

Department of Education
INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Fiscal Year 2015 Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language	H-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	H-5
Appropriation Adjustments and Transfers	H-11
Summary of Changes	H-13
Authorizing Legislation.....	H-17
Appropriations History.....	H-20
Significant Items in FY 2014 Appropriations Reports.....	H-21
Summary of Request	H-22
Activities:.....	H-28
Race to the top	H-28
Investing in innovation	H-37
STEM Innovation:	H-44
STEM innovation	H-44
Mathematics and science partnerships.....	H-54
High school redesign	H-58
Excellent instructional teams:	H-62
Excellent instructional teams	H-62
Improving teacher quality State grants	H-71
Transition to teaching	H-82
Teacher quality partnership	H-89
Teacher incentive fund	H-95
School leadership	H-101
Expanding educational options:	H-107
Expanding educational options.....	H-107
Charter schools grants	H-110
Credit enhancement for charter school facilities	H-119
Magnet schools assistance.....	H-124
Fund for the improvement of education: programs of national significance	H-129
Recognizing education success, professional excellence, and collaborative teaching	H-135
State tables*	

*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>.

INNOVATION AND [IMPROVEMENT] INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS¹

[For carrying out activities authorized by part G of title I, subpart 5 of part A and parts C and D of title II, parts B, C, and D of title V of the ESEA, and sections 14006 and 14007 of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, as amended, \$1,181,317,000:² *Provided*, That \$250,000,000 shall be available through December 31, 2014 for awards to States, in accordance with the applicable requirements of section 14006 of division A of Public Law 111-5, as amended: *Provided further*, That the Secretary, jointly with the Secretary of HHS, shall use all funds made available under the immediately preceding proviso to make competitive awards in accordance with such section 14006 to States for improving early childhood care and education, except that, notwithstanding sections 14006(a) and 14005(d)(6) of such division, such awards may be limited to activities that build the capacity within the State to develop, enhance, or expand high-quality preschool programs, including comprehensive services and family engagement, for preschool-aged children from families at or below 200 percent of the Federal poverty line:³ *Provided further*, That each State may subgrant a portion of such grant funds to local educational agencies and other early learning providers (including but not limited to Head Start programs and licensed child care providers), or consortia thereof, for the implementation of high-quality preschool programs for children from families at or below 200 percent of the Federal poverty line: *Provided further*, That subgrantees that are local educational agencies shall form strong partnerships with early learning providers and that subgrantees that are early learning providers shall form strong partnerships with local educational agencies, in order to carry out the requirements of the subgrant: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the second proviso, up to 3 percent of such funds for improving early childhood care and education shall be available for technical assistance, evaluation, and other national activities related to such grants: *Provided further*, That not later than 30 days prior to the announcement of a competition under such section 14006 pursuant to the requirements of

this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report outlining the proposed competition and priorities to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall administer State grants for improving early childhood care and education under such section jointly with the Secretary of HHS on such terms as such Secretaries set forth in an interagency agreement:⁴ *Provided further*, That up to \$141,602,000 shall be available through December 31, 2014 for section 14007 of division A of Public Law 111-5, and up to 5 percent of such funds may be used for technical assistance and the evaluation of activities carried out under such section: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may renew a grant made under section 14007 for additional 1-year periods, for fiscal year 2014 and thereafter, if the grantee is meeting its performance targets, up to a total award period of 6 years:⁵ *Provided further*, That the education facilities clearinghouse established through a competitive award process in fiscal year 2013 is authorized to collect and disseminate information on effective educational practices and the latest research regarding the planning, design, financing, construction, improvement, operation, and maintenance of safe, healthy, high-performance public facilities for early learning programs, kindergarten through grade 12, and higher education:⁶ *Provided further*, That \$288,771,000 of the funds for subpart 1 of part D of title V of the ESEA shall be for competitive grants to local educational agencies, including charter schools that are local educational agencies, or States, or partnerships of: (1) a local educational agency, a State, or both; and (2) at least one nonprofit organization to develop and implement performance-based compensation systems for teachers, principals, and other personnel in high-need schools: *Provided further*, That such performance-based compensation systems must consider gains in student academic achievement as well as classroom evaluations conducted multiple times during each school year among other factors and provide educators with incentives to take on additional responsibilities and leadership roles: *Provided further*, That recipients of such grants shall demonstrate that such performance-based

compensation systems are developed with the input of teachers and school leaders in the schools and local educational agencies to be served by the grant: *Provided further*, That recipients of such grants may use such funds to develop or improve systems and tools (which may be developed and used for the entire local educational agency or only for schools served under the grant) that would enhance the quality and success of the compensation system, such as high-quality teacher evaluations and tools to measure growth in student achievement:

Provided further, That applications for such grants shall include a plan to sustain financially the activities conducted and systems developed under the grant once the grant period has expired:

Provided further, That up to 5 percent of such funds for competitive grants shall be available for technical assistance, training, peer review of applications, program outreach, and evaluation activities:⁷ *Provided further*, That of the funds available for part B of title V of the ESEA, the Secretary shall use not less than \$11,000,000 to carry out activities under section 5205(b) and shall use not less than \$12,000,000 for subpart 2: *Provided further*, That of the funds available for subpart 1 of part B of title V of the ESEA, and notwithstanding section 5205(a), the Secretary shall reserve not less than \$45,000,000 to make multiple awards to non-profit charter management organizations and other entities that are not for-profit entities for the replication and expansion of successful charter school models and shall reserve up to \$11,000,000 to carry out the activities described in section 5205(a), including improving quality and oversight of charter schools and providing technical assistance and grants to authorized public chartering agencies in order to increase the number of high-performing charter schools: *Provided further*, That funds available for part B of title V of the ESEA may be used for grants that support preschool education in charter schools:⁸ *Provided further*, That each application submitted pursuant to section 5203(a) shall describe a plan to monitor and hold accountable authorized public chartering agencies through such activities as providing technical assistance or establishing a professional development program, which may include evaluation, planning,

training, and systems development for staff of authorized public chartering agencies to improve the capacity of such agencies in the State to authorize, monitor, and hold accountable charter schools: *Provided further*, That each application submitted pursuant to section 5203(a) shall contain assurances that State law, regulations, or other policies require that: (1) each authorized charter school in the State operate under a legally binding charter or performance contract between itself and the school's authorized public chartering agency that describes the rights and responsibilities of the school and the public chartering agency; conduct annual, timely, and independent audits of the school's financial statements that are filed with the school's authorized public chartering agency; and demonstrate improved student academic achievement; and (2) authorized public chartering agencies use increases in student academic achievement for all groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA as the most important factor when determining to renew or revoke a school's charter.^{9]} (*Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2014.*)

NOTES

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>¹ <u>INNOVATION AND [IMPROVEMENT] INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS</u></p>	<p>The Administration proposes to rename this account.</p>
<p>² [For carrying out activities authorized by part G of title I, subpart 5 of part A and parts C and D of title II, parts B, C, and D of title V of the ESEA, and sections 14006 and 14007 of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, as amended, \$1,181,317,000:]</p>	<p>This language appropriates funds for the following programs: Advanced Placement, School Leadership, Transition to Teaching, Ready-to-Learn Television, Charter Schools Grants, Magnet Schools Assistance, Teacher Incentive Fund, Fund for the Improvement of Education: Programs of National Significance, Arts in Education, Race to the Top, and Investing in Innovation.</p>
<p>³ [<i>Provided</i>, That \$250,000,000 shall be available through December 31, 2014 for awards to States, in accordance with the applicable requirements of section 14006 of division A of Public Law 111-5, as amended: <i>Provided further</i>, That the Secretary, jointly with the Secretary of HHS, shall use all funds made available under the immediately preceding proviso to make competitive awards in accordance with such section 14006 to States for improving early childhood care and education, except that, notwithstanding sections 14006(a) and 14005(d)(6) of such division, such awards may be limited to activities that build the capacity within the State to develop, enhance, or expand high-quality preschool programs, including comprehensive services and family engagement, for preschool-aged children from families at or below 200 percent of the Federal poverty line:]</p>	<p>This language provides funds for Race to the Top grants for States to build capacity in early childhood care and education and requires the Secretary to jointly administer the program with the Secretary of Health and Human Services.</p>

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes—continued

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>⁴ [<i>Provided further</i>, That each State may subgrant a portion of such grant funds to local educational agencies and other early learning providers (including but not limited to Head Start programs and licensed child care providers), or consortia thereof, for the implementation of high-quality preschool programs for children from families at or below 200 percent of the Federal poverty line: <i>Provided further</i>, That subgrantees that are local educational agencies shall form strong partnerships with early learning providers and that subgrantees that are early learning providers shall form strong partnerships with local educational agencies, in order to carry out the requirements of the subgrant: <i>Provided further</i>, That, notwithstanding the second proviso, up to 3 percent of such funds for improving early childhood care and education shall be available for technical assistance, evaluation, and other national activities related to such grants: <i>Provided further</i>, That not later than 30 days prior to the announcement of a competition under such section 14006 pursuant to the requirements of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report outlining the proposed competition and priorities to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: <i>Provided further</i>, That the Secretary shall administer State grants for improving early childhood care and education under such section jointly with the Secretary of HHS on such terms as such Secretaries set forth in an interagency agreement:</p>	<p>This language allows States to subgrant Race to the Top awards and specifies requirements thereof, allows up to 3 percent of the program’s appropriation to be used for national activities, and requires the Secretary to submit a plan before formally announcing and inviting applications for the competition.</p>

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes—continued

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>⁵ [<i>Provided further</i>, That up to \$141,602,000 shall be available through December 31, 2014 for section 14007 of division A of Public Law 111-5, and up to 5 percent of such funds may be used for technical assistance and the evaluation of activities carried out under such section: <i>Provided further</i>, That the Secretary may renew a grant made under section 14007 for additional 1-year periods, for fiscal year 2014 and thereafter, if the grantee is meeting its performance targets, up to a total award period of 6 years:]</p>	<p>This language allows the Secretary to use funding for Investing in Innovation; allows the Secretary to use a portion of the funding for technical assistance and evaluation; and allows the Secretary to extend grants in their final year for an additional year up to a total grant award of 6 years.</p>
<p>⁶ [<i>Provided further</i>, That the education facilities clearinghouse established through a competitive award process in fiscal year 2013 is authorized to collect and disseminate information on effective educational practices and the latest research regarding the planning, design, financing, construction, improvement, operation, and maintenance of safe, healthy, high-performance public facilities for early learning programs, kindergarten through grade 12, and higher education:]</p>	<p>This language allows funds awarded to the current Educational Facilities Clearinghouse grantee to be used to collect and disseminate information on research and effective practices regarding facilities for early learning programs and higher education, in addition to collecting and disseminating information on research and effective practices regarding facilities for kindergarten through grade 12.</p>

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes—continued

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>^z [Provided further, That \$288,771,000 of the funds for subpart 1 of part D of title V of the ESEA shall be for competitive grants to local educational agencies, including charter schools that are local educational agencies, or States, or partnerships of: (1) a local educational agency, a State, or both; and (2) at least one nonprofit organization to develop and implement performance-based compensation systems for teachers, principals, and other personnel in high-need schools: <i>Provided further</i>, That such performance-based compensation systems must consider gains in student academic achievement as well as classroom evaluations conducted multiple times during each school year among other factors and provide educators with incentives to take on additional responsibilities and leadership roles: <i>Provided further</i>, That recipients of such grants shall demonstrate that such performance-based compensation systems are developed with the input of teachers and school leaders in the schools and local educational agencies to be served by the grant: <i>Provided further</i>, That recipients of such grants may use such funds to develop or improve systems and tools (which may be developed and used for the entire local educational agency or only for schools served under the grant) that would enhance the quality and success of the compensation system, such as high-quality teacher evaluations and tools to measure growth in student achievement: <i>Provided further</i>, That applications for such grants shall include a plan to sustain financially the activities conducted and systems developed under the grant once the grant period has expired: <i>Provided further</i>, That up to 5 percent of such funds for competitive grants shall be available for technical assistance, training, peer review of applications, program outreach, and evaluation activities:]</p>	<p>This language provides, within the Fund for the Improvement of Education appropriation, funding for the Teacher Incentive Fund and describes eligibility and other requirements for the program.</p>

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes—continued

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>⁸ [<i>Provided further</i>, That of the funds available for part B of title V of the ESEA, the Secretary shall use not less than \$11,000,000 to carry out activities under section 5205(b) and shall use not less than \$12,000,000 for subpart 2: <i>Provided further</i>, That of the funds available for subpart 1 of part B of title V of the ESEA, and notwithstanding section 5205(a), the Secretary shall reserve not less than \$45,000,000 to make multiple awards to non-profit charter management organizations and other entities that are not for-profit entities for the replication and expansion of successful charter school models and shall reserve up to \$11,000,000 to carry out the activities described in section 5205(a), including improving quality and oversight of charter schools and providing technical assistance and grants to authorized public chartering agencies in order to increase the number of high-performing charter schools: <i>Provided further</i>, That funds available for part B of title V of the ESEA may be used for grants that support preschool education in charter schools:]</p>	<p>This language establishes minimum amounts to be used, from the Charter Schools appropriation, for grants under the State Facilities Incentive and Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities programs, allows the Secretary to reserve funds appropriated for Charter Schools Grants to make awards to charter management organizations and other entities for the replication and expansion of successful charter school models, allows the Secretary to reserve a portion of the appropriation for national activities, and allows grants under the program to be used for preschool education.</p>

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes—continued

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>⁹ [<i>Provided further</i>, That each application submitted pursuant to section 5203(a) shall describe a plan to monitor and hold accountable authorized public chartering agencies through such activities as providing technical assistance or establishing a professional development program, which may include evaluation, planning, training, and systems development for staff of authorized public chartering agencies to improve the capacity of such agencies in the State to authorize, monitor, and hold accountable charter schools: <i>Provided further</i>, That each application submitted pursuant to section 5203(a) shall contain assurances that State law, regulations, or other policies require that: (1) each authorized charter school in the State operate under a legally binding charter or performance contract between itself and the school's authorized public chartering agency that describes the rights and responsibilities of the school and the public chartering agency; conduct annual, timely, and independent audits of the school's financial statements that are filed with the school's authorized public chartering agency; and demonstrate improved student academic achievement; and (2) authorized public chartering agencies use increases in student academic achievement for all groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA as the most important factor when determining to renew or revoke a school's charter.]</p>	<p>This language establishes application requirements for grants to State educational agencies under the Charter Schools Program that go beyond the requirements in the authorizing statute.</p>

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Appropriation Adjustments and Transfers (dollars in thousands)

Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers	2013	2014	2015
Discretionary:			
Appropriation.....	\$1,527,536	\$1,181,317	\$3,853,812
Across-the board reduction (P.L. 113-6).....	<u>-3,055</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, discretionary appropriation	1,524,481	1,181,317	3,853,812
Sequester (P.L. 112-25)	<u>-76,844</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, adjusted discretionary appropriation	1,447,637	1,181,317	3,853,812
Comparative transfer to:			
<u>Education Improvement Programs</u> for:			
Advanced placement.....	-28,483	-28,483	0
Ready-to-learn television.....	-25,771	-25,741	0
Arts in education	-23,648	-25,000	0
Comparative transfer from:			
<u>Education Improvement Programs</u> for:			
Improving teacher quality State grants	2,337,830	2,349,830	0
Mathematics and science partnerships.....	141,902	149,717	0
<u>Higher Education</u> for:			
Teacher quality partnership	<u>40,592</u>	<u>40,592</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, comparative discretionary appropriation.....	3,890,059	3,642,232	3,853,812
Mandatory:			
Appropriation	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5,000,000</u>
Total, comparable discretionary and mandatory appropriation	3,890,059	3,642,232	8,853,812

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Appropriation Adjustments and Transfers—continued
(dollars in thousands)

Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers	2013	2014	2015
Advance:			
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	-\$1,681,441	-\$1,681,441	0
Advance from prior year	<u>1,681,441</u>	<u>1,681,441</u>	<u>\$1,681,441</u>
Total, budget authority	3,890,059	3,642,232	10,535,253
Comparative transfer from:			
<u>Education Improvement Programs for:</u>			
Improving teacher quality State grants			
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	1,681,441	1,681,441	0
Advance from prior year	<u>-1,681,441</u>	<u>-1,681,441</u>	<u>-1,681,441</u>
Total, comparable budget authority.....	3,890,059	3,642,232	8,853,812

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Summary of Changes (dollars in thousands)

2014.....	\$3,392,232
2015.....	<u>8,853,812</u>
Net change from 2014.....	+5,461,580

Increases:	<u>2014 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
<p>Increase for a reauthorized Race to the Top program to support and create incentives for State and local reforms designed to lead to significant improvements in student achievement, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment rates, and to significant reductions in opportunity and achievement gaps.</p>	0	+\$300,000
<p>Increase for a reauthorized Investing in Innovation program to expand innovative strategies and practices that have been shown to be effective in improving educational outcomes for students and to test and evaluate promising strategies and practices whose efficacy has not yet been systematically studied and to support the Advanced Research Project Agency-Education (ARPA-ED).</p>	\$149,717	+23,398
<p>Initial funding for the new Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Innovation initiative to help improve student engagement and achievement in STEM subjects.</p>	0	+319,717
<p>Initial funding for the new High School Redesign program to transform teaching and learning in high schools by encouraging partnerships among LEAs, postsecondary institutions, and other entities such as businesses and nonprofit organizations to prepare students for college and career.</p>	0	+150,000

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Summary of Changes—continued
(dollars in thousands)

Increases:	<u>2014 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
Initial funding for the new Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program to provide formula grants to States and LEAs to improve the effectiveness and equitable distribution of effective teachers and leaders and, through an expanded set-aside of funds, to support efforts to build evidence on how best to best recruit, prepare, and support effective teachers and leaders and enhance the teaching and leadership professions.	0	+\$2,000,000
Initial funding for the new ConnectEDucators grant program to help support educators as they transition to using technology and data to improve student learning, including educators in schools receiving technology upgrades through the Administration’s ConnectED initiative.	0	+200,000
Initial funding for the new Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund to support the development and implementation of innovative teacher and leader policies.	0	+320,000
Increase for the School Leadership program to train highly effective leaders for high-need schools and districts.	\$25,763	+\$9,237
Initial funding for the Expanding Educational Options program to increase the supply of high-quality public educational options available to students, especially students attending low-performing schools, by creating and expanding effective charter and autonomous schools.	0	+248,172
	0	

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Summary of Changes—continued
(dollars in thousands)

Increases:	<u>2014 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
Mandatory funding for the Recognizing Education Success, Professional Excellence, and Collaborative Teaching (RESPECT) Project, which would provide significant, one-time support for educators across the country, responding to needs they have identified in a changing school environment, including the implementation of new college- and career-ready (CCR) standards and assessments and new educator evaluation systems.		<u>+\$5,000,000</u>
Subtotal, increases		+8,570,524

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Summary of Changes—continued
(dollars in thousands)

Decreases:	<u>2014 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
Elimination of the Mathematics and Science Partnerships program because it would be replaced by the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics program.	\$149,717	-\$149,717
Elimination of the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, Transition to Teaching, and Teacher Quality Partnership programs because they would be consolidated into the proposed Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program.	2,404,184	-2,404,184
Elimination of the Teacher Incentive Fund because it would be replaced by the proposed Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund.	288,771	-288,771
Elimination of the Charter Schools Grants and Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities programs and redirection of funding to the proposed Expanding Educational Options program.	248,172	-248,172
Decrease for the Fund for the Improvement in Education because the program would focus on a non-cognitive skills initiative, interagency strategies to strengthen services to disconnected youth, and an initiative to enhance communities' tracking of and performance on multiple outcomes for youth.	42,376	<u>-18,100</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-3,108,944
Net change		+5,461,580

