

Department of Education
SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS
Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language	F-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	F-2
Appropriation, Adjustments and Transfers	F-3
Summary of Changes	F-4
Authorizing Legislation	F-6
Appropriations History.....	F-8
Significant Items in FY 2014 Appropriations Reports.....	F-9
Summary of Request	F-10
Activities:	
Promise neighborhoods	F-13
Successful, safe, and healthy students	F-19
Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities.....	F-27
Elementary and secondary school counseling.....	F-36
Physical education program	F-40
21 st Century community learning centers	F-46
State table*	

*State tables reflecting 2014 allocations and 2015 estimates are posted on the Department's Web page at:<http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/statetables/index.html#update>

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

[SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION] SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS¹

[For carrying out activities authorized by part A of title IV and subparts 1, 2, and 10 of part D of title V of the ESEA, \$270,892,000: *Provided*, That \$90,000,000 shall be available for subpart 2 of part A of title IV², of which up to \$8,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for the Project School Emergency Response to Violence (“Project SERV”) program to provide education-related services to local educational agencies and institutions of higher education in which the learning environment has been disrupted due to a violent or traumatic crisis³: *Provided further*, That \$56,754,000 shall be available for Promise Neighborhoods and shall be available through December 31, 2014⁴.] (*Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2014.*)

NOTES

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

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

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
¹ <u>[SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION] SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS</u>	The Administration proposes to rename this account.
² <i>[Provided, That \$90,000,000 shall be available for subpart 2 of part A of title IV...]</i>	This language earmarks funds for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) National Programs (subpart 2 of part A of title IV).
³ <i>[...of which up to \$8,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for the Project School Emergency Response to Violence (“Project SERV”) program to provide education-related services to local educational agencies and institutions of higher education in which the learning environment has been disrupted due to a violent or traumatic crisis...]</i>	This language earmarks funds for Project SERV (under SDFSC National Programs) and makes these funds available for obligation at the Federal level until they are expended.
⁴ <i>[Provided further, That \$56,754,000 shall be available for Promise Neighborhoods and shall be available through December 31, 2014.]</i>	This language earmarks funds for the Promise Neighborhoods program, and gives the Department an additional 3 months beyond the end of fiscal year 2014 to obligate them.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Appropriation, Adjustments and Transfers
(dollars in thousands)

Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers	2013	2014	2015
Discretionary authority:			
Appropriation	\$255,753	\$270,892	\$1,463,370
Across-the-board reduction (P.L.113-6)	<u>-512</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, discretionary appropriation.....	255,241	0	0
Sequester (P.L.112-25).....	<u>-12,866</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, adjusted discretionary appropriation	242,375	270,892	1,463,370
Comparative transfer from			
<u>Education Improvement Programs</u> for:			
21st Century community learning centers	<u>1,151,673</u>	<u>1,149,370</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, comparable budget authority.....	1,407,426	1,420,262	1,463,370

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Summary of Changes (dollars in thousands)

2014.....	\$1,420,262
2015.....	<u>1,463,370</u>
Net change	+43,108

Increases:	<u>2014 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
<p>Increase for Promise Neighborhoods to expand the program and support significant new investments in grants to community-based organizations for the development or implementation of plans to provide a continuum of services and supports to children and youth in our most distressed communities, from cradle to career, in order to significantly improve their developmental, educational, and life outcomes.</p>	\$56,754	+ <u>\$43,246</u>
<p>Increase to initiate the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program to support student achievement to high standards and to help ensure that students are mentally and physically healthy and ready to learn by strengthening efforts to improve school climate and improve students' safety and physical and mental health and well-being.</p>	0	+ <u>214,000</u>
Subtotal, increases		+257,246
Decreases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
<p>Elimination of funds for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities because the Administration's reauthorization proposal would consolidate this program into the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program.</p>	90,000	-90,000

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Summary of Changes (dollars in thousands)

Decreases:	<u>2014 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
Elimination of funds for Elementary and Secondary School Counseling because the Administration's reauthorization proposal would consolidate this program into the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program.	\$49,561	-\$49,561
Elimination of funds for the Physical Education program because the Administration's reauthorization proposal would consolidate this program into the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program.	74,577	<u>-74,577</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-214,138
Net change		+43,108

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Authorizing Legislation
(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2014 Authorized	2014 Estimate	2015 Authorized	2015 Request
Promise neighborhoods (<i>ESEA-V-D, Subpart 1</i>)	0 ¹	\$56,754	To be determined ¹	\$100,000
Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students (<i>proposed legislation</i>)	0	0	To be determined	214,000
Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities (<i>ESEA IV-A, Subpart 2, Sections 4121 and 4122</i>)	0 ^{2,3}	90,000	0 ²	0
Elementary and secondary school counseling (<i>ESEA-V-D, Subpart 2</i>)	0 ²	49,561	0 ²	0
Physical education program (<i>ESEA-V-D, Subpart 10</i>)	0 ²	74,577	0 ²	0
21st century community learning centers (<i>ESEA-IV-B</i>)	0 ¹	1,149,370	To be determined ¹	1,149,370
<u>Unfunded authorizations</u>				
Safe and drug-free schools and communities State grants (<i>ESEA IV-A, Subpart 1</i>)	0 ⁴	0	Indefinite ⁴	0
Alcohol abuse reduction (<i>ESEA section 4129</i>)	0 ⁴	0	Indefinite ⁴	0
Mentoring program (<i>ESEA section 4130</i>)	0 ⁴	0	Indefinite ⁴	0
Character education (<i>ESEA V-D, Subpart 3</i>)	0 ⁴	0	0 ⁴	0
Grants directed at preventing and reducing alcohol abuse at institutions of higher education (<i>Section 2(e)(2) of P.L. 109-422</i>)	<u>0⁵</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0⁵</u>	<u>0</u>
Total definite authorization	0		0	
Total appropriation		1,420,262		1,463,370
Portion of the request subject to reauthorization				1,463,370

F-6

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Authorizing Legislation—continued

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2015.

² The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2015 under new legislation.

³ Funds appropriated for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs in fiscal year 2014 may not be increased above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2013 unless the amount appropriated for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants in fiscal year 2014 is at least 10 percent greater than the amount appropriated in 2013.

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

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

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2006	\$396,767	\$763,870	\$697,300	\$729,517
2007 Supplemental (P.L. 110-28)	266,627	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	729,518 8,594
2008	324,248	760,575	697,112	639,404
2009	281,963	714,481 ²	666,384 ²	690,370
2010	413,608	395,753	438,061 ³	393,053
2011	1,786,166	384,841 ⁴	426,053 ³	288,465 ⁵
2012	1,781,132	65,000 ⁶	270,463 ⁶	255,753
2013	1,447,539	108,487 ⁷	259,589 ⁷	242,375
2014	1,831,673	N/A ⁸	330,481 ³	270,892
2015	1,463,370			

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁸ The House Allowance is shown as N/A because there was no Subcommittee action.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Significant Items in FY 2014 Appropriations Reports

Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities

Managers' Statement: The Managers Statement accompanying P.L. 113-76 directs that within the 30 days of enactment of the 2014 Consolidated Appropriations Act the Department consult with the House and Senate Appropriations Committees on possible uses of the funds provided for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities, and provide the Committees with an operating plan describing the Department's planned use of those funds.

Response: The Department consulted with the Committees and will provide them the operating plan as requested.

21st Century Community Learning Centers

Senate: The Committee directs the Department to refrain from giving priority to, showing preference for, or providing direction about whether communities should use these funds for afterschool, before school, summer school, or expanded school day programs, unless specifically requested by State educational agencies (SEAs) or local educational agencies (LEAs).

