			
<u>Education Improvement Programs</u> for:			
Advanced placement.....	-3,106	-3,106	0
Total, comparative discretionary appropriation.....	4,104,451	4,113,800	5,335,000
<b>Mandatory:</b>			
Appropriation	0	5,000,000	0
Total, comparable discretionary and mandatory appropriation	4,104,451	9,113,800	5,335,000

**INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS**

**Appropriation Adjustments and Transfers—continued**  
(dollars in thousands)

Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers	2012	2013	2014
<b>Advance:</b>			
Advance for succeeding fiscal year .....	-1,681,441	-1,681,441	0
Advance from prior year .....	<u>1,678,263</u>	<u>1,681,441</u>	<u>1,681,441</u>
Total, budget authority .....	4,101,273	9,113,800	7,016,441
Comparative transfer from:			
<u>Education Improvement Programs for:</u>			
Improving teacher quality State grants			
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	1,681,441	1,681,441	0
Advance from prior year .....	<u>-1,678,263</u>	<u>-1,681,441</u>	<u>-1,681,441</u>
Total, comparable budget authority .....	4,104,451	9,113,800	5,335,000

NOTE: Amounts for transferred programs exclude the 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided by P.L. 112-175. The comparable total 0.612 percent across-the-board increase for the account is \$14,829 thousand.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Summary of Changes (dollars in thousands)

---

2012.....	\$4,104,451
2014.....	<u>5,335,000</u>
Net change from 2012.....	+1,230,549

---

<b>Increases:</b>	<u>2012 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
<p>Increase for a reauthorized Race to the Top program to support and create incentives for State and local reforms designed to lead to significant improvements in student achievement, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment rates, and to significant reductions in achievement gaps.</p>	\$548,960	+\$451,040
<p>Increase for a reauthorized Investing in Innovation program to expand innovative strategies and practices that have been shown to be effective in improving educational outcomes for students and to test and evaluate promising strategies and practices whose efficacy has not yet been systematically studied.</p>	149,417	+65,583
<p>Initial funding for the new Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Innovation initiative to help improve student engagement and achievement in STEM subjects.</p>	0	+414,716
<p>Initial funding for the new High School Redesign program to transform teaching and learning in high schools by encouraging partnerships among LEAs, postsecondary institutions, businesses, and non-profits to prepare students for college and career.</p>	0	+300,000
<p>Initial funding for the new Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program to provide formula grants to States and LEAs to improve the effectiveness and equitable distribution of effective and highly effective teachers and leaders and, through an expanded set-aside of funds, to support efforts to build evidence on how best to best recruit, prepare, and support effective teachers and school leaders, and enhance the teaching and leadership professions.</p>	0	+\$2,466,567

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

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

Increases:	<u>2012 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
Increase for the School Leadership program to train highly effective leaders for high-need schools and districts.	\$29,107	+\$68,887
Initial funding for the new Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund to support the development and implementation of innovative teacher and leader policies.	0	+400,000
Initial funding for the Expanding Educational Options program to increase the supply of high-quality public educational options available to students, especially students attending low-performing schools, by creating and expanding effective charter and autonomous schools.	0	+294,836
Increase for the Magnet Schools Assistance program to help LEAs implement desegregation plans for the support of high-quality magnet schools and to expand and improve options for students and increase diversity in schools.	96,705	+2,906
Increase for the Fund for the Improvement in Education activities to fund a math initiative, to support interagency strategies to strengthen services to disconnected youth, to continue the Data Quality Initiative, and to enhance communities' tracking of and performance on multiple outcomes for at-risk youth.	40,823	<u>+5,453</u>
Subtotal, increases		+4,469,988

**INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS**

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

<b>Decreases:</b>	<u>2012 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
Eliminate funding for Mathematics and Science Partnerships because it would be replaced by the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics program.	\$149,716	-\$149,716
Elimination of Improving Teacher Quality State Grants and redirection of funding to the proposed Effective Teachers and Leaders program.	2,466,567	-2,466,567
Elimination of the Transition to Teaching and Teacher Quality Partnership programs and redirection of funding to the School Leadership program.	68,887	-68,887
Elimination of the Teacher Incentive Fund and redirection of funding to the proposed Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund.	299,433	-299,433
Elimination of the Charter Schools Grants and Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities programs and redirection of funding to the proposed Expanding Educational Options program.	254,836	<u>-254,836</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-3,239,439
Net change		+1,230,549

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Authorizing Legislation

(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2013 Authorized	2013 Estimate	2014 Authorized	2014 Request
Race to the top ( <i>ARRA-XIV-14006</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	\$548,960	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	\$1,000,000
Investing in innovation ( <i>ARRA-XIV-14007</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	149,417	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	215,000
STEM innovation:				
STEM innovation ( <i>proposed legislation</i> )	--	--	To be determined	414,7160
Mathematics and science partnerships ( <i>ESEA II-B</i> )	0 <sup>2</sup>	149,716	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
High school transformation ( <i>proposed legislation</i> )	--	--	To be determined	300,000
Excellent instructional teams:				
Effective teachers and leaders:				
Effective teacher and leaders State grants ( <i>proposed legislation</i> )	--	--	To be determined	2,466,567
Improving teacher quality State grants ( <i>ESEA II-A</i> )	0 <sup>2</sup>	2,466,567	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
Transition to teaching ( <i>ESEA II-C-1-B</i> )	0 <sup>2</sup>	26,054	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
Teacher quality partnership ( <i>HEA II-A</i> )	Indefinite <sup>3</sup>	42,833	Indefinite <sup>3</sup>	0
School leadership ( <i>ESEA II-A-5-2151(b)</i> )	0 <sup>2</sup>	29,107	0 <sup>2</sup>	97,994
Teacher and leader innovation fund:				
Teacher and leader innovation fund ( <i>proposed legislation</i> )	--	--	To be determined	400,000
Teacher incentive fund ( <i>ESEA V-D-1</i> )	0 <sup>2</sup>	299,433	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
Expanding educational options:				
Expanding educational options ( <i>proposed legislation</i> )	--	--	To be determined	294,836
Charter schools grants ( <i>ESEA V-B-1</i> )	0 <sup>2</sup>	254,836 <sup>4</sup>	0 <sup>2</sup>	0

H-7

**INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS**

**Authorizing Legislation—continued**  
(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2013 Authorized	2013 Estimate	2014 Authorized	2014 Request
Credit enhancement for charter school facilities (ESEA V-B-2)	0 <sup>5</sup>	0 <sup>4</sup>	0 <sup>5</sup>	0
Magnet schools assistance (ESEA V-C)	0 <sup>6</sup>	\$96,705	To be determined <sup>6</sup>	\$99,611
FIE programs of national significance (ESEA V-D-1)	0 <sup>6</sup>	40,823	To be determined <sup>6</sup>	46,276
Recognizing education success, professional excellence, and collaborative teaching ( <i>proposed legislation</i> )	To be determined <sup>7</sup>	5,000,000	0 <sup>7</sup>	0
<u>Unfunded authorizations:</u>				
Advanced credentialing (ESEA II-A-5-2521(c))	0 <sup>2</sup>	0	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
Voluntary public school choice (ESEA V-B-3)	0 <sup>2</sup>	0	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
Advanced placement and international baccalaureate programs (America COMPETES Act VI-A-II)	0 <sup>8</sup>	0	0 <sup>8</sup>	0
Ready to teach (ESEA V-D-8)	0 <sup>2</sup>	0	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
Exchanges with historic whaling and trading partners (ESEA V-D-12)	0 <sup>9</sup>	0	0 <sup>9</sup>	0
Parental information and resource centers (ESEA V-D- 16)	0 <sup>2</sup>	0	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
Women’s educational equity (ESEA V-D-21)	0 <sup>9</sup>	0	0 <sup>9</sup>	0
Total definite authorization	0		0	

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Authorizing Legislation—continued

(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2013 Authorized	2013 Estimate	2014 Authorized	2014 Request
Total discretionary appropriation		9,104,451		5,335,000
Portion of request subject to reauthorization				243,881
Portion of request not authorized				\$5,091,119
Total mandatory appropriation		\$5,000,000		0
Total discretionary appropriation including 0.612 percent ATB increase		4,113,800		

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

<sup>1</sup> The program is authorized in FY 2013 through appropriations language; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2014.

<sup>2</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2014 under new legislation.

<sup>3</sup> The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2014 under new legislation.

<sup>4</sup> From the amount appropriated for Charter Schools, the fiscal year 2012 appropriations act required the Secretary to use not less than \$22,957 thousand for State Facilities Incentive grants and Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities grants. The Department expects to use the same amount for State Facilities Incentive Grants and Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities in FY 2013.

<sup>5</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2004. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2014 under new legislation.

<sup>6</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2014.

<sup>7</sup> Authorization for the program is sought for FY 2013. No reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2014.

<sup>8</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011. No appropriations language or reauthorizing legislation is sought.

<sup>9</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. No appropriations language or reauthorizing legislation is sought.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2005 Discretionary	\$885,161	\$669,936	\$1,154,894	\$1,092,642
2006 Discretionary	1,307,871	708,522	1,308,785	936,488
2007 Discretionary	850,966	N/A <sup>1</sup>	N/A <sup>1</sup>	837,686
2008 Discretionary	922,018	982,354	962,889	985,517
2009 Discretionary	867,517	976,846 <sup>2</sup>	944,314 <sup>2</sup>	996,425
Recovery Act Supplemental (PL 111-5) (Discretionary)	0	225,000	0	200,000
2010 Discretionary Rescission (PL 111-226) (Discretionary)	1,489,949	1,347,363	1,234,787 <sup>3</sup>	1,389,065 -10,700
2011 Discretionary	6,330,000	1,870,123 <sup>4</sup>	2,224,843 <sup>3</sup>	1,856,179 <sup>5</sup>
2012 Discretionary	4,995,000	821,411 <sup>6</sup>	1,740,212 <sup>6</sup>	1,527,536
2013 Discretionary	4,332,166	663,080 <sup>7</sup>	1,545,966 <sup>7</sup>	1,536,885 <sup>8</sup>
2013 Mandatory	5,000,000	0	0	
2014 Discretionary	5,335,000			

<sup>1</sup> 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.

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

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

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

<sup>5</sup> The level for appropriation reflects the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 112-10).

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

<sup>7</sup> The levels for the House and Senate allowances reflect action on the regular annual 2013 appropriations bill, which proceeded in the 112<sup>th</sup> Congress only through the House Subcommittee and the Senate Committee.

<sup>8</sup> The amount shown includes the 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided by P.L. 112-175, in effect through March 27, 2013.

## **INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS**

### **Significant Items in FY 2013 Appropriations Reports**

#### **Race to the Top**

Senate: Committee expects a significant portion of the fiscal year 2013 appropriation to be used for RTT–ELC. In combination with additional resources allocated for the CCDBG and Head Start programs, the Committee expects these investments to help improve early learning and development systems and opportunities for young children. The Committee bill includes language requiring the Departments of Education and HHS to jointly administer RTT–ELC.

Response: The Department plans to use a significant portion of the fiscal year 2013 appropriation for RTT-ELC.

Senate: The Committee applauds the Department's efforts to ensure that rural areas have a fair opportunity to compete in recent grant competitions, including the LEA-level competition under RTT. The Committee directs the Department in developing any fiscal year 2013 notice under RTT to provide an absolute priority for rural States or rural LEAs, as applicable.

Response: The Department plans to include absolute priorities for applicants serving rural areas in the fiscal year 2013 Race to the Top-District competition whether or not those applicants are in States with a Race to the Top-State grant.

#### **Investing in Innovation**

Senate: The Committee expects the Department to distribute grants equally among the absolute priority categories unless there are an insufficient number of qualified grants for a particular category.

Response: The Department intends to provide awards in all absolute priority categories for which applications of sufficient quality are received and for which funding is available. However, the final number of grants made under each absolute priority category will depend on several factors, including the number and quality of applications received under each absolute priority, and the total amount of funding requested by applicants.

#### **Charter Schools Grants**

Senate: The Committee urges the Department to continue using a portion of the funds available for national activities to address issues related to services to students with disabilities enrolled in or interested in enrolling in charter schools, as well as efforts to strengthen charter authorizing practices that will result in a greater share of high-quality charter schools.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

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

Response: The Department will continue to use national activities funds in fiscal year 2013 to support efforts to ensure access to charter schools, and improve services in those schools, for students with disabilities as well as efforts to improve charter authorizing practices and strengthen authorizer capacity, including through technical assistance and other resources provided by the National Charter School Resource Center and data collection and monitoring activities.

### **Fund for the Improvement in Education: Programs of National Significance**

Senate: Within programs of national significance, the Committee includes \$29 million to continue the initiative funded in last year's bill that provides competitive awards to national not-for-profit organizations or school libraries for providing books and childhood literacy activities to children and families living in high-need communities. The Committee expects no less than 50 percent of these funds to be made available to applications from school libraries proposing high quality projects for increasing access to a wide range of print and electronic resources that provide learning opportunities to all students, but particularly those less likely to have access to such materials at home.

Response: In accordance with the Committee's expectation, the Department plans to use \$29 million provided by the Committee to fund continuations for grants made under the Innovative Approaches to Literacy initiative in fiscal year 2012. From the 2012 slate, the Department awarded no less than 50 percent of fiscal year 2012 funds to applications from LEAs (on behalf of school libraries) for high-quality school library projects that increase access to a wide range of literacy resources (either print or electronic) and provide learning opportunities to all students.

### **Arts in Education**

Senate: The Committee appreciates the recent release of the arts education report prepared by NCES. The Committee believes that this survey should be conducted more frequently than once every 10 years. The Committee also directs the Department to take more effective steps in disseminating what is being learned through the model and professional development grants funded under the Arts in Education program.

Response: The Department will make every effort to more effectively disseminate findings from the Arts Models and Professional Development grants funded under Arts in Education.

[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
<b>Innovation and Instructional Teams</b>						
1. Race to the Top (AARA XIV, sec. 14006)	D	548,960	548,960	1,000,000	451,040	82.163%
2. Investing in innovation (AARA XIV, sec. 14007)	D	149,417	149,417	215,000	65,583	43.893%
3. STEM innovation						
(a) STEM innovation networks (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	414,716	414,716	---
(b) Mathematics and science partnerships (ESEA II, Part B)	D	149,716	149,716	0	(149,716)	-100.000%
Subtotal		149,716	149,716	414,716	265,000	177.002%
4. High school redesign (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	300,000	300,000	---
5. Excellent instructional teams:						
(a) Effective teachers and leaders:						
(1) Effective teachers and leaders State grants (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	2,466,567	2,466,567	---
(2) Improving teacher quality State grants (ESEA II-A)						
Annual appropriation	D	785,126	785,126	0	(785,126)	-100.000%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	1,681,441	1,681,441	0	(1,681,441)	-100.000%
Subtotal		2,466,567	2,466,567	2,466,567	0	0.000%
(3) Transition to teaching (ESEA II-C-1-B)	D	26,054	26,054	0	(26,054)	-100.000%
(4) Teacher quality partnership (HEA II-A)	D	42,833	42,833	0	(42,833)	-100.000%
(5) School leadership (ESEA section 2151(b))	D	29,107	29,107	97,994	68,887	236.668%
Subtotal	D	97,994	97,994	97,994	0	0.000%
(b) Teacher and leader innovation fund:						
(1) Teacher and leader innovation fund (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	400,000	400,000	---
(2) Teacher incentive fund (ESEA V-D-1)	D	299,433	299,433	0	(299,433)	-100.000%
Subtotal	D	299,433	299,433	400,000	100,567	33.586%

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
<b>Innovation and Instructional Teams (continued)</b>						
6. Expanding educational options:						
(a) Expanding educational options (proposed legislation) <sup>1</sup>	D	0	0	294,836	294,836	---
(b) Charter schools grants (ESEA V-B-1) <sup>1, 2</sup>	D	254,836	254,836	0	(254,836)	-100.000%
(c) Credit enhancement for charter school facilities (ESEA Title V-B-2) <sup>1</sup>	D	0	0	0	0	---
Subtotal	D	254,836	254,836	294,836	40,000	15.696%
7. Magnet schools assistance (ESEA V-C) <sup>2</sup>	D	96,705	96,705	99,611	2,906	3.005%
8. Fund for the improvement of education: Programs of national significance (ESEA V-D-1)	D	40,823	40,823	46,276	5,453	13.358%
Subtotal		137,528	137,528	145,887	8,359	6.078%
9. Recognizing Education Success, Professional Excellence, and Collaborative Teaching (RESPECT) (proposed legislation)	M	0	5,000,000		0	---
Total, Appropriation <sup>2, 3</sup>		4,104,451	4,104,451	5,335,000	1,230,549	29.981%
Total, Budget authority		4,101,273	4,104,451	7,016,441	2,915,168	71.080%
Current <sup>4</sup>		2,423,010	2,423,010	5,335,000	2,911,990	120.181%
Prior year's advance		1,678,263	1,681,441	1,681,441	3,178	0.189%
Across-the-board 0.612% increase applied to discretionary appropriation, provided in P.L. 112-175.			14,829			

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.

<sup>1</sup> From the amount appropriated for Charter Schools Grants, FY 2012 appropriations language required the Department to use no less than \$22,957 thousand for State Facilities Incentive Grants and Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities. The Department expects to use the same amount for State Facilities Incentive Grants and Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities in FY 2013. The FY 2014 request would subsume both programs into the proposed Expanding Educational Options program.

<sup>2</sup> Reflects a reprogramming in FY 2012 of \$2,906 thousand from Magnet Schools Assistance and \$200 thousand from Charter Schools Grants to Advanced Placement, under the Education Improvement Programs account.

<sup>3</sup> Adjusted for comparability. In fiscal years 2012 and 2013, includes \$2,466,567 thousand for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants and \$149,716 thousand for Mathematics and Science Partnerships, appropriated in those years to the Education Improvement Programs account; and \$42,833 thousand for Teacher Quality Partnership, appropriated in those years to the Higher Education account.

<sup>4</sup> Adjusted for comparability. In fiscal years 2012 and 2013, excludes \$30,055 thousand for Advanced Placement, \$27,194 thousand for Ready-to-Learn Television, and \$24,953 thousand for Arts in Education, requested in the FY 2014 President's Budget in the Education Improvement Programs account. Also excludes advanced appropriations of \$1,681,441 thousand in fiscal years 2012 and 2013 that become available on October 1 of the following fiscal year. Advance appropriations shown in this account were for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants and were appropriated in fiscal years 2012 and 2013 in the School Improvement Programs account, now the Education Improvement Programs account.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Summary of Request

Programs in the Innovation and Instructional Teams account support the goal of improving student achievement in three key ways: providing incentives for States and local educational agencies (LEAs) to implement comprehensive educational reforms and to test, evaluate, and expand innovative educational strategies and practices, including in science, technology, mathematics, and science (STEM); increasing the supply of effective teachers and principals; and providing parents with expanded options for the education of their children. The Administration requests a total of \$5.3 billion in discretionary funds.

The new structure of this account reflects the framework of the Administration's proposal for reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. A key objective of this proposal is to increase efficiency by consolidating currently authorized programs with similar purposes. In fiscal years 2012 and 2013, for example, the Department's appropriation contained several programs focused on teaching and school leadership issues with different purposes, requirements, and authorized activities.

While each of these programs has worthy goals, the result of these fragmented funding streams has been inefficiencies at the Federal, State, and local levels; grantees have had to deal with numerous small grant competitions with different applications and requirements rather than focusing on improving outcomes for students, and the Department has had to focus on running separate grant competitions and monitoring compliance with different programs rather than on providing strong support and directing funding to the most proven or promising practices. The Administration expects that the new structure for programs in this account will allow States and LEAs to identify how to best meet the needs of their students and teachers, and allow the Department to focus funding on programs that improve student achievement, especially for students in high-need schools.