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Authorizing Legislation

(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2014 Authorized	2014 Estimate	2015 Authorized	2015 Request
Race to the top (<i>ARRA-XIV-14006</i>)	0 ^{1,2}	0	To be determined ²	\$300,000
Investing in innovation (<i>ARRA-XIV-14007</i>)	0 ²	\$141,602	To be determined ²	165,000
STEM innovation:				
STEM innovation (<i>proposed legislation</i>)	--	--	To be determined	319,717
Mathematics and science partnerships (<i>ESEA II-B</i>)	0 ³	149,717	0 ³	0
High school transformation (<i>proposed legislation</i>)	--	--	To be determined	150,000
Excellent instructional teams:				
Effective teachers and leaders:				
Effective teacher and leaders State grants (<i>proposed legislation</i>)	--	--	To be determined	2,000,000
Improving teacher quality State grants (<i>ESEA II-A</i>)	0 ³	2,349,830	0 ³	0
Transition to teaching (<i>ESEA II-C-1-B</i>)	0 ³	13,762	0 ³	0
Teacher quality partnership (<i>HEA II-A</i>)	Indefinite ⁴	40,592	Indefinite ⁴	0
ConnectEDucators (<i>proposed legislation</i>)	--	--	To be determined	200,000
Teacher and leader innovation fund:				
Teacher and leader innovation fund (<i>proposed legislation</i>)	--	--	To be determined	320,000
Teacher incentive fund (<i>ESEA V-D-1</i>)	0 ³	288,771	0 ³	0
School leadership (<i>ESEA II-A-5-2151(b)</i>)	0 ³	25,763	0 ³	35,000

H-17

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Authorizing Legislation—continued
(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2014 Authorized	2014 Estimate	2015 Authorized	2015 Request
Expanding educational options:				
Expanding educational options (<i>proposed legislation</i>)	--	--	To be determined	248,172
Charter schools grants (<i>ESEA V-B-1</i>)	0 ³	\$248,172 ⁵	0 ³	0
Credit enhancement for charter school facilities (<i>ESEA V-B-2</i>)	0 ⁶	0 ⁵	0 ⁶	0
Magnet schools assistance (<i>ESEA V-C</i>)	0 ⁷	\$91,647	To be determined ⁷	\$91,647
FIE programs of national significance (<i>ESEA V-D-1</i>)	0 ⁷	42,376	To be determined ⁷	24,276
Recognizing education success, professional excellence, and collaborative teaching (<i>proposed legislation</i>)	0	0	To be determined ⁸	5,000,000
<u>Unfunded authorizations:</u>				
Advanced credentialing (<i>ESEA II-A-5-2521(c)</i>)	0 ³	0	0 ³	0
Voluntary public school choice (<i>ESEA V-B-3</i>)	0 ³	0	0 ³	0
Advanced placement and international baccalaureate programs (<i>America COMPETES Act VI-A-II</i>)	0 ⁹	0	0 ⁹	0
Ready to teach (<i>ESEA V-D-8</i>)	0 ³	0	0 ³	0
Exchanges with historic whaling and trading partners (<i>ESEA V-D-12</i>)	0 ¹⁰	0	0 ¹⁰	0
Parental information and resource centers (<i>ESEA V-D-16</i>)	0 ³	0	0 ³	0
Women's educational equity (<i>ESEA V-D-21</i>)	0 ¹⁰	0	0 ¹⁰	0

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Authorizing Legislation—continued

(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2014 Authorized	2014 Estimate	2015 Authorized	2015 Request
Total definite authorization	0		0	
Total discretionary appropriation		\$3,392,232		\$3,853,812
Portion of request subject to reauthorization				615,923
Portion of request not authorized				3,237,889
Total mandatory appropriation		5,000,000		0

H-19

¹ The FY 2014 Appropriations Act provided \$250,000 thousand under Race to the Top for competitive awards to States for early childhood care and education. This funding is included as Preschool Development Grants under the proposed School Readiness account.

² The program is authorized in FY 2014 through appropriations language; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2015.

³ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2015 under new legislation.

⁴ The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2015 under new legislation.

⁵ From the amount appropriated for Charter Schools, the fiscal year 2014 appropriations act required the Secretary to use not less than \$12,000 thousand for Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities.

⁶ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2004. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2015 under new legislation.

⁷ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2015.

⁸ Authorization for the program is sought for FY 2015.

⁹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011. No appropriations language or reauthorizing legislation is sought.

¹⁰ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. No appropriations language or reauthorizing legislation is sought.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2006 Discretionary	1,307,871	708,522	1,308,785	936,488
2007 Discretionary	850,966	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	837,686
2008 Discretionary	922,018	982,354	962,889	985,517
2009 Discretionary	867,517	976,846 ²	944,314 ²	996,425
Recovery Act Supplemental (PL 111-5) (Discretionary)	0	225,000	0	200,000
2010 Discretionary Rescission (PL 111-226) (Discretionary)	1,489,949	1,347,363	1,234,787 ³	1,389,065 -10,700
2011 Discretionary	6,330,000	1,870,123 ⁴	2,224,843 ³	1,856,179 ⁵
2012 Discretionary	4,995,000	821,411 ⁶	1,740,212 ⁶	1,527,536
2013 Discretionary	4,332,166	799,133 ⁷	1,545,966 ⁷	1,447,637
2014 Discretionary	5,335,000	N/A ⁸	1,331,598	1,181,317
2014 Mandatory	5,000,000	0	0	
2015 Discretionary	3,853,812			

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 reflect 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 and the level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Committee action only.

⁷ The levels 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.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Significant Items in FY 2014 Appropriations Reports

Race to the Top: High Quality Preschool Programs

Managers'

Statement: The bill also requires that the Secretary submit a report outlining the proposed competition and priorities to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. It is expected that the Department will consult with the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, Committee on Education and Workforce, and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions (HELP), prior to the submission of the required report, including on the criteria to be used under a competition to define a high-quality preschool infrastructure and program.

Response: The Department plans to consult with the committees and will submit a report outlining the proposed Preschool Development Grants competition to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

Race to the Top: Evaluations

Managers'

Statement: The Secretary shall continue to provide, on a timely and periodic basis, the findings from evaluations, including impact evaluations and interim progress evaluations, of activities conducted using any Race to the Top funds to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

Response: The Department will notify the committees of findings from Race to the Top evaluations and studies. By December 2014, the Department expects to issue the first full report of a study evaluating the implementation and impact of efforts to turn around persistently lowest-achieving schools under the Race to the Top and School Improvement Grants programs.

Investing in Innovation

Senate: The Committee bill continues language from last year's bill providing up to 5 percent of the appropriation for this program to be used for evaluation and technical assistance.

Response: The Department will notify the committee of its plans for the technical assistance and evaluation funds before carrying out activities with those funds.

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
Innovation and Instructional Teams						
1. Race to the Top – Equity and Opportunity (ARRA section 14006) ¹	D	520,247	0	300,000	300,000	---
2. Investing in Innovation (ARRA section 14007)	D	141,602	141,602	165,000	23,398	16.524%
3. STEM Innovation:						
(a) STEM Innovation (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	319,717	319,717	---
(b) Mathematics and science partnerships (ESEA II, Part B)	D	141,902	149,717	0	(149,717)	-100.000%
Subtotal		141,902	149,717	319,717	170,000	113.548%
4. High school redesign (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	150,000	150,000	---
5. Excellent instructional teams:						
(a) Effective teachers and leaders:						
(1) Effective teachers and leaders State grants (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	2,000,000	2,000,000	---
(2) Improving teacher quality State grants (ESEA II-A)						
Annual appropriation	D	656,389	668,389	0	(668,389)	-100.000%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	1,681,441	1,681,441	0	(1,681,441)	-100.000%
Subtotal	D	2,337,830	2,349,830	2,000,000	(349,830)	-14.887%
(3) Transition to teaching (ESEA II-C-1-B)	D	24,691	13,762	0	(13,762)	-100.000%
(4) Teacher quality partnership (HEA II-A)	D	40,592	40,592	0	(40,592)	-100.000%
Subtotal		65,283	54,354	0	(54,354)	-100.000%
(b) ConnectEDucators (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	200,000	200,000	---
(c) Teacher and leader innovation fund:						
(1) Teacher and leader innovation fund (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	320,000	320,000	---
(2) Teacher incentive fund (ESEA V-D-1)	D	283,771	288,771	0	(288,771)	-100.000%
Subtotal		283,771	288,771	320,000	31,229	10.814%

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 In FY 2013, funds supported RTT-Early Learning Challenge and RTT-District competitions. The Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2014, provided \$250,000 thousand, which is shown in the School Readiness account for Preschool Development Grants.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2015 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(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
Innovation and Instructional Teams (continued)						
6. School leadership (ESEA section 2151(b))	D	27,584	25,763	35,000	9,237	35.854%
7. Expanding educational options:						
(a) Expanding educational options (proposed legislation) ¹	D	0	0	248,172	248,172	---
(b) Charter schools grants (ESEA V-B-1) ¹	D	241,507	248,172	0	(248,172)	-100.000%
(c) Credit enhancement for charter school facilities (ESEA Title V-B-2) ¹	D	0	0	0	0	---
Subtotal		241,507	248,172	248,172	0	0.000%
8. Magnet schools assistance (Part C)	D	91,647	91,647	91,647	0	0.000%
9. Fund for the improvement of education: Programs of national significance (ESEA V-D-1) ²	D	38,280	42,376	24,276	(18,100)	-42.713%
10. Recognizing Education Success, Professional Excellence, and Collaborative Teaching (RESPECT) (proposed legislation)	M	0	0	5,000,000	5,000,000	---
Total, Appropriation ^{2,3}	D	3,889,653	3,392,232	3,853,812	461,580	13.607%
Total, Budget authority	D	3,889,653	3,392,232	5,535,253	2,143,021	63.174%
Current ⁴		2,208,212	1,710,791	3,853,812	2,143,021	125.265%
Prior year's advance		1,681,441	1,681,441	1,681,441	0	0.000%

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 Of the amount appropriated for Charter School Grants for FY 2013, appropriations language required the Department to use not less than \$21,756 thousand for State Facilities Incentive Grants and Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities. The Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2014, requires the Department to use not less than \$11,000 thousand for State Facilities Incentive Grants and not less than \$12,000 thousand for Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities. The 2015 President's Budget would subsume both programs into the proposed Expanding Educational Options program.

² Reflects a reprogramming in FY 2013 of \$407 thousand from the Fund for the Improvement of Education: Programs of National Significance to Advanced Placement, in the School Improvement Programs account, now the Education Improvement Programs account.

³ Adjusted for comparability. Includes \$2,337,830 thousand in FY 2013 and \$2,349,830 thousand in FY 2014 for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants and \$141,902 thousand in FY 2013 and \$149,717 thousand in FY 2014 for Mathematics and Science Partnerships, appropriated to the School Improvement Programs account, now the Education Improvement Programs account; and \$40,592 thousand in FY 2013 and in FY 2014 for Teacher Quality Partnership, appropriated to the Higher Education account.

⁴ Adjusted for comparability. Excludes \$25,771 thousand in FY 2013 and \$25,741 thousand in FY 2014 for Ready-to-learn Television, \$23,648 thousand in FY 2013 and \$25,000 thousand in FY 2014 for Arts in Education, and \$28,890 thousand in FY 2013 and \$28,483 thousand in FY 2014 for Advanced Placement, proposed in FY 2015 under the Education Improvement Programs account. Also excludes advanced appropriations of \$1,681,441 thousand in fiscal years 2013 and 2014 that become available October 1 of the following fiscal year. Advanced appropriations shown in this account were for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants and were appropriated in fiscal years 2013 and 2014 in the School Improvement Programs account, now the Education Improvement Programs account.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Summary of Request

Programs in the Innovation and Instructional Teams account support the goal of improving student achievement in three key ways: providing incentives for States and local educational agencies (LEAs) to implement comprehensive educational reforms and to test, evaluate, and expand innovative educational strategies and practices, including in science, technology, mathematics, and science (STEM); increasing the supply of effective teachers and principals; and providing parents with expanded options for the education of their children. The Administration requests a total of \$3.9 billion in discretionary funds.

The new structure of this account reflects the framework of the Administration's proposal for reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. A key objective of this proposal is to increase efficiency by consolidating currently authorized programs with similar purposes. In fiscal year 2014, for example, the Department's appropriation contained several programs focused on teaching and school leadership issues with different purposes, requirements, and authorized activities.

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

System-wide Reform and Innovation

The Administration requests \$489.3 million to support efforts to drive State and local reform and innovation. Specifically, the request includes:

- \$300.0 million for the **Race to the Top** program to support grants that can demonstrate the capacity and willingness to undertake reforms and innovations to reduce opportunity and achievement gaps. Under this new initiative, applicants would be required to demonstrate a commitment to making comprehensive changes in how they identify and close opportunity and achievement gaps. Grants would support the development and implementation of systems that integrate data on school-level finances, human resources, and academic achievement; strategies to get effective teachers and leaders to high-poverty schools; evidence-based practices, such as increasing access to rigorous coursework; activities that mitigate the effects of concentrated poverty like enhancing school climate and culture.
- \$165.0 million for the **Investing in Innovation** program to expand innovative strategies and practices that have been shown to be effective in improving educational outcomes for students and to test and evaluate promising practices, strategies, or programs whose efficacy has not yet been systematically studied. Funds would also support the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Education (ARPA-ED), a new entity modeled after similar

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Summary of Request—continued

agencies in the Department of Defense and Department of Energy. The mission of ARPA-ED would be to pursue development of educational technology and learning systems; support systems for educators; and tools that result in improvements for all students (but especially those from low-income backgrounds) by increasing educational achievement and attainment for students in both traditional and non-traditional learning environments.

- \$24.3 million for the Fund for the Improvement of Education: Programs of National Significance (FIE) to support nationally significant projects to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education, including continuation of a data quality initiative that helps improve the quality, analysis, and reporting of Department of Education elementary and secondary education data. Of the amount requested, the Department would use \$10.0 million for competitive grants to develop and test interventions to improve students' non-cognitive skills like self-control and social and emotional skills; \$8.0 million to support activities to strengthen services provided to disconnected youth; and \$5.0 million to support a youth data pilot that would enhance communities' tracking of and performance on multiple outcomes for at-risk youth using existing data sets.

STEM Innovation

The Administration requests \$319.7 million to help increase the number of students effectively prepared for postsecondary education and careers in STEM fields, including:

- \$110.0 million for a new STEM Innovation Networks initiative to help improve student engagement and achievement in STEM subjects by developing, validating, and scaling up innovative and effective STEM educational practices in networks of participating schools.
- \$40.0 million for STEM Teacher Pathways to support the Administration's goal of recruiting and preparing 100,000 effective STEM teachers over 10 years.
- \$20.0 million to establish a National STEM Master Teacher Corps that would provide leadership roles for effective STEM teachers to help improve STEM instruction.
- \$149.7 million for Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics to support comprehensive State and local efforts to improve STEM education through such activities as professional development for STEM teachers and implementation of high-quality curriculum, instructional materials, and assessments.

High School Redesign

The Administration requests \$150.0 million for a new, competitive High School Redesign program to help redesign high schools to prepare students to be college- and career-ready (CCR) by using existing Federal, State, and local resources and creation of learning models that are rigorous, relevant, and focus on real-world experiences while incorporating personalized learning and career and college exploration.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Summary of Request—continued

Excellent Instructional Teams and School Leadership

The Administration requests \$2.5 billion for the new **Excellent Instructional Teams** programs, which would provide both formula grants and competitive awards to help States and LEAs increase the effectiveness of teachers and principals.

- \$2.0 billion for **Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants** to provide flexible, formula-based support for States and LEAs that commit to improving their teacher and principal evaluation systems and ensuring that low-income and minority students have equitable access to teachers and principals who are effective at raising student achievement. A 10-percent national activities set-aside totaling \$200 million would allow the Department to build evidence on how best to recruit, prepare, and support effective teachers and leaders, and invest in efforts to enhance the teaching and leadership professions.
- \$200.0 million for a new **ConnectEDucators** program that would help educators transition to using technology and data to personalize learning and improve CCR instruction. The ConnectEDucators program would help ensure that teachers and leaders with access to high-speed Internet and devices for students are prepared to use these resources in a way that increases student learning and achievement.
- \$320.0 million for the **Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund** to help States and LEAs improve the effectiveness of teachers and leaders in high-need schools and LEAs, in particular by creating the conditions to identify, recruit, prepare, support, retain, and advance effective and highly effective teachers, teacher leaders, principals, and school leadership teams in those schools.

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

The Administration also requests \$35.0 million for a redesigned **School Leadership Program**. The 2015 competition would support grants for high-quality, large-scale professional development for school leaders that build evidence of effectiveness. Funded projects would help current principals and school leadership teams strengthen essential school leadership skills (such as evaluating and providing feedback to teachers, analyzing student data, developing school leadership teams, and creating a positive school climate), and deepen school leaders' understanding of CCR standards and effective instruction aligned to those standards.

The Administration proposes \$5.0 billion in mandatory funding for the Recognizing Education Success, Professional Excellence, and Collaborative Teaching (RESPECT) Project, which would provide significant, one-time support for educators across the country, responding to needs they have identified in a changing school environment, including the implementation of new CCR standards and assessments and new educator evaluation systems. RESPECT would support ambitious plans to address needs educators are calling out for: to attract the most capable candidates into education, improve teacher and principal preparation and support early in their careers, provide career ladders and other opportunities for educators to take on

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Summary of Request—continued

leadership roles, and create conditions in schools that support effective teaching, including great school leadership and time for collaboration.

Expanding Educational Options

The Administration requests \$248.2 million for the new **Expanding Educational Options** program to support competitive grants to State educational agencies (SEAs), charter school authorizers, charter management organizations, local educational agencies and other nonprofit organizations to start or expand high-performing charter schools and other autonomous public schools. The Department would also be authorized to make competitive grants to high-need LEAs, and to SEAs in partnership with one or more high-need LEAs, for the development and implementation of comprehensive programs of public school choice that increase the range of high-quality educational options available to students and help improve the academic achievement of students attending low-performing schools. All grantees would also be required to fund or operate parent information and outreach programs to make families and students aware of their options.

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

In addition, the Administration requests \$91.6 million for **Magnet Schools Assistance** to LEAs to establish and operate magnet schools that are part of an approved desegregation plan.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Race to the top

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: To be determined

Budget Authority:

<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
0 ¹	\$300,000	+\$300,000

¹ The FY 2014 Appropriations Act provided \$250,000 thousand under Race to the Top for competitive awards to States for early childhood care and education. This funding is included as Preschool Development Grants under the proposed School Readiness account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

With funds provided by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act), in 2010, the Department invested more than \$4 billion in a Race to the Top – State (RTT-State) competition that made 4-year awards to support comprehensive reforms in 11 States and the District of Columbia, based on their record of improving student outcomes and on their record of and commitment to putting in place conditions for innovation and reform. Applications were also evaluated based on the quality and likelihood of success of the applicants' comprehensive and coherent plans, including the level of support from relevant stakeholders, for improving student achievement and attaining the other objectives of the program. In addition to the RTT-State grants, the Department made awards to two consortia of States under the Race to the Top Assessment program (RTT-A). The consortia are working to develop assessments that are

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Race to the top

valid, support and inform instruction, provide accurate information about what students know and can do, and measure student achievement against standards designed to ensure that all students gain the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in college and the workplace.