Response: The Department agrees that State and local grantees have discretion in meeting program requirements and in using program funds to provide additional time, support, and enrichment activities needed to improve student achievement.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2015 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

[Click here for accessible version.](#)

(in thousands of dollars)

Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	2013 Appropriation	2014 Appropriation	2015 President's Budget	2015 President's Budget Compared to 2014 Appropriation	
					Amount	Percent
Supporting Student Success						
1. Promise Neighborhoods (ESEA V-D, subpart 1)	D	56,754	56,754	100,000	43,246	76.199%
2. Successful, safe, and healthy students:						
(a) Successful, safe, and healthy students (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	214,000	214,000	---
(b) Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities (ESEA IV-A-2, Subpart 2, sections 4121 and 4122)	D	61,484	90,000	0	(90,000)	-100.000%
(c) Elementary and secondary school counseling (ESEA V-D, subpart 2)	D	49,561	49,561	0	(49,561)	-100.000%
(d) Physical education program (ESEA V-D, subpart 10)	D	74,577	74,577	0	(74,577)	-100.000%
Subtotal		185,622	214,138	214,000	(138)	-0.064%
3. 21st century community learning centers (ESEA IV-B)	D	1,091,564	1,149,370	1,149,370	0	0.000%
Total ¹	D	1,333,940	1,420,262	1,463,370	43,108	3.035%

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

- Programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for which funds are requested or that are proposed for consolidation in FY 2015 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 2013 and FY 2014 have been adjusted for comparability to FY 2015.
- Accounts are shown under the administering office that has primary responsibility for most programs in that account; however, there may be some programs that are administered by another office.

Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

¹ Adjusted for comparability. Includes \$1,091,564 thousand in FY 2013 and \$1,149,370 thousand in FY 2014, appropriated in the School Improvement Programs account, now the Education Improvement Programs account.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Summary of Request

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

All of the programs in this account are authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and are, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that the programs in this account will be implemented in fiscal year 2015 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal. Funding in the account is requested for the following three programs:

- \$100 million for the Promise Neighborhoods initiative, a \$43 million increase, to provide competitive 1-year planning grants and up to 5-year implementation grants to community-based organizations for the development and implementation of comprehensive neighborhood programs designed to combat the effects of poverty and improve educational and life outcomes for children and youth. This investment would also contribute to the Administration's Promise Zones, a key strategy in the new Ladders of Opportunity initiative, which is aimed at giving hard-working Americans in high-poverty communities a leg up into the middle class. The Department has developed a priority for programs and projects that support activities in designated Promise Zones, which will be available for use in appropriate programs beginning in fiscal year 2014. The fiscal year 2015 competition for Promise Neighborhoods would include this priority.
- \$214 million for a new Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program that would support student achievement to high standards and help ensure that students are safe, and mentally and physically healthy and ready to learn, by strengthening efforts to: establish school conditions that support learning; reduce or prevent drug use, violence, bullying, and harassment, and improve school safety; improve students' physical health and well-being through the use of, or provision of access to, comprehensive services that improve student nutrition, physical activity, and fitness; and improve student's mental health and well-being through the use of, or provision of access to, comprehensive services, such as counseling, health, and mental health services, social services, and innovative family engagement programs or supports. Within the \$214 million requested, \$80 million would be used to carry out school safety initiatives that are included in "Now Is The Time," the President's plan to protect our children and our communities by reducing gun violence, including efforts to improve school emergency plans, create positive school climates, and counter the effects of pervasive violence on students.
- \$1.1 billion for 21st Century Community Learning Centers to support State and local efforts to implement in-school and out-of-school strategies for providing students (and,

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Summary of Request

where appropriate, teachers and family members), particularly those in high-need schools, the additional time, support, and enrichment activities needed to improve student achievement. The Administration's reauthorization proposal would continue to allow funds to be used for before- and after-school programs, summer enrichment programs, and summer school programs, and would also permit States and eligible local entities to use funds to support expanded-learning-time programs as well as full-service community schools.

No funds are requested in the fiscal year 2015 budget for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities, Elementary and Secondary School Counseling, and Physical Education programs, because they would be subsumed under the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program, which constitutes a major consolidation of these three existing programs, and would provide increased flexibility to States and districts in designing strategies that best address the needs of their students, schools, and communities.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Promise neighborhoods

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: To be determined ¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$56,754	\$100,000	+\$43,246

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2015.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Promise Neighborhoods provides competitive grants to support distressed communities in developing or implementing a feasible, sustainable plan for provision of a continuum of effective family and community services, strong family supports, and ambitious, comprehensive education reforms designed to improve the educational and life outcomes for children and youth, from birth through college. Beginning in fiscal year 2010, the Congress has funded Promise Neighborhoods under the broad authority of Title V, Part D of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Fund for the Improvement of Education).

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

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

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Promise neighborhoods

data system that will provide information that the grantee will use for learning, improvement, and accountability; and (5) participating in a “community of practice” with the other grantees. Planning grantees and other eligible entities with a feasible, high-quality plan may apply for implementation grants. The Department awards 3-year implementation grants, with the possibility of extending those grants to 5 years if grantees reach their performance goals. To be successful, applicants must show the ability to work effectively with a variety of other organizations, such as nonprofit organizations, foundations, local agencies, and State agencies and, through those partnerships, to bring a variety of resources to the project, including matching funds. Required activities for implementation grantees include: (1) implementation of a continuum of solutions that addresses neighborhood challenges and that will improve results for children and youth in the neighborhood; (2) building and strengthening partnerships that will support the continuum of solutions and that will commit resources to sustain and scale up what works; (3) collecting data on indicators at least annually, and using and improving a longitudinal data system for learning, continuous improvement, and accountability; (4) demonstrating progress on goals for improving organizations’ internal systems, such as by making changes in policies and organizational structure and by leveraging resources to sustain and scale up what works; and (5) participating in a community of practice.

Eligible organizations for both types of grants are nonprofit organizations, institutions of higher education, and Indian tribes that are representative of the geographic area proposed to be served; currently provide at least one of the proposed solutions in the proposed geographic area; and operate, or propose to work with, at least one public elementary or secondary school located within the proposed geographic area. The Department has given priority to applicants proposing to work in rural communities and to those proposing to work in tribal communities.

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

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

	(dollars in thousands)
2010	\$10,000
2011	29,940
2012	59,877
2013	56,754
2014	56,754

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$100 million in fiscal year 2015 for Promise Neighborhoods, an increase of \$43 million over the 2014 level. Fiscal year 2015 funds would support an estimated 20 new planning grants and 5 new implementation grants as well as support for 12 implementation grant continuation awards. Funds would also provide increased technical assistance to grantees. By providing an additional \$200 million for Promise Neighborhoods, the Opportunity, Growth, and Security Initiative will support up to an additional 35 new

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Promise neighborhoods

implementation grants. The 2015 request for Promise Neighborhoods would be implemented under the Administration's reauthorization proposal for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, which would include a specific authorization for the program based closely on current program requirements.

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

With a greater focus on leveraging existing Federal resources for efficiency and sustainability, the Promise Neighborhoods program was modeled after the Harlem Children's Zone (HCZ) project, a comprehensive, place-based, anti-poverty program begun in the 1990s that is achieving impressive results for disadvantaged children and youth who live in a 97-block zone in New York City. Evidence suggests that students in HCZ schools are achieving at significantly higher levels in reading and math than other, similarly situated students. Harvard University economics professor Roland Fryer, Jr. and Harvard graduate student Will Dobbie's 2009 assessment found that the HCZ produced significant gains for the students in the zone, stating that the "HCZ is enormously successful at boosting achievement in math and ELA [English/Language Arts] in elementary school and math in middle school."¹ The HCZ reports that its students are also showing success in their college-acceptance and college-going rates, as well as in their ability to obtain financial aid in the form of full scholarships and grants.

The demand for Promise Neighborhood grants far exceeded the available funding in fiscal years 2010 through 2012, (funding levels were insufficient for new awards in 2013 and 2014). The increased investment proposed for fiscal year 2015 would allow the Department to address some of this unmet need. In particular, the almost 40 communities that have received planning grants, but not implementation grants, represent a pool of potential high-quality candidates for implementation grants in fiscal year 2015. The Department also believes that a larger Federal investment will help attract financial support from non-Federal sources like philanthropies, private sources, and other governmental entities. Additionally, to promote interagency coordination and maximum benefits from existing Federal funding, the Department would work with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to ensure coordination within

¹ Will Dobbie and Roland G. Fryer, Jr., "Are High-Quality Schools Enough to Close the Achievement Gap? Evidence from a Bold Social Experiment in Harlem" (working paper, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, Massachusetts, April 2009).