### System-wide Reform and Innovation

The Administration requests \$1.3 billion to support efforts to drive State and local reform and innovation. Specifically, the request includes:

- \$1.0 billion for the **Race to the Top** program to support grants to States that can demonstrate the capacity and willingness to undertake reforms and innovations to improve college access, affordability, quality, and completion. Under this new initiative, States would be required to demonstrate a commitment to reforms in key areas and their projects would result in the identification, dissemination, adoption, and use of effective policies and practices.
- \$215.0 million for the **Investing in Innovation** program to expand innovative strategies and practices that have been shown to be effective in improving educational outcomes for students and to test and evaluate promising practices, strategies, or programs whose efficacy has not yet been systematically studied. Funds would also support the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Education (ARPA-ED), a new entity modeled after similar agencies in the Department of Defense and Department of Energy. The mission of ARPA-ED would be to pursue development of educational technology and learning systems; support systems for educators; and tools that result in improvements for all students (but

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Summary of Request—continued

especially those from low-income backgrounds) by increasing educational achievement and attainment for students in both traditional and non-traditional learning environments.

- \$46.3 million for the **Fund for the Improvement of Education: Programs of National Significance** (FIE) to support nationally significant projects to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education, including continuation of a data quality initiative that helps improve the quality, analysis, and reporting of Department of Education elementary and secondary education data. Of the amount requested, the Department would use \$30.0 million to run an evidence-based grant competition, in partnership with the National Science Foundation, focused on developing, evaluating, and scaling proven practices that can help increase student achievement in mathematics. The Department would also use \$10.0 million to support activities to strengthen services provided to disconnected youth and \$5.0 million to support a youth data pilot.

### STEM Innovation

The Administration requests \$414.7 million to help increase the number of students effectively prepared for postsecondary education and careers in STEM fields, including:

- \$150.0 million for a new **STEM Innovation Networks** initiative to help improve student engagement and achievement in STEM subjects by developing, validating, and scaling up innovative and effective STEM educational practices in networks of participating schools.
- \$80.0 million in support of the Administration's goal of recruiting and preparing, over 10 years, 100,000 effective and highly effective STEM teachers through **STEM Teacher Pathways**.
- \$35.0 million to establish a **STEM Master Teacher Corps** that would provide leadership roles for highly effective STEM teachers and help improve STEM instruction.
- \$149.7 million for **Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics** to support comprehensive State and local efforts to improve STEM education through such activities as professional development for STEM teachers and implementation of high-quality curriculum, instructional materials, and assessments.

### High School Redesign

The Administration requests \$300.0 million for a new competitive High School Redesign program to help redesign high schools to prepare students to be college- and career-ready by using existing Federal, State, and local resources and creation of learning models that are rigorous, relevant, and focus on real-world experiences while incorporating personalized learning and career and college exploration.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Summary of Request—continued

#### Excellent Instructional Teams

The Administration requests \$3.0 billion for the new **Excellent Instructional Teams** programs, which would provide both formula grants and competitive awards to help States and LEAs increase the effectiveness of teachers and principals.

- \$2.5 billion for **Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants** to provide flexible, formula-based support for States and LEAs that commit to improving their teacher and principal evaluation systems and ensuring that low-income and minority students have equitable access to teachers and principals who are effective at raising student achievement. A 25 percent national activities set-aside totaling nearly \$617 million would allow the Department to build evidence on how best to recruit, prepare, and support effective teachers and school leaders, and invest in efforts to enhance the teaching and leadership professions.
- \$400 million for the **Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund**, an increase of \$100 million, to help States and LEAs improve the effectiveness of teachers and leaders in high-need schools and LEAs, in particular by creating the conditions to identify, recruit, prepare, support, retain, and advance effective and highly effective teachers, teacher leaders, principals, and school leadership teams in those schools.
- \$98 million for a redesigned **School Leadership Program** that would more than triple the Federal investment in principal training. The 2014 competition would support grants for high-quality, large-scale professional development for school leaders that build evidence of effectiveness. Funded projects would help current principals and school leadership teams strengthen essential school leadership skills (such as evaluating and providing feedback to teachers, analyzing student data, developing school leadership teams, and creating a positive school climate), and deepen school leaders' understanding of college- and career-ready standards and effective instruction aligned to those standards.

The new programs would replace an array of current activities that address teaching and school leadership issues: **Improving Teacher Quality State Grants**, the **Teacher Incentive Fund**, **Transition to Teaching**, and **Teacher Quality Partnership**.

The Administration proposes \$5 billion in mandatory funding for the Recognizing Education Success, Professional Excellence, and Collaborative Teaching (RESPECT) Project, which would help States and districts dramatically reshape the teaching profession. Funds would be used to reform teacher and principal preparation programs; strengthen teacher and principal evaluation and professional development systems; redesign educator career ladders and compensation systems to attract and retain top talent; and create conditions in schools that support effective teaching, including by providing teachers greater autonomy, shared leadership and responsibility for student outcomes, and time for collaboration.

#### Expanding Educational Options

The Administration requests \$294.8 million for the new **Expanding Educational Options** program to support competitive grants to State educational agencies (SEAs), charter school

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Summary of Request—continued

authorizers, charter management organizations, local educational agencies and other nonprofit organizations to start or expand high-performing charter schools and other autonomous public schools. The Department would also be authorized to make competitive grants to high-need LEAs, and to SEAs in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs, for the development and implementation of comprehensive programs of public school choice that increase the range of high-quality educational options available to students and help improve the academic achievement of students attending low-performing schools. All grantees would also be required to fund or operate parent information and outreach programs to make families and students aware of their options.

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

In addition, the Administration requests \$99.6 million for **Magnet Schools Assistance** to LEAs to establish and operate magnet schools that are part of an approved desegregation plan.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Race to the top

(American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, Title XIV, section 14006)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: To be determined

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$548,960	\$548,960 <sup>1</sup>	\$1,000,000	+\$451,040

---

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

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Race to the Top program (RTT) creates incentives for comprehensive State and local reforms and innovations designed to lead to significant improvements in student achievement, high school graduation rates, college enrollment rates, and rates of college persistence and completion, and to significant reductions in achievement gaps, including for students with disabilities and English learners. In the first 3 years of the program, the RTT competition's focused on the implementation of ambitious plans in five core reform areas: (1) adopting standards and assessments that measure the progress of the educational system in preparing students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy; (2) building data systems that measure student growth and success and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction; (3) recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most; (4) turning around the lowest-achieving schools; and (5) improving State and local systems of early learning. In addition, the program encourages the broad identification, dissemination, adoption, and use of effective State and local policies and practices that lead to significant improvement in outcomes for all children and youth and the elimination of those policies and practices that are not effective in improving student outcomes.

With funds provided by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act), the Department invested a total of more than \$4 billion in the plans of 11 States and the District of Columbia based on their recent record of improving student outcomes and on their record of and commitment to putting in place conditions for innovation and reform. Applications were also evaluated based on the quality and likelihood of success of the applicants' comprehensive and coherent plans for improving student achievement and attaining the other objectives of the program, including the level of support from relevant stakeholders. In addition, the Department made awards to two consortia of States under the Race to the Top Assessment program (RTT-A). The consortia are working to develop assessments that are valid, support and inform instruction, provide accurate information about what students know and can do, and measure

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Race to the top

---

student achievement against standards designed to ensure that all students gain the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in college and the workplace.

The 2011 Appropriations Act provided nearly \$700 million in additional funding for RTT, which allowed the Department to award grants based on previously submitted applications, and amended the Recovery Act to permit the Department to make grants to improve early learning. The Department used approximately \$200 million of these funds to make awards to seven of the highest-ranked but unfunded finalist States from the previous Recovery Act competition. The seven States that received new awards from the \$200 million are using grant funds to carry out a selection of the key activities included in their original applications, including activities to improve science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education.

In addition, the Department used approximately \$500 million for a new Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) competition in fiscal year 2011. The RTT-ELC competition was designed to encourage State efforts to better coordinate, develop, implement, and evaluate their systems of early learning, with the overall goal of improving the quality of early learning programs and services for high-need children birth to age five and closing the school readiness gap between children with high needs and their peers. Nine States shared the \$497 million in fiscal year 2011 funds awarded through this competition.

The 2012 Appropriations Act allowed the use of RTT funds to support and encourage district-level reform and innovation through an RTT competition for local educational agencies (LEAs) focused on bold, innovative reform at the local level. In fiscal year 2012, the Race to the Top-District (RTT-D) competition invited applicants to demonstrate how they would personalize education for all students in their schools, building on the experiences of States in implementing reforms in the four core educational assurance areas. The competition encouraged and rewarded LEAs and consortia of LEAs that had the best plans for implementing the strategies, structures, and systems needed to support personalized, student-focused approaches to learning and teaching that will produce excellence and ensure equity for all students. Grantees will create opportunities for students to identify and pursue areas of personal academic interest—all while ensuring that each student masters critical areas identified in college- and career-ready standards. In fiscal year 2012, the Department awarded \$383 million to 16 RTT-D applicants representing 55 LEAs. In addition, the Department used \$133 million to make awards to five additional States that submitted applications in the fiscal year 2011 RTT-ELC competition.

In fiscal year 2013, the Department plans to conduct a new RTT-ELC competition as well as a competition for a second round of RTT-D grants.

The Department awarded a contract in 2010 to run the RTT Technical Assistance Network. Initial technical assistance efforts have been guided by the needs and requests of the first two cohorts of grantee States, but will include reports and other technical assistance that will be broadly available to both grantee and non-grantee States. Network reports and other resources are available at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/implementation-support-unit/tech-assist/resources.html>.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Race to the top

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009.....	\$4,350,000
2010.....	0
2011 .....	698,600
2012.....	548,960
2013.....	548,960 <sup>1</sup>

---

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

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$1.0 billion in fiscal year 2014 funding for RTT, an increase of \$451 million over the fiscal year 2012 level. The full amount would be used to support a Race to the Top – College Affordability and Completion competition, a new initiative designed to drive comprehensive change in State higher education policies and practices in order to improve college access, affordability, completion, and quality nationwide.

To date, the RTT program has leveraged funding to spur significant, system-wide reforms in elementary and secondary education, as well as in early education. Building on the success of this program, the Administration will shift the focus of RTT in 2014 to comprehensive reforms in postsecondary education, establishing RTT as a fund that promotes system-wide reform efforts and can shift its focus each year to support the most promising and comprehensive solutions to strengthen public education and improve outcomes from preschool through college. Given the extraordinary response generated by the initial RTT competitions, we expect a similarly strong response from the postsecondary education community. Extending the RTT program to the Nation's higher education system should result in major benefits through the broad identification, dissemination, adoption, and use of effective policies and practices, and the cessation of ineffective ones while also benefitting the K-12 system by spurring greater alignment between high school graduation and college entrance requirements.

With the funds requested for fiscal year 2014, the Department would support grants to States that can demonstrate the capacity and willingness to undertake reforms and innovations to improve college access, affordability, and quality, achieve better student outcomes, and increase institutional capacity to graduate more students from college with high-quality credentials. States seeking funding under this new initiative would be required to demonstrate a commitment to reforms in areas such as: (1) sustaining fiscal support for higher education while modernizing funding policies to constrain costs and improve outcomes; (2) removing barriers preventing the creation of innovative methods of student learning and new degree pathways; (3) empowering consumer choice through increased transparency; and (4) smoothing transitions for students from high school into college, for adult learners into and returning to college, and between institutions of higher education. The Administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization proposal would consolidate the Race to the Top program within the ESEA. If the Congress does not reauthorize the ESEA prior to enactment of the fiscal year 2014 appropriations, the Administration will request authority to

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Race to the top

---

make grants to States willing to undertake these fundamental postsecondary reforms and pursue innovative strategies designed to improve student learning outcomes while making college more affordable.

States that are successful in this competition would receive funds to support and augment foundational investments that improve the value of students' postsecondary education, such as redesigning courses to improve learning and reduce costs, tackling problems with developmental education, or exploring alternative ways to measure learning and award credits and degrees. These investments would simultaneously focus on both quality and productivity, reflecting the Administration's belief that States and institutions should strive to increase the quality and rigor of the education they are providing while making that education available to more students. This dual emphasis on quality and productivity would result in better student learning outcomes and increased capacity to graduate more students from college.

This new dimension of the RTT program will also complement funds requested for a First in the World (FITW) initiative under the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) in the Higher Education account. These funds would be used to support an evidence-based grant competition, modeled after the Investing in Innovation (i3) program for K-12, to support and expand innovative projects that successfully improve college student outcomes, enhance quality, and support students as they progress toward their college degrees. Additionally, up to \$75 million of the funds requested for FITW would be used to support: 1) projects to develop third-party validation systems that identify competencies, assessments, and curricula for specific fields, and 2) Pay for Success awards to providers of free two-year degrees, especially in fields supported by validation systems.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
<b>Early Learning and K-12</b>			
Award funding	\$517,304	\$517,304	0
Peer review of applications	4,571	4,571	0
Technical assistance and evaluation	27,085	27,085	0
Total, Early Learning and K-12	548,960	548,960	0
<b>College Affordability and Completion</b>			
Award funding	0	0	\$992,000
Peer review of applications	0	0	2,000
Technical assistance and evaluation	0	0	6,000
Total, College Affordability and Completion	0	0	1,000,000
Number of awards	0	0	4-10
Average award	0	0	\$99,200 - \$248,000

---

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

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Race to the top

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

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

The Department has posted the annual performance reports (APRs) submitted by the States for school years 2010-11 and 2011-12. These reports allow the Department and the public to follow grantees' progress in implementing their education reform plans and meeting the goals. These reports can be found at <http://www.rtt-apr.us> and <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/performance.html>. The RTT APRs document grantees' progress toward the annual and four-year targets set forth by the grantees in their applications. Additionally, the APR includes State-reported updates on the laws, statutes, regulations, and guidelines that affect key elements of their Race to the Top plans. The majority of RTT APR data is self-reported by grantee States, but the source of the NAEP data is the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and the Department provided Common Core of Data (CCD) information for the statewide number of K-12 students and statewide number of students eligible for free and reduced price lunch where possible.

The Department established five performance measures for the Comprehensive Assessment Systems Grants awarded under RTT-A in 2010. Those measures are: (1) the number of States that have formally adopted a common set of college- and career-ready standards in mathematics and English language arts (ELA); (2) the number of States that have fully implemented the summative assessment components of the assessment systems developed by the consortium; (3) the number of institutions of higher education (IHEs) that are working with grantees to design and develop the final high school summative assessments in mathematics

---

<sup>1</sup> "Qualifying evaluation systems" are those teacher and principal evaluation systems that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement, and are rigorous, transparent, and fair.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Race to the top

---

and ELA; (4) the number of IHEs that have implemented policies that exempt from remedial courses and place into credit-bearing college courses students who meet the achievement standard for the final high school summative assessments in mathematics and ELA and any other placement requirements; and (5) the percentage of direct matriculation students in public IHEs who are enrolled in IHEs that are working with grantees to design and develop the final high school summative assessments in mathematics and ELA and/or have implemented policies that exempt from remedial courses and place into credit-bearing college courses students who meet the achievement standard for the final high school summative assessments in mathematics and ELA. The Department will have data for these measures in 2015.

The Department will develop separate performance measures for the RTT-ELC competition. At a minimum, the implementation measures will be based on the performance measures included in the application, including: the number and percentage of early learning and development programs participating in a statewide tiered quality rating and improvement system (TQRIS); the number of early learning and development programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS; and the number and percentage of children with high needs who are enrolled in early learning and development programs that are in the top tiers of the TQRIS. In addition, the Department will develop appropriate outcome measures for the program.

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

In addition to these efforts to gauge program effectiveness through performance measures, the Department is conducting or is planning to conduct three key evaluations. First, the Department is evaluating the implementation and impact of both the RTT – State and School Improvement Grants (SIG) programs. This Evaluation of RTT and SIG involves collecting data from roughly 60 districts and 525 schools in the 50 States and DC. The study is focusing 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. Second, the Department is conducting an evaluation of the RTT-ELC grantees that will describe the design and implementation plans for the TQRIS measures in RTT-ELC States and, for grantees that are farther along in implementing their TQRIS, examine the components of quality that appear to be the strongest predictors of child outcomes. Third, the Department is conducting an evaluation for the RTT-D program.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Investing in innovation

(American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, Sec. 12007)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: To be determined

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$149,417	\$149,417 <sup>1</sup>	\$215,000	+\$65,583

---

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

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Investing in Innovation (i3) program promotes the development and expansion of innovative practices for which there is evidence of effectiveness. The program is authorized under Section 14007 of the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act of 2009 (the Recovery Act).

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

The i3 program employs a rigorous framework that directs the highest level of funding to projects with the strongest evidence base, but also provides significant support for promising projects that are willing to undergo rigorous evaluation. Grantees use funds to: (1) scale up practices, strategies, or programs for which there is strong evidence that the proposed activity has had a significant and positive effect on improving student achievement, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, or increasing high school graduation rates; (2) validate and expand practices, strategies, or programs for which there is moderate evidence that the proposed activity has had a significant and positive effect on those same outcomes; or (3) develop and test promising practices, strategies, or programs for which there is a strong theory or evidence of promise that indicates potential for positive impacts or some positive research-based findings, but for which efficacy has not yet been systematically studied.

Each grantee is also required to support an independent evaluation of its project and to identify strategies for expanding the project, if effective, after the grant period expires. In addition, each grantee is required to obtain a specified amount of matching funds from the private sector and to use funds to develop or expand strategies to improve the performance of high-need students. To date the Department has awarded 92 i3 grants, including 5 in the Scale-up category, 28 in Validation, and 59 in Development. The Department awarded 49 grants during the first competition, held in 2010, comprised of 4 Scale-up, 15 Validation, and 30 Development grants.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Investing in innovation

---

In 2011 it awarded 23 grants: 1 Scale-up, 5 Validation, and 17 Development grants. In 2012 the Department made 20 grant awards—8 Validation and 12 Development grants.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009.....	0
Recovery Act .....	\$650,000
2010.....	0
2011.....	149,700
2012.....	149,417
2013.....	149,417 <sup>1</sup>

---

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

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2014, the Administration requests \$215 million for the Investing in Innovation (i3) program, an increase of \$65.6 million over the 2012 appropriation. The request would build on the Department's success in using program funds to build an evidence base that will help ensure that schools and districts have access to innovative strategies and practices that are effective in improving educational outcomes for students. In addition, up to 30 percent of the available funds would support activities to be carried out by the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Education (ARPA-ED).

The goal of the i3 program is to improve educational outcomes for students by developing, identifying, and scaling up effective practices; while encouraging innovation. The program's emphasis on supporting projects with either evidence of effectiveness or a strong research-based framework increases the likelihood that funded projects succeed and that we learn more about what works. The focus on strong evidence and the requirement for rigorous program evaluations also helps expand local capacity to properly evaluate implementation and impact and determine whether educational interventions are effective. In addition, the program garners significant non-Federal interest in supporting innovation in education; to date, private institutions have made commitments of almost \$150 million to assist in the implementation of grantee projects.

The i3 program continues to experience significant demand across the Nation. In 2012, the Department received over 700 applications for projects to validate or scale up proven practices and pre-applications for projects to develop and test promising practices. The funding requested for 2014 would allow the Department to continue to build on this success in fostering educational innovation while developing an evidence base in areas of high need and generating private-sector investment to complement the Federal investment.