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

In addition, the Department used approximately \$500 million for a new Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) competition in fiscal year 2011. The RTT-ELC competition was designed to encourage State efforts to develop, implement, better coordinate, and evaluate their systems of early learning, with the overall goals of (1) improving the quality of early learning programs and services for high-need children birth to age 5; and (2) closing the school readiness gap between children with high needs and their peers. Nine States received RTT-ELC awards in the first round of this competition.

The 2012 appropriations act allowed the use of RTT funds to support and encourage district-level reform and innovation through a competition for local educational agencies (LEAs) focused on bold, innovative reform at the local level. The Race to the Top – District (RTT-D) competition invited applicants to demonstrate how they would personalize education for all students in their schools, building on the experiences of States in implementing reforms in the core educational assurance areas. The competition encouraged and rewarded LEAs and consortia of LEAs that had the best plans for implementing the strategies, structures, and systems needed to support personalized, student-focused approaches to learning and teaching that will produce learning growth for all students. In 2012, the Department awarded \$384 million to 16 RTT-D applicants representing 55 LEAs. In addition, the Department used \$133 million in fiscal year 2012 funds to make awards to five additional States that submitted applications in the fiscal year 2011 RTT-ELC competition.

In 2013, the Department awarded \$281 million to six States in a new RTT-ELC competition and provided \$89 million in supplemental awards to the 2012 RTT-ELC grantees. The Department also conducted a second competition for RTT-D grants, awarding \$121 million for five new awards representing 22 LEAs.

The 2014 appropriations act required the Department to use the RTT funding for competitive awards to States for early childhood care and education consistent with the President's 2014 request for Preschool Development Grants (PDG). The Department is currently developing plans for a competition focused on support for and development of high-quality preschool programs, as described under the PDG program in the School Readiness account.

The Department awarded a contract in 2010 to run an RTT Reform Support Network (RSN), which provides technical assistance guided by the needs and requests of the grantee States

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Race to the top

while also making available reports and other technical assistance to both grantee and non-grantee States. Network reports and other resources are available at: <http://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/implementation-support-unit/tech-assist/resources.html>. In 2012, the Department awarded a contract to provide similar support to RTT-ELC and RTT-D grantees. Like the RSN, resources developed under the 2012 contract will be available to non-grantee States and LEAs as well.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2010	0
2011	\$698,600
2012	548,960
2013	520,247
2014	0 ¹

¹ The FY 2014 appropriations act provided \$250,000 thousand under Race to the Top for competitive awards to States for early childhood care and education. This funding is included as Preschool Development Grants under the proposed School Readiness account.

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$300 million for fiscal year 2015 for a new Race to the Top – Equity and Opportunity (RTT-Opportunity) competition centered on improving the academic performance of students in the Nation’s highest poverty schools. RTT-Opportunity is designed to drive meaningful changes in how States and LEAs identify and close persistent educational opportunity and achievement gaps.

The work of States implementing RTT and ESEA Flexibility has shown that a critical challenge is ensuring that the high-need students who are the key focus of Federal education programs share fully in the benefits of these reforms. Even today, in America:

- Low-income and minority students are more likely to be assigned to inexperienced, out-of-field, academically weaker, and less effective teachers than are other students.¹
- 1 in 6 high school students lack access to essential STEM courses such as Algebra I, geometry, and biology; more than 1 in 3 lack access to physics; 1 in 2 lack access to calculus.²

¹ Heather Peske and Kati Haycock, “Teaching Inequality: How Poor and Minority Students Are Shortchanged on Teacher Quality,” Washington, D.C.: The Education Trust, June 2006, <http://www.edtrust.org/sites/edtrust.org/files/publications/files/TQReportJune2006.pdf>.

² 2009-10 Civil Rights Data Collection, Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, <http://ocrdata.ed.gov>.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Race to the top

- In 2013, not a *single* Black student took the computer science Advanced Placement (AP) exam in 11 States and not a *single* Latino student took the exam in 8 States.³
- 45 percent of high-poverty schools receive State and local funds *below* what is typical for other schools in their LEA.⁴

Recent data show that despite a national focus on achievement gaps dating back to the Department-commissioned "Equality of Educational Opportunity" report (known as the Coleman Report) in 1966, these gaps persist. For example, in the 2013 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), only 24 percent of students eligible for free lunch under the National School Lunch Program scored proficient or above on the 4th-grade mathematics assessment, compared to 59 percent of students not eligible for free or reduced-priced lunch. As the 2013 Equity and Excellence Commission report made clear, inequitable opportunities deny students the quality education needed to successfully compete in the global economy and impose a substantial economic cost to the country.

Every student, regardless of zip code, should have access to a safe, high-quality school that provides a real ladder of opportunity into the middle class and beyond. Providing all students with the opportunities to succeed is not only a moral imperative but America's continued economic prosperity in our increasingly competitive, technology-driven global marketplace depends on ensuring that all of our students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

RTT-Opportunity will directly address key elements that contribute to longstanding opportunity and achievement gaps. The initiative will link together State and local fiscal, student achievement, and human resource data systems, allowing States, LEAs, and schools to identify and address the needs of underserved students by improving access to high-quality teachers and leaders, rigorous coursework, and other evidence-based supports. The initiative will build on reforms implemented under previous RTT competitions and ESEA Flexibility, while also improving the use and effectiveness of resources from other Federal programs. RTT-Opportunity will provide incentives and support for the implementation of high-quality plans to ensure that high-need students and schools share fully in the benefits of these reforms. There will be two types of required activities:

First, grantees will develop, implement, or enhance data systems for local or State use that integrate information on school-level finances, teacher and principal experience and effectiveness, student coursework, and academic achievement. Grantees will use these newly available data to: (1) identify LEAs, schools, and student groups with the greatest disparities in opportunity and outcomes; (2) develop strategies for addressing these gaps to ensure all students are prepared for college and careers; and (3) measure the success of these strategies and use the results to support continuous improvement.

³ Eric Westervelt, "A Push to Boost Computer Science Learning, Even At An Early Age," www.npr.org, February 17, 2014, <http://www.npr.org/blogs/alltechconsidered/2014/02/17/271151462/a-push-to-boost-computer-science-learning-even-at-an-early-age>.

⁴ Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, "Comparability of State and Local Expenditures Among Schools Within Districts: A Report From the Study of School-Level Expenditures," November 2011, <http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/title-i/school-level-expenditures/school-level-expenditures.pdf>.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Race to the top

Second, grantees will use funds to develop, attract, and retain more effective teachers and leaders in high-need schools, through strategies such as targeted and individualized professional development, career ladder opportunities, financial incentives, strengthening school culture and climate, and educator training and preparation programs, including those focused on developing effective principals trained to foster success and support excellent teachers in high-need schools.

In addition to the required activities, grantees will be expected to address other factors contributing to educational opportunity and achievement gaps. These include, for example, school safety; non-cognitive skills; expanded learning time; fair and appropriate school discipline policies; mental, physical, and social emotional supports; college and career counseling, and other strategies that help break up and mitigate the effects of concentrations of poverty. Grantees could also promote evidence-based practices that expand access to rigorous coursework linked to college- and career-ready standards; AP and IB classes; gifted and talented programs; high-quality job-embedded career and technical education pathways; and early college programs in high schools.

Operating in tandem, these strategies will build a foundation for assessing the effectiveness of specific interventions and reform strategies. Another key goal of RTT-Opportunity is to help States, LEAs, and schools to examine the use and alignment of existing Federal education resources, including Title I, Title II, and State Longitudinal Data Systems to ensure it is being used effectively and is aligned with their comprehensive plans to address opportunity and achievement gaps. States would collect data on school-level expenditures, make that data transparent and easily accessible, and use that data to improve the effectiveness of resources and to support continuous improvement. Participating LEAs would ensure that State and local funds are distributed fairly by implementing a more meaningful comparability standard, based on actual school-level expenditures.

There is clear and compelling research about the fundamental disparities addressed by RTT-Opportunity.

One resource to which poor and minority students in high-poverty schools have less access is effective teachers, despite the fact that teachers are the single most important in-school factor determining student achievement, and that effective teaching has been linked to improved outcomes. According to a 2011 analysis by Raj Chetty et al., these improved outcomes include increased achievement levels, increased likelihood of college attendance, and higher wages. Yet a recent study by the Department's Institute of Education Sciences concluded that "on average, disadvantaged students had less access to effective teaching" in all of the 29 LEAs and in all grades 4 through 8 in the study. Further, administrative data collected through the relatively new Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems demonstrate the same pattern of poor and minority students having less access to effective teachers in many places. These data strongly suggest that increasing access to effective teaching is essential to closing achievement gaps for high-need students.

High-need students also tend to have less experienced teachers. The Department's 2012 report, "Providing Effective Teachers for All Students: Examples from Five Districts" (<http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/teaching/providing-effective-teachers/report.pdf>), notes that

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Race to the top

“studies have documented that, on average, teachers migrate toward working in affluent, high achieving schools.” This leads to higher proportions of inexperienced teachers in struggling schools, which is significant given that teacher effectiveness, on average, increases after the first few years of teaching. The result is higher proportions of inexperienced teachers are in the very schools where students have the greatest need for experienced, effective teachers.

Students also face large disparities in their access to, and completion of, rigorous college-preparatory coursework. Poor and minority students have fewer opportunities to take challenging courses – a key factor associated with a student’s completion of a bachelor’s degree. In 2009, the National Center for Education Statistics found that in low-poverty schools, half of graduates earned credits in dual credit, AP, or International Baccalaureate (IB) courses, compared with just one-third of graduates in high-poverty schools.

Not surprisingly, the disparities in access to effective teachers and rigorous coursework also hold for other school resources. Most recently, the Department’s 2011 report, “Comparability of State and Local Expenditures Among Schools Within Districts: A Report From the Study of School-Level Expenditures” (<http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/title-i/school-level-expenditures/school-level-expenditures.pdf>), demonstrated that among LEAs that had both Title I schools and non-Title I schools, 31 percent of Title I schools had State and local per-pupil personnel expenditures that were more than 10 percent below the average expenditures for non-Title I schools. Clearly, many schools with significant numbers of disadvantaged students do not receive the same level of State and local resources per student as schools that do not have as many disadvantaged students, much less the greater level of resources that these disadvantaged schools may require to provide equitable instruction and services. It is important to note that such resource disparities have a significant impact on the effectiveness of key Federal education programs, such as Title I Grants to LEAs, which are intended to improve student outcomes, in part, by providing supplemental educational resources and services on top of an equitable base of State and local resources.

Effective teaching and learning cannot take place unless students and their teachers feel safe and supported. This is especially true for high-need students involved in the foster care or juvenile justice systems, who are homeless or struggle with substance abuse and mental health issues, as well as those who drop out of school or are at risk of doing so. Such high-need students are often disproportionately represented in high-poverty schools. Students need positive school climates that are welcoming and include appropriate and fair discipline practices and other supports that mitigate the effects of poverty. Such environments also promote the retention of effective teachers in high-need schools. Yet, according to data from the Department’s Schools and Staffing Survey, 18 percent of secondary schools with at least three-fourths of their students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch have no counselors, psychologists, or social workers compared to 5 percent of secondary schools with less than one-third of their students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. In addition, data collected by the Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights (OCR) for the 2011-12 school year indicate that students of color are disciplined more harshly and more frequently than other students. For example, Black students without disabilities represented 35 percent of students suspended once, 44 percent of those suspended more than once, and 36 percent of students expelled, but Black students comprise only 15 percent of all students in the OCR’s Civil Rights Data Collection.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Race to the top

Reducing educational inequity is a longstanding, overarching goal of the Federal investment in elementary and secondary education, dating back to the original Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Combining the new reform tools created through existing RTT and ESEA flexibility activities with advances in data collection and analysis and the adoption of evidence-based practices can lead to improved educational outcomes and will reduce achievement gaps. RTT-Opportunity will provide the incentives and resources to States and LEAs committed to taking on this challenge, closing achievement gaps, preparing the 21st century workforce needed to ensure our continued economic competitiveness and prosperity, and delivering on our Nation’s promise of equal opportunity for all Americans.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Early Learning and K-12			
Award funding	\$490,852	0	0
Peer review of applications	3,676	0	0
Technical assistance and evaluation	<u>25,719</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, Early Learning and K-12	520,247	0	0
Equity and Opportunity			
Award funding	0	0	\$289,000
Peer review of applications	0	0	2,000
Technical assistance and evaluation	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>9,000</u>
Total, Equity	0	0	300,000

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Department has established eight performance measures for the RTT-State grantees. The first four measures are designed to gauge grantee progress on the implementation of RTT plans in the area of teachers and leaders: (1) the number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems;⁵ (2) the number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or highly effective in the prior academic year; (3) the percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both, who were evaluated as highly effective in the prior academic year; and (4) the percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both who were evaluated as highly effective in the prior academic year. The remaining four measures seek to determine the program’s effect on student outcomes: (1) the number of States that achieve greater than the 75th percentile in overall score gains across all States in at least 3 of the 4 subject-grade combinations (grade 4 reading, grade 4 math, grade 8 reading, and grade 8 math) on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and have no statistically significant increase in exclusion rates for students with disabilities or English

⁵ “Qualifying evaluation systems” are those teacher and principal evaluation systems that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement and are rigorous, transparent, and fair.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Race to the top

Learners; (2) the number of States that meet their Title I high school graduation rate target; (3) the number of States that report an increase in the percentage of students graduating from high school who enroll in an institution of higher education (IHE); and (4) the number of States that report an increase in the number of students who complete at least 1 year's worth of college credit that is applicable to a degree within 2 years of enrollment in an IHE. The Department will have data for these measures in May 2014.

The Department has posted the annual performance reports (APRs) submitted by the States for school years 2010-11 and 2011-12 at <http://www.rtt-apr.us> and <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/performance.html>. These reports allow the Department and the public to follow grantees' progress in implementing their education reform plans and meeting their goals and targets. The APRs also include State-reported updates on the laws, statutes, regulations, and guidelines that affect key elements of their RTT plans.

The Department established five performance measures for the Comprehensive Assessment Systems Grants awarded under the RTT-A program in 2010: (1) the number of States that have formally adopted a common set of college- and career-ready standards in mathematics and English language arts (ELA); (2) the number of States that have fully implemented the summative assessment components of the assessment systems developed by the consortium; (3) the number of IHEs that are working with grantees to design and develop the final high school summative assessments in mathematics and ELA; (4) the number of IHEs that have implemented policies that exempt from remedial courses and place into credit-bearing college courses students who meet the achievement standard for the final high school summative assessments in mathematics and ELA and any other placement requirements; and (5) the percentage of direct matriculation students in public IHEs who are enrolled in IHEs that are working with grantees to design and develop the final high school summative assessments in mathematics and ELA and/or have implemented policies that exempt from remedial courses and place into credit-bearing college courses students who meet the achievement standard for the final high school summative assessments in mathematics and ELA. The Department will have data for these measures in late 2015.

The Department has developed performance measures for the RTT-ELC competition. At a minimum, grants are required to report on the following measures: (1) the number and percentage of early learning and development programs participating in a statewide tiered quality rating and improvement system (TQRIS); (2) the number of early learning and development programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS; and (3) the number and percentage of children with high needs who are enrolled in early learning and development programs that are in the top tiers of the TQRIS. The Department has developed additional measures on which grantees will report, depending on the objectives of their projects.

The Department is establishing performance measures for RTT-D grantees to ensure the collection of high-quality, comparable data that will inform the assessment of the effectiveness of the program. The Department expects to finalize these measures in spring 2014.

The Department is evaluating the implementation and impact of efforts to turn around persistently lowest-achieving schools under both the RTT-State and School Improvement Grants (SIG) programs. This evaluation involves collecting data from roughly 60 LEAs and 525 schools in the 50 States and DC. The study is focusing on (1) the implementation of RTT

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Race to the top

and SIG; (2) the relationship between receipt of RTT funds and student outcomes; (3) the impact of the receipt of SIG funds on student outcomes in the lowest-achieving schools; and (4) the relationship between the four school turnaround models (and related improvement strategies) and student outcomes and school performance. Data collection for this study will continue through the 2013-14 school year. The Department released an evaluation brief in December 2013 (<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20144008/>), which outlines the trends in operational authority of SIG and non-SIG schools (e.g., autonomy over school budgets, student discipline policies, staffing), the most common forms of technical assistance and other supports for turnaround efforts, and the role of State monitoring. The Department will issue the first full report by December 2014.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Investing in innovation

(American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, Sec. 12007)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: To be determined

Budget Authority:

	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$141,602	\$165,000	+\$23,398

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

Each grantee is also required to support an independent evaluation of its project and to identify strategies for expanding the project, if effective, after the grant period expires. In addition, each grantee is required to obtain a specified amount of matching funds from the private sector and to use funds to develop or expand strategies to improve the performance of high-need students.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Investing in innovation

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2010	0
2011	\$149,700
2012	149,417
2013	141,602
2014	141,602

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2015, the Administration requests \$165 million for the Investing in Innovation (i3) program, an increase of \$23.4 million over the 2014 appropriation. The request would build on the Department's success in using program funds to build an evidence base that will help ensure that schools and districts have access to innovative strategies and practices that are effective in improving educational outcomes for students. In addition, up to 30 percent of the available funds would support activities to be carried out by the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Education (ARPA-ED).

The goal of the i3 program is to encourage innovation and improve educational outcomes for students by developing, identifying, and scaling up effective practices. The program's emphasis on supporting projects with either evidence of effectiveness or a strong research-based framework increases the likelihood that funded projects succeed and that we learn more about what works, for whom and in what context. The focus on strong evidence and the requirement for rigorous program evaluations also helps expand local capacity to properly evaluate implementation and impact, and determine whether educational interventions are effective. In addition, the program garners significant non-Federal interest in supporting innovation in education. As of December 2013, private institutions such as foundations, nonprofit organizations, and institutions of higher education have made commitments of over \$200 million to assist in the implementation of grantee projects.

The i3 program continues to experience significant demand across the Nation. In 2013, the Department received over 600 applications for projects to validate or scale up proven practices and pre-applications for projects to develop and test promising practices across a range of key challenges that affect student learning. As of December 2013, the Department has awarded 117 i3 grants, including 5 in the Scale-up category, 35 in Validation, and 77 in Development.

The funding requested for 2015 would allow the Department to continue to build on the success in fostering educational innovation while developing an evidence base in areas of high need and generating private-sector investment to complement the Federal investment. The Department will determine priorities for the 2015 grant competition after the competition for fiscal year 2014 funds is finalized. The Department's strategy for choosing competition priorities is to ensure that it funds projects in high-priority areas as well as projects in areas where few or no projects have been funded previously in order to build out the "portfolio" of i3-supported solutions. Priorities under consideration include targeting the improvement of student attainment in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) subjects, supporting high-quality

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Investing in innovation

education in rural locations, and accelerating achievement of students with disabilities or English Learners. For fiscal year 2015, the Department would reserve \$5.8 million for national activities, including providing technical assistance to help grantees develop and implement rigorous evaluation plans, among other activities. The Department is also considering reserving up to \$10 million for “pay-for-success” projects to incentivize service providers to achieve better results in a cost-effective manner.