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Promise neighborhoods

communities that intend to apply for both Promise Neighborhoods and HUD's Choice Neighborhoods planning grants.

The Administration's reauthorization proposal would retain the 5 percent reservation for national leadership activities, which would allow the Department to continue direct assistance and coaching for grantees. Other activities would include work with grantees on collection strategies for required indicator data and work on a database that will house and record these performance data. Provided the data are of sufficient quality to use, the initial restricted-use data file of indicator and implementation data from grantees will likely be made available to researchers in spring 2015. The Department would also use Promise Neighborhoods national leadership activities funding to continue support for technical assistance for the Building Neighborhood Capacity Program (BNCP). The BNCP helps low-income neighborhoods build the infrastructure and access the resources needed to ensure residents and families experience better results around education, employment, safety, housing and other key areas. Established in 2011 as part of the White House Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative's (NRI) partnership between the Departments of Education, HUD, Justice, Health and Human Services, and Treasury, BNCP continues to grow, catalyzing community-driven change in neighborhoods that have historically faced barriers to revitalization.

In January 2014, the Administration launched the Promise Zones Initiative by designating 5 communities as Promise Zones. The Promise Zones Initiative builds on the work of the NRI and Strong Cities, Strong Communities (SC2). Promise Zones designations are intended to lead to the revitalization of many of America's highest-poverty communities by creating jobs, attracting private investment, increasing economic activity, expanding educational opportunity, and reducing violent crime. Promise Zones are a key strategy in the Administration's Ladders of Opportunity initiative, which is aimed at giving millions of hard-working Americans in high-poverty communities a leg up into the middle class. The Administration will designate an additional 15 Promise Zones in the year ahead, selecting communities that identify a set of positive outcomes for their proposed Zone and its residents, develop an evidence-based strategy and implementation plan, encourage private investment, and realign Federal, State, local, and Tribal resources to achieve those outcomes. The process ensures rural and Native American representation. The Budget request includes tax incentives to stimulate economic activity and create jobs within and around Promise Zones. Promise Zones will also receive intensive Federal technical assistance aimed at breaking down regulatory barriers and using existing Federal funds in more coordinated and effective ways. In addition, applicants from Promise Zones will receive competitive preference points for other Federal discretionary grant programs that will contribute to the Promise Zone goal attainment. The Department has developed a priority for programs and projects that support activities in designated Promise Zones, beginning in fiscal year 2014. The fiscal year 2015 competition for Promise Neighborhoods would include this priority.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Promise neighborhoods

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
<u>Planning Grants</u>			
Number of new awards	0	0	20
Funding for new awards	0	0	\$10,000
<u>Implementation Grants</u>			
Number of new awards	0	0	5
Funding for new awards	0	0	\$25,141
Number of continuing awards	12	12	12
Funding for continuing awards	\$54,640	\$54,031	\$59,859
<u>National Activities</u>			
Technical assistance	\$846	\$1,162	\$2,900
BNCP	\$150	\$271	\$250
Data and evaluation assistance	\$930	\$1,290	\$1,200
Peer review of new award applications	0	0	\$650

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

The Department established the following performance measure for planning grantees: the percentage of planning grantees that produce a high-quality plan as measured by their receiving at least 90 of 100 possible points in the subsequent competition for an implementation grant. Four of the 21 fiscal year 2010 planning grantees, or 19 percent, received a score of 90 points or more in the final review of the fiscal year 2011 implementation competition. Fiscal year 2011 planning grantees were more successful, with 7 of the 15 planning grantees, or 47 percent, receiving a score of 90 points or more in the final review of the fiscal year 2012 implementation competition. Since a competition was not held in fiscal year 2013, no new data are available.

The Department established the following performance measure for implementation grantees: the percentage of implementation grantees that attain or exceed the annual goals that they establish and that are approved by the Department for (a) project indicators; (b) improving systems; and (c) leveraging resources. Data from the first cohort of implementation grantees became available in May 2013. In the first year, grantees had inconsistent data collection practices, however, the Department is currently reviewing the recently submitted data from year two and hopes that technical assistance efforts will have yielded data of sufficient quality for aggregation.

Through the data and evaluation assistance contract, the Department will continue providing assistance to grantees on data collection and reporting, as well as on the production of a restricted-use data file, to ensure consistency across grantees in how they collect and report data. Assistance includes refining and improving grantee performance measures, data collection strategies, data analyses, and meeting reporting requirements. In 2014, all

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Promise neighborhoods

implementation grantees will be using the Promise Neighborhoods Scorecard to report their data and information on the solutions they are implementing. Grantees will also have in place data plans to address critical issues like parental consent and Institutional Review Boards.

Other Performance Information

Consistent with the Administration's support for place-based strategies, the Department contributed fiscal year 2012 funds to an evaluation of SC2. SC2 is a Federal interagency initiative² that is designed to help lay the foundation for economic recovery and transformation in some of the Nation's most economically distressed cities. The evaluation will examine the impact of SC2 on the six pilot cities; a final report is expected to be available in April 2014.

The Department, working with other agencies across the Federal Government, is exploring ways to strengthen data capacity and conduct rigorous evaluations to understand the impacts of Promise Zones and other important cross-sector initiatives designed to improve outcomes for high-poverty communities and individuals living in those communities. A key focus will be on utilizing reliable administrative data sources at the Federal, State, and local level for measuring common outcomes across multiple sites, an approach that can enhance the quality of the evaluations while minimizing their costs.

² The following Federal agencies are participating in SC2: Housing and Urban Development, Commerce, Education, Labor, Transportation, Environmental Protection Agency, Agriculture, Justice, Health and Human Services, Small Business Administration, Treasury, Energy, Army Corps of Engineers, and the Corporation for National and Community Service.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Successful, safe, and healthy students (Proposed legislation)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: To be determined

Budget Authority:

<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
0	\$214,000	+\$214,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Administration's reauthorization proposal for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) would create a new Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students (SSHS) program that would award competitive grants to increase the capacity of State educational agencies (SEAs), high-need local educational agencies (LEAs), and their partners to develop and implement programs and activities that improve conditions for learning so that students are safe, healthy, and successful. Programs and activities supported by this program would include those that reduce or prevent drug use, alcohol use, bullying, harassment, or violence, including dating violence, and promote and support the safety and physical and mental well-being of students.

The new program would make competitive SSHS State and Local Grants to SEAs, high-need LEAs, and their partners for development and implementation of comprehensive strategies designed to improve conditions for learning and student outcomes for students in turnaround or high-poverty schools or schools with demonstrated needs. Research studies and data have shown that children in poverty are more likely than their more affluent peers to face mental and physical health challenges; to have poor nutrition and exercise habits; to attend high-poverty, low-performing schools; and to live in neighborhoods where safety is a concern. The SSHS State and Local Grants program would help schools address poverty-related barriers and create a school culture where all students can succeed. Activities could include those aimed at preventing and reducing substance use, violence, harassment or bullying; promoting student mental, behavioral, and emotional health; strengthening family and student engagement in school; reducing expulsions and out-of-school suspensions; and implementing programs designed to improve students' physical health and well-being, including their physical activity, nutrition, fitness, and safety.

Grantees would be required to develop, adapt, or adopt and implement a State- or district-wide school climate measurement system that would consist of incident data (such as data on suspensions and expulsions) and information on the conditions for learning collected through a comprehensive needs assessment (which may include surveys) of students, staff, and families. The school climate measurement system would be used to identify school and student needs and inform the implementation of activities that meet those needs. Additionally, this information

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Successful, safe, and healthy students

would be aggregated at the school-building level and reported to the public, including parents, in a timely and accessible manner.