The Department is considering priorities for the 2014 grant competition. The priorities under consideration include funding for projects that propose to improve early learning outcomes; improve student attainment in science, technology, engineering, and science (STEM) subjects; and improve productivity.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Investing in innovation

---

For fiscal year 2014, the Department would reserve \$10.8 million for national activities, including providing technical assistance to help grantees develop evaluation plans, among other activities. The Department is considering using up to \$10 million to carry out “pay-for-success” projects to incentivize service providers to achieve better results in a cost-effective manner that ensures that public funds are used efficiently. In addition the Department would reserve \$64.5 million for ARPA-ED. ARPA-ED would be a new entity within the Department modeled after similar agencies in the Department of Defense and Department of Energy. Its mission would be to pursue development of educational technology and tools that result in improvements for all students (especially those from low-income backgrounds) by increasing educational achievement and attainment for students in both traditional and non-traditional learning environments. Funds for ARPA-ED would need to be appropriated on a no-year basis to remain available for obligation until expended.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Amount for new awards	\$142,762	\$140,452	\$137,600
Number of new awards	20	17-23	15-20
Range of awards	\$1,975- 14,954	\$1,000- 20,000	\$1,000- 20,000
Peer review of new award applications	\$991	\$1,494	\$2,150
National activities	\$5,664	\$7,471	\$ 10,750
ARPA-ED	0	0	\$64,500

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

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

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

**Goal: To improve educational outcomes for students by developing, identifying, and scaling up effective practices that are demonstrated to have an impact on student achievement and other student outcomes.**

**Objective:** *To validate and scale effective solutions to persistent educational challenges across the country to serve a substantially larger numbers of students.*

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Investing in innovation

---

**Measure:** The percentage of Scale-up grantees that reached their annual target of students.

Year	Target	Actual
2011		67
2012	70	
2013	75	
2014	80	

**Measure:** The percentage of Validation grantees that reached their annual target of students.

Year	Target	Actual
2011		46
2012	50	
2013	54	
2014	60	

**Additional information:** The source of the data is annual grantee performance reports. Data reported are from the first cohort of i3 grantees and represent grantee performance from October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011. This is the first set of performance reports submitted by grantees since the program was first funded, and the Department will continue providing technical assistance to grantees in order to improve the quality, completeness, and consistency of the data. Actual data are based on partial data, as not every grantee provided targets for the number of students that would be served nor did grantees report student data consistently. Data for fiscal year 2012 will be available in late 2013.

**Objective:** *To promote rigorous evaluation of i3 funded projects that will generate significant new information about the effectiveness of diverse strategies, practices, and products that address persistent educational challenges.*

**Measure:** The percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Scale-up grant with ongoing well-designed and independent evaluations that will provide evidence of their effectiveness at improving student outcomes.

Year	Target	Actual
2011		100
2012	80	
2013	80	
2014	80	

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Investing in innovation

---

**Measure:** The percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Validation grant with ongoing well-designed and independent evaluations that will provide evidence of their effectiveness at improving student outcomes.

Year	Target	Actual
2011		100
2012	90	
2013	92	
2014	94	

**Measure:** The percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Development grant with ongoing evaluations that provide evidence of their promise for improving student outcomes.

Year	Target	Actual
2011		97
2012	94	
2013	95	
2014	96	

**Additional information:** The source of the data is annual grantee performance reports. Data reported are from the first cohort of i3 grantees and represent grantee performance from October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011. The Department will continue providing technical assistance to grantees in order to improve the quality, completeness, and consistency of the data. Data for fiscal year 2012 will be available in late 2013.

Assessment of evaluation design and efficacy is based on reviews by external reviewers trained in the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards. A well-designed study is one that would meet the WWC standards, with or without reservations, if it were also well-implemented. An independent evaluation means that the evaluation is being conducted by an organization that is not responsible for project development and implementation. To qualify as providing evidence of effectiveness at improving student outcomes, a study must estimate the impact of the program, practice, or strategy on one or more of the student outcomes specified in the intervention's logic model and that meet WWC Outcome Standards in terms of face validity, alignment, reliability, and validity. Although the evaluation plans for all 4 Scale-Up grantees and all 15 Validation grantees currently meet these standards, the program may not be able to maintain these first year results throughout the end of each project. For example, differences in attrition among students in treatment and control groups could pose a significant challenge to the design of a project evaluation. Furthermore, given the small number of projects in the Scale-Up grant category, problems in one project would dramatically change the percentage of projects meeting the measure.

For Development grants, determinations of evidence of promise were based on whether project evaluations used research designs that would provide a comparison for the outcomes of the intervention group.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Investing in innovation

---

**Measure:** The percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Scale-Up grant with ongoing evaluations that are providing high-quality implementation data and performance feedback that allow for periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Year	Target	Actual
2011		100
2012	80	
2013	80	
2014	80	

**Measure:** The percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Validation grant with ongoing evaluations that are providing high-quality implementation data and performance feedback that allow for periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Year	Target	Actual
2011		93
2012	90	
2013	90	
2014	90	

**Measure:** The percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Development grant with ongoing evaluations that are providing high-quality implementation data and performance feedback that allow for periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Year	Target	Actual
2011		90
2012	90	
2013	90	
2014	90	

**Additional information:** The source of the data is annual grantee performance reports. Data reported are from the first cohort of i3 grantees and represent grantee performance from October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011. The Department will continue providing technical assistance to grantees in order to improve the quality, completeness, and consistency of the data. Data for fiscal year 2012 will be available in late 2013.

Although the Department's evaluation contractor worked with the i3 grantees and evaluators to develop logic models and fidelity measures of program implementation, it is unlikely that initial program results will be maintained throughout the life of all of the projects. Slight programmatic changes could affect the quality of program implementation data. The Department is providing technical assistance to grantees and their evaluators on this issue.

Note that at this time the Department is not reporting data separately on the percentage of Development grantees that are implementing their projects with fidelity to the approved design. However, the evaluation contractor, in determining which Development projects to count as

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Investing in innovation

---

meeting the elements of the last measure above (the percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Development grant with ongoing evaluations that are providing high-quality implementation data and performance feedback that allow for periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes), examines whether Development projects' evaluation plans include a strategy for measuring implementation fidelity.

### Efficiency Measures

The Department has established cost per student as the efficiency measure for the i3 program. Data for this measure are based on aggregate total project costs and the number of students served by all grantees. Aggregate program costs were used to calculate costs per student due to inconsistencies in the data grantees reported. The Department is developing a new annual reporting format and providing technical assistance to grantees in order to improve the quality, completeness, and consistency of the data. Data for fiscal year 2012 will be available in late 2013. In the future, the Department expects to be able to provide data for this measure based on both total aggregate program costs and program costs minus evaluation costs. Being able to disaggregate evaluation costs is critical because evaluation costs for i3 projects tend to be large due to the goal of meeting WWC standards.

Year	Cost per student, Scale-Up grants	Cost per student, Validation grants	Cost per student, Development grants
2011	\$53	\$177	\$140
2012			
2013			
2014			

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### STEM innovation networks

(Proposed legislation)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: To be determined

Budget Authority:

	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
STEM Innovation Networks	0	0	\$150,000	+\$150,000
STEM Teacher Pathways	0	0	80,000	+80,000
STEM Master Teacher Corps	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>35,000</u>	<u>+35,000</u>
Subtotal, STEM Innovation Networks	0	0	265,000	+265,000
Effective teaching and learning: STEM	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>149,716</u>	<u>+149,716</u>
Total	0	0	414,716	+414,716

---

### PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Scientists and engineers create many of the innovations that drive our nation's global competitiveness. Our nation's capacity to create and innovate must never be limited by a shortage of talent in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields. To prepare our students for STEM jobs and other high-skill careers, we must provide them with meaningful opportunities to develop knowledge and competencies in these subjects.

Federal agencies have developed a range of STEM education programs over the years in order to meet this need, but with limited success. In the absence of a single guiding plan, these efforts have proliferated to include over 220 programs across 13 different agencies at an annual Federal investment of almost \$3 billion. Many of these initiatives are not effectively aligned either to the needs of students or to national priorities, and this fragmented approach to investment has made it difficult to reform and improve Federal STEM education efforts.

The Administration is proposing a comprehensive reorganization of STEM education programs to support a cohesive national STEM education strategy and to increase the impact of Federal investments in four areas: pre-kindergarten-through-grade-twelve (pre-K-12) instruction; undergraduate education; graduate fellowships; and informal education activities. The reorganization involves consolidating or restructuring 90 programs across 11 agencies and improving the delivery, impact, and visibility of STEM education efforts.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### STEM innovation networks

---

The proposed STEM Innovation initiative is a central element of the Administration's efforts to ensure that our Nation's children are prepared to succeed in a global economy increasingly reliant on STEM knowledge and skills. The programs included in this initiative are designed to help achieve that goal by: (1) developing, validating, and scaling up effective practices in pre-K-12 STEM instruction; (2) increasing student engagement in STEM subjects; and (3) recruiting, preparing, and further developing highly effective STEM educators.

The STEM Innovation initiative is comprised of the following complementary authorities: (1) STEM Innovation Networks, (2) STEM Teacher Pathways, (3) the STEM Master Teacher Corps, and (4) Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM.

### **STEM Innovation Networks**

#### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The proposed STEM Innovation Networks (STEM-INS) program would provide competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) or consortia of LEAs, in partnership with institutions of higher education (IHEs), nonprofit organizations, other public agencies, museums, and businesses, to transform STEM teaching and learning, especially for high-need students, and accelerate adoption of practices in pre-K-12 education that help increase the number of students who seek out and are effectively prepared for postsecondary education and careers in STEM fields.

STEM-INS would connect schools, educators, students, and community partners to local, regional, and national resources to enhance STEM education. Eligible partnerships would develop comprehensive plans for identifying, developing, testing, and spreading the use of evidence-based practices that provide students with rich STEM learning opportunities, including rigorous programs of STEM study that involve inquiry-, project-, and work-based learning; opportunities to interact with, learn from, and be inspired by STEM professionals and experts; and advanced coursework, including dual enrollment and other options for earning credit toward a postsecondary certificate or degree.

Depending on local needs and the resources available through partnerships with business, research organizations, and IHEs, grantees would focus their projects on areas such as: (1) recruitment, preparation, placement, and development of effective STEM educators; (2) teaching and learning models that enable students to successfully meet STEM-focused college- and career-ready standards; and (3) meaningful out-of-school experiences designed to increase student engagement in STEM.

To support effective implementation of these plans, STEM-INS would employ a wide range of strategies and utilize a rich array of resources and assets, including using technology to promote the broad adoption of effective STEM innovations and instructional technologies and leveraging regional and national STEM resources and assets as well as those of federal agencies. Other key elements of STEM-INS could include STEM Platform Schools, a subset of participating schools that would serve as "test beds" for intensive experimentation, research, and innovation in STEM topics relevant to local needs; research and evaluation partnerships to

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### STEM innovation networks

---

measure the impact of STEM-IN activities and build an evidence base for effective practices that would be broadly disseminated; and partnerships with teacher preparation and professional development providers to help align pre-service and in-service teacher training with network goals. STEM-INS could also engage with existing networks at the State and local levels and build on lessons learned to increase student engagement and achievement in STEM.

To be eligible to receive a grant, an applicant would be required to implement a set of high-quality pre-K-12 standards in mathematics and science that build toward college- and career-readiness; offer a rigorous 4-year course of study in high school science and mathematics; and have data systems that support timely collection and analysis of project implementation and impact data, including data on student outcomes such as accumulation of postsecondary credits in STEM subjects. Grantees would initially receive funding for 3 years and could receive an additional 2 years of funding if meeting performance expectations.

STEM Innovation Networks grants would be rigorously evaluated, with each grantee required to partner with a research institution for short- and long-term evaluative studies and to participate in a Department-funded program evaluation. The Department would be authorized to reserve up to 5 percent of program funds to support a range of national activities, including technical assistance, data collection, evaluation, and dissemination.

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$150 million in fiscal year 2014 to initiate the STEM Innovation Networks program as part of a government-wide consolidation of smaller, fragmented STEM activities that is intended to transform STEM teaching and learning using a coherent approach aligned to meaningful priorities. STEM-INS would help organize LEAs to share best practices, identify common problems that can be addressed through research and innovation programs, and support a rapid scale-up of effective STEM instructional models throughout the Nation.

Improving American students' engagement and achievement in STEM fields is vital to ensuring the continued economic well-being of our country and is a priority of the Administration. In a 2005 report, *Rising Above the Gathering Storm*, the National Academies concluded that a primary factor influencing the future health of the American economy and our ability to create jobs is innovation resulting from advances in science and engineering. In addition, recent projections from the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate that over 80 percent of the fastest-growing occupations (such as those in healthcare- and computer-related fields) require knowledge of STEM subjects. Yet US students finished 17th out of 33 countries in mathematics and 12<sup>th</sup> out of 33 countries in science on the 2009 Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), which measures the mathematics and science literacy of 15-year-olds in the world's most advanced countries. For the United States to build and maintain the highly skilled workforce and nourish the technological innovation needed to remain competitive in the global economy, we must improve STEM teaching and learning and ensure access to rigorous courses of study for our students.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### STEM innovation networks

---

The STEM Innovation Networks program builds on models already being developed and implemented in States and school districts with a strong STEM focus, including those using funding through Race to the Top. Ohio launched the first statewide STEM Learning Network in 2007, including several successful STEM schools and an intensive partnership structure that has now expanded to engage 15 additional States in STEM education reform. STEM schools have also adopted a network approach, such as the Harmony Science Academy schools in Texas or the New Tech Network that currently operates in 18 States. These networks have demonstrated improvements in student engagement and achievement in STEM and promoted effective teaching practices. The STEM Innovation Networks proposal is designed to build on and scale up these early successes by fostering new systems of support and expanding the evidence base for effective practices in STEM teaching and learning.

### STEM Virtual Learning Network

In fiscal year 2014, the Department would use STEM Innovation Networks national activities funds to develop a STEM Virtual Learning Network, an online community based on the Department's Connected Educator and Learning Registry initiatives and designed both to facilitate interaction among STEM educators and to accelerate identification, dissemination, adoption, and use of effective practices. The Department would leverage the work of STEM Innovation Networks grantees by requiring them to contribute actively to this community.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

	<u>2014</u>
<u>Measures</u>	
Amount for new awards	\$141,750
Peer review of new award applications	\$750
National activities, including STEM Virtual Learning Network	<u>\$7,500</u>
Total, STEM Innovation Networks	\$150,000

### STEM Teacher Pathways

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

STEM Teacher Pathways would directly support the President's goal of developing 100,000 new effective and highly effective STEM teachers while also building evidence on the characteristics and requirements of high-quality STEM teacher preparation programs.

This competition would provide grant awards to create or expand high-quality pathways to teacher certification and other innovative approaches for recruiting, training, and placing talented recent college graduates and mid-career professionals in STEM fields in high-need

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### STEM innovation networks

---

schools. Traditional and nontraditional teacher preparation programs, including alternative routes to certification, would be eligible to compete for funding, and the Department would look at ways to leverage and integrate the Pathways program with the work of the STEM Innovation Networks (STEM-INS). For example, the Department could give priority to STEM Teacher Pathways applicants that propose partnerships with schools and districts served by STEM-INS.

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The \$80 million request for STEM Teacher Pathways would help high-need schools and areas address a critical need for effective STEM teachers. Public high schools, in particular, report greater difficulties in filling STEM teaching positions, such as mathematics, biology, and physical sciences, than other subjects, such as English and social studies. Moreover, public high schools report that higher proportions of individuals teaching mathematics and science lack an undergraduate major or certification in their field when compared to teachers of other subjects, such as English or history.

This program's emphasis on STEM teacher preparation and retention reflects the Department's commitment to promoting excellence in STEM throughout our education system, and would complement the other proposed STEM programs. For example, while the STEM-INS could include pre-service teacher preparation as part of a region's overall comprehensive approach to improving STEM teaching and learning, STEM Teacher Pathways would focus more specifically on the recruitment, selection, preparation, and induction support of new, effective and highly effective STEM teachers.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2014</u>
Amount for new awards	\$75,200
Peer review of new award applications	\$800
National activities	<u>\$4,000</u>
Total, STEM Teacher Pathways	\$80,000

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### STEM innovation networks

---

#### STEM Master Teacher Corps

##### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

In July 2012, the Administration proposed the creation of a national STEM Master Teacher Corps comprised of some of the nation's finest educators in STEM subjects. Selected teachers would make a multi-year commitment to the Corps and, in exchange for their expertise, leadership and service, receive an annual stipend on top of their base salary.

The STEM Master Teacher Corps may also involve collaboration with nonprofit organizations and local public-private partnerships between STEM-related businesses and industries and school districts. Members of the Corps would be selected through a rigorous recruitment and selection process based on teachers' demonstrated effectiveness in teaching one or more STEM subjects, content knowledge, and contributions to the continuous improvement of teaching and learning both within their schools and across the community of STEM educators. Key goals would include recognizing, retaining, and rewarding expert STEM teachers while elevating the STEM teaching profession. Corps members would be a national resource, and would have an ongoing commitment to professional learning, building a community of practice, and helping students excel in STEM subjects while taking on leadership and mentorship roles in their schools and communities.

##### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$35.0 million to support a pilot project for the STEM Master Teacher Corps in fiscal year 2014. The STEM Master Teacher Corps is a key recommendation of the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, and is designed to recognize and help retain the Nation's most talented STEM teachers, build a community of practice among them, provide leadership opportunities for those teachers to help transform STEM teaching and learning, and raise the profile of the STEM teaching profession.

The proposed pilot project would, among other things, establish guidelines for Corps member recruitment, selection and integration into existing reforms, and define Corps members' roles, emphasizing their contribution to improving STEM teaching and learning across the country.

The STEM Master Teacher Corps would complement the other programs within the STEM Innovation initiative to support highly effective STEM teachers. In particular, Corps members could take on leadership roles in developing and implementing the STEM Innovation Networks (STEM-INS), validate and promote practices to improve STEM teaching and learning in Platform schools and across regional areas through the STEM-INS, work with a range of Federal STEM resources to enrich the efforts of the STEM-INS, and contribute to the Virtual Learning Network. The STEM Master Teacher Corps also could contribute to the design and support of STEM Teacher Pathways projects and to the effective implementation of Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund grants.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### STEM innovation networks

---

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

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2014</u>
Amount for new awards	\$32,900
Peer review of new award applications	\$350
National activities	<u>\$1,750</u>
Total, STEM Master Teacher Corps	\$35,000

### **Effective teaching and learning: STEM**

#### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM program, proposed as part of the Administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization plan in 2010, would reform the Mathematics and Science Partnerships program under current law and provide grants to SEAs, alone or in partnership with other entities, to support State and local efforts to implement a comprehensive strategy for the provision of high-quality pre-K-12 STEM instruction. Grantees and subgrantees would be required to focus on improving teaching and learning in mathematics or science, or both, and could also carry out activities designed to increase student achievement in technology or engineering, in high-need LEAs and schools.

In light of the Administration's bold new STEM education program reorganization, the Administration is revising its Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM proposal to complement the proposed STEM Innovation Networks. The Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM program would retain the formula grant structure of Mathematics and Science Partnerships but improve the awarding and use of subgrants under current law to align with the Administration's STEM education goals. This would allow all States to invest in STEM education while targeting support to the development and implementation of evidence-based STEM education programs. Further, improvements in STEM education supported with Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM grants could be leveraged by the STEM Innovation Networks and further disseminated through the STEM Virtual Learning Network.

States would be permitted to reserve up to 20 percent of grant funds for State-level activities to support the development and implementation of a coherent statewide approach to providing high-quality, evidence-based STEM instruction in high-need schools. States would be required to use remaining funds to make subgrants to high-need LEAs and eligible partnerships for efforts to improve STEM instruction at the local level that include effective professional development of teachers and school leaders; high-quality curricula, instructional materials, and assessment systems aligned with State standards; and continuous monitoring of project implementation and outcomes. Subgrantees also would be permitted to use funds for activities that integrate STEM instruction into teaching of other core academic subjects, improve

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### STEM innovation networks

---

engagement in STEM, and use technology to support teaching and learning. In making subgrants, States would be required to give priority to eligible entities that propose projects supported by the strongest available evidence.

The Department would be authorized to reserve up to 10 percent of program funds to support a range of national activities, including identification of effective programs and best practices, development of high-quality educational and professional development content, technical assistance, and dissemination. The Department would also be permitted to reserve up to 5 percent of funds for competitive grants to strengthen States capacity to improve the teaching and learning of STEM subjects.

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$149.7 million in fiscal year 2014 for the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM program, the same as the fiscal year 2012 level for Mathematics and Science Partnerships. This request would support the first year of the program, which would replace Mathematics and Science Partnerships with a more comprehensive, flexible authority under a reauthorized ESEA and would address the need to strengthen instruction comprehensively and increase student achievement in STEM subjects in high-need LEAs and schools.