In addition, the Department would reserve up to \$49.5 million for ARPA-ED. ARPA-ED would be a new entity within the Department, modeled after similar agencies within the Department of Defense and Department of Energy. The ARPA-ED mission would be to pursue development of educational technology and tools that result in breakthrough improvements for all students (especially those from low-income backgrounds) by increasing educational achievement and attainment for students in both traditional and non-traditional learning environments. Funds for ARPA-ED would be appropriated on a no-year basis to remain available for obligation until expended.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Amount for new awards	\$134,724	\$133,106	\$108,570
Number of new awards	25	12-25	10-20
Range of awards	\$2,375-11,871	\$1,000-20,000	\$1,000-20,000
Peer review of new award applications	\$818	\$1,416	\$1,155
National activities	\$6,059	\$7,080	\$5,775
ARPA-ED	0	0	\$49,500

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

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

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Investing in innovation

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

Year	Target	Actual
2011		67%
2012	70%	60
2013	75	
2014	80	
2015	60	

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

Year	Target	Actual
2011		46%
2012	50%	70
2013	54	
2014	60	
2015	65	

Additional information: The source of the data is annual grantee performance reports. Data reported are from the first two cohorts of i3 grantees and represent grantee performance from October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012 for the first cohort, and from January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011 for the second cohort. Actual percentages are based on partial data, as not every grantee provided targets for the number of students that would be served nor did grantees report student data consistently. The Department reset some targets based on the additional data available after 2 years of reporting for one cohort of grantees plus availability of initial data for a second cohort of grants. The Department will continue providing technical assistance to grantees in order to improve the quality, completeness, and consistency of the data. Data for fiscal year 2013 will be available in winter 2014.

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2011		100%
2012	80%	100
2013	80	
2014	80	
2015	80	

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Investing in innovation

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

Year	Target	Actual
2011		100%
2012	90%	89
2013	92	
2014	94	
2015	75	

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

Year	Target	Actual
2011		97%
2012	94%	100
2013	95	
2014	96	
2015	96	

Additional information: The source of the data is the most updated grantee evaluation plan as of October 2013. The Department reset some targets based on the additional data available after 2 years of reporting for one cohort of grantees plus availability of initial data for a second cohort of grants. The Department will continue providing technical assistance to grantees in order to improve the quality, completeness, and consistency of the data. Data for fiscal year 2013 will be available in spring 2015.

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Investing in innovation

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2011		100%
2012	80%	100
2013	80	
2014	80	
2015	80	

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

Year	Target	Actual
2011		93%
2012	90%	100
2013	90	
2014	90	
2015	90	

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

Year	Target	Actual
2011		90%
2012	90%	97
2013	90	
2014	90	
2015	90	

Additional information: The source of the data is the most updated grantee evaluation plan as of October 2013. The Department will continue providing technical assistance to grantees in order to improve the quality, completeness, and consistency of the data. Data for fiscal year 2013 will be available in spring 2015.

Although the Department's evaluation contractor worked with the i3 grantees and evaluators to develop logic models and fidelity measures of program implementation, it is unlikely that initial

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Investing in innovation

program results will be maintained throughout the life of all of the projects. Slight programmatic changes could affect the quality of program implementation data. The Department is providing technical assistance to grantees and their evaluators on this issue.

The Department is not reporting data separately on the percentage of Development grantees that are implementing their projects with fidelity to the approved design. However, the evaluation contractor, in determining which Development projects to count as meeting the elements of the last measure above, examines whether Development projects' evaluation plans include a strategy for measuring implementation fidelity.

Efficiency Measures

The Department has established cost per student as the efficiency measure for the i3 program. Data for this measure for 2011 are based on aggregate total project costs (including evaluation costs) and the number of students served by all grantees. Aggregate program costs were used to calculate costs per student due to inconsistencies in the data grantees reported. The Department developed a new annual reporting format and provided technical assistance to grantees in order to improve the quality, completeness, and consistency of the data. Going forward with the new reporting format, data for this measure for 2012 and subsequent years will be based on total project costs minus evaluation costs and the number of students served by all grantees. Separating the evaluation costs is critical because evaluation costs for i3 projects tend to be large due to the complexity of the evaluation designs and the goal of meeting WWC standards. Data for 2012 are partial because not all grantees provided a breakdown of costs for evaluation versus other expenses. Data shown represent all 5 Scale-up grants, 15 out of 20 Validation grants, and 30 of 47 Development grants. Data for fiscal year 2013 will be available in winter 2014.

Year	Cost per student, Scale-up grants	Cost per student, Validation grants	Cost per student, Development grants
2011	\$53	\$177	\$140
2012	61	159	182
2013			
2014			
2015			

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

STEM innovation

(Proposed legislation)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: To be determined

Budget Authority:

	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change from 2014</u>
STEM Innovation Networks	0	\$110,000	+\$110,000
STEM Teacher Pathways	0	40,000	+40,000
National STEM Master Teacher Corps	0	20,000	+20,000
Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM	<u>0</u>	<u>149,717</u>	<u>+149,717</u>
Total	0	319,717	+319,717

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Scientists and engineers create many of the innovations that drive our Nation's global competitiveness. Unfortunately, it is clear that this technology-based capacity to create and innovate is at risk due to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) curricula and instruction that are under-preparing and not effectively engaging students in these critical STEM fields. To address this problem, and to ensure that our economic competitiveness is not at risk because of a shortage of STEM talent, we must expand the capacity of our elementary and secondary schools to provide all students, including girls, minority students, and others historically underrepresented in STEM fields, with engaging and meaningful opportunities to develop knowledge and competencies in these subjects.

Federal agencies have developed a range of STEM education programs over the years in order to accomplish this goal, but recognize the need for continued improvement. In 2014, the President's Budget proposed a framework for delivering STEM education to more students and more teachers more effectively. The Administration has also published a Federal STEM Education Five-Year Strategic Plan¹ to help align the framework with key goals and strategies. The major areas of priority for this plan include: improving pre-kindergarten-through-grade-twelve (P-12) STEM instruction; increasing and sustaining youth and public engagement in STEM; enhancing the STEM experience of undergraduate students; better serving groups historically underrepresented in STEM, and designing graduate education for tomorrow's STEM workforce.

¹ http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/stem_stratplan_2013.pdf

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

STEM innovation

Over the past year, agencies have made considerable progress towards a stronger and more cohesive infrastructure for developing policies and delivering programs in STEM education. In implementing the Strategic Plan, mission agencies have increased coordination with the lead agencies (the Department of Education (Department), the National Science Foundation, and the Smithsonian Institution) and are identifying ways to leverage existing resources to improve the reach of agency assets. For example, NASA and the Department successfully launched a pilot project combining content from NASA's Summer of Innovation project and the platform of the Department's 21st Century Community Learning Centers program to engage students in engineering design challenges at over 23 sites nationwide.

The 2015 Budget builds on these efforts by proposing a fresh reorganization with targeted adjustments to enable more strategic investment in STEM education, with a focus on building and using evidence-based practices and developing new interagency models for leveraging assets and expertise. For example, the Department will work with the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to co-administer NIH's Science Education Partnership Award program to ensure that program activities are aligned with ongoing P-12 reform efforts, designed to reach the highest need schools, and disseminated broadly.

The proposed STEM Innovation initiative is a central element of this strategy and would help ensure that our Nation's children are prepared to succeed in a global economy increasingly reliant on STEM knowledge and skills by: (1) developing, validating, and scaling up effective practices in P-12 STEM instruction; (2) increasing student engagement in STEM subjects; and (3) recruiting, preparing, and further developing highly effective STEM educators. The STEM Innovation initiative is comprised of the following complementary authorities: (1) STEM Innovation Networks, (2) STEM Teacher Pathways, (3) the National STEM Master Teacher Corps, and (4) Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM.

STEM Innovation Networks

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

STEM-INS would connect schools, educators, students, and community partners to local, regional, and national resources to enhance STEM education. Eligible partnerships would develop coordinated plans to: promote student inspiration, achievement, and preparation in STEM subjects; improve STEM instruction; and build regional networks of support for STEM.

Depending on local needs and the resources available through partnerships with business, research organizations, and IHEs, grantees would focus their projects on accomplishing the

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

STEM innovation

following goals, with a particular focus on engaging students who are traditionally underrepresented in STEM fields:

- Increasing student engagement and achievement in STEM subjects;
- Supporting teachers to improve student interest and outcomes in STEM;
- Increasing the opportunities for students to have authentic STEM experiences, both during the school day and in informal settings;
- Creating a system of integrated and strategic support for STEM education that is designed for sustainability, replication and scaling up; and
- Increasing opportunities for students and teachers to interact with, learn from, and be inspired by STEM professionals and experts.

These goals would be accomplished through the development and implementation of comprehensive plans to identify, develop, test, and spread the use of evidence-based practices for both student and teacher support. Examples of possible activities include rigorous programs of STEM study that involve inquiry-, project-, and work-based learning in all grades as well as advanced coursework, including dual enrollment and other options for earning credit toward a postsecondary certificate or degree for high school aged students.

To support effective implementation of these plans, STEM-INS would employ a wide range of strategies and utilize a rich array of resources and assets, including using technology to promote the broad adoption of effective STEM instructional practices and leveraging regional STEM resources and assets as well as those of Federal agencies. Other key elements of STEM-INS could include STEM Platform Schools, a subset of participating schools that would serve as “test beds” for intensive experimentation, research, and innovation in STEM topics relevant to local needs; research and evaluation partnerships to measure the impact of STEM-INS activities and build an evidence base for effective practices that would be broadly disseminated; and partnerships with teacher preparation and professional development providers to help align preservice and in-service teacher training with network goals. STEM-INS could also engage with existing networks at the State and local levels and build on lessons learned to increase student engagement and achievement in STEM.

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

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$110 million to initiate the STEM-INS program as part of a Governmentwide strategy to create a more cohesive and coordinated framework for delivering STEM education. STEM-INS would help organize LEAs to share best practices, identify common problems that can be addressed through research and innovation programs, and

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

STEM innovation

support the evaluation, replication, and scaling up of effective STEM instructional models throughout the Nation. In doing so, STEM-INs is would bring effective STEM resources and strategies to a far greater number of schools, teachers, and students than currently have access to them.

Improving American students' engagement and achievement in STEM fields is vital to ensuring the continued economic well-being of our country and is an Administration priority. In a 2005 report, "Rising Above the Gathering Storm," the National Academies concluded that a primary factor influencing the future health of the American economy and our ability to create jobs is innovation resulting from advances in science and engineering. In addition, recent projections from the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate that over 80 percent of the fastest-growing occupations (such as those in healthcare- and computer-related fields) require knowledge of STEM subjects. Yet U.S. students finished behind those of 29 countries in mathematics and 22 countries in science on the 2012 Program for International Student Assessment, which measures the mathematics and science literacy of 15-year-olds in the world's most advanced countries. For the United States to build and maintain the highly skilled workforce and nourish the technological innovation needed to remain competitive in the global economy, we must improve STEM teaching and learning and ensure access to rigorous courses of study for our students. These findings have also been echoed in two major reports by the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology.²

The STEM-INs program would learn from and build on models currently in use in several States and LEAs with a strong STEM focus, including those funded through Race to the Top. For example, Ohio launched the first statewide STEM Learning Network in 2007, including several successful STEM schools and an intensive partnership structure that has now expanded to engage 15 additional States in STEM education reform. This multi-state network is working to develop models for leveraging STEM resources, create evaluation frameworks, and provide tools to help with policy, practice, and partnership development. These networks and other STEM efforts across the country have demonstrated improvements in student engagement and achievement in STEM and promoted effective teaching practices. The STEM-INs proposal is designed to help identify the most effective practices in these leading-edge States and LEAs and take them to scale nationwide by fostering new systems of support and expanding the evidence base for effective practices in STEM teaching and learning.

STEM Virtual Learning Network

In fiscal year 2015, the Department would use a portion of STEM-INs national activities funds to develop the STEM Virtual Learning Network, an online community based on the Department's Connected Educator and Learning Registry initiatives and designed both to facilitate interaction among STEM educators and to accelerate identification, dissemination, adoption, and use of effective practices. The Department would leverage the work of STEM-INs grantees by requiring them to contribute actively to this community.

² <http://www.whitehouse.gov/administration/eop/ostp/pcast>

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

STEM innovation

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>
Amount for new awards	\$103,400
Peer review of new award applications	1,100
National activities, including STEM Virtual Learning Network	<u>5,500</u>
Total, STEM Innovation Networks	110,000

STEM Teacher Pathways

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

Traditional and nontraditional teacher preparation programs, including those run by national nonprofit organizations, as well as alternative routes to certification and licensure, would be eligible to compete for funding. The Department would also look at ways to leverage and integrate the Pathways program with the work of the STEM-INS. For example, the Department could give priority to STEM Teacher Pathways applicants that propose partnerships with schools and districts served by STEM-INS.

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The \$40.0 million request for STEM Teacher Pathways in 2015 would help high-need schools and areas address a critical need for effective STEM teachers. Public high schools in particular report greater difficulties in filling STEM teaching positions, such as mathematics, biology, and physical sciences, than other subjects, such as English and social studies. Moreover, public high schools report that higher proportions of individuals teaching mathematics and science lack an undergraduate major or certification in their field compared to teachers of other subjects.

As documented by the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology report "Prepare and Inspire: K-12 Education in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math for America's Future,"³ research suggests that being a great STEM teacher requires both deep content knowledge and strong teaching skills. Teachers need to have enough content knowledge to link STEM to compelling real world issues, model the process of scientific

³ <http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/pcast-stemed-report.pdf>

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

STEM innovation

investigation, effectively address student misconceptions, and help their students learn to reason and solve problems like scientists and engineers.

The STEM Teacher Pathways program would build the evidence base in this area and leverage lessons learned from previous Department initiatives that included a focus on the preparation of STEM educators and the strong momentum already created in the private sector. Responding to the President's call to action to prepare 100,000 excellent STEM teachers over the next 10 years, more than 150 organizations, including the Department and other Federal agencies, have come together in a network called "100Kin10."⁴

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

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>
Amount for new awards	\$37,600
Peer review of new award applications	400
National activities	<u>2,000</u>
Total, STEM Teacher Pathways	40,000

National STEM Master Teacher Corps

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

The National STEM Master Teacher Corps will build on and amplify efforts States, districts, nonprofit organizations, and other groups have begun to create leadership pathways for excellent STEM educators to improve STEM teaching and learning nationwide. These efforts are providing opportunities for STEM educators to advance on career ladders, take on leadership roles and responsibilities, and earn additional compensation. They provide the

⁴ <http://www.100kin10.org/>

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

STEM innovation

professional development and organizational support to enable STEM educators to design curriculum and to coach and support their peers, especially in the transition to college- and career-ready (CCR) standards in math and science. Through participation in the Corps, teachers would build their capacity to be leaders in the field and enhance the professional learning of other STEM teachers; identify and share promising practices in their schools, districts, and States; become equipped to participate in local, State and National STEM education policy forums and communities of practice; and help students excel in STEM subjects while taking on coaching and mentorship roles in their schools and communities.

This pilot project will also identify, refine, and share models of effective ways to support, compensate, and develop these teachers through the creation of a set of National advisors to help identify different approaches to teacher leadership and capacity building. These National advisors will contribute to shaping a set of roles and responsibilities for membership in the Corps, help identify pathways for leadership within States and districts, and create models based on best practices for retaining and supporting STEM teachers across the country.

Members of the Corps would be identified through existing rigorous recruitment and selection programs based on teachers' demonstrated effectiveness in teaching STEM subjects, content knowledge, and contributions to the continuous improvement of teaching and learning both within their schools and across the community of STEM educators. The proposed program will build on the work of the Department's Teacher Incentive Fund STEM grantees, which are developing leadership opportunities for STEM teachers as part of broader reform strategies. The National STEM Master Teacher Corps may also involve collaboration with nonprofit organizations and local public-private partnerships between STEM-related businesses and industries and school districts.

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$20.0 million to support a pilot project for the National STEM Master Teacher Corps in 2015. The STEM Master Teacher Corps is a key recommendation of the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, and is designed to allow the Nation's most talented STEM teachers to help transform STEM teaching and learning in their schools and communities, to recognize and help retain these teachers, to build a community of practice among them, and to raise the profile of the STEM teaching profession.

The proposed pilot project would rely on established Federal programs that recognize and reward excellent STEM teachers and establish opportunities for participation in a National Corps by defining Corps members' roles, providing opportunities for leadership capacity building, and creating opportunities for members to improve STEM teaching and learning across the country.

The National STEM Master Teacher Corps would complement the other programs within the STEM Innovation initiative and other Department programs to support highly effective STEM teachers. In particular, Corps members could take on leadership roles in developing and implementing the STEM-INS; evaluate content, and promote practices to improve STEM teaching and learning in Platform schools and across regional areas through the STEM-INS; work with a range of Federal STEM resources to enrich the efforts of the STEM-INS; and

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

STEM innovation

contribute to the Virtual Learning Network. The National STEM Master Teacher Corps could also contribute to the design and support of STEM Teacher Pathways projects and to the effective implementation of Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund grants.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>
Amount for new awards	\$18,800
Peer review of new award applications	200
National activities	<u>1,000</u>
Total, National STEM Master Teacher Corps	20,000

Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

States would be permitted to reserve up to 20 percent of grant funds for State-level activities to support the development and implementation of a coherent statewide approach to providing high-quality, evidence-based STEM instruction in high-need schools. States would be required to use remaining funds to make subgrants to high-need LEAs and eligible partnerships for efforts to improve STEM instruction at the local level that include effective professional development of teachers and school leaders; high-quality curricula, instructional materials, and

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

STEM innovation

assessment systems aligned with State standards; and continuous monitoring of project implementation and outcomes. Subgrantees also would be permitted to use funds for activities that integrate STEM instruction into teaching of other core academic subjects, improve engagement in STEM, and use technology to support teaching and learning. In making subgrants, States would be required to give priority to eligible entities that propose projects supported by the strongest available evidence.

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

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Department requests \$149.7 million in fiscal year 2015 for the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM program, the same as the fiscal year 2014 level for Mathematics and Science Partnerships. This request would support the first year of the program, which would address the need to strengthen instruction comprehensively and increase student achievement in STEM subjects in high-need LEAs and schools.

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

STEM innovation

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>
Amount for new awards	\$134,745
National activities	<u>14,972</u>
Total, Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM	149,717

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Mathematics and science partnerships

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$149,717	0	-\$149,717

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The Administration proposes to consolidate the program in FY 2015 under new legislation.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Mathematics and science partnerships

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2010.....	\$180,478
2011.....	175,127
2012.....	149,716
2013.....	141,902
2014.....	149,717

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting fiscal year 2015 funding for the Mathematics and Science Partnerships program. In place of this program, the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization, a new program, Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM), which (as discussed in more detail elsewhere in this account) would provide grants to SEAs to support State and local efforts to implement a comprehensive strategy for the provision of high-quality STEM instruction and support to students from prekindergarten through grade 12.

If the Congress does not reauthorize the ESEA prior to enactment of fiscal year 2015 appropriations, the Administration will request authority through appropriations language to align the awarding and use of subgrants under Mathematics and Science Partnerships (while retaining the program’s formula grant structure) with the evidence-based STEM Innovation Networks proposal and to use up to 5 percent of the appropriation for national activities, including technical assistance, evaluation, and dissemination.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Amount for State grants	\$141,193	\$148,968	0
Average State award	2,521	2,660	0
Range of State awards	706-16,775	745–18,411	0
Evaluation	709	749	0

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Mathematics and science partnerships

Data for these measures for 2013 will be available in the summer 2014. No targets are shown for 2015 because the program is proposed for consolidation.