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

The Department would set aside up to 1 percent of SSHS funds for programs for Indian youth administered by the Department of the Interior and up to 1 percent for the Outlying Areas. The Department would be authorized to reserve funds for National Activities to carry out national leadership activities that support safe, healthy, and drug-free students, including research and development, dissemination and outreach, and technical assistance, as well as for activities to help ensure that college campuses are safe and healthy environments. Up to 1.5 percent of appropriations would be used for program evaluation.

The Department also would be authorized to fund continuation awards for grants and contracts made under the following antecedent programs: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs; Elementary and Secondary School Counseling; and Physical Education.

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$214 million in 2015 for the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students (SSHS) program. This request proposes to consolidate several existing, narrowly targeted programs into a broader, more flexible authority that would increase the capacity of States, high-need districts, and their partners to provide the resources and supports necessary to help students overcome poverty-related barriers and ensure that students are safe, healthy, and successful. The program would use data on school climate to drive resources where they are most needed and in a manner that will address local needs more effectively than current programs, encouraging continuous improvement, and generating information on what works. A key priority for 2015 is continued funding, under the National Activities portion of the SSHS authority, for school safety activities included in “Now is the Time,” the President’s plan to protect our children and our communities by reducing gun violence.

The request includes \$45 million for the competitive SSHS State and Local Grants program that would target funds to creating positive learning environments that meet the needs of students living in poverty. The Department would give priority to SEA and LEA applicants proposing to implement comprehensive strategies designed to improve conditions for learning and to meet the needs of students (1) from low-income families; (2) in turnaround schools; and (3) in schools identified as high-need based on school climate data. Such strategies could include provision of mental health services and social and emotional supports, as well as developing the capacity for school leaders and teachers to work with at-risk students. School-based programs focused on

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Successful, safe, and healthy students

social and emotional learning (SEL) have shown positive impacts on a wide range of student outcomes, including social and emotional skills, social behaviors, attitudes toward self and others, and academic performance. A review of these programs found that the average student (i.e., a student at the 50th percentile) gained 11 percentile points on standardized tests as a result of participating in a SEL program and, furthermore, that the impact of SEL programs, on average, was similar to the impact found for academic interventions.

The reauthorized National Activities program would permit the Department to support activities that complement the SSHS State and Local Grants program, including those that help promote and scale up strategies for successful, safe, and healthy students in LEAs that are not grantees or subgrantees under the SSHS State and Local Grants program.

Both the SSHS State and Local Grants and the National Activities portion of the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program recognize the need for improving school culture and student/faculty communication as a means to prevent school violence, including school shootings, consistent with one of the findings of the Safe Schools Initiative, a collaboration between the U.S. Secret Service and the Department of Education in the wake of the 1999 Columbine tragedy. In consultation with experts as part of the Safe Schools Initiative, researchers examined and analyzed incidents of targeted school violence from 1974 through 2000. Their report supports the notion that keeping students safe in school requires a positive school climate in which students and staff are supported, engaged in activities that promote achievement and development, and have open lines of communication within the school as well as between the school and the community.

In January of 2013, the President released “Now Is The Time,” his plan to reduce gun violence, make schools safer, and increase access to mental health services. Key elements of this plan were funded by the 2014 Consolidated Appropriations Act, as described elsewhere in this account under Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities. The 2015 request for National Activities funding would continue support for the plan’s common-sense proposals designed to create positive school climates and counter the effects of pervasive violence on students, including:

- \$50 million for School Climate Transformation Grants and related technical assistance to help schools train their teachers and other school staff to implement evidence-based strategies to improve school climate. The School Climate Transformation Grants initiative builds on the development and testing of evidence-based multi-tiered decision making frameworks, such as Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), which have been supported with funds from the Department’s Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. These funds would enable SEAs and LEAs to develop and adopt, or expand to more schools, a multi-tiered decision making framework that guides the selection, integration, and implementation of the best evidence-based behavioral practices for improving school climate and behavioral outcomes for all students. A key aspect of this multi-tiered approach is that it provides differing levels of support and interventions to students based on their needs.

Research shows that when these frameworks are implemented with fidelity, schools can reduce problem behavior (as measured by office discipline referrals and suspension),

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Successful, safe, and healthy students

decrease bullying and peer victimization, improve organizational health and perception of school as a safe setting, and increase academic performance in reading and math. There is also evidence that: (1) youth risk factors are reduced in schools where these frameworks are implemented well; and (2) reduced risk factors are correlated with reduced drug use, among other improved behaviors.

Funds would be used to implement data tracking systems; train the staff to analyze the data and select the most appropriate programs to address students' needs; train staff to implement the selected programs with fidelity; and purchase associated programmatic materials. The Department is working with the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) and Department of Justice to coordinate the 2014 School Climate Transformation Grants competition with related activities at the other agencies so as to promote comprehensive State and local efforts to address school climate, school safety, and mental health needs. The 2015 School Climate Transformation Grants program will continue to support this interagency initiative.

- \$25 million for Project Prevent grants to LEAs to help schools in communities with pervasive violence break the cycle of violence. Research shows that both direct and indirect exposure to community violence can impact children's mental health and development and can increase the likelihood that these children will later commit violent acts themselves. Being the victim of, or being exposed to, community violence in childhood is also associated with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Project Prevent would address this problem by supporting the deployment of resources and technical assistance through local projects that would offer students (1) access to school-based counseling services, or referrals to community-based counseling services, for trauma or anxiety (including PTSD); (2) social and emotional supports (such as enhancing coping skills) to help address the effects of violence; and (3) conflict resolution and other school-based strategies to prevent future violence.

Other activities supported under the 2015 request for National Activities include:

- \$5 million for Project SERV (School Emergency Response to Violence) to replenish a longstanding reserve fund that supports the provision of education-related services to LEAs and to institutions of higher education (IHEs) in which the learning environment has been disrupted due to a violent or traumatic crisis. Consistent with previous appropriations, funds for Project SERV are requested on a no-year basis, to remain available for obligation at the Federal level until expended.
- \$2.5 million to continue the Readiness and Emergency Management for Schools Technical Assistance Center to provide resources and training to support school emergency management efforts for schools, LEAs, and IHEs in school emergency preparedness, including the development and implementation of comprehensive all-hazards emergency management plans.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Successful, safe, and healthy students

- \$4.6 million for other activities that promote safe and healthy students, including the following:
 - \$2.5 million to continue support for the National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments to provide technical assistance to SEAs and LEAs, as well as to IHEs, relating to alcohol and drug use and violence prevention at the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary levels. The Center also supports the collection and dissemination of information and best practices on improving school climate; and would provide technical assistance to the Project Prevent grantees to strengthen the implementation of their projects.
 - \$2.1 million for other data collection, dissemination, outreach, and technical assistance activities that promote safe and healthy students.

The fiscal year 2015 request for Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students also would provide \$1.5 million for set-asides for Department of the Interior/Bureau of Indian Education schools and the Outlying Areas; \$1 million for program evaluation; and approximately \$79.4 million for continuation awards for projects originally funded under the following programs: Elementary and Secondary School Counseling (\$30.1 million); Physical Education (\$48.3 million); and the Education Facilities Clearinghouse (\$1.0 million).