Improving achievement in STEM fields is imperative for maintaining our Nation's economic security. Moreover, we must redouble our efforts to ensure that high-need students have access to rigorous, high-quality programs of STEM instruction. While a 2007 report from the Department's National Center for Education Statistics, *Advanced Mathematics and Science Coursetaking in the Spring High School Senior Classes of 1982, 1992, and 2004*, indicates that high school graduates' completion of mathematics and science courses increased between 1982 and 2004 and that greater percentages of graduates took advanced mathematics and science courses in 2004 compared to 1982, graduates in the highest socioeconomic status (SES) quartile were consistently more likely than graduates in the lowest SES quartile to have completed advanced-level coursework in mathematics and science. In addition, as reported in the Department's *Condition of Education 2012*, the percentages of White and Asian/Pacific Islander high school graduates who completed advanced science and mathematics coursework between 1990 and 2009 were consistently higher than those of their Black and Hispanic peers. Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM would help address these concerns by focusing on teaching and learning of STEM subjects in a manner that is aligned with college- and career-ready standards and targeted to high-need LEAs serving large concentrations of poor and minority students.

If Congress does not reauthorize the ESEA prior to enactment of fiscal year 2014 appropriations, the Administration will request authority through appropriations language to improve the awarding and use of subgrants under Mathematics and Science Partnerships (while retaining the program's formula grant structure) to align with the evidence-based STEM Innovation Networks proposal.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### STEM innovation networks

---

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

2014

#### Measures

Amount for new awards	\$134,244
Peer review of new award applications	\$500
National activities	\$14,972

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

#### **Performance Measures**

The Department will establish goals and performance indicators to assess the impact of the STEM Innovation programs.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Mathematics and science partnerships

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$149,716	\$149,716 <sup>2</sup>	0	-\$149,716

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The Administration proposes to consolidate the program in FY 2014 under new legislation.

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

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

The Department provides grants to States by formula based on the number of children ages 5 to 17 who are from families with incomes below the poverty line, with no State receiving less than 0.5 percent of the appropriation; States then award funds competitively to eligible partnerships. Eligible partnerships must include an engineering, mathematics, or science department of an institution of higher education (IHE) and a high-need local educational agency (LEA). Partnerships may also include other engineering, mathematics, science, or teacher training departments of an IHE; additional LEAs and public or private elementary or secondary schools, including charter schools; businesses; and nonprofit or for-profit organizations with demonstrated effectiveness in improving the quality of mathematics and science teachers.

In fiscal year 2013, the Department intends to develop regulations to help ensure that MSP-funded partnerships implement projects on a schoolwide basis (and not only for a handful of

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Mathematics and science partnerships

---

teachers in a school, resulting in uneven within-school impact too often seen under the current program structure) and have the commitment of school administrators.

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009 .....	\$178,978
2010 .....	180,478
2011 .....	175,127
2012 .....	149,716
2013 .....	149,716 <sup>1</sup>

---

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

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting fiscal year 2014 funding for the Mathematics and Science Partnerships program. In place of this program, the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization, a new program, Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM). This program would provide competitive grants to SEAs (alone or in partnership with appropriate outside entities) to support State and local efforts to implement a comprehensive strategy for the provision of high-quality STEM instruction and support to students from prekindergarten through grade 12. Grantees and subgrantees would be required to focus on mathematics or science, or both, and could also carry out activities in technology or engineering.

In awarding grants, the Department would give priority to SEAs that have adopted and are implementing a set of high-quality K-12 standards in at least mathematics that build toward college- and career-readiness and are common to a significant number of States. States would be permitted to reserve up to 20 percent of grant funds for State-level activities to support the development and implementation of a coherent statewide approach to providing high-quality evidence-based STEM instruction in high-need schools. States would be required to use their remaining grant funds to make subgrants to high-need LEAs and eligible partnerships for efforts to improve STEM instruction at the local level that include effective professional development of teachers and school leaders; high-quality curricula, instructional materials, and assessment systems aligned with State standards; and continuous monitoring of project implementation and outcomes.

If the Congress does not reauthorize the ESEA prior to enactment of fiscal year 2014 appropriations, the Administration will request authority through appropriations language to improve the awarding and use of subgrants under Mathematics and Science Partnerships (while

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Mathematics and science partnerships

---

retaining the program's formula grant structure) to align with the evidence-based STEM Innovation Networks proposal and to use up to 5 percent of the appropriation for national activities, including technical assistance, evaluation, and dissemination.

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

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Amount for State grants	\$148,968	\$148,968	0
Average State award	2,660	2,660	0
Range of State awards	745-17,876	745-17,876	0
Evaluation	748	748	0

---

NOTE: 2013 excludes a 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 as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Data for these measures for 2012 will be available in the summer of 2013. No targets are shown for 2014 because the program is proposed for consolidation.

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

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

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Mathematics and science partnerships

---

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009	71	70
2010	66	66
2011	65	69
2012	65	
2013	65	

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

Data for this measure are provided only for teachers who completed pre- and post-assessments. In the following table are background data for this measure. The decreases in the number of participating teachers (in mathematics and in science) as shown in this table might be due, among other things, to States' funding fewer, more intensive subgrant projects.

Year	Number of participating teachers – mathematics	Number of participating teachers with pre- and post-assessments – mathematics	Number of participating teachers – science	Number of participating teachers with pre- and post-assessments – science
2009	36,546	15,567	31,762	15,041
2010	31,512	13,391	23,310	10,949
2011	25,344	13,410	19,562	11,735

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

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Mathematics and science partnerships

---

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009	46	58
2010	48	64
2011	50	66
2012	52	
2013	54	

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

Year	Number of students taught by participating teachers – mathematics	Number of students taught by participating teachers with student assessment data – mathematics	Number of students taught by participating teachers – science	Number of students taught by participating teachers with student assessment data – science
2009	1,442,254	623,950	1,252,853	325,586
2010	1,476,835	752,225	1,157,168	380,647
2011	1,280,438	824,388	903,788	354,150

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009	39	52
2010	40	51
2011	41	47
2012	42	
2013	43	

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Mathematics and science partnerships

---

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009	14	6
2010	15	13
2011	16	24
2012	17	
2013	18	

**Additional Information:** The Department's contractor collects information related to evaluation from annual performance reports and assesses evaluation designs using a rubric that was developed for the Department in 2007 and revised in 2011 and 2012 to better align with What Works Clearinghouse evidence standards. Included in this measure are only evaluation designs for which sufficient information is provided to enable an assessment. We believe that conveying high expectations for project evaluation through the rubric and prominently featuring subgrantees with strong evaluation designs in technical assistance and dissemination activities have contributed to the increase in the percentage of evaluations that are conducted successfully and with rigor.

### Efficiency Measure

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009	100	100
2010	100	100
2011	100	100
2012	100	
2013	100	

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

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### High school redesign (Proposed legislation)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: To be determined

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change From 2012</u>
0	0	\$300,000	+\$300,000

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The proposed High School Redesign program would promote the whole school redesign of the high school experience in order to provide students with challenging and relevant academic and career-related learning experiences that prepare them for postsecondary education and careers. Grantee activities would include (1) redesigning academic content and instructional practices to align with postsecondary education and careers; (2) providing personalized learning opportunities and academic and wrap-around support services; (3) providing high-quality career and college exploration and counseling services; (4) offering opportunities to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school; (5) offering career-related experiences; (6) offering project-based learning; (7) making more strategic use of learning time, which could include effective application of technology, redesigning school calendars, and competency-based progression; and (8) providing evidence-based professional development to educators.

Funds would support competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) in partnership with (1) institutions of higher education and (2) entities such as non-profits, community-based organizations, government agencies, and business or industry-related organizations that can help schools prepare students to apply academic concepts to real world challenges. Grantees would also be required to leverage existing Federal, State, and local resources to implement their projects. Special consideration would be given to partnerships that propose projects that are located in areas with limited access to quality career and college opportunities such as high-poverty or rural LEAs. Special consideration would also be given to partnerships with employers that provide students at participating schools with career-related experience or help students attain career-related credentials.

Under our proposal the Department would set aside one-half of 1 percent of the total appropriation for the Bureau of Indian Education for activities consistent with the purposes of the program. The Department would also reserve up to 2.5 percent of the appropriated funds for national activities, including research, development, demonstration, dissemination, technical assistance, and evaluation.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### High school redesign

---

#### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2014, the Department requests \$300 million for a new High School Redesign program to promote the whole school redesign of high schools through competitive grants to consortia of LEAs and partners so that students graduate from high school with the academic foundation and career-related skills they need to be successful. These models will ensure that all students in these high schools participate in project- or problem-based learning and performance assessments and graduate with:

- College credit, earned through dual enrollment, Advanced Placement courses, or other postsecondary learning opportunities; and
- Career-related experiences or competencies, obtained through organized internships and mentorships, structured work-based learning, and other related experiences.

Accomplishing these goals will help improve longer term outcomes for high school students, including increased high school graduation rates, high rates of enrollment in postsecondary studies without the need to take remedial courses, higher postsecondary completion rates, and higher rates of completion of industry-recognized credentials and certifications. Graduates also are more likely to enjoy higher rates of employment and command higher salaries due to their stronger college preparation and skills development.

Improving American high schools is a critical step for ensuring that America remains competitive in today's global economy. Today's high school students are tomorrow's engineers, entrepreneurs, and civic leaders who must be critical thinkers and able to find solutions to complex and emerging challenges. High schools must provide them with a rigorous and relevant education that prepares them to meet the demands of college and careers.

Yet many of America's students are not meaningfully engaged or motivated in their academic experiences while in high school, and many who graduate lack exposure to the relevant learning that bridges their classroom work with future college experiences and careers. In response to these concerns, some reformers are trying new program designs for America's high schools to help prepare students for an innovation economy by fostering problem-solving and analytical skills; encouraging creativity and collaboration; and equipping students with the knowledge and skills needed to be competitive in the workforce. Similarly, the High School Redesign proposal responds to evidence that students learn best when they are engaged in complex projects and tasks aligned with their interests, and when they work with others through practical examples and case studies that keep them engaged in rigorous academic coursework and in the application of knowledge.

The Center on Education and the Workforce projects that, by 2018, two-thirds of job openings will require some postsecondary education, and about 30 percent of job openings will require at least a certificate or associate's degree. In blue collar occupations, about 35 percent of jobs will require some college or more by 2018. Unfortunately, we know that many high school graduates are not prepared to succeed in college; according to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), 20 percent of first-year undergraduate students enrolled in institutions of higher education during academic year 2007-08 reported taking remedial courses.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### High school redesign

---

The proposed High School Redesign program would seek to address these challenges by funding high-quality, innovative high school models that prepare students to be college- and career-ready. Funded projects would be expected to incorporate strategies that engage students in learning opportunities tied to real world experience (such as work-based learning) and also provide students with rigorous, challenging academic content aligned with college-level expectations, including programs that allow students to gain postsecondary credit while still in high school. These experiences would help students develop not only academic content and cognitive competencies (such as critical thinking, solving complex and non-routine problems, and evaluating arguments on the basis of evidence) but also pertinent employability skills (including interpersonal and intrapersonal competencies, such as conscientiousness and persistence) that have been shown to have consistent positive correlations with desirable educational and career outcomes (*Education for Life and Work: Developing Transferable Knowledge and Skills in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, NRC, 2012). In addition, projects would be expected to incorporate meaningful career exploration opportunities and high-quality college and career advisory services to help students plan for the pathway they need to follow to learn the skills and attain the credentials they need to enter their chosen careers.

Grantees would use requested funds to leverage other existing Federal, State, and local funds, including through the development of partnerships with business and industry and public or private nonprofit and community-based organizations. A key goal of such partnerships would be to ensure that career-related activities are aligned with real world expectations, and with institutions of higher education, to ensure alignment between secondary and postsecondary content and expectations.

The Department would encourage applicants for High School Redesign funding to propose projects that connect high school experiences with relevant industry and community partners in science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) fields. The High School Redesign program would also complement Administration efforts to reform career and technical education as outlined in its 2012 blueprint for reauthorizing the Perkins Career and Technical Education Act, which seeks to create stronger links between secondary education, postsecondary education, and the employment needs of in-demand industries. The program also expands on Administration efforts to improve high school graduation rates and college enrollment rates through the College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program proposed under the Administration's proposal for reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2014</u>
Amount for new awards	\$288,000
Range of awards	\$5,000-\$25,000
Average award	\$15,000
Number of new awards	15-25

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### High school redesign

---

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2014</u>
Peer review of new award applications	\$3,000
BIE	1,500
National activities	7,500

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

#### **Performance Measures**

The Department will establish goals and performance indicators to assess the impact of the activities that receive support under this program. The development of these measures would build on our experience in creating performance measures for other programs, and the Department would also seek to align program measures for High School Redesign with measures for related programs.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Excellent instructional teams

(Proposed legislation)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: To be determined

Budget Authority:

	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
Effective teachers and leaders State grants	0	0	\$2,466,567	+\$2,466,567
Teacher and leader innovation fund	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>400,000</u>	<u>+400,000</u>
Total	0	0	2,866,567	+2,866,567

---

### PROGRAM OVERVIEW

States and local educational agencies (LEAs) are facing new challenges and will require significant Federal support in order to promote and enhance the education profession and improve teacher and principal effectiveness. The Excellent Instructional Teams programs, proposed as part of the Administration's plan for reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), would address those needs by providing funds to foster teacher collaboration and the creation of excellent instructional teams through efforts to recruit, prepare, support, and retain effective and highly effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders, especially in high-need LEAs, schools, fields, and subjects. These programs would also help States and LEAs ensure the equitable distribution of effective and highly effective teachers and principals across schools.

The Excellent Instructional Teams programs would have two components: Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants, a formula grant program with a 25-percent set-aside, and the competitive Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund. Together, these new initiatives would provide formula grants to States and districts to improve the effectiveness of teachers and school leaders and to support a more equitable distribution of effective and highly effective teachers and leaders; investments in the development, improvement and expansion of high-quality teacher and leader pathways with evidence of effectiveness; and competitive grants to States and districts to support the development and implementation of innovative teacher and leader policies. With amounts reserved for evaluation and national activities, the Department would build evidence on how best to recruit, prepare, and support effective teachers and school leaders, and invest in efforts to enhance the teaching and leadership professions.

This approach would support State and local efforts to: (1) promote and enhance the teaching profession; (2) recruit, prepare, develop, reward, and retain effective and highly effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders and foster excellent instructional teams,

## **INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS**

### **Excellent instructional teams**

---

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

The Administration is also proposing \$5 billion in mandatory funding for the Recognizing Education Success, Professional Excellence, and Collaborative Teaching (RESPECT) Project. The competition would unleash a wave of reform across the country by awarding grants to States and consortia of districts with the most ambitious plans and policies for reforming the teaching profession. Funds under this initiative would be used to reform teacher and principal preparation programs; strengthen teacher and principal evaluation and professional development systems; redesign educator career ladders and compensation systems to attract and retain top talent; and create conditions in schools that support effective teaching, including by providing teachers greater autonomy, shared leadership and responsibility for student outcomes, and time for collaboration. This proposal builds on existing reforms initiated through Race to the Top, the Teacher Incentive Fund, and ESEA Flexibility.

### **Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants**

#### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

States would distribute funds to LEAs by formula based 20 percent on each LEA's relative share of the population aged 5 to 17 and 80 percent on each LEA's relative share of children aged 5 to

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Excellent instructional teams

---

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

The Department would reserve up to 25 percent of the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants appropriation to make competitive awards for teacher and leader preparation activities. Activities funded under the proposed set-aside would play a key role in helping to create or expand high-quality pathways into the teaching profession and other innovative approaches for recruiting, training, and placing talented recent college graduates and mid-career professionals with strong content knowledge in high-need schools. It would support the essential elements of preparing new teachers to enter the classroom, supporting them during their first years in the profession, and addressing inequities in the distribution of effective and highly effective teachers. The proposed set-aside would also support the recruitment, preparation, and retention of effective principals and school leadership teams who are able to turn around low-performing schools.

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

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$2.5 billion for the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program for fiscal year 2014. This program would focus on improving teacher and principal effectiveness and ensuring the equitable distribution of effective and highly effective teachers and principals. States and LEAs would have flexibility in how they use formula grant funds, but would be accountable for improving their teacher and principal evaluation systems and ensuring that low-income and minority students have equitable access to teachers and principals who are effective at raising student achievement.

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

Over the next 10 years, 1.6 million teachers will retire, and 1.6 million new teachers will be needed to take their place. This poses both an enormous challenge and an extraordinary

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Excellent instructional teams

---

opportunity for our education system; if we succeed in recruiting, preparing, supporting, and retaining great teaching talent, we can transform public education in this country and begin to deliver an excellent education for every child. A growing body of research also indicates that the quality of a school's leadership has a substantial effect on student achievement. Effective school leaders are able to create cultures focused on learning, with high expectations for all students, as well as recruit and retain highly effective teachers. Moreover, the impact of strong leadership may be greatest in high-need and low-performing schools. These schools need serious, systematic change, requiring transformative leaders. Federal investments in the recruitment, preparation, and retention of effective principals and school leadership teams will also be particularly important given that the Bureau of Labor Statistics expects increased demand for educational administrators through 2018, as the number of school-age children grows and current school leaders retire in greater numbers.

In recognition of the changing nature of America's teaching workforce and the need to enhance the role of teachers and principals in transforming public education, the Department would use the 25-percent set-aside to support:

- The creation and expansion of high-quality pathways into the teaching profession and school leadership, including university- and LEA-based traditional and alternative routes into teaching, and the recruitment, preparation, and retention of principals and school leadership teams that are able to turn around low-performing schools. The Department would also use these funds to support the expansion and improvement of teacher preparation programs at minority-serving institutions to increase the number of effective minority educators in high-need schools.
- Competitive grants to States and LEAs to dramatically improve the quality of teacher and principal preparation, including the development of rigorous accountability systems for teacher and principal preparation programs, the enhancement of teacher and principal certification and licensure standards so that those standards are based on performance, and the development and improvement of teacher and principal evaluation systems.
- The new Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED) program, which was initiated with fiscal year 2011 funds under the current Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program. Under the SEED program, the Department makes grants to national nonprofit organizations to support teacher and school leader enhancement projects with evidence of effectiveness.
- National research, technical assistance, outreach, and dissemination activities. The Department would support activities to strengthen teacher and principal evaluation, improve teacher and principal certification, develop and disseminate model surveys on the quality of educator support and working conditions, and scale up the work of nonprofit organizations that support LEAs in strengthening their teacher and principal pipelines and human resource practices.

The Department would reserve up to an additional 1.5 percent for evaluation. In fiscal year 2014, continuation costs for the Transition to Teaching program would be funded from the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants set-aside for national leadership activities.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Excellent instructional teams

---

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

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2014</u>
Funding for State grants	\$1,788,261
Range of awards to States	8,558–201,862
Average State grant	34,390
Amount for Outlying Areas	12,333
Amount for BIE	12,333
National leadership activities	616,642
Evaluation	36,999

---

NOTE: In 2014, the Department would use approximately \$16,381 thousand from the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants set-aside to pay continuation costs under the Transition to Teaching program.

### Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund

#### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

Grantees, selected competitively, would use funds to reform teacher and school leader compensation and career advancement systems, improve the use of evaluation results for retention, compensation, and other human capital management decisions, improve hiring and placement practices, improve certification and licensure systems, and implement other innovative strategies to strengthen the workforce.

#### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$400 million in 2014, a \$100 million increase from the fiscal year 2012 appropriation for the current Teacher Incentive Fund, for the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund. This program would help States and LEAs improve the effectiveness of teachers and leaders in high-need schools and LEAs, in particular by creating the conditions to identify, recruit, prepare, support, retain, and advance effective and highly effective teachers, teacher leaders, principals, and school leadership teams in those schools. It would also support activities to improve teacher and leader effectiveness, reduce disparities in the access of students to effective and highly effective teachers and leaders, and support the improvement of persistently low-performing schools.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Excellent instructional teams

---

In fiscal year 2014, continuation costs for the Teacher Incentive Fund would be funded from the appropriation for the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund.

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

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2014</u>
Funding for new awards	\$18,000
Number of new awards	2
Average new award	\$9,000
Peer review of new award applications	\$1,000
Evaluation	\$6,000
TIF continuation costs	\$375,000

---

NOTE: In 2014, the Department would use approximately \$375,000 thousand from the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund to pay continuation costs under the Teacher Incentive Fund.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### **Performance Measures**

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

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

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Improving teacher quality State grants

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
Annual appropriation	\$785,126	\$785,126	0	-\$785,126
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	<u>1,681,441</u>	<u>1,681,441</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-1,681,441</u>
Total	2,466,567	2,466,567 <sup>2</sup>	0	-2,466,567

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2014 under new legislation.