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

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010	66%	66%
2011	65	69
2012	65	65
2013	65	
2014	65	

Additional Information: Data for this measure are provided only for teachers who completed pre- and post-assessments.

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010	48%	64%
2011	50	66
2012	52	65
2013	54	
2014	56	

Additional Information: Student assessment data are available only for subjects and grades that are tested using a statewide assessment.

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Mathematics and science partnerships

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010	40%	51%
2011	41	47
2012	42	50
2013	43	
2014	44	

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010	15%	13%
2011	16	24
2012	17	29
2013	18	
2014	19	

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

Efficiency Measure

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010	100%	100%
2011	100	100
2012	100	100
2013	100	
2014	100	

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

High school redesign

(Proposed legislation)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: To be determined

Budget Authority:

<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$0	\$150,000	+\$150,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The proposed High School Redesign program would promote the whole school redesign of the high school experience by funding competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) and their partners to redesign high schools in innovative ways that better prepare students for college and career success so that all students graduate from high school with postsecondary credit and career-related experiences or competencies, obtained through project or problem-based learning or real-world challenges. Grantees activities would include: (1) redesigning academic content and instructional practices to better align them with postsecondary education and careers; (2) personalizing learning opportunities to support the educational needs and interests of individual students; (3) providing academic and wrap-around support services for those students who need them; (4) providing high-quality career and college exploration and counseling on options for students after high school graduation; (5) offering multiple opportunities to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school; and (6) strategically using learning time in more meaningful ways, such as through technology, redesigning the school day or calendar, or through competency-based progression.

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

High school redesign

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2015, the Administration requests \$150 million for a new High School Redesign program that would promote the whole school redesign of high schools through competitive grants to LEAs in partnership with institutions of higher education and other entities so that students graduate from high school with the academic foundation and career-related skills they need to be successful.

In particular, the new program would ensure that all students in redesigned high schools participate in project- or problem-based learning and graduate with:

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

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

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

The Center on Education and the Workforce at Georgetown University projects that, by 2020, nearly two-thirds of job openings will require some postsecondary education, and about 30 percent of job openings will require at least a certificate or associate's degree. In blue collar occupations, about 31 percent of jobs will require some postsecondary education and training by 2020 ("Recovery: Projections of Jobs and Education Requirements through 2020." Georgetown University, 2013).

Unfortunately, we know that many high school graduates are not prepared to succeed in college. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), 20 percent of first-year undergraduate students enrolled in institutions of higher education during academic year 2007-08 reported taking remedial courses ("First-Year Undergraduate Remedial Coursetaking: 1999-2000, 2003-04, 2007-08." Statistics in Brief. NCES, 2013).

These data suggest that too many of America's existing high schools fail to engage, motivate, or adequately support and prepare students or to provide exposure to the relevant learning that bridges their classroom learning with future college experiences and careers. In order to address these concerns, the Administration's High School Redesign proposal would promote

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

High school redesign

reforms based on evidence that students learn best when they are engaged in complex projects and tasks aligned with their interests, and when they work with others through practical examples and case studies that keep them engaged in rigorous academic coursework and in the application of knowledge.

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

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

The Department would encourage applicants for High School Redesign funding to propose projects that connect high school experiences with relevant industry and community partners in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) fields. The High School Redesign program would also complement Administration efforts to reform career and technical education as outlined in its 2012 blueprint for reauthorizing the Perkins Career and Technical Education Act, which seeks to create stronger links between secondary education, postsecondary education, and the employment needs of in-demand industries. The program also expands on Administration efforts to improve high school graduation rates and college enrollment rates through the College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program proposed under the Administration’s reauthorization proposal for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Finally, the program builds on the \$100 million Youth Career Connect grants through the Department of Labor by emphasizing stronger connections between classroom learning and real-world careers and choices.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

High school redesign

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>
Amount for new awards	\$144,000
Range of awards	\$5,000-\$25,000
Average award	\$15,000
Number of new awards	5-15
Peer review of new award applications	1,500
BIE	750
National activities	3,750

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Excellent instructional teams

(Proposed legislation)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: To be determined

Budget Authority:

	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
Effective teachers and leaders			
State grants	0	\$2,000,000	+\$2,000,000
ConnectEDucators	0	200,000	+200,000
Teacher and leader innovation fund	<u>0</u>	<u>320,000</u>	<u>+320,000</u>
Total	0	2,520,000	+2,520,000

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Educators are diligently working to implement rigorous new college- and career-ready (CCR) standards and assessments that will help improve student knowledge and preparation for success in higher education and the workforce. Effective instruction based on these standards requires new methods of teaching and learning that emphasize critical thinking, creativity, and problem solving. The Excellent Instructional Teams programs, proposed as part of the Administration's plan for reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), would provide funds to address educator needs by fostering teacher and principal collaboration and the creation of excellent instructional teams through efforts to recruit, prepare, support, and retain effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders, especially in high-need local educational agencies (LEAs), schools, fields, and subjects. These programs would also help States and LEAs ensure the equitable distribution of effective educators across schools.

The Excellent Instructional Teams authority would have three components: (1) Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants, a formula grant program with a 10-percent competitive grant set-aside; (2) ConnectEDucators grants designed to support educators as they transition to using technology and data to improve student learning; and (3) the competitive Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund. Together, these programs would provide formula grants to States and districts to improve the effectiveness of teachers and leaders and to support a more equitable distribution of effective teachers and leaders; investments in the development, improvement, and expansion of high-quality teacher and leader pathways with evidence of effectiveness; and competitive grants to States and districts to support teachers' and principals' use of technology to personalize learning and improve instruction. With amounts reserved for evaluation and competitive grants, the Department would build evidence on how best to recruit, prepare, and support effective teachers and school leaders while continuing to invest in efforts to enhance the teaching and leadership professions.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Excellent instructional teams

The Excellent Instructional Teams programs will also reinforce reforms that 44 States and several school districts are making under the Department's ESEA flexibility initiative. States and LEAs that were approved for ESEA flexibility are adopting new systems for evaluating and supporting teachers and principals based in part on student growth, as well as implementing academic standards linked to college- and career-readiness, new assessments aligned with those standards, and instituting differentiated approaches to school accountability that target improvement resources to the lowest-performing schools and those with the largest achievement gaps.

The Excellent Instructional Teams programs would also complement the \$5 billion proposed in mandatory funding for a targeted implementation of the Recognizing Education Success, Professional Excellence, and Collaborative Teaching (RESPECT) Project. With so many demands placed on teachers and school leaders, districts, States, and the Federal Government must do more to meet educators' needs at important stages of their careers. The RESPECT Project would be designed to provide large-scale incentives for State- and locally directed reforms to improving teacher and principal preparation and support early in their careers; providing career ladders and other opportunities for educators to take on leadership roles as they transition to CCR standards; and creating conditions in schools that support effective teaching, including great school leadership and time for collaboration.

Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

States could use their State-level funds for a variety of activities, including those designed to support the creation of effective teacher career ladders, reform certification and licensure requirements, increase the effectiveness of professional development, and reform teacher and school leader compensation. For example, States could use program funds to help encourage the adoption and expansion of school-based instructional leadership roles for effective teachers, such as master teacher, mentor teacher, or instructional coach positions, and to develop distributed leadership capacities. States would be required to strengthen teacher and principal evaluation systems; develop definitions of effective teachers and principals; design and implement plans to ensure that low-income and minority students have equitable access to effective teachers and leaders; and report on the effectiveness of their teacher and principal preparation programs, as measured, in part, by the performance of their graduates in the classroom. In addition, some State-level funds would be explicitly focused on improving the effectiveness of the State's principals.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Excellent instructional teams

Also consistent with the current ESEA Title II, Part A formula, States would distribute funds to LEAs based 20 percent on each LEA's relative share of the population age 5 to 17, and 80 percent on each LEA's relative share of children age 5 to 17 from low-income families. In order to receive an award, an LEA would be required to develop and implement high-quality teacher and principal evaluation systems that, among other things, differentiate teachers across multiple performance levels, based in significant part on student academic growth as well as other measures. LEAs would also be required to conduct an assessment of local needs and to use program funds, along with other local, State, and Federal funds, to meet those needs and to ensure the equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals within the LEA. LEAs would use program funds to carry out a broad range of activities, including those designed to recruit, prepare, support, and retain effective and highly effective teachers and principals, particularly for high-need and low-performing schools.

The Department would reserve up to 10 percent of the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants appropriation to make competitive awards for teacher and leader preparation activities. Activities funded under the proposed set-aside would play a key role in helping to create or expand high-quality pathways into the teaching profession and other innovative approaches for recruiting, training, and placing talented recent college graduates and mid-career professionals with strong content knowledge in high-need schools. These activities would address the essential elements of preparing new teachers to enter the classroom, supporting them during their first years in the profession, and addressing inequities in the distribution of effective and highly effective teachers. The proposed set-aside would also support the recruitment, preparation, improvement, and retention of effective principals and school leadership teams who are able to turn around low-performing schools.

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

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$2.0 billion for the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program for fiscal year 2015. This program would focus on improving teacher and principal effectiveness and ensuring the equitable distribution of effective and highly effective teachers and principals. States and LEAs would have flexibility in how they use formula grant funds, but would be accountable for improving their teacher and principal evaluation systems and ensuring that low-income and minority students have equitable access to teachers and principals who are effective at raising student achievement.

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Excellent instructional teams

Over the next 10 years, as many as 1.6 million teachers will retire, and 1.6 million new teachers will be needed to take their place. While replacing so many teachers in such a short period of time poses an enormous challenge to States and LEAs, it also provides an opportunity to—through strong recruitment, preparation, support, and retention—elevate the overall quality of instruction and transform our education system so every child gets an excellent education. In addition, a growing body of research indicates that the quality of a school’s leadership has a substantial effect on student achievement.¹ Effective school leaders are able to create cultures focused on learning, with high expectations for all students, as well as recruit and retain highly effective teachers.² Moreover, the impact of strong leadership may be greatest in high-need and low-performing schools requiring serious, systemic changes. Federal investments in the recruitment, preparation, and retention of effective principals and school leadership teams will also be particularly important given that the Bureau of Labor Statistics expects increased demand for educational administrators through 2022, as the number of school-age children grows and current school leaders retire in greater numbers.

In recognition of the changing nature of America’s teaching workforce and the need to enhance the role of teachers and principals in transforming public education, particularly for high-need students, including students with disabilities and English Learners, the Department would use the proposed 10-percent set-aside to support:

- The creation and expansion of high-quality pathways into the teaching profession and school leadership, including university- and LEA-based traditional and alternative routes into teaching and leading, and the recruitment, preparation, and retention of principals and school leadership teams that are able to turn around low-performing schools. The Department would also use these funds to support the expansion and improvement of teacher and principal preparation programs at minority-serving institutions to increase the number of effective minority educators in high-need schools.
- Competitive grants to States and LEAs to raise the standards for teacher and principal preparation, including the enhancement of teacher and principal certification and licensure standards, especially in the context of new CCR learning standards for students, and the development and implementation of rigorous accountability systems for teacher and principal preparation programs informed by graduates’ performance in classrooms.
- The Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED) program, which was initiated in the fiscal year 2011 appropriation as a smaller Federal reservation of Improving Teacher Quality State Grants funds. Under the SEED program, the Department makes grants to national nonprofit organizations to support teacher and school leader enhancement projects with evidence of effectiveness and conducts related national leadership activities.
- National research, technical assistance, outreach, and dissemination activities. The Department would support activities to strengthen teacher and principal evaluation, improve teacher and principal certification, develop and disseminate model surveys on the quality of

¹ Leithwood, Louis, Anderson & Wahlstrom, “How Leadership Influences Student Learning” (2004).

² Loeb, Kalogrides & Béteille, “Effective Schools: Teacher Hiring, Assignment, Development, and Retention,” *Journal of Education Finance and Policy* (2012).

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Excellent instructional teams

educator support and working conditions, and scale up the work of nonprofit organizations that support LEAs in strengthening their teacher and principal pipelines and human resource practices.

The Department would reserve up to an additional 1.5 percent for evaluation. In fiscal year 2015, continuation costs for the Transition to Teaching program would be funded from the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants set-aside for national leadership activities.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>
Funding for State grants	\$1,750,000
Range of awards to States	8,387–197,096
Average State grant	33,654
Amount for Outlying Areas	10,000
Amount for BIE	10,000
National leadership activities	200,000
Evaluation	30,000

NOTE: In 2015, the Department would use approximately \$15,000 thousand from the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants set-aside to pay continuation costs under the Transition to Teaching program.

ConnectEDucators

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The ConnectEDucators program would help ensure that teachers and school leaders across the Nation have the skills to significantly increase student learning through the effective use of education technology and related strategies. This proposal supports the President's ConnectED initiative, a 5-year plan to bring next-generation broadband and high-speed wireless networks to schools and libraries, by providing needed support to teachers and school leaders so that they can leverage technology in ways that transform student learning.

ConnectEDucators would provide (1) formula-based State Leadership Grants to enhance State capacity to support the transition to digital learning; and (2) competitive, 3-year grants to LEAs that have put in place key technology supports, including district- and school-wide high-speed broadband access and high device-to-student ratios, for the implementation of comprehensive plans to ensure that educators have the skills and digital content needed to dramatically improve student access to high-quality instruction aligned with CCR standards. Allowable State-level activities would include improving educational technology resources and coordination, increasing the availability of high-quality tools and materials for districts.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Excellent instructional teams

The Department would give priority to supporting LEA applicants that propose to work in consortia or in partnership with local or national organizations. Grantees would be required to align a portion of their Effective Teachers and Leaders State grants with the objectives and activities in their comprehensive ConnectEDucators plan, and grantees and partner organizations would be required to make digital learning materials open-source and publicly available. Grant activities would be informed by individual educator and student needs and would improve instructional practices through personalized and collaborative support for teachers and school leaders. Finally, LEAs and their partners would commit to evaluating the program's impacts on student outcomes and educator knowledge and practices.

Allowable LEA activities would include, for example: (1) professional development and coaching for teachers and principals on ways to use the district's chosen devices, platforms, digital tools, and assessments to improve instruction; (2) aiding educators with the creation, selection, and implementation of high-quality open digital learning resources aligned to CCR standards; (3) increasing educators' access to and use of real-time data to personalize learning; (4) developing exemplary digital citizenship skills, resulting in more appropriate use of technology and social media for students; (5) increasing educators' engagement with families, professional networks, and other communities through technology, and (6) increasing access to effective educators, such as master teachers, through online or blended learning environments to assist with hard-to-staff schools and subjects.

The Department would reserve up to 2.5 percent of program funds for evaluation and national leadership activities, such as working with States and districts to improve procurement and planning practices and to develop and disseminate innovative technology-based tools and products.

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$200.0 million in 2015 for ConnectEDucators. This program would support teachers and leaders as they transition to using technology to improve student learning as enabled by the Administration's ConnectED initiative. The Opportunity, Growth, and Security Initiative includes an additional \$300 million for ConnectEDucators, providing a total of 100,000 teachers in 500 districts with access to professional development to take greater advantage of the high-speed broadband and wireless networks provided through the ConnectED initiative.

The President's ConnectED initiative, announced in June 2013, sets clear goals: provide high-speed Internet to schools and classrooms, increase the availability of mobile learning devices to enhance the accessibility of learning materials, provide support to develop or purchase high-quality learning content, and support teachers so that they can take full advantage of increased connectivity and content. To reach these goals, Federal agencies, States, LEAs, and private-sector partners must work together to bring the right resources to the table.

The Federal Communications Commission has announced a new plan to direct \$2 billion to dramatically expand its investment in high-speed connectivity for America's school and libraries. This is an important step to reaching the President's goal of connecting students across the country to high-speed broadband and wireless networks. ConnectEDucators is an essential

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Excellent instructional teams

complement to this investment in physical infrastructure; the request will address the critical need to support teachers and leaders in using technology effectively to improve and personalize learning.

Technology can help transform learning when used with innovative instructional approaches such as those outlined in the National Education Technology Plan.³ Yet many schools, particularly high-need schools, lack the connectivity, resources, and support for teachers and leaders needed to implement digital learning strategies. High-need schools in rural communities will experience some of the greatest benefits of new education technologies, as ConnectED will help provide new learning opportunities to level the playing field for rural students. However, technology can help improve learning and educational outcomes for students only when teachers and principals have the resources and support to use technology to improve instruction.

ConnectEDucators would build on the Department's current efforts to support the President's ConnectED initiative by helping LEAs ensure equitable access to technology and better support educators' use of both technology and data to improve student learning aligned with CCR standards. For example, the Department has provided guidance on how States, school districts, and other grantees may be able to use their current Federal grant program funds to support innovative, technology-based strategies to personalize learning and improve student learning.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>
Funding for grants to States	\$26,000
Number of State grants	52
Average State grant	\$500
Funding for grants to LEAs	\$169,000
Number of LEA grants	200
Average LEA grant	\$845
Evaluation and national leadership activities	\$5,000

Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund would support State and LEA efforts to develop and implement innovative approaches to improving human capital management systems. It would build on the strengths of the Teacher Incentive Fund and provide support for compensation

³ This plan is available online at: <http://www.ed.gov/edblogs/technology/netp-2010/>.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Excellent instructional teams

reforms and complementary reforms of teacher and principal development, evaluation, placement, and other practices, including the creation of and support for new instructional leader positions, such as master teacher positions.

Grantees, selected competitively, would use program funds to reform teacher and school leader compensation and career advancement systems; incorporate the use of evaluation results in retention, compensation, and other personnel decisions; reform hiring and placement practices; improve certification and licensure systems; and implement other innovative strategies, including comprehensive professional learning systems to strengthen the workforce.

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$320.0 million in 2015 for the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund. This program would help States and LEAs improve the effectiveness of teachers and leaders in high-need schools and LEAs, in particular by creating the conditions to identify, recruit, prepare, support, retain, and advance effective teachers, teacher leaders, principals, and school leadership teams in those schools. It would also support activities to improve teacher and leader effectiveness, reduce disparities in the access of students to effective and highly effective teachers and leaders, and support the improvement of persistently low-performing schools.

In fiscal year 2015, continuation costs for the Teacher Incentive Fund would be funded from the appropriation for the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>
Funding for new awards	\$84,700
Number of new awards	8
Average new award	\$10,588
Peer review of new award applications	\$500
Evaluation	\$4,800
TIF continuation costs	\$230,000

NOTE: In 2015, the Department would use approximately \$230,000 thousand from the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund to pay continuation costs under the Teacher Incentive Fund.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Excellent instructional teams

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority:

	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
Annual appropriation	\$668,389	0	-\$668,389
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	<u>1,681,441</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-1,681,441</u>
Total	2,349,830	0	-2,349,830

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

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

Each State allocates 95 percent of its funds for subgrants to LEAs, 2.5 percent for subgrants to eligible partnerships (or a smaller percentage if the total amount reserved by all States for this purpose would exceed \$125 million), and the remainder for State-level activities. A State awards subgrants to LEAs using a formula that is similar to the one that the Department uses for State allocations, except that, after LEAs receive the amount equivalent to their 2001 allocations from the Eisenhower Professional Development State Grants and Class Size

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

Reduction programs, remaining funds are then allocated to LEAs by a formula based 20 percent on LEAs' share of the population age 5 to 17 and 80 percent on LEAs' share of children from low-income families age 5 to 17. In addition to using these funds for professional development and class-size reduction, LEAs may use program funds for other activities to improve teacher and school leader quality, including teacher and principal recruitment and retention initiatives, signing bonuses and other financial incentives, teacher and principal mentoring, developing professional learning systems, reforming tenure systems, and differentiated compensation initiatives.