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>
Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students State and Local Grants	
Grant award funds (new)	\$44,500
Peer review of new award applications	<u>500</u>
Total budget authority	45,000
Number of SEA awards	5
Average SEA award	\$5,000
Number of LEA awards	40
Average LEA award	\$488

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Successful, safe, and healthy students

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>
National Activities	
<u>School Climate Transformation Grants</u>	
SEA grant award funds (new)	\$4,275
SEA grant award funds (continuation)	7,375
LEA grant award funds (new)	12,825
LEA grant award funds (continuation)	22,125
Technical assistance (continuation)	3,000
Peer review of new award applications	<u>400</u>
Total budget authority	50,000
Number of SEA awards (new)	10
Number of SEA awards (continuations)	18
Average SEA award	\$416
Number of LEA awards (new)	64
Number of LEA awards (continuations)	110
Average LEA award	\$201
<u>Project Prevent</u>	
Grant award funds (new)	\$14,900
Grant award funds (continuation)	9,750
Peer review of new award applications	<u>350</u>
Total budget authority	25,000
Number of LEA awards (new)	30
Number of LEA awards (continuations)	20
Range of Awards	\$250-\$1,000
Average award	\$493
<u>Project SERV</u>	\$5,000
<u>School Emergency Management Activities</u>	
Technical assistance contract (continuation)	\$2,500

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Successful, safe, and healthy students

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>
<u>Other National Activities</u>	
National center for safe and supportive schools technical assistance contract (continuation)	\$2,500
Other data collection, dissemination, outreach, and assistance (new and continuation)	<u>2,123</u>
Total budget authority	4,623
Set-Asides for DOI Schools and Outlying Areas	\$1,500
Evaluation	\$1,000
Continuation Awards for Other Programs Consolidated into Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students:	
Elementary and Secondary School Counseling	\$30,091
Physical Education	48,292
Education Facilities Clearinghouse	<u>994</u>
Total	79,377

NOTE. FY 2015 continuation costs of \$48,550 thousand for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities are included in the measures for the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students National Activities.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Department has not yet developed performance measures for the SSHS State and Local Grants program, but they will likely resemble the following measures the Department used for the Safe and Supportive Schools Grants funded between 2010 and 2013 under SDFSC National Programs:

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

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Successful, safe, and healthy students

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

Data for the above measures would come from grantee annual performance reports. Performance measures for the proposed School Climate Transformation Grants and Project Prevent Grants will be developed later in 2014.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$90,000	0	-\$90,000

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2015 under new legislation.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) National Activities statute authorizes the Department to carry out a wide variety of discretionary activities designed to prevent the illegal use of drugs and violence among, and promote safety and discipline for, students. These activities may be carried out through grants to or contracts with public and private organizations and individuals, or through agreements with other Federal agencies. In recent years these activities have included:

- Schools Climate Transformation grants to State educational agencies (SEAs) and local educational agencies (LEAs) to develop and adopt, or expand to more schools, a multi-tiered decision-making framework that guides the selection, integration, and implementation of the best evidence-based behavioral practices for improving school climate and behavioral outcomes for all students.
- Project Prevent awards to LEAs to help schools in communities with pervasive violence break the cycle of violence by offering students: (1) access to school-based counseling services, or referrals to community-based counseling services, for trauma or anxiety (including post-traumatic stress disorder); (2) social and emotional supports (such as enhancing coping skills) to help address the effects of violence; and (3) conflict resolution and other school-based strategies to prevent future violence.
- Technical assistance, and grants to SEAs, to help LEAs and schools develop, implement, and improve their emergency management plans.
- Safe and Supportive Schools grants to State educational agencies to support data collection and analysis aimed at guiding programmatic interventions to improve conditions for learning in order to help schools improve student safety and reduce drug abuse. Projects take a systematic approach to improving conditions for learning in

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

eligible schools through improved measurement systems that assess conditions for learning, which must include school safety, and the implementation of programmatic interventions that address problems identified by data.

- Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant awards for comprehensive projects to help LEAs and communities create safe, disciplined, and drug-free learning environments, promote healthy childhood development, and provide needed mental health services for youth. The Department of Education has administered this initiative in collaboration with the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and the Department of Justice (DOJ), with joint agency funding.
- Project SERV (School Emergency Response to Violence), which provides education-related services – including increased safety and security, and counseling and referral to mental health services as needed – to LEAs and to IHEs in which the learning environment has been disrupted due to a violent or traumatic crisis.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2010	\$191,341
2011	119,226
2012	64,877
2013	61,484
2014	90,000

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities for fiscal year 2015. Instead, a similar National Activities authority would be funded under the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students (SSHS) program, described elsewhere in this account, that would be created by the Administration’s Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization proposal.

Activities supported in fiscal year 2015 under the proposed new National Activities authority would include (1) several new initiatives that are included in “Now Is The Time,” the President’s plan to protect our children and our communities by reducing gun violence, making schools safer, and increasing access to mental health services, and (2) Project SERV (School Emergency Response to Violence). These “Now is the Time” proposals include \$50 million for School Climate Transformation grants and related technical assistance to help schools train their teachers and other school staff to implement evidence-based strategies to improve school climate; and \$25 million for Project Prevent grants to LEAs to help schools in communities with pervasive violence break the cycle of violence. Finally, the request for Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students includes funds to pay 2015 continuation costs for additional Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities grants and contracts awarded in 2014 and previous years.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
School Emergency Management Activities			
Grant award funds (new)	0	\$29,950	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	50	0
Technical assistance (continuation)	<u>\$3,000</u>	<u>2,500</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	3,000	32,500	0
Number of SEA awards	0	56	0
Range of SEA awards	0	\$175-\$3,306	0
Average SEA award	0	\$529	0
Bureau of Indian Education schools	0	\$600	0
School Climate Transformation Grants			
SEA grant award funds (new)	0	\$7,375	0
LEA grant award funds (new)	0	22,125	0
Technical assistance (new)	\$75	3,000	0
Peer review of new award applications	<u>0</u>	<u>500</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	0	33,000	0
Number of SEA awards	0	18	0
Average SEA award	0	\$410	0
Range of SEA awards		\$250-\$750	
Number of LEA awards	0	110	0
Average LEA award		\$201	
Range of LEA awards	0	\$100-\$750	0
Project Prevent			
Grant award funds (new)	0	\$9,750	0
Peer review of new award applications	<u>0</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	0	10,000	0
Number of LEA awards	0	20	0
Range of LEA awards	0	\$250-\$1,000	0
Average LEA award		\$488	

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
School Emergency Response to Violence (Project SERV)	\$2,843	\$8,000	0
Safe and Supportive Schools			
Grant award funds (continuations)	\$48,610	0	0
Number of grant awards	11	0	0
Average grant award	\$4,419	0	0
Evaluation	0	\$1,000	0
Other Activities	\$6,956	\$5,500	0

NOTE. FY 2015 continuation costs of \$48,550 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

Safe and Supportive Schools

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

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

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

Measure: The percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience either a decrease or an increase in the percentage of students who report current (30-day) alcohol use (2010 cohort).

	Decrease		Increase	
Year	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
2012		58.0%		37.0%
2013	60.9%	73.9	35.1%	22.6
2014	77.6		21.5	

Measure: The percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience either a decrease or an increase in the percentage of students who report personal harassment or bullying on school property during the current school year (2010 cohort).

	Decrease		Increase	
Year	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
2012		50.0%		43.0%
2013	52.5%	54.0	40.9%	42.0
2014	56.7		39.9	

Measure: The percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience either a decrease or an increase in the number of suspensions for violent incidents without physical injury (2010 cohort).

	Decrease		Increase	
Year	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
2012		45.0%		43.0%
2013	47.3%	48.0	40.9%	41.0
2014	50.4		39.0	

Measure: The percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience either an improvement or a worsening in their school safety score (2010 cohort).

	Improvement		Worsening	
Year	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
2012		59.0%		30.0%
2013	62.0%	72.9	28.5%	20.8
2014	76.5		19.8	

Additional information: For each of the above measures, the data from 2 of the 11 grants in the cohort were excluded from the 2012 and 2013 actuals because the data from those two

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

grants were not comparable to the data from the other grants in the cohort. The two grantees are receiving technical assistance related to performance data collection to enable them to provide comparable data in 2014. Data for the nine grantees represented above show improvement from 2012 to 2013 on all eight measures, with the 2013 targets exceeded on seven of the eight measures.

Safe Schools/Healthy Students

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

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

The following performance information is for the most recent (2007, 2008, and 2009) cohorts of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grants. (Between 2010 and 2012 the program funded continuation awards only.)