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

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

Improving Teacher Quality State Grants funds are distributed by formula. Each State receives the amount of funds that it received from the antecedent Eisenhower Professional Development State Grants and Class Size Reduction programs in fiscal year 2001, totaling around \$2.1 billion. Remaining funds (around \$300 million) are then allocated to States by formula, with 35 percent of remaining allocations based on States' relative shares of the population aged 5 to 17 and 65 percent based on States' relative shares of children from low-income families aged 5 to 17. Each State must receive at least one-half of 1 percent of these remaining funds. The Bureau of Indian Education in the Department of the Interior and the Outlying Areas each receive one-half of 1 percent of the appropriation.

Each State allocates 95 percent of its funds for subgrants to LEAs, 2.5 percent for subgrants to eligible partnerships (or a smaller percentage if the total amount reserved by all States for this purpose would exceed \$125 million), and the remainder for State-level activities. A State

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

---

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

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

States may use their State-level funds for a variety of activities, including the reform of teacher and principal certification or licensing requirements, teacher mentoring, creation or improvement of alternative routes to certification, teacher recruitment and retention programs, tenure reform, professional development for teachers and principals, technical assistance to LEAs, activities to promote State reciprocity of teacher and principal certification or licensing, performance-based compensation systems, and pay differentiation programs.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, required all SEAs receiving Title I, Part A funds to develop a plan to have all public school teachers of core academic subjects meet the Act's definition of a "highly qualified teacher" no later than the end of the 2005-2006 school year. "Highly qualified" means that the teacher: (1) has obtained full State certification; (2) holds a minimum of a bachelor's degree; and (3) has demonstrated subject-matter competency in each of the academic subjects in which he or she teaches.

In the fiscal year 2011 appropriations act, Congress directed the Department to use 1 percent of that year's appropriation for the new Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED) program, and in the fiscal year 2012 appropriations act, Congress increased this set-aside to 1.5 percent. Under this program, the Department makes grants to national nonprofit organizations to support teacher and school leader enhancement projects with evidence of effectiveness. Grantees use the funds to recruit, select, and prepare or provide professional development activities for teachers or principals.

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

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009.....	\$2,947,749
2010.....	2,947,749
2011.....	2,464,876
2012.....	2,466,567
2013.....	2,466,567 <sup>1</sup>

---

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

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program, which under the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal would be consolidated into a new Excellent Instructional Teams initiative. The new authority would include two new programs that would provide formula-based Effective Teachers and Leaders grants to States and districts to improve the effectiveness and equitable distribution of teachers and leaders and competitive Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund awards to States and districts to support the development and implementation of innovative teacher and leader policies. With amounts reserved for evaluation and national activities under these programs—including a 25-percent set-aside within the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants—the Department would build evidence on how best to recruit, prepare, and support effective teachers and school leaders and invest in efforts to enhance the teaching and leadership professions.

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

Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants would focus on developing and improving existing systems to evaluate teacher and principal effectiveness, based in significant part on student growth, as well as other factors. These evaluation systems would be designed to provide educators with timely feedback and inform decisions about professional development, mentoring, compensation, leadership opportunities, promotion, and other human capital matters. States and local educational agencies (LEAs) would have flexibility in how they use formula grant funds, but would be accountable for having in place rigorous teacher and principal evaluation systems and for ensuring that all students, including students in high-poverty and

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

---

high-minority schools, have equitable access to teachers and principals who are effective at raising student achievement.

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

##### **State Grants**

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Funding for States awards	\$2,392,694	\$2,392,694	0
Range of States awards	11,494-270,254	11,451-270,091	0
Average State award	46,013	46,013	0
Amount for Outlying Areas	12,271	12,271	0
Amount for BIE	12,271	12,271	0
Evaluation	12,333	12,333	0
Total	2,429,569	2,429,569	0

##### **Supporting Effective Educator Development**

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Funding for new awards	\$25,350	\$32,256	0
Number of new awards	3	3	0
Average new award	\$8,450	10,752	0
Funding for continuation awards	\$11,279	\$4,373	0
Number of continuation awards	2	1	0
Average continuation award	\$5,640	\$4,373	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$370	\$370	0
Total	\$36,999	\$36,999	0

---

NOTE: 2013 excludes a 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

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

---

progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

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

**Measure:** The percentage of core academic classes in high-poverty elementary schools taught by highly qualified teachers.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	100	96
2010	100	97
2011	100	97
2012	100	
2013	100	

**Measure:** The percentage of core academic classes in high-poverty secondary schools taught by highly qualified teachers.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	100	93
2010	100	95
2011	100	94
2012	100	
2013	100	

**Measure:** The percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in elementary schools.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	100	97
2010	100	98
2011	100	98
2012	100	
2013	100	

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

---

**Measure:** The percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in secondary schools.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	100	95
2010	100	96
2011	100	95
2012	100	
2013	100	

**Additional information:** The program made progress on this objective from 2008 to 2009 and from 2009 to 2010 but did not meet the 100 percent targets called for under current law. No targets are shown for 2014 because the Administration is proposing to consolidate this program.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009		31
2010		30
2011		34

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009		31
2010		29
2011		32

**Additional information:** These measures present the number of States that reduced (from the year prior to the year for which the data are reported) the difference in the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in highest-poverty versus lowest-poverty schools. For example, 34 States reduced the difference in these percentages in elementary schools between 2010 and 2011, and 32 States reduced the difference in these percentages in secondary schools between those 2 years. The Department has not set targets for these measures because the Administration is proposing to consolidate this program.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

---

#### Efficiency Measure

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009	35	29
2010	34	16

**Additional information:** The Department did not conduct monitoring visits in fiscal year 2011 because program staff were working with States on their revised State plans for ensuring that all teachers are highly qualified. In addition, the Department was unable to conduct on-site monitoring in 2012 due to a lack of staff capacity. The Department is beginning a new round of monitoring, including in-person and desk monitoring, in 2013, but has not set new targets for this measure because the Administration is proposing to consolidate the program.

#### Other Performance Information

The Department has used Improving Teacher Quality State Grants evaluation funds to conduct rigorous impact studies on pre-service training, professional development, equitable distribution of effective teaching, and teacher retention strategies.

#### Completed evaluations

A study of pre-service training,<sup>1</sup> released in February 2009, identified different models of teacher training, including alternative routes to certification, and compared the performance of students taught by teachers who have received different types of preparation. It found no differences in performance on reading and math assessments of students taught by teachers trained through traditional routes versus teachers who had pursued alternative routes to certification.

The Department has also invested in two studies of teacher professional development activities to identify and then test promising approaches to in-service training. The first, which was published in September 2008, examined the extent to which particular professional development activities (not necessarily related to federally funded program activities) change teaching practices in ways that research suggests are effective in improving student achievement in early reading.<sup>2</sup> It found that although there were positive impacts on teachers' knowledge of scientifically based reading instruction, neither of the two professional development activities in the study led to higher student test scores over a 1-year period, and

---

<sup>1</sup> *An Evaluation of Teachers Trained Through Different Routes to Certification*, February 2009, [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq\\_training.asp](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_training.asp).

<sup>2</sup> *The Impact of Professional Development Models and Strategies on Teacher Practice and Student Achievement in Early Reading*, September 2008, [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq\\_reading.asp](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_reading.asp).

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

---

any additional effect of coaching activities on teaching practices was also statistically insignificant.

The second study examined particular professional development activities that focus on improving middle school student achievement in mathematics.<sup>3</sup> An interim report on this study, published in April 2010, found that providing middle-school teachers 1 year of intensive math professional development (about 55 hours of specialized training during the 2007-08 school year) did not significantly improve their students' math achievement compared to achievement of students whose teachers did not receive that professional development. The training did not significantly improve teacher knowledge, either, relative to the comparison group of teachers, but did affect one aspect of instructional practice—teachers who received the intensive professional development more frequently engaged in activities that elicited student thinking. The final report, which was released in May 2011, found that the intensive professional development activities were implemented as intended, but teacher turnover limited the amount of training teachers received. For example, some teachers left the study schools and others entered as the study progressed, so not all teachers had the opportunity to experience the full course of professional development. The report found no evidence that the intensive professional development resulted in improved teacher knowledge, as measured by a specially designed assessment. Finally, there was no evidence that the intensive professional development led to improvements in student achievement in the specific math content covered by the professional development, rational numbers knowledge. As described below, the Department plans to build on lessons learned from this evaluation and next measure the impact – on teacher knowledge, classroom practices, and student achievement – of math professional development that focuses on mathematical content and integrating that content into the classroom at the upper elementary school grades.

The Department has also assessed existing induction programs in order to identify promising teacher retention strategies.<sup>4</sup> The first report, released in October 2008, found that there was no statistically significant difference between retention rates of participants in a comprehensive teacher induction activity and teachers in a control group. The second report, released in August 2009, includes information from 10 districts in which teachers were offered 1 year of induction services (“1-year districts”) and 7 districts in which teachers were offered 2 years of induction services (“2-year districts”). The report found no discernible impact of comprehensive induction on teacher retention rates after 2 years for either 1-year or 2-year districts. In addition, the report found that there were no statistically significant impacts on overall student achievement across all grade levels in reading or math during the teachers' second year. The final report on induction programs, released in June 2010, found that among teachers who received 2 years of comprehensive induction services, there was no impact on student achievement during the first 2 years, but there was a positive impact on student achievement in both reading and math in the third and final year of the study. Receiving only 1 year of induction services had no impact on student achievement. In addition, neither 1 year nor 2 years of comprehensive induction services led to improvements in teacher retention rates.

---

<sup>3</sup> *Middle School Mathematics Professional Development Impact Study*, May 2011, [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq\\_mathematics.asp](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_mathematics.asp).

<sup>4</sup> *Impact Evaluation of Teacher Induction Programs*; October 2008, August 2009, and June 2010, [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq\\_induction.asp](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_induction.asp).

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

---

Finally, the Department has used program evaluation funds to assess the progress that States, school districts, and schools have made in implementing the teacher quality and professional development provisions of the ESEA. The report of this assessment, which was released early in 2009, is based on the second round of data collection from the *National Longitudinal Study of No Child Left Behind* and the *Study of State Implementation of Accountability and Teacher Quality Under No Child Left Behind*.<sup>5</sup> It presents findings from interviews with State education officials in all States and surveys of nationally representative samples of school district officials, principals, and teachers conducted in 2004-05 and 2006-07. The study found that by 2006-07, the vast majority of classes (around 94 percent) were taught by teachers who had met their States' requirements for being considered highly qualified under the ESEA. However, teachers in high-poverty and high-minority schools, as well as special education and middle school teachers, were more likely to report that they were not highly qualified. Moreover, even among teachers who were considered highly qualified, teachers in high-poverty schools had less experience and were less likely to have a degree in the subject they taught. In 2006-07, 44 percent of school districts reported facing moderate or major challenges in attracting qualified applicants for teaching positions in mathematics, 53 percent for science, and 55 percent for special education. More than 90 percent of high-minority districts reported difficulty attracting highly qualified applicants in mathematics and science.

### Ongoing evaluations

The Department is currently supporting three additional studies on pre-service teacher preparation. One will look at the effectiveness of teachers who chose to enter teaching through highly selective alternative routes to certification; the report is expected in summer 2013.<sup>6</sup> Another will provide descriptive and implementation analyses on teacher residency grant projects that include a year-long "clinical" experience, shadowing, and co-teaching with an experienced mentor.<sup>7</sup> These grants generally also provide support and mentoring after participants become teachers. The study will also include information on retention rates. A report from this study is expected in summer 2014. Finally, the Department plans to examine teacher preparation programs with features thought to be promising and look at the classroom performance of their graduates compared to those from other teacher preparation programs; a report is expected in 2015.<sup>8</sup>

The Department is also continuing research on the effectiveness of in-service teacher training. In particular, a study of elementary school math professional development will look at the impact of specialized professional development in that area on teachers' content knowledge and

---

<sup>5</sup> *State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act*, Volume VIII--Teacher Quality Under NCLB: Final Report, <http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/teaching/nclb-final/index.html>.

<sup>6</sup> *An Evaluation of the Impact on Secondary Student Math Achievement of Two Highly Selective Routes to Alternative Certification*, [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq\\_alternative.asp](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_alternative.asp).

<sup>7</sup> *Implementation Evaluation of Teacher Residency Programs*, [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq\\_residency.asp](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_residency.asp).

<sup>8</sup> *A Study of Promising Features of Teacher Preparation Programs*, [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq\\_teacherprep\\_us.asp](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_teacherprep_us.asp).

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

---

classroom practices, as well as changes in student achievement.<sup>9</sup> The report from this study, expected in 2016, will also describe how the professional development was implemented.

The Department is concerned with ensuring the equitable distribution of effective teachers. One forthcoming report will provide information about the distribution of effective teachers within districts over a 5-year period.<sup>10</sup> An interim report is expected in spring 2013. The final report will also explore any changes in that distribution that may be associated with district strategies to ensure an equitable distribution of effective teachers. Another evaluation in this area is looking at the effects of offering incentives to high-performing teachers to teach in low-performing schools with high-need students.<sup>11</sup> An initial report, published in April 2012, found that filling teacher vacancies in these schools using transfer incentives was feasible but required a large candidate pool. The report also noted that teachers who transferred had, on average, 5 years more experience than teachers normally tapped to fill such positions. A final report, expected in summer 2013, will also estimate the impact of these teachers on student achievement.

The Department is also examining the implementation of policies promoted through ESEA Titles I and II 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 reflect the impact of ESEA flexibility and other initiatives on the implementation of Title I and Title II of the ESEA. The first report is expected in late 2014.

---

<sup>9</sup> *Impact Evaluation of Math Professional Development*,  
[http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq\\_mathpd.asp](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_mathpd.asp).

<sup>10</sup> *Study of the Distribution of Effective Teaching*,  
[http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq\\_distribution.asp](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_distribution.asp).

<sup>11</sup> *Impact Evaluation Of Moving High-Performing Teachers to Low-Performing Schools*,  
[http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq\\_recruitment.asp](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_recruitment.asp).

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Teacher incentive fund

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$299,433	\$299,433 <sup>2</sup>	0	-\$299,433

---

<sup>1</sup>The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The Administration proposes to consolidate the program in FY 2014 under new legislation.

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

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) supports States and school districts that develop and implement innovative strategies for providing financial incentives to teachers and principals who raise student achievement and close achievement gaps in some of our highest-need schools. The goals of TIF are to improve student achievement by increasing teacher and principal effectiveness; reform teacher and principal compensation systems so that teachers and principals are rewarded for gains in student achievement; increase the number of and retain effective teachers teaching low-income, minority, and disadvantaged students in hard-to-staff subjects; and create sustainable performance-based compensation systems. These systems also provide educators with professional development and additional compensation for taking on additional responsibilities and leadership roles.

Under TIF, the Department makes competitive 5-year grants to support the development and implementation of performance-based compensation systems (PBCSs) that include professional development and career advancement opportunities for public school teachers and principals in high-need schools. Eligible entities include (1) local educational agencies (LEAs), including charter schools that are LEAs; (2) States; and (3) nonprofit organizations in partnership with an LEA, a State, or both. Applicants must propose PBCSs that take into consideration gains in student achievement as well as other factors, including classroom observations conducted multiple times during the year, and must demonstrate a commitment to ensuring the fiscal and programmatic sustainability of their projects.

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

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) provided an additional \$200 million for TIF in 2009 to allow the Department to significantly expand support for PBCSs. The Recovery Act also required the Department, through the Institute of Education Sciences

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teacher incentive fund

---

(IES), to conduct a rigorous national evaluation to assess the impact of performance-based teacher and principal compensation systems on teacher and principal recruitment and retention in high-need schools and subjects. The Recovery Act, in addition to providing a 5-percent reservation for an evaluation, allowed the Department to reserve up to 1 percent for management and oversight of activities supported by those funds.

The fiscal year 2012 competition included a priority on supporting projects with performance-based compensation systems that not only are well-designed and implemented LEA-wide, but also are part of a broader districtwide plan to evaluate teachers and principals fairly and rigorously, improve LEA human capital management, improve instruction, and positively affect student achievement. This competition also supported projects that proposed innovative ways to use performance-based compensation systems to improve instruction and student achievement in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics and to build career ladders that include school-based instructional leadership positions (such as master teachers, mentor teachers, or instructional coach roles).

Funding is appropriated for TIF under the Fund for the Improvement of Education, authorized by Title V, Part D, Subpart 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, but key program requirements are established through annual appropriations language.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009.....	\$97,270
Recovery Act .....	200,000
2010.....	400,000
2011.....	399,200
2012.....	299,433
2013.....	299,433 <sup>1</sup>

---

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

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) for fiscal year 2014. In place of several narrowly targeted programs that serve current and prospective teachers and school leaders, the Administration is proposing to create a broader Excellent Instructional Teams initiative through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization. This initiative would include a new Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund that would build on the experience of the TIF program to provide support for State and school district efforts to develop and implement innovative approaches to creating human capital systems that improve teacher and leader effectiveness and student outcomes. The new program would include a focus on the recruitment, development, retention, promotion, and reward of teachers and principals who raise student achievement and close the achievement gap in high-need schools.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teacher incentive fund

---

Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund grantees would use program funds to reform teacher and school leader compensation and career advancement systems; support the development and implementation of evaluation systems that can be used to guide professional development and continuous improvement of instruction; inform retention, tenure, and compensation decisions; improve hiring and placement practices and certification and licensure decisions; and implement other human resource reforms and innovations to support and strengthen the workforce.

The proposed Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund would reinforce the broader Excellent Instructional Teams initiative by supporting compensation systems that reward effective teachers' and leaders' contributions. These systems can be an important tool in efforts to attract effective and highly effective teachers and leaders and build strong instructional and school leadership teams in high-need schools, to create robust career advancement systems for teachers and other school leaders, and to create more effective professional development systems.

Under the Administration's reauthorization proposal, in fiscal year 2014 TIF continuation grant costs would be funded from the new Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Amount for new awards	\$290,557	0	0
Number of new awards	35	0	0
Average new award	\$8,302	0	0
Amount for continuation awards	0	\$284,461	0
Number of continuation awards	0	93	0
Average continuation award	0	\$3,059	0
Technical assistance, training, outreach, and evaluation	\$7,881	\$14,972	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$995	0	0

---

NOTES: Continuation costs of approximately \$375,000 thousand in 2014 would be provided from the appropriation for the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund.

2013 excludes a 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

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teacher incentive fund

---

progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2014 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department has established the following goal and performance indicators to assess the impact of the Teacher Incentive Fund. The Department has not set targets for these indicators because the Administration has proposed to consolidate the program in its last 3 budget requests.

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

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

**Measure:** The percentage of teachers and principals in high-need schools who have a record of effectiveness.

Year	2006 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Actual
<b>2009</b>	33.0	45.1
<b>2010</b>	35.7	44.3
<b>2011</b>	33.9	44.6

**Additional information:** The Department collects these data from grantee annual performance reports.

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

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

Year	2006 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Actual
<b>2009</b>	0.7	1.2
<b>2010</b>	1.0	0.7
<b>2011</b>	1.4	0.9

**Additional information:** The Department collects these data from grantee annual performance reports.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teacher incentive fund

---

#### New Measures

The Department established four new measures as part of the 2012 grant competition: (1) the percentage of teachers and principals, who are rated at the highest level, at least effective, and not effective, as measured by the district's evaluation system and the percentage who are not rated; (2) the percentage of teachers teaching in a high-need field or subject, such as teaching English learners, students with disabilities, or STEM, who are rated at the highest level, at least effective, and not effective, as measured by the district's evaluation system and the percentage who are not rated; (3) the percentage of teachers and principals who were rated at the highest level, at least effective, and not effective, as measured by the district's evaluation system, and the percentage who were not rated, in the previous year and who returned to serve in the same high-need school in the LEA; and (4) the percentage of school districts participating in a TIF grant that use educator evaluation systems to inform the following human capital decisions: recruitment; hiring; placement; retention; dismissal; professional development; tenure; promotion; or all of the above.