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

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

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, required all SEAs receiving Title I, Part A funds to develop a plan to have all public school teachers of core academic subjects meet the ESEA's definition of a "highly qualified teacher" no later than the end of the 2005-06 school year. "Highly qualified" means that the teacher: (1) has obtained full State certification; (2) holds a minimum of a bachelor's degree; and (3) has demonstrated subject-matter competency in each of the academic subjects in which he or she teaches.

In the fiscal year 2011 appropriations act, Congress directed the Department to use 1 percent of that year's appropriation for the new Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED) program. Congress increased this set-aside to 1.5 percent in the fiscal year 2012 and fiscal year 2013 appropriations acts and to 2 percent in the fiscal year 2014 appropriation act. Under the SEED program, the Department makes grants to national nonprofit organizations to support teacher and school leader enhancement projects with evidence of effectiveness. Grantees use the funds to recruit, select, and prepare or provide professional development activities for teachers or principals. The 2014 appropriations act also allows the Department to reserve up to 10 percent of SEED funds for related research, dissemination, evaluation, technical assistance, and outreach activities.

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2010	\$2,947,749
2011	2,464,876
2012	2,466,567
2013	2,337,830
2014	2,349,830

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program, which under the Administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization proposal would be consolidated into a new Excellent Instructional Teams initiative. The new authority would include three new programs: (1) formula-based Effective Teachers and Leaders grants to States and districts to improve the effectiveness and equitable distribution of teachers and leaders, (2) ConnectEDucators grants designed to support educators as they transition to using technology to improve learning, and (3) competitive Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund awards to States and districts to support the development and implementation of innovative teacher and leader policies. With amounts reserved for evaluation and national activities under these programs—including a 10-percent set-aside within the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants—the Department would build evidence on how best to recruit, prepare, and support effective teachers and school leaders and invest in efforts to enhance the teaching and leadership professions.

Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants would focus on developing and improving existing systems to evaluate teacher and principal effectiveness, based in significant part on student growth as well as other factors. These evaluation systems would be designed to provide educators with timely feedback and inform decisions about professional development, mentoring, compensation, leadership opportunities, promotion, and other personnel matters. States and LEAs would have flexibility in how they use formula grant funds, but would be accountable for having in place rigorous teacher and principal evaluation and support systems and for ensuring that all students, including students in high-poverty and high-minority schools, have equitable access to teachers and principals who are effective at raising student achievement.

The 2015 request for the Excellent Instructional Teams programs will also reinforce reforms that 44 States (including the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico) and several school districts have made under the Department's ESEA flexibility initiative. States and LEAs that have been approved for ESEA flexibility are adopting new systems for evaluating and supporting teachers and principals based in part on student growth, as well as academic standards linked to college- and career-readiness, new assessments aligned with those standards, and differentiated approaches to school accountability that target improvement resources to the lowest-performing schools and those with the largest achievement gaps.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

State Grants

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Funding for States awards	\$2,267,812	\$2,267,704	0
Range of States awards	\$10,869-254,874	\$10,869-255,403	0
Average State award	\$43,612	\$43,610	0
Amount for Outlying Areas	\$11,631	\$11,690	0
Amount for BIE	\$11,631	\$11,690	0
Evaluation	<u>\$11,688</u>	<u>\$11,749</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	\$2,302,762	\$2,302,833	0

Supporting Effective Educator Development

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Funding for new awards	0	\$24,829	0
Number of new awards	0	5	0
Average new award	0	\$4,966	0
Funding for continuation awards	\$35,067	\$17,000	0
Number of continuation awards	7	4	0
Average continuation award	\$5,010	\$4,250	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$469	0
National leadership activities	<u>0</u>	<u>\$4,699</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	\$35,067	\$46,997	0

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

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

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

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010	100%	97%
2011	100	97
2012	100	97
2013	100	
2014	100	

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010	100%	95%
2011	100	94
2012	100	94
2013	100	
2014	100	

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010	100%	98%
2011	100	98
2012	100	98
2013	100	
2014	100	

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010	100%	96%
2011	100	95
2012	100	96
2013	100	
2014	100	

Additional information: The program made progress on this objective from 2008 to 2009 and from 2009 to 2010 but did not meet the 100 percent targets called for under current law. No targets are shown for 2015 because the Administration is proposing to consolidate this program.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010		30
2011		34
2012		22

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010		29
2011		32
2012		27

Additional information: These measures present the number of States that reduced (from the year prior to the year for which the data are reported) the difference in the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in highest poverty versus lowest poverty schools. For example, 22 States reduced the difference in these percentages in elementary schools between 2011 and 2012, and 27 States reduced the difference in these percentages in secondary schools between those 2 years. The Department has not set targets for these measures because the Administration is proposing to consolidate this program.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

Efficiency Measure

The efficiency measure for the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program focuses on decreasing the average number of days between the date of a monitoring visit and the date that the Department sends a monitoring report to the State. In fiscal year 2010, the Department took an average of 16 days to send a monitoring report to States after monitoring. The target was 36 days. The Department did not conduct monitoring visits in fiscal year 2011 because program staff were working with States on their revised State plans for ensuring that all teachers are highly qualified. In addition, the Department was unable to conduct onsite monitoring in 2012 and 2013 due to a lack of staff capacity, but did conduct fiscal monitoring of all grantees. The Department is beginning a new round of monitoring in 2014, including in-person and desk monitoring, but has not set new targets for this measure because the Administration is proposing to consolidate the program.

Other Performance Information

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

Completed Evaluations

A study of preservice training,¹ released in February 2009, identified different models of teacher training, including alternative routes to certification, and compared the performance of students taught by teachers who have received different types of preparation. It found no differences in performance on reading and math assessments of students taught by teachers trained through traditional routes versus teachers who had pursued alternative routes to certification. Another study on preservice teacher preparation, released in September 2013, looked at the effectiveness of teachers who entered teaching through two highly selective alternative routes to certification: Teach For America (TFA) and The New Teacher Project's Teaching Fellows program.² The study found that, on average, students assigned to novice TFA teachers had higher math scores than students assigned to comparison teachers, including more experienced teachers, in the same schools. Students of Teaching Fellows and comparison teachers had similar scores, on average, on the math tests they took at the end of the school year, but the differences in scores varied depending on the selectivity of the alternative routes to certification and teacher experience. Teaching Fellows' students had higher math scores than students taught by teachers from less-selective alternative routes to certification, but similar scores to students taught by teachers from traditional routes to certification. Novice Teaching Fellows' students had higher scores than students taught by novice comparison teachers; experienced Teaching Fellows' students had similar scores to students taught by experienced comparison teachers. This research indicates that teachers who enter teaching through alternative routes to certification can help fill teacher shortages in hard-to-staff schools and subjects without reducing

¹ "An Evaluation of Teachers Trained Through Different Routes to Certification," February 2009, http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_training.asp.

² "An Evaluation of the Impact on Secondary Student Math Achievement of Two Highly Selective Routes to Alternative Certification," http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_alternative.asp.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

student achievement. However, it also suggests that predicting teacher effectiveness at the time of hiring appears to be difficult.

The Department has also invested in two studies of teacher professional development activities to identify and then test promising approaches to in-service training. The first, published in September 2008, examined the extent to which particular professional development activities (not necessarily related to federally funded program activities) change teaching practices in ways that research suggests are effective in improving student achievement in early reading.³ It found that although there were positive impacts on teachers' knowledge of scientifically based reading instruction, neither of the two professional development activities in the study led to higher student test scores over a 1-year period, and any additional effects of coaching activities on teaching practices were also statistically insignificant.

The second study examined particular professional development activities that focus on improving middle school student achievement in mathematics.⁴ An interim report on this study, published in April 2010, found that providing middle-school teachers 1 year of intensive math professional development (about 55 hours of specialized training during the 2007-08 school year) did not significantly improve their students' math achievement compared to achievement of students whose teachers did not receive that professional development. The training did not significantly improve teacher knowledge, either, relative to the comparison group of teachers, but did affect one aspect of instructional practice: teachers who received the intensive professional development more frequently engaged in activities that elicited student thinking. The final report, released in May 2011, found that the intensive professional development activities were implemented as intended, but teacher turnover limited the amount of training teachers received. For example, some teachers left the study schools and others entered as the study progressed, so not all teachers had the opportunity to experience the full course of professional development. The report found no evidence that the intensive professional development resulted in improved teacher knowledge, as measured by a specially designed assessment. Finally, there was no evidence that the intensive professional development led to improvements in student achievement in the specific math content (rational numbers knowledge) covered by the professional development. As described below, the Department plans to build on lessons learned from this evaluation and next measure the impact—on teacher knowledge, classroom practices, and student achievement—of math professional development that focuses on mathematical content and integrating that content into the classroom at the upper elementary school grades.

The Department has also assessed existing induction programs in order to identify promising teacher retention strategies.⁵ The first report, released in October 2008, found that there was no statistically significant difference between retention rates of teachers who participated in a comprehensive teacher induction activity and teachers in a control group who received what their schools typically offered for induction. The second report, released in August 2009,

³ "The Impact of Professional Development Models and Strategies on Teacher Practice and Student Achievement in Early Reading, September 2008," http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_reading.asp.

⁴ "Middle School Mathematics Professional Development Impact Study, May 2011," http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_mathematics.asp.

⁵ "Impact Evaluation of Teacher Induction Programs; October 2008, August 2009, and June 2010," http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_induction.asp.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

includes information from 10 districts in which teachers were offered 1 year of induction services (“1-year districts”) and 7 districts in which teachers were offered 2 years of induction services (“2-year districts”). The report found no discernible impact of comprehensive induction on teacher retention rates after 2 years for either 1-year or 2-year districts. In addition, the report found that there were no statistically significant impacts on overall student achievement across all grade levels in reading or math during the teachers’ second year. The final report on induction programs, released in June 2010, found that among teachers who received 2 years of the specific comprehensive induction services tested, there was no impact on student achievement during the first 2 years, but there was a positive impact on student achievement in both reading and math in the third and final year of the study. Receiving only 1 year of induction services as designed in this study had no impact on student achievement. In addition, neither 1 year nor 2 years of comprehensive induction services led to improvements in teacher retention rates.

In addition, the Department has used program evaluation funds to assess the progress that States, school districts, and schools have made in implementing the teacher quality and professional development provisions of the ESEA. The report of this assessment, which was released early in 2009, is based on the second round of data collection from the “National Longitudinal Study of No Child Left Behind” and the “Study of State Implementation of Accountability and Teacher Quality Under No Child Left Behind.”⁶ It presents findings from interviews with State education officials in all States and surveys of nationally representative samples of school district officials, principals, and teachers conducted in 2004-05 and 2006-07. The study found that by 2006-07, the vast majority of classes (around 94 percent) were taught by teachers who had met their States’ requirements for being considered highly qualified under the ESEA. However, teachers in high-poverty and high-minority schools, as well as special education and middle school teachers, were less likely to be highly qualified. Moreover, even among teachers who were considered highly qualified, teachers in high-poverty schools had less experience and were less likely to have a degree in the subject they taught. In 2006-07, 44 percent of school districts reported facing moderate or major challenges in attracting qualified applicants for teaching positions in mathematics, 53 percent for science, and 55 percent for special education. More than 90 percent of high-minority districts reported difficulty attracting highly qualified applicants in mathematics and science.

Finally, the Department is concerned with ensuring the equitable distribution of effective teachers. A recent evaluation in this area looked at the effects of offering incentives to high-performing teachers to teach in low-performing schools with high-need students.⁷ An initial report, published in April 2012, found that filling teacher vacancies in these schools using transfer incentives was feasible but required making the transfer offer to a large candidate pool to attract enough transferees. The report also noted that the teachers who transferred had, on average, 5 years more experience than teachers normally tapped to fill such positions. The final report, released in fall 2013, also examined teacher retention rates and the impact on student achievement in the low-performing schools to which the high-performing teachers transferred. The study found that the incentives improved retention rates during the 2-year incentive-

⁶ “State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, Volume VIII--Teacher Quality Under NCLB: Final Report,” <http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/teaching/nclb-final/index.html>.

⁷ “Impact Evaluation Of Moving High-Performing Teachers to Low-Performing Schools,” http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_recruitment.asp.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

payment period for the high-performing teachers who transferred; however, there was no statistically significant difference in retention rates in the fall immediately after the last incentive payment. In addition, the study concluded that the transfer incentives had a positive impact on student achievement in mathematics and reading at the elementary school level in each of the 2 years after a teacher transferred. These impacts were equivalent to raising achievement by between 4 and 10 percentile points relative to the average of all students in their state. The study found no impact on student achievement at the middle school level. The study authors also estimated that the transfer incentive program in elementary schools was more cost-effective than class-size reduction strategies aimed at generating the same impacts on student achievement, but cautioned that overall cost-effectiveness can vary depending on a number of factors, such as teacher retention rates.

Ongoing Evaluations

The Department is currently supporting two additional studies on preservice teacher preparation. One will provide descriptive and implementation analyses on teacher residency grant projects that include a year-long “clinical” experience, shadowing, and co-teaching with an experienced mentor.⁸ These grants generally also provide support and mentoring after participants become teachers. The study will also include information on retention rates; a report is expected in summer 2014. Finally, the Department plans to examine teacher preparation programs with features thought to be promising and look at the classroom performance of their graduates compared to those from other teacher preparation programs; a report is expected in 2015.⁹

The Department is also continuing research on the effectiveness of in-service teacher training. In particular, a study of elementary school math professional development will look at the impact of specialized professional development in that area on teachers’ content knowledge and classroom practices, as well as changes in student achievement.¹⁰ The report from this study, expected in 2016, will also describe how the professional development was implemented.

Another evaluation on the equitable distribution of effective teachers will provide information about the distribution of effective teachers within districts over a 5-year period based on value-added measures.¹¹ An interim report, released in fall 2013, looked at disadvantaged students’ access to effective teaching in grades 4 through 8 in English/language arts (ELA) and mathematics in 29 geographically dispersed school districts over the 2008-09 to 2010-11 school years. Levels of access varied across school districts in the study sample, but disadvantaged students had on average less access to effective teaching, compared to non-disadvantaged students, and did not have greater access to effective teaching in any school district. The report authors estimated that providing these students with equal access to effective teaching would reduce the student achievement gap from 28 percentile points to

⁸ “Implementation Evaluation of Teacher Residency Programs,” http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_residency.asp.

⁹ “A Study of Promising Features of Teacher Preparation Programs,” http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_teacherprep_us.asp.

¹⁰ “Impact Evaluation of Math Professional Development,” http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_mathpd.asp.

¹¹ “Study of the Distribution of Effective Teaching,” http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_distribution.asp.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

26 percentile points in ELA and from 26 percentile points to 24 percentile points in mathematics in a given year. The final report will also explore any changes in that distribution that may be associated with district strategies to ensure an equitable distribution of effective teachers.

The Department is also examining the implementation of policies promoted through ESEA Titles I and II at the State, district and school levels, in four core areas: State content standards, aligned assessments, accountability and school turnaround, and developing effective teachers and leaders. The study will reflect the impact of ESEA flexibility and other initiatives on the implementation of Title I and Title II of the ESEA. The first report is expected in late 2014.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Transition to teaching

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$13,762	0	-\$13,762

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

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

Grantees are expected to ensure that program participants are placed in high-need schools in high-need LEAs and must give priority to schools that are located in areas with the highest percentages of students from families with incomes below the poverty line. A "high-need school" is defined as a school in which at least 30 percent of the students are from low-income families or that is located in an area with a high percentage of out-of-field teachers, is within the top 25 percent of schools statewide with unfilled teacher positions, is located in an area with a high teacher turnover rate, or is located in an area with a high percentage of teachers who are not licensed or certified. A "high-need LEA" is defined as an LEA for which at least 20 percent or 10,000 of the children served are from families with incomes below the poverty line and that has a high percentage of teachers teaching out-of-field or with emergency credentials.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Transition to teaching

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2010.....	\$43,707
2011.....	41,125
2012.....	26,054
2013.....	24,691
2014.....	13,762

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration’s fiscal year 2015 budget request includes no funding for Transition to Teaching, which would be consolidated into the broader Excellent Instructional Teams authority through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization. This authority would include (1) the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program, which would provide formula grants to States and districts to improve the effectiveness and equitable distribution of teachers and leaders, (2) ConnectEDucators, which would support educators as they transition to using technology to improve learning, and (3) the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund, which would award competitive grants to States and districts to support the development and implementation of innovative teacher and leader policies. With amounts reserved for evaluation and national activities under these programs—including a 10-percent set-aside within the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program that would help improve and expand high-quality teacher and leader pathways with evidence of effectiveness—the Department would build evidence on how best to recruit, prepare, and support effective teachers and school leaders, and invest in efforts to enhance the teaching and leadership professions.

The new Excellent Instructional Teams programs would build on lessons learned from the Transition to Teaching program’s support for alternative-route programs. The Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program and the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund would provide support for States and LEAs to reform their certification or licensure policies and practices. In addition, the Department would reserve a portion of the 10-percent set-aside within the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program to make direct awards to create or expand high-quality pathways into the teaching profession and other innovative approaches for recruiting, training, and placing mid-career professionals and recent college graduates whose knowledge and experience can help them become successful teachers in high-need schools. This initiative would also support State efforts to dramatically improve the quality of teacher preparation, including the development of systems to hold teacher preparation programs accountable, the enhancement of teacher certification and licensure standards so that those standards are based on performance, and the elimination of barriers to operating effective “alternative route” programs. In addition, the proposed Recognizing Education Success, Professional Excellence, and Collaborative Teaching (RESPECT) Project would more broadly support State and local efforts to improve teacher and principal preparation and support early in their careers; provide career ladders and other opportunities for educators to take on leadership roles as they transition to CCR standards; and create conditions in schools that support effective teaching, including great school leadership and time for collaboration.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Transition to teaching

Under the Administration's reauthorization proposal, Transition to Teaching continuation grant costs in fiscal year 2015 would be funded from the proposed 10-percent national activities set-aside under the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Funding for continuation awards	\$24,568	\$13,694	0
Number of continuation awards	50	30	0
Average continuation award	\$491	\$456	0
Evaluation	\$123	\$68	0
Number of participants	7,000	3,000	0

NOTE: Continuation costs of approximately \$15,000 thousand in fiscal year 2015 would be provided from the proposed 10-percent national activities set-aside under the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

The Transition to Teaching authorization requires that each grantee submit an interim evaluation report at the end of the third year of the 5-year grant period and a final evaluation report at the end of the grant. This evaluation must describe the extent to which the grantee met program goals relating to teacher recruitment and retention.