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

Year	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2009	76.5%	37.5%		30.0%		
2010	78.8	55.7	50.0%	62.8		37.5%
2011	83.5	40.7	64.7	55.0	50.0%	55.2
2012			68.6	46.4	56.9	31.0
2013					32.9	61.5

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

Year	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2009	77.0%	54.5%		66.7%		
2010	79.3	66.7	68.0%	65.9		25.0%
2011	84.1	29.6	70.1	51.6	50.0%	55.2
2012			74.3	48.1	56.9	79.3
2013					84.1	73.1

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

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

Year	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2009	54.9%	42.9%		50.0%		
2010	56.5	37.5	51.0%	43.6		0.0%
2011	59.9	51.9	52.5	58.3	50.0%	55.2
2012			61.8	45.6	56.9	55.1
2013					58.4	65.4

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

Year	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2009	72.8%	47.8%		56.0%		
2010	75.0	66.7	57.1%	60.0		0.0%
2011	79.5	70.4	61.8	75.0	50.0%	58.6
2012			79.5	63.1	60.4	65.5
2013					69.4	69.2

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

Year	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2009	70.0%	90.0%		83.3%		
2010	90.0	87.5	87.5%	81.4		80.0%
2011	90.0	51.9	90.0	56.7	84.0%	62.1
2012			90.0	72.2	90.0	70.3
2013					74.5	62.0

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

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

Year	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2009	78.8%	75.0%		60.0%		
2010	86.6	50.0	63.0%	71.8		80.0%
2011	90.0	11.1	79.0	51.7	84.0%	34.5
2012			90.0	42.3	90.0	54.2
2013					57.4	50.1

Additional information: For the second measure above (the percentage of grantees that experience a decrease in the percentage of their students who have been in a physical fight on school property in the 12 months prior to the survey), data for the 2007 cohort are a mixture of survey data and incident data. For the 2008 and 2009 cohorts, data for that measure are exclusively survey data. For the 2007 cohort for the last measure (the percentage of grantees that report an increase in the percentage of mental health referrals for students that result in mental health services being provided in the community), the 2011 actual data of 11 percent warrant some explanation. Only 48 percent of grantees reported a decrease on this metric, while the remaining 41 percent either reported they had no change, or did not report both of the 2 years of data needed to determine how they performed on this measure.

Other Performance Information

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

The first evaluation focused on the fiscal year 1999, 2000, and 2001 cohorts under the initiative, a total of 97 sites. Three waves of data were collected from each of the sites, with data collection spanning 2001-2004, and changes were calculated between wave one and wave three data collection for each of the three grant cohorts. Statistically significant changes (at the $p < .05$ level) in student outcomes related to alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use and incidents of violence included the following:

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

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities national activities

- Teachers in elementary schools reported a 5 percent reduction in classroom bullying, a 21 percent reduction in feeling threatened by a student, and an 11 percent reduction in being verbally abused by a student.

The second evaluation examined activities implemented by 175 sites in the fiscal years 2005 through 2009 cohorts. Data were collected through site visits, project- and school-level surveys, telephone interviews, and focus groups. Thus far, this evaluation has found that communities can make effective use of limited funds through high-functioning partnerships that bring together key local agencies to serve children and youth. The results offer substantial evidence of the Initiative's success, including reduced violence and improved school safety, improved access to mental health services, and reduced alcohol and other drug use. By comparison, data for the same period (2005 to 2009) from sources such as the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (CDC, 2010) show no significant improvements in violence, school safety, or current substance use for youth in general across the Nation. Findings from the evaluation also demonstrate the effectiveness of the grants with regard to the collaboration among Safe Schools/Healthy Students partners, improved services and systems, and increased use of data to guide policies and procedures. Key findings from the evaluation for the 2005 to 2006 cohorts of grants (which have completed all grant activities and submitted complete data sets) include the following (based on data collected from the time of the grant award through January 2010):

- Violent incidents decreased by 11 percent.
- Fewer students reported that they had experienced violence (7 percent decrease) or witnessed violence (4 percent decrease).
- Ninety-six percent of school staff surveyed said SS/HS had improved school safety, more than 90 percent said SS/HS had reduced violence on school campuses, and almost 80 percent of school staff surveyed said SS/HS had reduced violence in the community.
- The number of students receiving school-based mental health services and community-based mental health services increased 263 percent and 519 percent, respectively.
- More than 80 percent of school staff saw reductions in alcohol and other drug use.

Data collection and analysis continue on the cohorts awarded in fiscal years 2007, 2008 and 2009.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Elementary and secondary school counseling

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$49,561	0	-\$49,561

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2015 under new legislation.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2010	\$55,000
2011	52,395
2012	52,296
2013	49,561
2014	49,561

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling (ESSC) program for fiscal year 2015. In place of this and other narrowly targeted programs that address students' safety, health, and drug-prevention needs, the Administration's reauthorization proposal for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) would create a broader Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program that would increase the capacity of

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Elementary and secondary school counseling

States, districts, and their partners to provide the resources and supports necessary for safe, healthy, and successful students. This new program, which is described in more detail elsewhere in this account, would help schools improve conditions for learning, including through the use of program funds for school counseling programs that contribute to the reduction or prevention of drug use, alcohol use, bullying, harassment, or violence, and that promote and support the physical and mental well-being of students.

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

The presence of counselors in schools provides benefits for both students and teachers by helping to create a safe school environment, improve teacher effectiveness and classroom management, increase academic achievement, and promote student well-being and healthy development. In a recent review of school counseling research, Whiston and Quinby (2009) found that students who participated in school counseling interventions tended to score on various outcome measures slightly above those students who did not receive interventions. These interventions were also shown to have a large effect in reducing student disciplinary problems, enhancing problem-solving skills, and increasing career knowledge. Counseling interventions were also found to have a small but significant impact on improving students’ academic achievement. For these reasons, the Administration’s reauthorization proposal would continue to support school counseling services as part of State and local plans for improving the conditions for learning.

The President’s 2015 budget also provides funds for several related initiatives included in “Now Is the Time,” the President’s plan to protect our children and our communities by reducing gun violence. These include \$25 million for Project Prevent grants under the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program to offer students mental health services for trauma or anxiety, and other efforts to help schools break the cycle of violence; \$75 million in the Department of Justice for a Comprehensive School Safety Program that will bring together the Nation’s best minds to research the root causes of school violence, develop technologies and strategies for increasing school safety, and provide pilot grants to test innovative approaches to enhance school safety across the Nation; and \$55 million in the Department of Health and Human Services budget for called Project AWARE (Advancing Wellness and Resilience in Education) to help teachers and other adults who regularly interact with students to recognize young people who need help and ensure they are referred to mental health services.

The fiscal year 2015 request for the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program would include funds to pay 2015 continuation costs for ESSC grants made in previous years.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Elementary and secondary school counseling

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Grant award funding (new)	\$12,694	\$14,780	0
Grant award funding (continuations)	\$36,867	\$34,281	0
Number of new awards	35	51	0
Number of continuations	103	95	0
Average grant award	\$353	\$354	0
Peer review of new award applications	0 ¹	\$500	0

NOTE: FY 2015 continuation costs of \$30,091 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program.

¹The Department funded new applications in FY 2013 from the FY 2012 slate.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data, and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2015 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Elementary and secondary school counseling

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

Year	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual	2010 Cohort Target	2010 Cohort Actual	2011 Cohort Target	2011 Cohort Actual	2012 Cohort Target	2012 Cohort Actual
2010		100						
2011	100	91	100	90				
2012	100		100	81	100	84		
2013			100		100	49	100	64
2014								
2015								

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

Year	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual	2010 Cohort Target	2010 Cohort Actual	2011 Cohort Target	2011 Cohort Actual	2012 Cohort Target	2012 Cohort Actual
2010		1,220						
2011	1,159	1,205		1,648				
2012	1,037		1,400	1,241	1,200	1,152		
2013			1,117		1,037	690		1,589
2014							1,430	
2015								

Additional information: Performance data are collected through annual grantee reports; 2012 data for the 2010 cohort will be available later in 2014. The 2013 cohort will submit baseline data later in 2014; the Department plans to establish performance targets once grantees submit baseline data.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Physical education program

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$74,577	0	-\$74,577

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2015 under new legislation.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

Building on the priorities and requirements established in 2010, the Department developed further improvements to PEP for the fiscal year 2013 competition. Among the changes, the

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Physical education program

Department included a priority for projects that are designed to serve students enrolled in persistently lowest-achieving schools. Given the high correlation between low-income schools and persistently lowest-achieving schools, the Department intends for this priority to expand the availability of physical and nutrition education to low-income children, who are more likely than higher-income students to have poor health outcomes and face greater barriers to physical activity.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2010.....	\$79,000
2011.....	78,842
2012.....	78,693
2013.....	74,577
2014.....	74,577

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for PEP for fiscal year 2015. In place of this and other narrowly targeted programs that address students' safety, health, and drug-prevention needs, the Administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization proposal would create a broader Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program. The new program would increase the capacity of States, districts, and their partners to provide the resources and supports necessary for safe, healthy, and successful students, including the development and implementation of comprehensive PE programs.