#### Other Performance Information

The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) is conducting a rigorous national evaluation, using a randomized controlled methodology, to assess the impact of performance-based teacher and principal compensation systems (PBCSs) on student achievement and teacher and principal recruitment and retention in high-need schools and subjects. The Department will release an initial report in early 2014. IES is also conducting a study to assess the impact of implementing a teacher and leader performance evaluation system on student achievement, classroom practices, and teacher and principal mobility. The Department expects to publish an initial report in early 2015 and a final report in summer 2016.

In 2012, the Department's Policy and Program Studies Service (PPSS) published an implementation study of the 2006 and 2007 cohorts finding, among other things, that most of the 34 grantees recognized the importance of providing teachers opportunities to learn how to improve their practices so they could earn an award. However, the report noted that in the majority of projects almost all teachers and administrators received awards and that many of the performance-pay projects faced significant challenges to financial sustainability.

PPSS's *Results in Brief: Providing Effective Teachers for All Students: Examples from Five Districts*, also published in 2012, looked at five districts that use data on student achievement growth to identify effective teachers, implement performance pay initiatives or other human resource policies, and seek to ensure an equitable distribution of effective teachers, particularly in high-need schools. Three of the districts received TIF grants, and another benefited from TIF support through a State grantee. The report described how these districts measure teacher effectiveness and some of the challenges they faced, such as hurdles in implementing classroom observation systems that were both rigorous and manageable in terms of scheduling complexity and time required.

A 2010 report supported by the Gates Foundation, the Joyce Foundation, and the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching, *Performance-Based Compensation: Design and Implementation at Six Teacher Incentive Fund Sites*, highlighted six particularly successful

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teacher incentive fund

---

grantees in the 2007 Cohort. The report underscored not only improvements in teacher practices and outcomes, such as increases in collaboration and retention rates, but also significant increases in student achievement at many project sites. For example, students who attended participating rural and urban schools in South Carolina and Texas, and participating charter schools in New Orleans and Philadelphia, averaged more than 1 year of academic growth per school year.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Transition to teaching

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$26,054	\$26,054 <sup>2</sup>	0	-\$26,054

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2014 under new legislation.

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

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Transition to teaching

---

or 10,000 of the children served are from families with incomes below the poverty line and that has a high percentage of teachers teaching out-of-field or with emergency credentials.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009 .....	\$43,707
2010 .....	43,707
2011 .....	41,125
2012 .....	26,054
2013 .....	26,054 <sup>1</sup>

---

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

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration's fiscal year 2014 budget request includes no funding for Transition to Teaching, which would be consolidated into a broader Excellent Instructional Teams initiative through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization. This new initiative would include two new programs: the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program would provide formula grants to States and districts to improve the effectiveness and equitable distribution of teachers and leaders, and the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund would award competitive grants to States and districts to support the development and implementation of innovative teacher and leader policies. With amounts reserved for evaluation and national activities under these programs – including a 25-percent set-aside from Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants funding dedicated to improving and expanding high-quality teacher and leader pathways with evidence of effectiveness – the Department would build evidence on how best to recruit, prepare, and support effective teachers and school leaders, and invest in efforts to enhance the teaching and leadership professions.

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

The new Excellent Instructional Teams programs would build on lessons learned from the Transition to Teaching program's support for alternative-route programs. The Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program and the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund would provide support for States and LEAs to reform their certification or licensure policies and

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Transition to teaching

---

practices. In addition, the Department would reserve a portion of the appropriation for Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants to make direct awards to create or expand high-quality pathways into the teaching profession and other innovative approaches for recruiting, training, and placing mid-career professionals and recent college graduates whose knowledge and experience can help them become successful teachers in high-need schools. This initiative would also support State efforts to dramatically improve the quality of teacher preparation, including the development of systems to hold accountable teacher preparation programs, the enhancement of teacher certification and licensure standards so that those standards are based on performance, and the elimination of barriers to operating effective “alternative route” programs.

Under the Administration’s reauthorization proposal, in fiscal year 2014, Transition to Teaching continuation grant costs would be funded from the proposed 25-percent national activities set-aside under the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program.

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

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Funding for continuation awards	\$25,924	\$25,924	0
Number of continuation awards	51	50	0
Average continuation award	\$508	\$518	0
Evaluation	\$130	\$130	0
Number of participants	11,100	12,000	0

---

NOTES: Continuation costs of approximately \$16,381 thousand in fiscal year 2014 would be provided from the proposed 25-percent national activities set-aside under the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program. 2013 excludes a 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.

The Transition to Teaching authorization requires that each grantee submit an interim evaluation report at the end of the third year of the 5-year grant period and a final evaluation

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Transition to teaching

---

report at the end of the grant. This evaluation must describe the extent to which the grantee met program goals relating to teacher recruitment and retention.

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

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

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

**Measure:** The percentage of Transition to Teaching participants who become teachers of record in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.

Year	2004 Cohort Target	2004 Cohort Actual	2006 Cohort Target	2006 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2009	85	76	79	66	60	67		
2010	85	85	83	74	79	71		55
2011			85	75	83	72	58	70
2012			85		85		59	
2013								
2014								

**Additional information:** Because the Department does not expect participants to become “teachers of record” in the first year of the program, baseline data are not provided for the first year of each cohort.

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

Year	2004 Cohort Target	2004 Cohort Actual	2006 Cohort Target	2006 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2009	50	47	40	31	15	23		
2010	50	61	48	45	40	33		17
2011			50	54	48	44	18	30
2012			50		50		19	
2013								
2014								

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Transition to teaching

---

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

Year	2004 Cohort Target	2004 Cohort Actual	2006 Cohort Target	2006 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2009	77	66						
2010	77	62		42		21		
2011			43	53		35		
2012			43					
2013								
2014								

**Additional information:** This measure is the number of teachers of record who are still teaching after 3 years divided by the total number who began teaching 3 years earlier. Since it usually takes at least a year for a participant to find a teaching position, the baseline year for each cohort is 4 years after the start of the grant.

### Efficiency Measures

**Measure:** The cost per participant who teaches in a high-need school in a high-need LEA for 3 years.

Year	2004 Cohort Target	2004 Cohort Actual	2006 Cohort Target	2006 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2009	\$16,240	\$15,287		\$33,317				
2010	16,240	13,640	\$23,317	21,951		\$65,537		
2011			18,317	19,657	\$55,537	41,394		
2012			18,317		50,537			
2013					50,537			
2014								

**Measure:** The cost per participant receiving certification or licensure.

Year	2004 Cohort Target	2004 Cohort Actual	2006 Cohort Target	2006 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2009	\$11,500	\$13,013	\$23,505	\$19,733		\$42,392		
2010	11,500	8,449	18,505	9,208	\$37,392	13,592		\$21,324
2011			18,505	10,508	32,392	14,320	\$15,602	17,003
2012			18,505		32,392		10,602	
2013					32,392		5,602	
2014								

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Transition to teaching

---

**Additional information:** The denominator for these measures is the cumulative amount of money expended for each cohort.

### Other Performance Information

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

The Department published an interim report on the fiscal year 2004 grantee cohort in 2009, describing the extent to which those grantees met goals related to teacher recruitment, certification, and retention as described in their application. The report found that when grantees worked closely with their partnering LEAs, they generally identified and selected candidates who better matched the needs of the schools in which they could be placed (than was the case when there was not a close working relationship). In addition, the report noted that projects prepared participants for teaching with courses on a variety of topics, most commonly classroom management and instructional strategies. About half of the grantees reported offering courses online, and more planned to use this method and other distance learning strategies in the future to deliver information to participants. The number of certified teachers across projects varied greatly, due, in part, to differences in State certification requirements and the fact that many projects devoted significant resources to recruiting and preparing teachers in the first three years of implementation. Several grantees commented that providing specific test-taking assistance, such as courses tailored to the exam, test preparation workshops, and even staffing a “certification specialist,” helped teachers complete the certification process in a timely manner. Finally, the report also looked at the support grantees provided to new teachers, primarily in the form of mentoring and professional development workshops and seminars, to help them adjust to the challenges of the classroom. The data suggest that a relationship exists between this type of support and high retention rates. However, grantees provided little information about why those who were not retained had left their school or project prior to the 3-year benchmark.

The Department expects to release final reports on the fiscal year 2002 and 2004 grantee cohorts in spring 2013, an interim report on the 2006 and 2007 grantee cohorts in summer 2013, and an interim report on the 2009 grantee cohort in fall 2013.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Teacher quality partnership

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: Indefinite

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$42,833	\$42,833 <sup>1</sup>	0	-\$42,833

---

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

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teacher quality partnership

---

The following three types of grants are eligible for funding through the program:

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

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

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

- Create a school climate conducive to professional development for teachers;
- Understand the teaching and assessment skills needed to support successful classroom instruction;
- Use data to evaluate teacher instruction and drive teacher and student learning,
- Manage resources and time to improve academic achievement,
- Engage and involve parents and other community stakeholders, and
- Understand how students learn and develop in order to increase academic achievement.

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

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teacher quality partnership

---

Partnerships may apply for funding under the Pre-Baccalaureate program, the Teaching Residency program, or both, and may also seek separate funding under the School Leadership program. In addition, grant funds are available to develop digital education content to carry out the activities for Pre-baccalaureate or Teaching Residency programs, but not for School Leadership programs. Partnerships are eligible to receive grants to support Pre-Baccalaureate or Teaching Residency programs for up to 5 years and must provide matching funds from non-Federal sources equal to at least 100 percent of the grant amount.

Program funds also can be used to support evaluations of program activities, and, in 2010, the Department awarded a contract for an evaluation of teacher residency programs supported through grants awarded in 2009 and 2010.

The HEOA also allows the Department to use program funds to support the State teacher quality accountability reporting system, as authorized by sections 205-207 of the Higher Education Act. The State teacher quality accountability reporting system gathers data from all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the outlying areas, and the Freely Associated States on such topics as the completion rates for traditional and alternative route teacher preparation programs, as well as State teacher assessments and certifications. These data are reported to Congress and the Nation through the Secretary's annual report on teacher quality, and they provide critical information on both the progress toward the Nation's goal of a highly qualified teacher in every classroom, and areas for further improvements are needed (<http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/teachprep/index.html>).

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009.....	\$50,000 <sup>1</sup>
Recovery Act.....	100,000
2010.....	43,000
2011.....	42,914
2012.....	42,833
2013.....	42,833 <sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Of this amount, the fiscal year 2009 Appropriations Act set aside \$6,556 thousand for non-competing continuation awards under the antecedent Teacher Quality Enhancement program.

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

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration's fiscal year 2014 budget request includes no funding for Teacher Quality Partnerships (TQP), which would be consolidated into a broader Excellent Instructional Teams initiative through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization. This new initiative would include two new programs: the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program would provide formula grants to States and districts to improve the effectiveness and equitable distribution of teachers and leaders, and the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teacher quality partnership

---

would award competitive grants to States and districts to support the development and implementation of innovative teacher and leader policies. With amounts reserved for evaluation and national activities under these programs – including a 25-percent set-aside from Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants funding dedicated to improving and expanding high-quality teacher and leader pathways with evidence of effectiveness – the Department would build evidence on how best to recruit, prepare, and support effective teachers and school leaders, recruit and prepare effective science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) teachers, and invest in efforts to enhance the teaching and leadership professions.

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

The new Excellent Instructional Teams programs would build on lessons learned from the TQP program's support for alternative-route programs. The Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program and the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund would provide support for States and LEAs to reform their certification or licensure policies and practices. In addition, the Department would reserve a portion of the appropriation for Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants to make direct awards to create or expand high-quality pathways into the teaching profession and other innovative approaches for recruiting, training, and placing mid-career professionals and recent college graduates whose knowledge and experience can help them become successful teachers in high-need schools. This initiative would also support State efforts to dramatically improve the quality of teacher preparation, including the development of systems to hold accountable teacher preparation programs, the enhancement of teacher certification and licensure standards so that those standards are based on performance, and the elimination of barriers to operating effective "alternative route" programs.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teacher quality partnership

---

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

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Number of continuation awards	28	28	0
Average continuation award	\$1,511	\$1,513	0
Total continuation award funding	\$42,310 <sup>1</sup>	\$42,353 <sup>2</sup>	0
State teacher quality accountability reports	\$523	\$480	0

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

FY 2014 projected costs of \$538 thousand for data collection for the State teacher quality accountability reports would be provided from the funds set aside under the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program. There will be no grant continuation costs for the TQP program in FY 2014.

<sup>1</sup> Continuation costs for these grants in 2012 were \$58,802 thousand, which exceeded the amount available, so the awards were reduced.

<sup>2</sup> Continuation costs for these grants in 2013 are \$56,833 thousand, which exceeds the amount available, so the awards will be reduced.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

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

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

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

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

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

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

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teacher quality partnership

---

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

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

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

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

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

Data for all of the above-mentioned performance measures will come from the revised annual performance report. It is expected that initial data for these measures will not be available until fall 2013 at the earliest.

### Efficiency Measure

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

### Other Performance Information

In 2010, the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) awarded a contract for an evaluation of the teacher residency projects supported through the TQP program to Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. Although the evaluation was originally intended to be an impact study that would examine whether or not having a teacher residency program graduate as a teacher had an effect on student achievement, IES determined that an experimental research design was not feasible. Instead, the evaluation has been restructured as an implementation study.

In spring 2011, the evaluator surveyed all 28 TQP teacher residency projects in order to collect descriptive information on the characteristics and implementation of the projects. In order to limit the administrative burden on schools and districts, for a subset of projects, the evaluator conducted interviews with project directors and surveyed teacher residents and their mentors in spring 2011. In spring 2012, the evaluator began conducting additional surveys of the teachers of record, collecting student administrative data and teacher employment verification data, and conducting a survey on teacher mobility.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Teacher quality partnership

---

The implementation study is addressing the following research questions:

- How do teachers who complete teacher residency projects compare to other novice teachers and to all teachers in their district?
- What is the retention rate of the residency project teachers compared to their novice colleagues who weren't prepared through a teacher residency project?
- What are the characteristics of the teacher residency projects (e.g., length of overall program, nature of required coursework and apprenticeship activities, characteristics of their assigned mentor teacher, criteria for selecting program participants, etc.)?
- What are the characteristics of the teacher applicants and participants in the teacher residency projects?

The descriptive study includes approximately 300 teachers prepared through the TQP program, and the study will follow a subset of these teachers for an additional 2 years to collect data on teacher retention. IES plans to release the findings of this study in two reports, which are scheduled to be completed in fall 2013 and fall 2014. The Department hopes that the findings will help inform the implementation of the Excellent Instructional Teams initiatives.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### School leadership

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$29,107	\$29,107 <sup>2</sup>	\$97,994	+\$68,887

---

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

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

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009 .....	\$19,220
2010 .....	29,220
2011 .....	29,162
2012 .....	29,107
2013 .....	29,107 <sup>1</sup>

---

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

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### School leadership

---

#### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$98.0 million for School Leadership for fiscal year 2014, \$68.9 million more than the fiscal year 2012 level. With this substantial increase in funding, the Department would dramatically expand the scope of this program to focus on training highly effective leaders for high-need schools and districts.

School leaders are second only to classroom teachers among in-school factors that affect student learning. Emerging research shows that effective leaders play a critically important role in students' academic success, especially in high-need schools, by creating cultures of high expectations for all students, as well as recruiting and retaining highly effective teachers. This research indicates that effective leaders create a vision of academic success for all children in their school and encourage other educators to take on leadership roles and responsibilities. Moreover, effective principals also provide instructional leadership in addition to carrying out management responsibilities.

The 2014 request would support grants for high-quality, large-scale professional development for school leaders that build evidence of effectiveness. In particular, the Department would give priority to projects that propose to help current principals and school leadership teams master essential school leadership skills (such as evaluating and providing feedback to teachers, analyzing student data, developing school leadership teams, and creating a positive school climate), and deepen school leaders' understanding of college- and career-ready standards and effective instruction aligned to those standards. Grantees serving current school leaders would also provide principal managers (such as district superintendents) training on how to support and evaluate school leaders, based on research showing that district-level staff play an important role in helping develop and retain effective and highly effective principals.

The Department would also create incentives for applicants to set ambitious goals for their professional development programs, including goals related to student achievement gains. These incentives would also support the adoption of reforms that would enable strong school leaders to put their training to good use and perform their jobs effectively, such as providing effective principals with greater autonomy over areas like staffing, budgeting, and scheduling.

The request reflects the growing recognition of the importance of strong school leadership in reaching the Nation's education reform goals and improving student achievement, and is designed to complement the Administration's other proposals. For example, the Department would reserve a portion of Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants funds to prepare school leaders and develop school leadership teams who are able to turn around low-performing schools. The Department would also make competitive Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund grants to support innovative strategies undertaken by States and LEAs to raise the quality of teaching and school leadership, including by empowering principals in high-need schools with greater authority to select effective instructional teams for their schools.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### School leadership

---

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

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Funding for new awards	0	\$14,715	\$71,524
Number of new awards	0	22	28
Average new award	0	\$669	\$2,554
Funding for continuation awards	\$29,107	\$14,097	\$25,000
Number of continuation awards	43	21	43
Average continuation award	\$677	\$671	\$581
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$150	\$980
Evaluation	0	\$145	\$490

NOTE: 2013 excludes a 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 GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2014 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

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

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### School leadership

---

**Measure:** The percentage of participants who meet certification requirements to become a principal or assistant principal.

Year	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual	2010 Cohort Target	2010 Cohort Actual
2009	30	70	20	19		
2010	40	58	30	20	20	33
2011	50	69	40	32	30	57
2012	60		50		40	
2013			60		50	
2014					60	

**Measure:** The percentage of participants who are certified and hired as a principal or assistant principal in a high-need local educational agency.

Year	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual	2010 Cohort Target	2010 Cohort Actual
2009	50	36	40	26		
2010	60	32	50	35	40	57
2011	70	31	60	45	50	69
2012	80		70		60	
2013			80		70	
2014					80	

**Measure:** The percentage of participants certified through the funded project who are hired as a principal or assistant principal in a high-need LEA and who remain in that position for at least 2 years.

Year	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual	2010 Cohort Target	2010 Cohort Actual
2009						
2010						
2011						
2012		29		98		
2013						
2014						

**Additional information:** These measures track participants who are enrolled in projects designed to train and certify new principals and assistant principals. Grantees report data through annual performance reports. The Department will use baseline progress results to set targets for future years.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### School leadership

---

**Objective:** *To train and support principals and assistant principals from schools in high-need LEAs in order to improve their skills and increase retention.*

**Measure:** The percentage of principals and assistant principals from schools in high-need local educational agencies who participated in School Leadership-funded professional development activities and showed an increase in their pre-post scores on a standardized measure of principal skills.

Year	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual	2010 Cohort Target	2010 Cohort Actual
2009	50	51	40	0		
2010	60	57	50	81	40	11
2011	70	25	60	39	50	30
2012	80		70		60	
2013			80		70	
2014					80	

**Measure:** The percentage of principals and assistant principals from schools in high-need LEAs who participated in School Leadership-funded professional development activities and remained in their administrative position for at least 2 years.

Year	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual	2010 Cohort Target	2010 Cohort Actual
2009						
2010						
2011						
2012		27		11		
2013						
2014						

**Additional information:** These measures track participants who are enrolled in projects designed to support individuals currently serving as principals and assistant principals in high-need LEAs. Grantees report data through annual performance reports. The Department will use baseline progress results to set targets for future years.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Expanding educational options

(Proposed legislation)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: To be determined

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
0	0	\$294,836	+\$294,836

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The purpose of the proposed Expanding Educational Options initiative is to increase the supply of high-quality public educational options available to students, especially students attending low-performing schools, by creating and expanding effective charter and autonomous schools and by implementing comprehensive systems of public school choice.

The Administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization proposal includes two component programs within the Expanding Educational Options initiative: (1) Supporting Effective Charter Schools Grants and (2) Promoting Public School Choice Grants. Under Supporting Effective Charter Schools Grants, the Department would make competitive grants to State educational agencies (SEAs), charter school authorizers, charter management organizations, local educational agencies (LEAs), and other nonprofit organizations to start or expand effective charter and autonomous schools and to develop and implement outreach programs that provide high-quality information to parents and students about the public school options available to them. Autonomous schools would be defined as public schools that have autonomy over key areas of operations, including staffing, budget, schedule, management, and instructional program, and are subject to higher levels of accountability than traditional public schools. The Department would work to ensure that funding is focused on the creation of high-quality schools by selecting applicants based on their record of success in (depending on the type of grantee) authorizing, supporting, funding, overseeing, or operating effective charter and autonomous schools, including their record of closing (or terminating funding for) ineffective charter and autonomous schools, as appropriate. The Department would also ensure that funding is targeted to areas most in need by selecting applicants that demonstrate that they will expand options for students attending low-performing schools. The Department would give priority for grants to applicants proposing to create or expand charter schools and to applicants that would create or expand schools (whether charter or autonomous schools) with significant percentages of students from low-income families, and could also give priority to applicants whose schools will work to increase the diversity of their student bodies.

In addition, the Department would be authorized to use Supporting Effective Charter Schools funds to make competitive grants to SEAs, LEAs, community development financial institutions,

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Expanding educational options

---

and State financing authorities for the purposes of improving the access of high-performing charter schools to facilities and facilities financing.

Under the second program within the Expanding Educational Options initiative, Promoting Public School Choice Grants, the Department would make competitive grants to high-need LEAs, and to SEAs in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs, to implement programs of public school choice that increase the range of high-quality educational options available to students in high-need schools. Grantees would use funds to: (1) develop and implement a comprehensive public school choice plan, which could include creating or expanding interdistrict and intradistrict choice programs, theme-based school programs, online learning programs, or “academic pathway” programs; and (2) develop and implement activities to assist parents and students in identifying and accessing high-quality educational options. The Department would give priority for grants to applicants that propose to implement or expand an interdistrict choice program and to applicants that propose to implement or expand a program that will increase diversity.

The Department would be authorized to reserve up to 5 percent of program funds for national activities, including research and development, data collection and analysis, technical assistance, and outreach and dissemination.

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2014, the Administration requests \$294.8 million for the proposed Expanding Educational Options initiative, an increase of \$40 million over the fiscal year 2012 level for Charter Schools Grants. The Administration’s ESEA reauthorization proposal recognizes the continued importance of increasing the availability of high-quality educational options, especially for students attending low-performing schools, and ensuring that families have the information they need to choose from among their options. This new initiative would improve upon existing ESEA public school choice programs by, among other things, funding applicants based on their record of success with respect to charter and autonomous schools and by supporting strengthened information and outreach campaigns.

In fiscal year 2014, the Department would use Expanding Educational Options funds for continuation awards for grants made prior to ESEA reauthorization under Charter Schools Grants, for new Supporting Effective Charter Schools Grants, and for national activities, and intends to use the increase proposed for 2014 for new Supporting Effective Charter Schools Grants to charter management organizations and LEAs for the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools.

Although Promoting Public School Choice Grants would be authorized under the Administration’s ESEA reauthorization proposal, the Administration is not requesting funds for this program in fiscal year 2014.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Expanding educational options

---

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

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2014</u>
<b>Supporting Effective Charter Schools Grants</b>	
Amount for new awards	\$62,973
Number of new awards	25-40
Peer review of new award applications	\$250
Continuation awards for antecedent programs	\$216,871
National activities	\$14,742

---

NOTE: Approximately \$216,871 thousand in fiscal year 2014 would be provided under Supporting Effective Charter School Grants to fund continuation awards for grants made under Charter Schools Grants (including \$176,286 thousand for SEA grants, \$5,118 thousand for Non-SEA Eligible Applicant grants, and \$35,467 thousand for Charter Management Organization grants).

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Charter schools grants

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$254,836 <sup>2,3</sup>	\$254,836 <sup>4</sup>	0	-\$254,836

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The Administration proposes to consolidate the program in FY 2014 under new legislation.

<sup>2</sup> From the amount appropriated for Charter Schools, the fiscal year 2012 appropriations act required the Department to use not less than \$22,957 thousand for State Facilities Incentive grants and Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities grants.

<sup>3</sup> Reflects a reprogramming in fiscal year 2012 of \$200 thousand from Charter Schools Grants to Advanced Placement to help address a funding shortfall in the Advanced Placement Test Fee program.

<sup>4</sup> Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Charter Schools program supports the planning, development, initial implementation, and replication of charter schools, which increase educational options for parents and students and, in exchange for stricter accountability, are exempt from many State and local requirements governing traditional public schools.

State educational agencies (SEAs) in States in which State law permits charter schools to operate are eligible to compete for grants (SEA grants). States receiving grants make subgrants to charter school developers, which may include individuals and public and private nonprofit organizations. If an eligible SEA does not receive a grant, charter school developers in the State may apply directly to the Department for funding (Non-SEA Eligible Applicant grants). Developers receive up to 3 years of assistance, of which they may use not more than 18 months for planning and program design and not more than 2 years for the initial implementation of a charter school. States may reserve up to 10 percent of their grants to make subgrants to successful charter schools for information dissemination activities; charter schools in eligible States not receiving a grant may also apply directly to the Department for grants for dissemination.

In awarding SEA grants, the Department must give priority to States that provide for review and evaluation of charter schools by their chartering agencies at least once every 5 years to determine whether the schools are meeting their charter terms and their requirements and goals for student academic achievement. The Department must also give priority to States that do one or more of the following: (1) demonstrate progress in increasing the number of charter

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Charter schools grants

---

schools that are held accountable for results; (2) have chartering agencies that are not local educational agencies (LEAs) or, if only LEAs are chartering agencies, have an appeals process for prospective charter schools that initially fail to gain approval; (3) and provide charter schools a high degree of autonomy over their budgets and expenditures.

Under the authorizing statute, the Department must use the amount appropriated above \$200 million but not exceeding \$300 million, as well as 50 percent of any funds exceeding \$300 million, to make competitive 5-year grants under the State Facilities Incentive Grants program. State Facilities Incentive Grants support per-pupil aid programs that assist charter schools with facility costs. States pay an increasing share of the cost of their per-pupil aid programs over the course of their grants.

Beginning in fiscal year 2010, appropriations language has revised the program's allocation rules to authorize or require the Department to use specific amounts for State Facilities Incentive grants and Credit Enhancement for Charter Schools Facilities grants and to make grants to charter management organizations and other nonprofit entities for the replication and expansion of successful charter school models (Charter Management Organization grants). For fiscal year 2012, the appropriations act required the Department to use not less than \$23 million for State Facilities Incentive grants and Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities grants and authorized the Department to use up to \$54.9 million for Charter Management Organization grants.

The authorizing statute also permits the Department to use up to \$8 million of the appropriation for national activities. Recent years' appropriations acts have overridden this cap and allowed the use of a higher amount for this purpose, including for technical assistance to public chartering agencies to increase the number of high-performing charter schools. The fiscal year 2012 appropriations act authorized the Department to use up to approximately \$11 million for these activities.

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

	(dollars in thousands)
2009 .....	\$216,031
2010 .....	256,031
2011 .....	255,519
2012 .....	254,836 <sup>1</sup>
2013 .....	254,836 <sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Reflects a reprogramming in fiscal year 2012 of \$200 thousand from Charter Schools Grants to Advanced Placement to help address a funding shortfall in the Advanced Placement Test Fee program.

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

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funding for the Charter Schools program for fiscal year 2014. In place of this and several other, sometimes narrowly targeted, programs that seek to

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Charter schools grants

---

expand educational options for students and families, the Administration has proposed to create a broader initiative, Expanding Educational Options, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization. This new initiative would address the need to increase the supply of high-quality public educational options available to students, especially students attending low-performing schools, through support of effective charter and autonomous schools and comprehensive systems of public school choice.

The proposed Expanding Educational Options authority, described in more detail elsewhere in this account, includes a new Supporting Effective Charter Schools Grants program. Under this program, the Department would make competitive grants to SEAs, charter school authorizers, charter management organizations, LEAs, and other nonprofit organizations to start or expand effective charter and autonomous schools and to develop and implement outreach programs that provide high-quality information to parents and students about the public school options available to them. Funds would also be available for competitive grants for charter schools facilities programs. Recipients of funds under the current Charter Schools program and other applicants would be eligible to apply for funds under the new Supporting Effective Charter Schools grants program to start or expand charter and autonomous schools.

The creation and expansion of charter schools remains a key element of the Administration's strategy to promote successful models of school reform. The Department would work to ensure that funding is focused on the creation of high-quality schools by selecting applicants based on their record of success in (depending on the type of grantee) authorizing, supporting, funding, overseeing, or operating effective charter and autonomous schools, including their record of closing (or terminating funding for) ineffective charter and autonomous schools, as appropriate; and would also ensure that funding is targeted to areas most in need by selecting applicants that demonstrate that they will expand options for students attending low-performing schools. The Department would give priority for grants to applicants proposing to create or expand charter schools and to applicants that would create or expand schools (whether charter or autonomous schools) with significant percentages of students from low-income families, and could also give priority to applicants whose schools will work to increase the diversity of their student bodies.

Under the Administration's reauthorization proposal, fiscal year 2014 Charter Schools grant continuation costs would be funded from the appropriation for the new Expanding Educational Options initiative.

If the Congress does not reauthorize the ESEA prior to enactment of fiscal year 2014 appropriations, the Administration will request authority through appropriations language to use up to \$75 million of the 2014 appropriation for Charter Management Organization grants and to allow grantees to use funds for pre-kindergarten education, which some grantees are not permitted to do under the current-law definition of "charter school."

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Charter schools grants

---

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

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
<b>SEA grants</b>			
Amount for new awards	\$17,392	0	0
Amount for supplemental awards	3,647	0	0
Amount for continuation awards	162,794	\$178,929	0
<b>Non-SEA Eligible Applicant grants</b>			
Amount for new awards	3,842	4,000	0
Amount for continuation awards	3,078	4,902	0
<b>Charter Management Organization grants</b>			
Amount for new awards	14,416	4,530	0
Amount for continuation awards	16,654	29,952	0
<b>State Facilities Incentive grants</b>			
Amount for continuation awards	12,000	11,000	0
Peer review of new award applications	150	100	0
National activities	9,827	9,423	0

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

The amounts shown on this table do not include \$11,036 thousand in 2012 and \$12,000 thousand in 2013 for Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities, which are shown in the program output measures for that activity.

Continuation costs of approximately \$216,871 thousand (including \$176,286 thousand for SEA grants, \$5,118 thousand for Non-SEA Eligible Applicant grants, and \$35,467 thousand for Charter Management Organization grants) would be provided from the appropriation for Expanding Education Options in fiscal year 2014.

#### 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 support the creation of a large number of high-quality charter schools.**

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Charter schools grants

---

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

**Measure:** The number of States that have charter school legislation (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico).

Year	Target	Actual
2009	44	41
2010	44	41
2011	44	42
2012	44	43
2013	44	
2014	44	

**Additional information:** In 2011 and in 2012, after more than 8 years with no change in the number of States with charter school legislation, this number increased when first Maine (in 2011) and then Washington (in 2012) approved such legislation. The remaining States without charter school laws are mainly rural States (e.g., South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia).

**Measure:** The number of charter schools in operation around the Nation.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	4,720	4,700
2010	5,190	4,991
2011	5,660	5,339
2012	6,130	
2013	6,600	
2014	7,062	

**Additional information:** Data on the number of charter schools in operation are provided annually by State educational agencies and are verified by the Department. 2012 data for this measure are expected to be available in December 2013.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Charter schools grants

---

**Measure:** The percentage of fourth-grade charter school students who are achieving at or above proficient on State assessments in reading.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	74.4	71.1
2010	79.5	72.2
2011	84.6	70.9
2012	89.7	
2013	94.8	
2014	100.0	

**Measure:** The percentage of fourth-grade students in charter schools who are achieving at or above proficient on State assessments in mathematics.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	72.5	70.1
2010	78.0	72.6
2011	83.5	71.2
2012	89.0	
2013	94.5	
2014	100.0	

**Measure:** The percentage of eighth-grade charter school students who are achieving at or above proficient on State assessments in reading.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	74.7	70.8
2010	79.8	70.9
2011	84.8	71.2
2012	89.9	
2013	94.9	
2014	100.0	

**Measure:** The percentage of eighth-grade students in charter schools who are achieving at or above proficient on State assessments in mathematics.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	65.1	62.3
2010	72.1	59.5
2011	79.1	60.2
2012	86.1	
2013	93.1	
2014	100.0	

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Charter schools grants

---

**Additional information:** Performance targets for these measures are based on the ESEA goal of 100 percent student proficiency in reading and mathematics by 2014.

Data for these measures are collected through grantee annual performance reports. Analysis of the data has found notable variation in performance among the schools funded. 2012 data for these measures are expected to be available in December 2013.

### Efficiency Measures

**Measure:** The ratio of funds leveraged by States for charter facilities to funds awarded by the Department under the State Charter School Facilities Incentive Grant Program.

Year	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2010	Baseline	1.6
2011	2.9	2.4
2012	4.2	3.2
2013	5.8	
2014	6.3	

**Additional information:** This efficiency measure assesses the State Facilities Incentive grants by examining the ratio of funds leveraged by grantees to funds awarded by the Department. The leveraging ratio is the total funds available (the Federal grant and the State match) divided by the Federal grant for a given year.

The Department has also developed a measure to assess the cost efficiency, across States, of the Federal investment in supporting charter school start-ups. The measure is defined as the Federal cost per student of launching a successful school (defined as a school in operation for 3 or more years). Data for 2009 show an average cost of \$904 per student, for 2010 an average cost of \$789 per student, and for 2011 an average cost of \$920 per student. Data for this measure, collected through grantee annual performance reports, assist the Department in determining what constitutes a reasonable cost per student for different types of charter schools.

### Other Performance Information

In 2010, the Department released findings from its first impact evaluation of charter schools, which addressed the effects of charter school strategies on student achievement and satisfaction and on parent satisfaction. Researchers also examined school factors that affect student outcomes (e.g., school or class size, proportion of certified teachers) and the extent to which policy conditions and autonomy in school operation influence effectiveness. Approximately 36 charter middle schools across 15 States participated in this random assignment study. The researchers followed two treatment groups of students and a control group for two consecutive grade levels and also surveyed students, parents, and principals.

The evaluation showed that the impact of charter middle schools on student achievement varied across participating schools, with schools that served more low-income or low-achieving students showing statistically significant positive effects in mathematics and no significant

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Charter schools grants

---

effects in reading, and with schools that served more advantaged students showing significant negative effects in both subjects. The evaluation also examined whether achievement impacts were associated with certain school characteristics and found some positive impacts for charter schools with comparatively longer hours of operation or with comparatively higher revenue per student, but these findings were not statistically significant once the researchers controlled for school and student characteristics. Lastly, the evaluation found no significant relationship between charter school policies and student achievement.

*Multiple Choice: Charter School Performance in 16 States*, a 2009 study by researchers at Stanford University's Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO), examined longitudinal student-level data from a sample of 2,403 charter schools across 15 States and the District of Columbia to determine whether students who attend charter schools performed better academically than if they had attended a traditional public school. The researchers found that 17 percent of charter schools in the sample demonstrated significantly higher growth in mathematics achievement compared to traditional public schools in the sample, and 46 percent of charter schools produced mathematics gains that were indistinguishable from the average growth among traditional public schools. The remaining 37 percent of charter schools in the sample posted gains that were significantly below what those students would have seen if enrolled in a traditional public school. The researchers also performed a State-by-State analysis of charter school results and found that the effectiveness of charter schools varies by State and depends on each State's charter school law and policies: the academic growth of students in charter schools was higher in States with no cap on the number of charter schools that may operate and where there was only one charter school authorizer.

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

Other recent studies have used a more rigorous experimental research design to compare the performance of students who were admitted by lottery into oversubscribed charter schools and those who were not admitted and instead attended traditional public schools. Hoxby, Murarka, and Kang, in a 2009 report for the New York City (NYC) Charter School Evaluation Project, found a positive achievement effect for students attending the city's charter schools. By the third grade, the average NYC charter school student scored 5.3 scale-score points above his or her peers in traditional public schools in English language arts and 5.8 scale-score points above in mathematics. In grades four through eight, the average charter school student gained 3.6 more scale-score points in English language arts and 5.0 more scale-score points in mathematics than did peers in traditional public schools each year. Hoxby and colleagues noted that, on average, students who attended a charter school for grades kindergarten through eight scored about 23 scale-score points higher in English language arts and 30 scale-score points higher in mathematics compared to their peers in traditional public schools, closing about 66 and 86 percent of the achievement gap in those subject areas, respectively. The evaluation also found that students applying to NYC charter schools were more likely to be African American (63 percent versus 34 percent) and eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (92 percent

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Charter schools grants

---

versus 72 percent) than students in the traditional public schools in the district. The researchers also examined charter school policies in relation to achievement and found that effects on achievement were associated with the length of the school year, the number of minutes devoted to English language arts during the school day, whether teacher compensation was based on performance, and whether a school's mission statement emphasized academic performance.

In January 2013, CREDO released findings from *Charter School Growth and Replication*, which examines, in charter schools across 25 States, changes in school performance in the years following a school's opening and the implications of these changes for school replication. The study found, among other things, that schools with initial high performance with respect to student achievement tended to stay high performers over time, while the performance of initially low-performing schools remained low. The study also found that schools opened by a charter management organization (CMO) typically performed at a level similar to the average of the other schools operated by the CMO.

In light of the changing charter school landscape and recent research findings, the Department has initiated new data collection and analysis activities, including the development of a central warehouse of data on charter schools providing detailed information on a complete list of charter schools in operation across the Nation; a data-reporting guide for States; and issue briefs on key charter school topics using available data. The development of the data warehouse, which included a reconciliation of multiple charter school data sets, was completed in November 2012, and the data-reporting guide, which incorporates lessons learned from the reconciliation, is expected to be released in the spring of 2013. The Department believes that these activities have improved, and will continue to strengthen, the quality and reliability of our charter school data. We expect to publish the issue briefs later in 2013.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Credit enhancement for charter school facilities

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$11,036 <sup>2</sup>	\$12,000 <sup>2,3</sup>	0	-\$11,036

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2004. The Administration proposes to consolidate the program in FY 2014 under new legislation.

<sup>2</sup> The FY 2012 appropriation did not provide a separate appropriation for this program; instead, from the amount provided for Charter Schools, the appropriations language required the Secretary to use at least \$22,957 thousand for Charter School Facilities Incentive Grants and Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities. The Department expects to use the same amount for State Facilities Incentive Grants and Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities in FY 2013. The Department used \$11,036 thousand for the Credit Enhancement program in FY 2012 and expects to use \$12,000 thousand of the FY 2013 Charter Schools appropriation for the Credit Enhancement program.

<sup>3</sup> Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Credit enhancement for charter school facilities

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009 .....	\$8,300
2010 .....	8,300
2011 .....	10,036
2012 .....	11,036 <sup>1</sup>
2013 .....	12,000

NOTE: The Department used \$8,300 thousand from each of the FY 2009 and FY 2010 appropriations, \$10,036 thousand from the FY 2011 appropriation, \$11,036 thousand from the FY 2012 appropriation, and plans to use \$12,000 thousand of the Charter Schools appropriation for Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities.

<sup>1</sup> Excludes a 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 the Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program for fiscal year 2014. In place of this and several other narrowly targeted programs that seek to expand educational options for students and families, the Administration is proposing to create a broader initiative, Expanding Educational Options, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization. This new initiative would address the need to increase the supply of high-quality public educational options available to students, especially students attending low-performing schools, by creating and expanding effective charter and other autonomous schools, implementing comprehensive systems of public school choice, supporting magnet schools that improve student achievement and promote diversity, and strengthening parent information and outreach efforts across these programs.

More specifically, the Expanding Educational Options initiative, would include a new authority for Supporting Effective Charter Schools Grants. This new authority would focus on competitive grants to start or expand effective charter and autonomous schools and to provide high-quality information to parents and students about the public school choice options, while also providing support for charter schools facilities programs.