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Transition to teaching

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

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

Year	2004 Cohort Target	2004 Cohort Actual	2006 Cohort Target	2006 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual
2010	85%	85%	83%	74%	79%	71%
2011			85	75	83	72
2012					85	79
2013						
2014						
2015						

Year	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual	2011 Cohort Target	2011 Cohort Actual
2010		55%		
2011	58%	70		
2012	59	81	55%	74%
2013				
2014				
2015				

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

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

Year	2004 Cohort Target	2004 Cohort Actual	2006 Cohort Target	2006 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual
2010	50%	61%	48%	45%	40%	33%
2011			50	54	48	44
2012					50	77
2013						
2014						
2015						

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Transition to teaching

Year	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual	2011 Cohort Target	2011 Cohort Actual
2010		17%		
2011	18%	30		
2012	19	79	25%	54%
2013				
2014				
2015				

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

Year	2004 Cohort Target	2004 Cohort Actual	2006 Cohort Target	2006 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2010	77%	62%		42%		21%		
2011			43%	53		35		
2012						82		47%
2013								
2014								
2015								

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

Efficiency Measures

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

Year	2004 Cohort Target	2004 Cohort Actual	2006 Cohort Target	2006 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2010	\$16,240	\$13,640	\$23,317	\$21,951		\$65,537		
2011			18,317	19,657	\$55,537	41,394		
2012			18,317		50,537	25,603		\$22,988
2013								
2014								
2015								

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Transition to teaching

Measure: The cost per participant receiving certification or licensure.

Year	2004 Cohort Target	2004 Cohort Actual	2006 Cohort Target	2006 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Target	2007 Cohort Actual
2010	\$11,500	\$8,449	\$18,505	\$9,208	\$37,392	\$13,592
2011			18,505	10,508	32,392	14,320
2012			18,505		32,392	15,684
2013						
2014						
2015						

Year	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual	2011 Cohort Target	2011 Cohort Actual
2010		\$21,324		
2011	\$15,602	17,003		
2012	10,602	13,210	\$15,240	\$18,240
2013				
2014				
2015				

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

Other Performance Information

Transition to Teaching grantees are required to conduct an interim evaluation at the end of their third year and a final evaluation at the end of their grant period, focused on teacher recruitment and retention.

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

The final report on the 2002 grantee cohort was published in 2013. The report found that of the more than 25,000 individuals recruited to participate in the program, over 19,000 (76 percent) became teachers of record in a high-need school in a high-need LEA, and over 13,000 received State certification. The report noted that many grantees worked closely with school district personnel (through both formal and informal partnerships) to find and place participants, including in positions as special education teachers, bilingual teachers, and teachers in rural

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Transition to teaching

school districts. Grantees reported having the most success recruiting mid-career professionals who were interested in beginning a second career as a teacher; a number of grantees also reported working with the Department of Defense's Troops-to-Teachers program to recruit military personnel. Three grantees also reported that over 500 of their participants earned State certification; these projects attributed their "tremendous success" to strategies such as using an online system to track individuals' progress towards certification, hiring dedicated staff focused on helping participants earn certification, and providing intensive test preparation. Finally, the report highlighted grantees' strategies for supporting and retaining participants once they were placed as teachers in high-need schools in high-need districts, including by mentoring, providing workshops and professional development, and establishing support teams. The report found that nearly 80 percent of the participants who began teaching in school year 2006-07 remained in a high-need school in a high-need LEA 3 years later. Grantees reported that participants who left teaching within 3 years did so because of cuts to teaching positions, unsatisfactory evaluations, low salaries, negative student teaching experiences, and dissatisfaction with school culture and leadership. Grantees also reported substantial difficulty in placing and retaining program participants in small, rural, and remote high-need LEAs due to geographic barriers, in addition to generally low teacher salaries and a limited number of positions in those districts.

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

The Department expects to release the final report on the 2004 grantee cohort, an interim report on the 2006 and 2007 grantee cohorts, and an interim report on the 2009 grantee cohort, in early 2014.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher quality partnership

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: Indefinite

Budget Authority:

	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$40,592	0	-\$40,592

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

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

Pre-Baccalaureate Preparation of Teachers program (Pre-Baccalaureate) – Grants are provided to implement a wide range of reforms in teacher preparation programs and, as applicable, preparation programs for early childhood educators. These reforms may include, among other things, implementing curriculum changes that improve and assess how well prospective teachers develop teaching skills; using teaching and learning research so that teachers implement research-based instructional practices and use data to improve classroom

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher quality partnership

instruction; developing a high-quality and sustained preservice clinical education program that includes high-quality mentoring or coaching; creating a high-quality induction program for new teachers; implementing initiatives that increase compensation for qualified early childhood educators who attain 2-year and 4-year degrees; developing and implementing high-quality professional development for teachers in partner high-need LEAs; developing effective mechanisms, which may include alternative routes to certification, to recruit qualified individuals into the teaching profession; and strengthening literacy instruction skills of prospective and new elementary and secondary school teachers.

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

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

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

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher quality partnership

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

The Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, also allows the Department to use program funds to support the State teacher quality accountability reporting system, as authorized by sections 205-207. The State teacher quality accountability reporting system gathers data from all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the outlying areas, and the Freely Associated States on such topics as the completion rates for traditional and alternative route teacher preparation programs, as well as State teacher assessments and certifications. These data are reported to Congress and the Nation through the Secretary's annual report on teacher quality, and they provide critical information on both the progress toward the Nation's goal of a highly qualified teacher in every classroom, and the areas needing further improvements (<http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/teachprep/index.html>).

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

	(dollars in thousands)
2010.....	\$43,000
2011.....	42,914
2012.....	42,833
2013.....	40,592
2014.....	40,592

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration's fiscal year 2015 budget request includes no funding for Teacher Quality Partnerships (TQP), which under the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal would be consolidated into a new Excellent Instructional Teams initiative. The new authority would have three components: (1) Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants, a formula grant program with a 10-percent competitive grant set-aside; (2) ConnectEDucators, a discretionary grant program designed to support educators as they transition to using technology and data to improve student learning, including educators in schools receiving technology upgrades through the Administration's ConnectED initiative; and (3) the competitive Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund. Together, these programs would provide formula grants to States and districts to improve the effectiveness of teachers and leaders and to support a more equitable distribution of effective teachers and leaders; investments in the development, improvement, and expansion of high-quality teacher and leader pathways with evidence of effectiveness; and competitive grants to States and districts to support the integration of technology into instruction and the development and implementation of innovative teacher and leader policies. With amounts reserved for evaluation and competitive grants, the Department would build evidence on how best to recruit, prepare, and support effective teachers and school leaders while continuing to invest in efforts to enhance the teaching and leadership professions.

The Excellent Instructional Teams programs will also reinforce reforms that 44 States and several school districts are making under the Department's ESEA flexibility initiative. States and

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher quality partnership

LEAs that were approved for ESEA flexibility are adopting new systems for evaluating and supporting teachers and principals based in part on student growth, as well as implementing academic standards linked to college- and career-readiness, new assessments aligned with those standards, and instituting differentiated approaches to school accountability that target improvement resources to the lowest-performing schools and those with the largest achievement gaps.

The Excellent Instructional Teams programs would also complement the \$5 billion proposed in mandatory funding for a targeted implementation of the Recognizing Education Success, Professional Excellence, and Collaborative Teaching (RESPECT) Project. The proposed RESPECT Project would more broadly support State and local efforts to reform teacher and principal recruitment, preparation, and mentoring, and redesign educator career ladders to help attract and retain top talent.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Partnership Grants			
New	0	\$40,054 ¹	0
Continuations	\$40,096 ²	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	40,096	40,054	0
State teacher quality accountability reports	497	538	0

NOTE: FY 2015 projected costs of \$538 thousand for data collection for the State teacher quality accountability reports would be provided from the funds set aside under the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program. There will be no grant continuation costs for the TQP program in FY 2015.

¹ The FY 2014 new awards total includes approximately \$32,043 in FY 2014 funds for support of continuations costs in fiscal years 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018.

² Continuation costs for these grants in 2013 are \$56,833 thousand, which exceeded the amount available, so the awards were reduced.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets. 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 2008, the program was reauthorized and extensively revised as part of the Higher Education Opportunity Act. The Department concluded that the performance measures that had been developed for the antecedent program were no longer appropriate. As a result, the Department developed new measures for the program. Data for the new measures will not be available until

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher quality partnership

fall 2015 at the earliest. For the interim period, the Department has created measures that will provide data in a shorter period of time. Data for these measures will come from the revised annual performance report. It is expected that initial data for these measures will not be available until spring 2014 at the earliest.

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

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

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

Interim Measure: The percentage of program participants who did not graduate in the previous reporting period and who persisted in the postsecondary program in the current reporting period.

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

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

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

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

Interim Measure: The percentage of beginning teachers who are retained in teaching in the partner high-need LEA or ECE program 1 year after initial employment.

Efficiency Measure

The Department also developed an efficiency measure for this program. The measure is the cost of a successful outcome, where successful outcome is defined as retention in the partner high-need LEA or ECE program 3 years after initial employment. This efficiency measure ties in with the program's new performance measures. Data for this measure will come from the revised annual performance report and will not be available until fiscal year 2014 at the earliest.

Other Performance Information

In 2010, the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) awarded a contract for an evaluation of the teacher residency projects supported through the TQP program to Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. Although the evaluation was originally intended to be an impact study that would

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher quality partnership

examine whether having a teacher residency program graduate as a teacher had an effect on student achievement, IES determined that an experimental research design was not feasible. Instead, the evaluation has been restructured as an implementation study.

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

The implementation study is addressing the following research questions:

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher incentive fund

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$288,771	0	-\$288,771

¹The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The Department proposes to continue funding this program in FY 2015 under new legislation.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) provided an additional \$200 million for TIF in 2009 to allow the Department to significantly expand support for PBCSs. The Recovery Act also required the Department, through the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), to conduct a rigorous national evaluation to assess the impact of performance-based

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher incentive fund

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

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

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2010	\$400,000
2011	399,200
2012	299,433
2013	283,771
2014	288,771

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) for fiscal year 2015. In place of several narrowly targeted programs that serve current and prospective teachers and school leaders, the Administration's reauthorization proposal for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act would create a broader Excellent Instructional Teams authority. This authority would include a new Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund that would build on the experience of the TIF program to support State and school district efforts to develop and implement innovative approaches to creating human capital systems that improve teacher and leader effectiveness and student outcomes. The new program would focus on recruiting and preparing promising candidates and retaining, promoting, and rewarding teachers and principals who raise student achievement and close the achievement gap in high-need schools.

Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund grantees would use program funds to reform teacher and school leader compensation and career advancement systems; incorporate the use of evaluation results in retention, compensation, and other personnel decisions; reform hiring and placement practices; improve certification and licensure systems; and implement other innovative strategies to strengthen the workforce.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher incentive fund

The proposed Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund would reinforce the broader Excellent Instructional Teams initiative by supporting compensation systems that reward effective and highly effective teachers and leaders. These systems can be an important tool in efforts to attract effective and highly effective teachers and leaders and build strong instructional and school leadership teams in high-need schools, to create robust career advancement systems for teachers and other school leaders, and to create more effective professional development systems. In addition, the proposed Recognizing Education Success, Professional Excellence, and Collaborative Teaching (RESPECT) Project would more broadly support State and local efforts to identify, support, and reward educators who take on leadership roles, such as master teacher positions, to help all teachers in their school excel.

Under the Administration's reauthorization proposal, in fiscal year 2015, TIF continuation grant costs would be funded from the new Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Amount for continuation awards	\$271,555	\$280,013	0
Number of continuation awards	92	92	0
Average continuation award	\$2,952	\$3,044	0
Technical assistance, training, outreach, and evaluation	\$12,216	\$8,758	0

NOTE: Continuation costs in 2015 of approximately \$230,000 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund.

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.

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher incentive fund

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

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

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

Year	2006 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Actual	2010 Cohort Actual
2009	33.0%	44.2%	
2010	35.7	47.5	
2011	29.3	46.3	70.8%
2012		44.3	79.9

Additional information: The Department collects these data from grantee annual performance reports. Only 14 of the 60 grantees in the 2010 cohort reported results for this measure for 2011; for the remaining grantees in the 2010 cohort, 2011 was a planning year. A number of grantees in each cohort reported very high percentages of “effective” teachers and principals based on the percentage of educators who received incentive payments. In those cases, grantees made incentive payments to a substantial number of teachers and principals in high-need schools, but the amounts of those payments might have varied by individual. The Department has addressed this reporting issue by establishing new measures for the 2012 Cohort, as described below.

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

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

Year	2006 Cohort Actual	2007 Cohort Actual	2010 Cohort Actual
2009	0.7%	0.9%	
2010	1.0	0.8	
2011	1.2	0.9	0.7%
2012		0.9	1.0

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher incentive fund

New Measures

The Department established four new measures as part of the 2012 grant competition: (1) the percentage of teachers and principals who are rated at each effectiveness level; (2) the percentage of teachers teaching in a high-need field or subject, such as teaching English Learners, students with disabilities, or STEM, who are rated at each effectiveness level; (3) the percentage of teachers and principals who were rated at each effectiveness level in the previous year and who returned to serve in the same high-need school in the LEA; and (4) the percentage of school districts participating in a TIF grant that use educator evaluation systems to inform key personnel decisions.

Other Performance Information

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

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

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

A 2010 report supported by the Gates Foundation, the Joyce Foundation, and the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching, "Performance-Based Compensation: Design and Implementation at Six Teacher Incentive Fund Sites," highlighted six particularly successful grantees in the 2007 Cohort. The report underscored not only improvements in teacher practices and outcomes, such as increases in collaboration and retention rates, but also significant increases in student achievement at many project sites. For example, students who

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Teacher incentive fund

attended participating rural and urban schools in South Carolina and Texas, and participating charter schools in New Orleans and Philadelphia, averaged more than the expected level of academic growth per school year.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

School leadership

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$25,763	\$35,000	+\$9,237

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

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2010	\$29,220
2011	29,162
2012	29,107
2013	27,584
2014	25,763

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$35.0 million for School Leadership for fiscal year 2015, approximately \$9.2 million more than the fiscal year 2014 level. With this increase in funding,

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

School leadership

the Department would hold a competition for new grant awards focused on training highly effective leaders for high-need schools and districts.

Emerging research shows that effective leaders play a critically important role in students' academic success, especially in high-need schools, by creating cultures of high expectations for all students and by recruiting and retaining highly effective teachers.¹ This research indicates that effective leaders create a vision of academic success for all children in their schools and encourage other educators to take on leadership roles and responsibilities. Moreover, effective principals also provide instructional leadership in addition to carrying out administrative responsibilities.²

The request would support grants for high-quality, large-scale professional development for school leaders that build evidence of effectiveness. In particular, the Department would give priority to projects that propose to help current principals and school leadership teams master essential school leadership skills (such as evaluating and providing feedback to teachers, analyzing student data, developing school leadership teams, and creating a positive school climate). The request would also support projects that deepen school leaders' understanding of college- and career-ready (CCR) standards and effective instruction aligned to those standards. Grantees serving current school leaders would provide principal managers (such as district superintendents) training on how to support and evaluate school leaders, based on research showing that district-level staff play an important role in helping develop and retain effective and highly effective principals.³

In addition, the Department would create incentives for applicants to set ambitious goals for their professional development programs, including goals related to student achievement gains. These incentives would also support the adoption of district-level reforms that would empower strong school leaders, such as providing effective principals with greater autonomy over areas like staffing, budgeting, and scheduling.

The Department began building the evidence base to support the new program emphasis in the 2013 competition, which encouraged applicants to address the challenges of preparing and supporting principals by creating or enhancing projects that contribute to the limited body of high-quality evidence on principal preparation, professional development for principals, or both. Applicants were asked to include an evaluation plan that is likely to produce valid, reliable, and rigorous evidence of the federally funded project's impact on producing effective principals, as measured, at least in part, using student outcome data where available.

The request reflects the growing recognition of the importance of strong school leadership in reaching the Nation's education reform goals and improving student achievement, and is designed to complement the Administration's other proposals for fiscal year 2015. For example,

¹ Loeb, Kalogrides & Bêteille, "Effective Schools: Teacher Hiring, Assignment, Development, and Retention," *Journal of Education Finance and Policy* (2012).

² Wallace Foundation, "The School Principal as Leader: Guiding Schools to Better Teaching and Learning" (2013).

³ Bêteille, Kalogrides & Loeb, "Stepping Stones: Principal Career Paths and School Outcomes," CALDER Working Paper No. 58 (2011); Mitgang, "Districts Matter: Cultivating the Principals Urban Schools Need," Wallace Foundation (2013).

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

School leadership

the Recognizing Education Success, Professional Excellence, and Collaborative Teaching (RESPECT) Project would more broadly support State and local efforts to improve teacher and principal preparation and support early in their careers; provide career ladders and other opportunities for educators to take on leadership roles as they transition to CCR standards; and create conditions in schools that support effective teaching, including great school leadership and time for collaboration. The Department also is proposing to use a portion of the 10-percent set-aside within the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program to support the recruitment, preparation, and retention of school leaders and development of school leadership teams that are able to turn around low-performing schools. Competitive grants under the set-aside would also help States and LEAs dramatically improve the quality of teacher and principal preparation, including through the development of rigorous accountability systems for preparation programs, the enhancement of certification and licensure standards so that those standards are based on performance, and the development and improvement of educator evaluation systems. Competitive Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund grants would also support innovative strategies undertaken by States and LEAs to raise the quality of teaching and school leadership, including by empowering principals in high-need schools with greater authority to select effective instructional teams for their schools.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Funding for new awards	\$13,421	0	\$17,975
Number of new awards	20	0	8
Average new award	\$671	0	\$2,247
Funding for continuation awards	\$14,097	\$25,705	\$16,500
Number of continuation awards	21	34	20
Average continuation award	\$671	\$756	\$825
Peer review of new award applications	\$66	0	\$350
Evaluation	0	\$58	\$175

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

School leadership

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

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

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

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

Year	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual	2010 Cohort Target	2010 Cohort Actual
2010	40%	58%	30%	20%	20%	33%
2011	50	69	40	32	30	57
2012	60	92	50	41	40	70
2013			60		50	
2014					60	
2015						

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

Year	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual	2010 Cohort Target	2010 Cohort Actual
2010	60%	32%	50%	35%	40%	57%
2011	70	31	60	45	50	69
2012	80	31	70	38	60	48
2013			80		70	
2014					80	
2015						

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

School leadership

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

Year	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual	2010 Cohort Target	2010 Cohort Actual
2010						
2011						
2012		29%		98%		
2013		74		84		67%
2014						
2015						

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

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

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

Year	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual	2010 Cohort Target	2010 Cohort Actual
2010	60%	57%	50%	81%	40%	11%
2011	70	25	60	39	50	30
2012	80	52	70	60	60	57
2013			80		70	
2014					80	
2015						

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

School leadership

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

Year	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual	2010 Cohort Target	2010 Cohort Actual
2010						
2011						
2012		27%		11%		
2013		57		23		60%
2014						
2015						

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Expanding educational options (Proposed legislation)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: To be determined

Budget Authority:

<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
0	\$248,172	+\$248,172

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Administration's proposal to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) would create a new Expanding Educational Options authority to increase the supply of high-quality public school options available to students, especially students attending low-performing schools, by supporting the development and expansion of effective charter and other autonomous schools and by implementing comprehensive systems of public school choice.