Under the proposed Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program, State educational agencies (SEAs), high-need LEAs, and their partners would be eligible to apply for competitive grants to develop and implement approaches for measuring and improving conditions for learning based on local needs, including by implementing activities that reduce or prevent drug use, alcohol use, bullying, harassment, or violence, and promote and support the physical and mental well-being of students. Further, this new program would provide increased flexibility for States and districts to design and implement strategies that best reflect the needs of their students and communities (which may include programs that support PE). Additionally, the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program in the Education Improvement Programs account would fund proposals to strengthen instruction and increase student achievement, across content areas, including health education and PE.

The Administration recognizes the importance of and need for continued support of PE, improved nutrition, and fitness. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the prevalence of unhealthy body weight among children has more than doubled over the past 30 years, a major cause for concern since obese children are more likely to develop high blood pressure, high cholesterol, type 2 diabetes, and breathing problems. As of the 2009-10 data collection period for the CDC's National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 17 percent of children and adolescents ages 2 through 19 were obese, compared to 6 percent in the 1976-1980 NHANES, a development likely resulting, in part, from reduced physical

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Physical education program

activity among youth. In 2007, only 18 percent of students in grades 9-12 met the *Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans* established by the Department of Health and Human Services. According to the 2011-12 National Survey of Children's Health conducted by the CDC, just over one-third of children ages 6-17 engaged in vigorous physical activity 3 or fewer days per week. This lack of physical activity could be partly a result of students' limited opportunities to participate in PE in school. According to the CDC's Youth Risk Behavior Survey, only 32 percent of students in grades 9-12 attended daily PE classes in 2011. Grants under the new Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students and Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education programs could be used help address these issues.

The fiscal year 2015 request for the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program includes funds to pay 2015 continuation costs for PEP grants made in previous years.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Grant award funding (new)	\$31,993	\$34,304	0
Grant award funding (continuations)	42,480	40,160	0
Peer review of new award applications	104	0 ¹	0
Evaluation	0	113	0
Number of new grant awards	60	64	0
Number of continuation grant awards	132	116	0
Average grant award	\$388	\$414	0

NOTE: FY 2015 continuation costs of approximately \$48,292 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program.

¹ In FY 2014, the Department plans to make new awards to applicants from the FY 2013 slate.

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.

In 2010, as part of a multi-agency effort to improve the effectiveness of programs supporting child health and fitness, the Department reviewed the performance measures for this program and published revised performance measures in the Notice Inviting Applications for fiscal year 2010. These measures are: (1) the percentage of students served by the grant who engage in at least 60 minutes of daily physical activity; (2) the percentage of students served by

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Physical education program

the grant who achieve age-appropriate cardiovascular fitness levels; (3) the percentage of students served by the grant who consume fruit two or more times per day and vegetables three or more times per day; and (4) the cost per student who engages in at least 60 minutes of daily physical activity.

Along with the changes to PEP being implemented in the fiscal year 2013 competition, the Department revised one of the measures developed in 2010. The new measure is replacing the one on age-appropriate cardiovascular fitness level with a more comprehensive measure of fitness: The percentage of students served by the grant who meet the standard of a healthy fitness zone as established by the assessment for the Presidential Youth Fitness Program (PYFP) in at least five of the six fitness areas of that assessment. The Department will have baseline and year 1 data for this measure in early 2015.

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

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

Measure: The percentage of students served by the grant who engage in at least 60 minutes of daily physical activity.

Year	2010 Cohort Target	2010 Cohort Actual	2011 Cohort Target	2011 Cohort Actual	2012 Cohort Target	2012 Cohort Actual
2010		36%				
2011		65		44%		
2012		68		46		30%
2013	69%			42		34
2014			45%		35%	
2015					38	

Measure: The percentage of students served by the grant who achieve age-appropriate cardiovascular fitness levels.

Year	2010 Cohort Target	2010 Cohort Actual	2011 Cohort Target	2011 Cohort Actual	2012 Cohort Target	2012 Cohort Actual
2010		36%				
2011		44		31%		
2012		55		44		56%
2013	57%			47		59
2014			49%		60%	
2015					64	

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Physical education program

Measure: The percentage of students served by the grant who consume fruit two or more times per day and vegetables three or more times per day.

Year	2010 Cohort Target	2010 Cohort Actual	2011 Cohort Target	2011 Cohort Actual	2012 Cohort Target	2012 Cohort Actual
2010		22%				
2011		20		29%		
2012		41		39		25%
2013	43%			53		30
2014			55%		32%	
2015					35	

Additional information: The Department will have final data for the 2010 cohort and 2014 data for the 2012 and 2013 cohorts in early 2015. The 2014 data for the 2011 cohort will not be available until early 2016. This is due to the fact that, each year, the Department provides many grantees in year three of their awards a 1-year, no-cost extension to complete their projects. The 2013 cohort will include the new measure on meeting the standard of a healthy fitness zone as established by the assessment for the PYFP, replacing the measure on age-appropriate cardiovascular fitness levels.

Efficiency Measure

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

Measure: The cost per student who engages in at least 60 minutes of daily physical activity.

Year	2010 Cohort Target	2010 Cohort Actual	2011 Cohort Target	2011 Cohort Actual	2012 Cohort Target	2012 Cohort Actual
2010						
2011		\$884				
2012		880		\$811		
2013	\$750			425		\$347
2014			\$400		\$300	
2015					280	

Additional information: The calculation for this measure includes both Federal and non-Federal funding. Unlike the measures in the above tables, there is no baseline figure for each cohort because there are no costs to report at the start of the grant. The Department will have final data for the 2010 cohort and 2014 data for the 2012 and 2013 cohorts in early 2015. The no-cost extension year will delay the 2014 data for the 2011 cohort.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Physical education program

Other Performance Information

The Department is conducting an evaluation of PEP using the 2010 cohort of grantees. Preliminary findings, released in an evaluation brief in August 2012, show that the overwhelming majority of grantees from that first cohort under the revamp of the program formed community partnerships, which aligns with one of the program's priorities. The study is also finding that grantees generally use more than half of their first-year grant funds for equipment and personnel, with LEA grantees allocating the largest proportion of their first-year grant funds to equipment and community-based organization grantees allocating the largest proportion to personnel. Grantees report that some of their most common challenges are the lack of proper reporting by students, loss of equipment such as pedometers, and the failure of students to complete and return the surveys needed for the performance measures. The final report of the study will be available in fall 2014.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

21st Century community learning centers

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$1,149,370	\$1,149,370	0

¹The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; reauthorizing language is sought for fiscal year 2015.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

21st Century community learning centers

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

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

As part of ESEA flexibility, States were able to request the authority to use 21st CCLC funds to support expanded learning time (ELT) during the school day in addition to activities during non-school hours or periods when school is not in session (i.e., before- and after-school or during the summer). Under ESEA flexibility, 21st CCLC funds may be used for activities to support ELT during the regular school day in a school that has added significantly more time by expanding the school day, school week, or school year to increase learning time for all students. Examples of such activities include using the additional time to support a well-rounded education that includes time for academics and enrichment activities; providing supplemental academic enrichment activities to students to allow teachers time to collaborate and plan; and partnering with one or more outside organizations, such as a nonprofit organization, with demonstrated experience in improving student achievement.