The Administration recognizes the importance of and need for continued support for charter school facilities and the challenges that charter schools encounter in financing and obtaining adequate facilities. The demands on and for charter school facilities are significant due both to the expansion of the number of public charter schools and to rapidly increasing enrollments in existing charter schools. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, while overall enrollment in public elementary and secondary schools increased by 0.5 percent between school years 2007-08 and 2010-11, charter school enrollment increased by 40 percent.

While charter schools receive public funding for operations, they often must find and finance their own facilities and have had difficulty obtaining funds in the same manner as traditional LEAs and public schools. Additionally, charter schools are less likely to be able to take advantage of economies of scale in their acquisition, construction, and renovation of facilities because they generally have smaller enrollments. In the 2010-11 school year, average

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Credit enhancement for charter school facilities

---

enrollment in traditional schools was 471 at the elementary level and 639 at the secondary level, while average enrollment in charter schools was 316 at the elementary level and 250 at the secondary level.

Charter schools have persistently received mediocre credit ratings, which has made capital financing challenging. In a March 2006 article, *U.S. Charter School Ratings Continue to Grow as the Market Broadens*, Standard & Poor's indicated that 74 percent of charter school bonds were at or below the lowest investment grade rating, causing charter schools to pay higher interest rates than those typically paid by LEAs. A 2006 Moody's Investors Service report cited limited capital funding, tight operating budgets, and the risk of declining enrollments as likely ongoing challenges to charter school credit worthiness. This difference has likely become even more pronounced during the more challenging financial environment of recent years. The Expanding Educational Options initiative would include, among its authorized activities, grants to SEAs, LEAs, CDFIs, and State financing authorities to improve access to facilities and facilities financing for high-performing charter schools, including by supporting implementation of credit enhancement strategies.

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

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Amount of new grants	\$6,019	\$7,348	0
Number of new grants	2	2	0
Amount of grant supplements	\$5,017	\$4,652	0
Number of grant supplements	1	1	0
Peer review of new award applications	0 <sup>1</sup>	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
Estimated amount of charter school facilities funds leveraged over the life of the grants	\$280,000 <sup>2</sup>	\$300,000 <sup>2</sup>	0
Estimated number of charter schools served over the life of the grants	60	50	0

NOTE: The fiscal year 2013 data exclude the 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

<sup>1</sup> In FY 2012, the Department funded additional applicants from the FY 2011 slate. In FY 2013, the Department plans to fund applicants from the FY 2011 slate again.

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

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Credit enhancement for charter school facilities

---

#### 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 as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

**Measure:** The amount of funding Credit Enhancement program grantees leverage for the acquisition, construction, or renovation of charter school facilities (in millions of dollars).

Year	Target	Actual
2009	\$200	\$670
2010	200	424
2011	200	555
2012	200	
2013	200	
2014	200	

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

**Measure:** The number of charter schools served through the Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities Program.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	60	59
2010	60	41
2011	60	48
2012	60	
2013	60	
2014	60	

**Additional information:** Data for the program have shown net decreases in the amount of funding leveraged and the number of schools served over the last 2 years. In 2009, new and continuing grantees leveraged \$670 million and served 59 schools that had not been served before. In 2011, grantees leveraged \$555 million and served 48 schools. The amount of

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Credit enhancement for charter school facilities

---

leveraged funds in 2011 still exceeded the target of \$200 million, while the number of schools is below the target of 60. Data for 2012 will be available in spring 2013. Targets for 2013 and 2014 are included because, while this program does not make multi-year awards (and, thus, will have no continuation costs in fiscal year 2013 or fiscal year 2014), the grant activities are implemented over a number of years and existing grantees will continue to report on these measures. Over the life of the program, it has provided 428 schools (8 percent of the Nation's charter schools) with \$2.7 billion in total financing, including leveraged funds.

### Other Performance Information

The Department has tracked the level of defaults on loans facilitated. As of 2012, only \$0.50 of every \$100 of grant funds had been lost to default over the life of the program. When leveraged funds are taken into account, this comes to approximately \$0.04 for every \$100 of the total amount supported through the program.

The Department completed an evaluation of the program in 2008. The evaluation addressed three primary research questions: (1) Is the program achieving its legislative purpose?; (2) Does the program provide for improved access to capital markets for facilities and for better rates and terms on financing than would be otherwise available to charter schools?; and (3) Do certain models of credit enhancement provide for more favorable outcomes than others?

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

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

---

### Magnet schools assistance

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$96,705 <sup>2</sup>	\$96,705 <sup>3</sup>	\$99,611	+\$2,906

---

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

<sup>2</sup> Reflects a reprogramming in fiscal year 2012 of \$2,906 thousand from Magnet Schools Assistance to Advanced Placement to help address a funding shortfall in the Advanced Placement Test Fee program.

<sup>3</sup> Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

MSAP grantees receive awards for up to 3 years and may not receive more than \$4 million per year. Funds must be used for activities intended to improve academic achievement and may be used for, among other things, planning and promotional activities; salaries of teachers and other instructional personnel; and acquisition of books, materials, and equipment. Expenditures for planning are limited to no more than 50 percent of a grant in the first year and 15 percent in the second and third years.

By statute, the Department gives priority for grants to applicants that demonstrate the greatest need for assistance, that propose to develop new magnet schools or significantly revise existing magnet school programs, and that use methods other than academic examinations (such as a lottery) to admit students. In fiscal year 2013, the Department is also giving priority to applicants whose projects promote science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education. In addition, applicants that did not receive an MSAP grant the previous fiscal year receive priority for any funds appropriated above \$75 million.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Magnet schools assistance

---

The Department may use up to 2 percent of an MSAP appropriation for national activities including evaluation, technical assistance, and dissemination of information on successful magnet school programs.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009.....	\$104,829
2010.....	100,000
2011.....	99,800
2012.....	96,705 <sup>1</sup>
2013.....	96,705 <sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Reflects a reprogramming in fiscal year 2012 of \$2,906 thousand from Magnet Schools Assistance to Advanced Placement to help address a funding shortfall in the Advanced Placement Test Fee program.

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

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$99.6 million for MSAP for fiscal year 2014, an increase of \$2.9 million over the fiscal year 2012 level. The request restores to MSAP in fiscal year 2014 the \$2.9 million that was reprogrammed in fiscal year 2012 to Advanced Placement to help address a funding shortfall in the Advanced Placement Test Fee program. The fiscal year 2014 appropriation would support new awards under the first year of a reauthorized program and continuation grant awards made under the antecedent program. The Administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization proposal would strengthen the Federal commitment to increasing the number of high-quality educational options for parents and students and to increasing diversity in schools by placing a greater emphasis on funding magnet school programs, particularly whole-school programs, with a record of effectiveness in raising student achievement and reducing minority-group isolation.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Magnet schools assistance

---

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

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Amount of awards	\$94,713	\$93,804	\$97,519
Number of new awards	0	30-40	2-4
Number of continuation awards	37	0	30-40
Range of awards	\$350-\$4,000	\$350-\$4,000	\$350-\$4,000
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$967	\$100
National activities	\$1,992	\$1,934	\$1,992

NOTE: 2013 excludes a 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 FY 2014 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

**Measure:** The percentage of magnet schools whose student applicant pool reduces, prevents, or eliminates minority group isolation.

	FY 2007 Cohort Target	FY 2007 Cohort Actual	FY 2010 Cohort Target	FY2010 Cohort Actual
<b>2009</b>	75	43		
<b>2010</b>	80	59		
<b>2011</b>			85.2	39.2
<b>2012</b>			90.1	46.4
<b>2013</b>			95.0	
<b>2014</b>			100.0	

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Magnet schools assistance

---

**Additional information:** This measure tracks, for the 2007 cohort, the percentage of magnet schools receiving assistance whose applicant pool reflects a racial and ethnic composition that, in relation to the districtwide average percentage of minority students at the same grade levels, reduces, prevents, or eliminates minority-group isolation. (Minority-group isolation refers to a condition in which minority students, including American Indians or Alaskan Natives, Asians, Native Hawaiians or Pacific Islanders, Hispanics, and Blacks (not of Hispanic origin), constitute more than 50 percent of the enrollment of a school.) In 2006, the Department established annual performance targets for this measure using a baseline of 58.3 percent and a goal of having 100 percent of schools reduce, prevent, or eliminate minority-group isolation in 2014.

In 2010, the Department published interim final regulations for the program that provide districts with greater flexibility in demonstrating that their magnet or feeder schools will eliminate, reduce, or prevent racial group isolation and that their voluntary desegregation plans are adequate under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. The regulations removed the definition of “minority-group isolation” because it required districts to use binary racial classifications and prohibited the creation of magnet schools that result in minority-group enrollments in magnet and feeder schools that exceed the districtwide average of minority-group students. These interim final regulations, which were adopted as final in November 2012, apply to the 2010 cohort; as a result, this measure has been adjusted for those grantees to reflect the percentage of magnet schools that have met individually determined objectives for reducing minority group isolation, without reference to districtwide averages. The measure has also been adjusted to examine the enrollment of schools in the 2010 cohort, not the applicant pool of those schools. The Department is considering further revisions to the measure (and the targets for the measure) to align it with the new regulations.

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

**Measure:** Percentage of magnet schools whose students from major racial and ethnic groups meet or exceed their State's annual progress standards in reading.

Year	FY 2007 Cohort Target	FY 2007 Cohort Actual	FY 2010 Cohort Target	FY 2010 Cohort Actual
2009	81	43		
2010	85	49		
2011			88.4	57.3
2012			92.2	54.5
2013			96.0	
2014			100.0	

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Magnet schools assistance

---

**Measure:** Percentage of magnet schools whose students from major racial and ethnic groups meet or exceed their State's annual progress standards in mathematics.

Year	FY 2007 Cohort Target	FY 2007 Cohort Actual	FY 2010 Cohort Target	FY 2010 Cohort Actual
2009	81	52		
2010	85	54		
2011			88.5	56.7
2012			92.3	54.3
2013			96.1	
2014			100.0	

**Additional information:** These measures track the percentage of students in magnet schools receiving assistance who score at the proficient level or above on State assessments in reading and in mathematics. Performance targets for these measures are based on the ESEA goal of all students being proficient in reading and mathematics by 2014.

Although the data for these measures show increases in student proficiency for the 2007 cohort, proficiency levels remain low. The Department is examining factors that may have influenced these results, such as whether projects were implemented fully or for a long enough time period to achieve intended effects, as well as the rigor of the magnet school curriculum and whether teacher training was sufficient.

The remaining performance measures focus on sustainability and examine the percentage of magnet schools in operation 3 years after Federal funding ends and the percentage of magnet schools that meet State adequate yearly progress standards at least 3 years after Federal funding ends. Analysis of the sustainability data for the 2004 MSAP cohort found that nearly 99 percent of magnet schools that received funding remained in existence in the 2009-2010 school year and that 45 percent of those magnet schools made adequate yearly progress at the end of the 2009-2010 school year, roughly the same percentage that made adequate yearly progress at the conclusion of the grant period (46 percent).

### Efficiency Measure

The Department has developed a measure to assess the efficiency of Federal investments in supporting magnet schools. The measure is defined as the Federal cost per student in a magnet school receiving assistance. Data for the 2010 cohort show an average cost of \$753 per student in 2011 and \$958 per student in 2012.

### Other Performance Information

In 2008, following a year-long feasibility study, the Department initiated a national evaluation of magnet schools that focuses on a single category of schools receiving funding through the MSAP program: elementary schools that convert to become whole-school magnets. The study is examining the relationship of magnet conversion to outcomes for resident students (those who live within a magnet school's attendance zone) and non-resident students (those who live outside the attendance zone but choose to attend the school). The evaluation involves fiscal

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### **Magnet schools assistance**

---

year 2004 and 2007 grantees and uses a comparative interrupted time series design to examine the relationship between magnet school conversion and student achievement and other outcomes, including minority-group isolation in schools. The evaluation is also examining how factors related to student achievement vary according to characteristics of the magnet schools and comparison schools and includes principal and magnet school coordinator surveys. A final evaluation report is expected to be released in mid-2013.

**Fund for the improvement of education: programs of national significance**  
 (Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 1)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$40,823	\$40,823 <sup>2</sup>	\$46,276	\$5,453

---

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

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

---

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

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

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

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Fund for the Improvement of education: programs of national significance

---

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

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

In fiscal year 2013, the Department is using FIE funds to support the *Data Quality Initiative*, which began in 2006 and is designed to improve the quality, analysis, and reporting of Department of Education elementary and secondary program data. In addition, the Department is using approximately \$5 million in fiscal year 2013 funds to make 11 continuation grants under the Full-Service Community Schools program. Fiscal year 2014 continuation costs for these grants would be provided under the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers program in the Supporting School Success account. In fiscal year 2013, FIE is also funding the final year of the Innovative Approaches to Literacy initiative, which awarded competitive grants to national nonprofit organizations and local educational agencies (LEAs) for provision of books and literacy activities to children and families in high-need communities.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009.....	\$115,965 <sup>1</sup>
2010.....	125,461 <sup>2</sup>
2011.....	12,009
2012.....	40,823
2013.....	40,823 <sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$88,015 thousand for Congressional earmarks.

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$88,791 thousand for Congressional earmarks.

<sup>3</sup> Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P. L. 112-175.

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is requesting \$46.3 million for FIE Programs of National Significance in 2014, an increase of \$5.5 million from the 2012 level. The requested level of funding would allow the Department to support the following activities in 2014:

\$30 million for the Improving Mathematics Achievement and Transition to College from High School (IMATCH) program, a grant competition focused on developing, evaluating, and

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Fund for the Improvement of education: programs of national significance

---

scaling effective practices that can help increase student achievement in mathematics during the transition from the last two years of high school through the first two years of college. This competition, to be jointly administered with the National Science Foundation (NSF), would generate new evidence about effective interventions for improving students' math achievement and engagement, in accordance with the joint ED–NSF evidence standards that have been recently developed. NSF began work on this initiative in 2013. A portion of these funds would also be used to conduct a program-level evaluation.

\$10 million for the cross-agency Disconnected Youth Initiative, which would strengthen services and improve outcomes for disconnected youth (defined as individuals, ages 14-24, who are neither employed nor enrolled in an educational institution or who are at high-risk of dropping out of high school). This initiative, which also would be supported through a \$5 million proposal in the Department's Disability Innovation Fund and a \$10 million request for the Department of Labor's Workforce Innovation Fund, may include activities to support the development of Performance Partnerships pilots, which would give States and localities enhanced flexibility in administering Federal youth-serving programs in exchange for greater accountability for results, as well as Pay for Success projects and evaluations.

Since March 2012, the Interagency Forum on Disconnected Youth (IFDY), led by the Department of Education, has helped to lay a strong foundation for future pilots and to explore how Federal agencies can better support State and local efforts to serve this population. The IFDY will continue to reach out to stakeholders in 2013 to determine the best possible uses of the Performance Partnerships Pilot authority.

The Department would use the funds provided in FIE to address issues such as (1) our limited knowledge of which program models are most effective in helping disconnected youth achieve positive outcomes; (2) a relative lack of attention to this population at the Federal, State, and local levels; and (3) the need for more comprehensive approaches to meeting the multi-faceted needs of youth who may have educational deficits, unstable housing, health challenges, and histories of involvement with the criminal justice system.

\$5 million for a Youth Data Pilot that would enhance communities' tracking of and performance on multiple outcomes for at-risk youth using existing data sets. This initiative would support communities that seek to gain a comprehensive picture of the progress of their youth towards healthy, productive lives by looking across multiple data sources at a variety of outcomes, such as high school attendance and graduation rates, postsecondary enrollment and credentials, employment, incarceration rates, birth outcomes, and shelter stays. Activities might include establishing common indicators of youth success, integrating administrative data sources, and developing easy-to-understand scorecards to help drive decision-making. All activities would be done in compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act. Policymakers, community leaders, and other stakeholders will be able to use these tools to improve or reassess a community's service delivery models and redirect resources into the most effective strategies and programs. This could also enable local, regional, and national benchmarking.

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Fund for the Improvement of education: programs of national significance

---

Funds would support this work by (1) sponsoring a prize or challenge for leading-edge communities to demonstrate how to make data on youth outcomes easily accessible across a range of indicators and how to use that data to secure community-wide commitments to set concrete goals for improvement on those outcome indicators while protecting student privacy, and (2) providing planning grants and technical assistance to communities that are just starting the work of developing common indicators and integrating administrative data to better track and use data on youth outcomes. The Department of Education will work closely with the Departments of Health and Human Services, Labor, and Justice on planning and implementing this cross-sector initiative.

\$1.3 million to continue the Data Quality Initiative (DQI), which is designed to improve the quality, analysis, and reporting of the Department's elementary and secondary program performance data. The DQI contractor provides program office staff with guidance on how to structure grant competitions so as to encourage grantees to plan for and collect high-quality program performance and evaluation data; provides technical assistance to grantees as they collect the data; and provides assistance to program offices and program analysis staff to improve the quality of data analysis.

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

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Full-Service Community Schools grants:			
2008 grantees (10 awards)	\$4,596	0	0
2010 grantees (11 awards)	<u>5,138</u>	<u>\$5,424</u>	<u>0<sup>1</sup></u>
Subtotal	10,094	5,424	0 <sup>1</sup>
Data Quality Initiative	1,298	1,276	\$1,276
Education Facilities Clearinghouse	732	0	0
STEM Initiative	0	0	29,700
Innovative Approaches to Literacy	28,600	29,000	0
Disconnected Youth Initiative	0	0	9,950
Youth Data Pilot	0	0	5,000
Peer review of new award applications	99	0	350
Other activities	<u>0</u>	<u>5,123</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	40,823	40,823	46,276

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

<sup>1</sup> Fiscal year 2014 continuation costs of approximately \$5,344 thousand would be covered under the request for 21st Century Community Learning Centers.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act contains specific accountability provisions for FIE grantees. Each application for funds must include clear objectives for the project that are based

## INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

### Fund for the Improvement of education: programs of national significance

---

on scientifically-based research and must describe the activities to be carried out to meet those objectives. In addition, recipients must evaluate the effectiveness of their funded programs and submit evaluations to the Department. The Department has not established general performance measures for the program, but does establish measures for specific grant competitions and monitors the progress of the grantees against these measures.

- For the Education Facilities Clearinghouse, the performance measure is the percentage of recipients of clearinghouse onsite training or technical assistance that implement one or more changes to improve their education facility based upon clearinghouse recommendations within 6 months of the training or technical assistance. Baseline data (corresponding to the 2012 performance period for the Clearinghouse grantee) are as follows: 62.5 percent, or five out of eight, recipients of clearinghouse onsite training or technical assistance implemented one or more changes to improve their education facility based on clearinghouse recommendations within 6 months of the training or technical assistance. More specifically, 100 percent (2 out of 2) of recipients of clearinghouse onsite training met this measure, and 50 percent (3 out of 6) recipients of clearinghouse technical assistance met this measure.
- For Full-Service Community Schools, the measure is the percentage of individuals targeted for services who receive services during each year of the project period. All grantees must submit an annual performance report documenting their contribution in assisting the Department in measuring the performance of the program against this indicator, as well as performance on project-specific indicators. In 2008, 96.3 percent of targeted individuals received services. In 2009, 100 percent of targeted individuals received services. In 2010, 98 percent of targeted individuals for the 2008 cohort received services; 100 percent of targeted individuals for the 2010 cohort received services. The Department expects to have performance data for 2011 in fall 2013.
- For the Innovative Approaches to Literacy initiative, the performance measures are: (1) the percentage of 4-year-old children participating in the project who achieve significant gains in oral language skills; (2) the percentage of participating 3rd-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on State reading or language arts assessments; (3) the percentage of participating 8th-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on State reading or language arts assessments; and (4) the percentage of participating high school students who meet or exceed proficiency on State reading or language arts assessments. The Department expects to have performance data available in fall 2013.
- In fiscal year 2010, the Department awarded a grant to support improvement of students' financial literacy. The grantee will report on the percentage of participating students who achieve an educationally significant improvement in their understanding of personal finance; the percentage of participating low-income students who complete the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA); and the percentage of participating low-income students who enroll in college. The Department expects to make this report available in fall 2013.