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2010	\$1,166,166
2011	1,153,854
2012	1,151,673
2013	1,091,564
2014	1,149,370

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$1.15 billion in fiscal year 2015 for the 21st CCLC program, the same as the 2014 level. The 21st CCLC program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization. The request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2015 under reauthorized legislation and is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal.

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

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

21st Century community learning centers

with one or more nonprofit organizations or local governmental entities) or nonprofit organizations.

Consistent with the ELT waiver available to the 44 States (including the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico) approved for ESEA flexibility, the reauthorized 21st CCLC program would support ELT in States, school districts, and schools that have significantly increased the number of hours in a regular school schedule or that have redesigned the school schedule. Grantees could also use program funds to provide the “wraparound services” now offered through the Full-Service Community Schools program (currently funded under the Fund for the Improvement of Education, in the Innovation and Improvement Account), which would be consolidated into the 21st CCLC program. The Administration’s reauthorization proposal would continue to allow funds to be used for before- and after-school programs, summer enrichment programs, and summer school programs, and would additionally permit States and eligible local entities to use funds to support ELT programs and full-service community schools. This enhanced flexibility would allow communities to determine the best strategies for providing their students and teachers the time and support they need to improve student and school performance.

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

The Department believes that the reauthorized 21st CCLC program would increase the likelihood for positive student outcomes. Research suggests that programs that significantly increase the total number of hours in a regular school schedule can produce gains in student academic achievement. Moreover, emerging research suggests that high-quality after-school programs may have a positive impact on other desirable student outcomes, such as higher attendance during the regular school day and increased student academic achievement. Regular participation in high-quality, enriching programs appears to be one factor that has an impact on student outcomes, but data from the current 21st CCLC program demonstrate that student participation rates may be a program quality concern. For example, in 2012, States reported that less than half of the total number of students served (about 930,000 of almost 1.9 million) attended programs for 30 days or more over the course of the 2011-12 program year. By lengthening the school day or year for all students, ELT programs could improve 21st CCLC program attendance by reaching beyond the students who are inclined to regularly attend voluntary after-school programs. In addition, the Department believes that allowing schools to provide comprehensive and integrated services (often referred to as “wraparound services”) at the school site, including during the school day, would help to meet the educational, developmental, mental, behavioral, and emotional health needs of students, families, and members of the community.

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

21st Century community learning centers

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

Finally, the Department would reserve a portion of the funds for national activities, including research, data collection, technical assistance, outreach, and dissemination. These activities would focus on the identification and promotion of effective efforts to expand learning time, provide comprehensive services, and increase community and parental involvement. In addition, fiscal year 2015 funds would be used to pay the 2015 continuation costs of Full-Service Community Schools grants made (under the Fund for the Improvement of Education in the Innovation and Improvement account) in prior fiscal years.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
<u>Formula Grant Program</u>			
Amount distributed to States	\$1,069,732	\$1,126,382	0
Average State award	\$20,572	\$21,661	0
Range of awards to States	\$5,349-\$122,135	\$5,632-\$124,945	0
Reservation for State activities (maximum)	\$32,092	\$33,791	0
Reservation for State administration (maximum)	\$21,395	\$22,528	0
National activities and evaluation	\$10,916	\$11,494	0
Amount for Bureau of Indian Education and the Outlying Areas	\$10,916	\$11,494	0
<u>Competitive Grant Program</u>			
Amount awarded to States and eligible local entities	0	0	\$1,116,726
Amount for Bureau of Indian Education and the Outlying Areas	0	0	\$11,494
National Activities	0	0	\$11,494
Peer review of new award applications	0	0	\$5,000

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

21st Century community learning centers

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Continuation costs for the Full-Service Community Schools program	0	0	\$4,656
<u>Data on Centers</u>			
Number of centers supported	10,200	11,000	12,000
Total students served	1,875,000	1,900,000	1,950,000
Students attending 30 days or more	930,000	950,000	975,000
Total adult family members served	300,000	325,000	350,000

NOTE: Data on the number of centers are based on State-reported data and the assumption of higher participation rates due to increased implementation of ELT programs.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program. No targets are shown for 2015 because the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal. The Department plans to establish new performance measures for the program when it is reauthorized.

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

Objective: *Participants in 21st CCLC programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.*

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

21st Century community learning centers

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

Year	Target Elementary School Participants	Target Middle and High School Participants	Target All Participants	Actual Elementary Participants	Actual Middle and High School Participants	Actual All Participants
2010	48.5%	48.5%	48.5%	38.4%	33.8%	36.7%
2011	48.5	48.5	48.5	39.5	34.1	37.2
2012	48.5	48.5	48.5	34.2	32.4	33.4
2013	48.5	48.5	48.5			
2014	48.5	48.5	48.5			

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

Year	Target Elementary School Participants	Target Middle and High School Participants	Target All Participants	Actual Elementary Participants	Actual Middle and High School Participants	Actual All Participants
2010	48.5%	48.5%	48.5%	40.2%	34.6%	44.3%
2011	48.5	48.5	48.5	40.3	35.7	38.1
2012	48.5	48.5	48.5	34.9	32.8	47.0
2013	48.5	48.5	48.5			
2014	48.5	48.5	48.5			

Additional information: A “regular program participant” is defined as a student who attends the program for 30 days or more during the course of the school year. To report data by grade span for this measure, the data system sorts program performance data by analyzing participant demographic information at the center level (as opposed to the individual student level). For this reason, programs that serve youth of all ages are not included in the columns disaggregated by grade level.

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

Year	Target Elementary Reading	Target Middle and High School Math	Actual Elementary Reading	Actual Middle and High School Math
2010	35.0%	20.0%	26.5%	17.8%
2011	40.0	25.0	19.9	18.2
2012	45.0	25.0	27.2	19.8
2013	45.0	25.0		
2014	45.0	25.0		

Additional information: The Department calculates results for this measure by dividing the number of regular participants who scored proficient or better in spring of the reporting year (but were not proficient in the previous year) by the total number of current-year regular participants who scored below proficient the previous spring. For a regular participant to be included in the

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

21st Century community learning centers

data for this measure, the center has to have data on the student's prior-year and current-year State assessment results. The 2012 data represent approximately 616,000 regular elementary school-aged attendees and 313,000 regular middle- and high-school-aged attendees.

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

Year	Target Elementary School Participants	Target Middle and High School Participants	Target All Participants	Actual Elementary Participants	Actual Middle and High School Participants	Actual All Participants
2010	75%	75%	75%	68.7%	65.0%	67.8%
2011	75	75	75	68.4	63.3	68.7
2012	75	75	75	69.9	64.6	67.9
2013	75	75	75			
2014	75	75	75			

Additional information: As with the measures for reading and math grades and proficiency, to report data by grade span for this measure the data system sorts program performance data by analyzing participant demographic information at the center level (as opposed to the individual student level). For this reason, programs that serve youth of all ages are not included in the columns disaggregated by grade level.

Efficiency Measures

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010	85%	86%
2011	90	94
2012	95	78
2013	95	
2014	95	

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010	40	45
2011	35	55
2012	35	60
2013	35	
2014	35	

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

21st Century community learning centers

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010	4	4
2011	4	3
2012	4	3
2013	4	
2014	4	

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

Other Performance Information

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

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

SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

21st Century community learning centers

The Department is conducting two additional evaluations of the 21st CCLC program. Through the first, led by PPSS, the Department is collecting information about State-administered competitions for 21st CCLC subgrants. Among other things, the Department expects to learn about State definitions of program quality, outreach efforts, and monitoring practices, and hopes that this information will inform efforts to strengthen technical assistance to States that conduct competitions for Federal funds now and in the future if more programs with this structure are created under a reauthorized ESEA. The second evaluation, led by IES, began in fall 2012 and focuses on assessing the implementation of ELT programs in States that received the authority, under ESEA flexibility, to use 21st CCLC funds to support ELT during the school day. The Department plans to use information from these studies to improve program management.