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

In addition, the Department would be authorized to use Supporting Effective Charter Schools funds to make competitive grants to SEAs, LEAs, community development financial institutions, and State financing authorities for the purposes of improving the access of high-performing charter schools to facilities and facilities financing.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Expanding educational options

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

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

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2015, the Administration requests \$248.2 million for the proposed Expanding Educational Options program, the same as the fiscal year 2014 level for Charter Schools Grants. The request recognizes the continued importance of increasing the availability of high-quality educational options, especially for students attending low-performing schools, and ensuring that families have the information they need to choose from among their options. The reauthorized program would improve on existing ESEA public school choice programs by, among other things, funding applicants based on their record of success with respect to charter and autonomous schools and by supporting strengthened information and outreach campaigns.

In fiscal year 2015, the Department would use funds only for Supporting Effective Charter Schools Grants and for national activities, and would not fund Promoting Public School Choice Grants.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>
Supporting Effective Charter Schools Grants	
Amount for new awards	\$160,101
Number of new awards	20-40
Peer review of new award applications	\$248

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Expanding educational options

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>
Continuation awards for antecedent programs	\$75,414
National activities	\$12,409

NOTE: Approximately \$75,414 thousand would be provided in fiscal year 2015 under Supporting Effective Charter School Grants to fund continuation awards for grants made under Charter Schools Grants, including \$45,954 thousand for SEA grants, \$4,350 thousand for Non-SEA Eligible Applicant grants, \$14,110 thousand for Charter Management Organization grants, and \$11,000 thousand for State Facilities Incentive grants.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

The Department will establish goals and performance indicators to assess the impact of the Expanding Educational Options programs.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Charter schools grants

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$248,172 ²	0	-\$248,172

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The Administration proposes to consolidate the program in FY 2015 under new legislation.

² From the amount appropriated for Charter Schools Grants, the fiscal year 2014 appropriations act requires the Department to use not less than \$12,000 thousand for Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

In awarding SEA grants, the Department must give priority to States that provide for review and evaluation of charter schools by their chartering agencies at least once every 5 years to determine whether the schools are meeting their charter terms and their requirements and goals for student academic achievement. The Department must also give priority to States that do one or more of the following: (1) demonstrate progress in increasing the number of charter schools that are held accountable for results; (2) have chartering agencies that are not local educational agencies (LEAs) or, if only LEAs are chartering agencies, have an appeals process for prospective charter schools that initially fail to gain approval; (3) and provide charter schools a high degree of autonomy over their budgets and expenditures.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Charter schools grants

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

Beginning in fiscal year 2010, appropriations language has revised the program's allocation rules to authorize or require the Department to use specific amounts for State Facilities Incentive grants and Credit Enhancement for Charter Schools Facilities grants and to make grants to charter management organizations and other nonprofit entities for the replication and expansion of successful charter school models (Charter Management Organization grants). For fiscal year 2014, the appropriations act requires the Department to use not less than \$11 million for State Facilities Incentive grants, not less than \$12 million for Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities grants, and not less than \$45 million for Charter Management Organization grants.

The authorizing statute also permits the Department to use up to \$8 million of the appropriation for national activities. Recent years' appropriations acts have overridden this cap and allowed the use of a higher amount for this purpose, including for technical assistance to public chartering agencies to increase the number of high-performing charter schools. The fiscal year 2014 appropriations act authorizes the Department to use up to \$11 million for these activities.

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

	(dollars in thousands)
2010.....	\$256,031
2011.....	255,519
2012.....	254,836 ¹
2013.....	241,507
2014.....	248,172

¹ Reflects a reprogramming in fiscal year 2012 of \$200 thousand from Charter Schools Grants to Advanced Placement.

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funding for the Charter Schools program for fiscal year 2015. In place of this and other narrowly targeted programs that seek to expand educational options for students and families, the Administration has proposed to create a broader initiative, Expanding Educational Options, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization. This new initiative would address the need to increase the supply of high-quality public educational options available to students, especially students attending low-performing schools, through support of effective charter and autonomous schools and comprehensive systems of public school choice.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Charter schools grants

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

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

Under the Administration's reauthorization proposal, fiscal year 2015 Charter Schools grant continuation costs would be funded from the appropriation for the new Expanding Educational Options initiative.

If the Congress does not reauthorize the ESEA prior to enactment of fiscal year 2015 appropriations, the Administration will request authority through appropriations language to use up to \$75 million of the 2015 appropriation for Charter Management Organization grants and to continue the policy initiated in fiscal year 2014 appropriations of allowing grantees to use funds to support preschool education in charter schools, which most grantees would otherwise not be permitted to do under the current-law definition of "charter school."

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
SEA grants			
Amount for continuation awards	\$177,320	\$144,653	0
Non-SEA Eligible Applicant grants			
Amount for new awards	2,899	4,000	0
Amount for continuation awards	3,758	5,208	0

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Charter schools grants

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Charter Management Organization grants			
Amount for new awards	0	\$26,445	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$29,130	33,666	0
State Facilities Incentive grants			
Amount for new awards		11,000	
Amount for continuation awards	10,000	0	0
Peer review of new award applications	47	200	0
National activities	5,353	11,000	0

NOTES: The amounts shown on this table do not include \$13,000 thousand in 2013 and \$12,000 thousand in 2014 for Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities, which are shown in the program output measures for that activity.

Continuation costs of approximately \$75,414 thousand (including \$45,954 thousand for SEA grants, \$4,350 thousand for Non-SEA Eligible Applicant grants, \$14,110 thousand for Charter Management Organization grants, and \$11,000 thousand for State Facilities Incentive grants) would be provided from the appropriation for Expanding Education Options in fiscal year 2015.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

Goal: To support the creation of a large number of high-quality charter schools.

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Charter schools grants

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010	44	41
2011	44	42
2012	44	43
2013	44	43
2014	44	43
2015	44	

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010	5,190	4,991
2011	5,660	5,339
2012	6,130	5,741
2013	6,600	
2014	7,070	
2015	7,510	

Additional information: Data on the number of charter schools in operation are provided annually by State educational agencies and are verified by the Department. The 2013 data for this measure are expected to be available in December 2014.

Measure: The percentage of 4th-grade charter school students who are achieving at or above proficient on State assessments in reading.

Year	Target	Actual
2010	79.5%	72.2%
2011	84.6	70.9
2012	89.7	68.6
2013	94.8	
2014	100.0	

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Charter schools grants

Measure: The percentage of 4th-grade students in charter schools who are achieving at or above proficient on State assessments in mathematics.

Year	Target	Actual
2010	78.0%	72.6%
2011	83.5	71.2
2012	89.0	65.1
2013	94.5	
2014	100.0	

Measure: The percentage of 8th-grade charter school students who are achieving at or above proficient on State assessments in reading.

Year	Target	Actual
2010	79.8%	70.9%
2011	84.8	71.2
2012	89.9	68.7
2013	94.9	
2014	100.0	

Measure: The percentage of 8th-grade students in charter schools who are achieving at or above proficient on State assessments in mathematics.

Year	Target	Actual
2010	72.1%	59.5%
2011	79.1	60.2
2012	86.1	56.5
2013	93.1	
2014	100.0	

Additional information: Performance targets for these measures are based on the ESEA goal of 100 percent student proficiency in reading and mathematics by 2014. The Department will develop targets for these measures for 2015 and future years at a later date. Data for these measures are collected through grantee annual performance reports. Analysis of the data has found notable variation in performance among the schools funded. The 2013 data for these measures are expected to be available in December 2014.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Charter schools grants

Efficiency Measures

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

Year	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual
2010	Baseline	1.6
2011	2.9	2.4
2012	4.2	3.1
2013	5.8	3.4
2014	6.3	

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

The Department has also developed a measure to assess the cost efficiency, across States, of the Federal investment in supporting charter school start-ups. The measure is defined as the Federal cost per student of launching a successful school (defined as a school in operation for 3 or more years). Data for 2010 show an average cost of \$789 per student, for 2011 an average cost of \$920 per student, and for 2012 an average cost of \$1,010. Data for this measure, collected through grantee annual performance reports, assist the Department in determining what constitutes a reasonable cost per student for different types of charter schools.

Other Performance Information

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Charter schools grants

The “National Charter School Study 2013,” a study by researchers at Stanford University’s Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO), is an update and expansion of CREDO’s 2009 study “Multiple Choice: Charter School Performance in 16 States.” The 2013 study examined longitudinal student-level data from a sample of 3,620 charter schools across 25 States, the District of Columbia, and New York City (treated separately from the rest of the State) to determine whether students who attend charter schools performed better academically than if they had attended a traditional public school. The researchers found that 29 percent of charter schools in the sample demonstrated significantly higher growth in mathematics achievement and 25 percent demonstrated significantly higher growth in reading compared to traditional public schools in the sample while 31 percent of charter schools in the sample posted mathematics gains and 19 percent posted reading gains that were significantly below what those students would have seen if enrolled in a traditional public school. Overall, the students in these charter schools have shown improvement over the results from 2009 and slow and steady progress over the past 5 years. Among the group of 16 States from the original study in 2009, the rise in performance was attributed in part to the closure of poorly performing charter schools and by declining performance in traditional public schools over the same period of time.

The CREDO analysis also showed that, in general, charter schools have had different effects on students of different family backgrounds. For students from low-income families, African-American students, or English Learners, charter schools had a larger, more positive effect academically compared to similar students in traditional public schools. The researchers also found that students perform better in charter schools over time, with charter school students on average experiencing smaller learning gains than their peers in traditional public schools in their first year but significant improvement in learning gains in the second year and beyond.

Other recent studies have used a more rigorous experimental research design to compare the performance of students who were admitted by lottery into oversubscribed charter schools and those who were not admitted and instead attended traditional public schools. Hoxby, Murarka, and Kang, in a 2009 report for the New York City (NYC) Charter School Evaluation Project, found a positive achievement effect for students attending the city’s charter schools. By the 3rd-grade, the average NYC charter school student scored 5.3 scale-score points above his or her peers in traditional public schools in English language arts and 5.8 scale-score points above in mathematics. In grades 4 through 8, the average charter school student gained 3.6 more scale-score points in English language arts and 5.0 more scale-score points in mathematics than did peers in traditional public schools each year. Hoxby and colleagues noted that, on average, students who attended a charter school for grades kindergarten through eight scored about 23 scale-score points higher in English language arts and 30 scale-score points higher in mathematics compared to their peers in traditional public schools, closing about 66 and 86 percent of the achievement gap in those subject areas, respectively. The evaluation also found that students applying to NYC charter schools were more likely to be African-American (63 percent versus 34 percent) and eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (92 percent versus 72 percent) than students in the traditional public schools in the district. The researchers also examined charter school policies in relation to achievement and found that effects on achievement were associated with the length of the school year, the number of minutes devoted to English language arts during the school day, whether teacher compensation was based on performance, and whether a school’s mission statement emphasized academic performance.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Charter schools grants

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

In light of the changing charter school landscape and recent research findings, the Department has initiated new data collection and analysis activities, including the development of a central warehouse of data on charter schools providing detailed information on a complete list of charter schools in operation across the Nation and a data-reporting guide for States. The development of the data warehouse, which included a reconciliation of multiple charter school data sets, was completed in November 2012. The data-reporting guide, which incorporates lessons learned from the reconciliation, has been released and is available at www.ed.gov/edfacts under “EDFacts System Documentation” (see “SY 2013-14 EDFacts Charter Workbook”). The Department believes that these activities have improved and will continue to strengthen the quality and reliability of our charter school data. We also expect to complete a set of internal analyses to help identify future directions for data collection and analysis in 2014.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Credit enhancement for charter school facilities

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$12,000 ²	0	-\$12,000

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2004. The Administration proposes to consolidate the program in FY 2015 under new legislation.

² The FY 2014 appropriations act does not provide a separate appropriation for this program; instead, from the amount provided for Charter Schools, the appropriations language requires the Secretary to use at least \$12,000 thousand for Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Credit enhancement for charter school facilities

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2010	\$8,300
2011	10,036
2012	11,036
2013	13,000
2014	12,000

NOTE: Since FY 2008, appropriations acts have not provided a separate appropriation for this program and, instead, have permitted or required the Department to use funding from the Charter Schools appropriation for Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities.

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program for fiscal year (FY) 2015. In place of this and other narrowly targeted programs that seek to expand educational options for students and families, the Administration is proposing to create a broader authority, Expanding Educational Options, as part of its proposal to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This new authority would help increase the supply of high-quality public educational options available to students, especially students attending low-performing schools, by creating and expanding effective charter and other autonomous schools, implementing comprehensive systems of public school choice, and strengthening parent information and outreach efforts across these programs.

More specifically, Expanding Educational Options would authorize a new Supporting Effective Charter Schools Grants program that, in addition to providing competitive grants to start or expand effective charter and autonomous schools, also would support charter schools facilities programs.

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

While charter schools receive public funding for operations, they often must find and finance their own facilities and have had difficulty obtaining funds in the same manner as traditional local educational agencies (LEAs) and public schools. Additionally, charter schools are less likely to be able to take advantage of economies of scale in their acquisition, construction, and renovation of facilities because they generally have smaller enrollments. In the 2010-11 school year, average enrollment across all public schools was 498, while average enrollment in charter schools was 339.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Credit enhancement for charter school facilities

Charter schools continue to receive mediocre credit ratings, which has made capital financing challenging. In 2012, Moody's Investors Service found that a sample of \$285 million in outstanding charter school debt had a median rating at the lowest investment grade. The 2010 Standard & Poor's report "Despite Funding And Regulatory Hurdles, The U.S. Charter School Sector Continues To Grow" states that "complicating many schools' limited ability to respond to tighter funding are their already weak fundamental financial profiles, which underlie the largely speculative-grade credit quality of the sector. These factors could put pressure on some schools' ratings and could lead to downgrades in the face of reduced operating flexibility." The Expanding Educational Options proposal would respond to these challenges by making grants to State educational agencies, LEAs, CDFIs, and State financing authorities to improve access to facilities and facilities financing for high-performing charter schools, including by supporting implementation of credit enhancement strategies.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Amount of new grants	\$6,019	\$11,900	0
Number of new grants	1	2	0
Amount of grant supplements	\$6,981	0	0
Number of grant supplements	2	0	0
Peer review of new award applications	0 ¹	\$100	0
Estimated amount of charter school facilities funds leveraged over the life of the grants	\$400,000 ²	\$400,000 ²	0
Estimated number of charter schools served over the life of the grants	50	50	0

¹ In FY 2013, the Department funded applicants from the FY 2011 slate.

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

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.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Credit enhancement for charter school facilities

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

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010	\$200	\$421
2011	200	563
2012	200	546
2013	200	
2014	200	
2015	200	

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010	60	41
2011	60	49
2012	60	38
2013	60	
2014	60	
2015	60	

Additional information: The data for charter schools served reflect the number of schools new to the program and do not include schools that have benefitted or continue to benefit from previous credit enhancements. Data for 2013 will be available in spring 2014. Targets for 2015 are included because, while this program does not make multi-year awards (and, thus, will have no continuation costs in FY 2015), the grant activities are implemented over a number of years and existing grantees will continue to report on these measures. Over the life of the program, it has provided 466 schools (8 percent of the Nation's charter schools) with \$3.2 billion in total financing, including leveraged funds.

Other Performance Information

The Department has tracked the level of defaults on loans facilitated. As of 2012, only \$0.91 of every \$100 of grant funds had been lost to default over the life of the program. When leveraged

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Credit enhancement for charter school facilities

funds are taken into account, this comes to approximately \$0.07 for every \$100 of the total amount supported through the program.

The Department completed an evaluation of the program in 2008. The evaluation addressed three primary research questions:

- Is the program achieving its legislative purpose?
- Does the program provide for improved access to capital markets for facilities and for better rates and terms on financing than would be otherwise available to charter schools?
- Do certain models of credit enhancement provide for more favorable outcomes than others?

The study found that the program is achieving its purpose and improving the borrowing capabilities of charter schools. Representatives of grantees, commercial lenders, investment banks, and rating agencies reported that, without the program, assisted schools would not have received facilities loans at any price. Unsuccessful applicants generally were not able to support their proposed lending levels, providing evidence that the program does provide improved access. Entities that used their program funds to credit-enhance a loan made by a lender or a bond purchased by an investor supported higher lending volumes and a greater number of schools than those making direct loans, indicating that the grantees tend to be more effective when acting as a third-party credit-enhancing agent rather than as a direct lender. (However, this finding is not conclusive, since it was based on only the eight grantees from the 2002, 2003, and 2004 cohorts.) Additional findings include that entities that had experience making direct loans to charter schools before becoming grantees were able to provide a significantly higher volume of loans after receiving program awards, and that charter schools assisted through the program were generally located in census tracts with a lower median household income than the relevant county as a whole and had a significantly higher proportion of minority students (76 percent) than public schools as a whole (42 percent) or even other charter schools (58 percent).

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Magnet schools assistance

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$91,647	\$91,647	0

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

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Magnet schools assistance

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2010.....	\$100,000
2011.....	99,800
2012.....	96,705 ¹
2013.....	91,647
2014.....	91,647

¹ Reflects a reprogramming in fiscal year 2012 of \$2,906 thousand from Magnet Schools Assistance to Advanced Placement.

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$91.6 million for MSAP for fiscal year 2015, the same as the fiscal year 2014 level. The fiscal year 2015 appropriation would support the final year of continuation funding for grantees in the fiscal year 2013 cohort.

The Administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization proposal for MSAP would strengthen the Federal commitment to increasing the number of high-quality educational options for parents and students and to increasing diversity in schools by placing a greater emphasis on funding magnet school programs, particularly whole-school programs, that have a record of effectiveness in raising student achievement and reducing minority-group isolation.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Amount of awards	\$89,814	\$89,814	\$89,814
Number of new awards	27	1	0
Number of continuation awards	0	27	28
Range of awards	\$738–\$4,000	\$557–\$4,000	\$757–\$4,000
Peer review of new award applications	\$311	0	0
National activities	\$1,522	\$1,833	\$1,833

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Magnet schools assistance

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

The Department will establish targets for these measures for the 2013 cohort (for years 2014, 2015, and 2016) at a later date.

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

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

Measure: The percentage of magnet schools in which the student applicant pool reduces, prevents, or eliminates minority group isolation.

	FY 2007 Cohort Target	FY 2007 Cohort Actual	FY 2010 Cohort Target	FY 2010 Cohort Actual
2010	80%	59%		
2011			85.2%	39.2%
2012			90.1	46.4
2013			95.0	38.4

Additional information: For the 2007 cohort, this measure tracks the percentage of magnet schools receiving assistance for which the applicant pool reflects a racial and ethnic composition that, in relation to the districtwide average percentage of minority students at the same grade levels, reduces, prevents, or eliminates minority-group isolation. (Minority-group isolation refers to a condition in which minority students constitute more than 50 percent of the enrollment of a school.) In 2006, the Department established annual performance targets for this measure using a baseline of 58.3 percent and a goal of having 100 percent of schools reduce, prevent, or eliminate minority-group isolation in 2014.

In 2010, the Department published interim final regulations for the program that provide districts with greater flexibility in demonstrating that their magnet or feeder schools will eliminate, reduce, or prevent racial group isolation and that their voluntary desegregation plans are adequate under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. The regulations removed the definition of “minority-group isolation” because it required districts to use binary racial classifications and prohibited the creation of magnet schools that result in minority-group enrollments in magnet and feeder schools that exceed the districtwide average of minority-group students. These interim final regulations, which were adopted as final in November 2012, apply to the 2010 cohort. As a

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Magnet schools assistance

result, this measure reflects the percentage of magnet schools that have met individually determined objectives for reducing minority group isolation, without reference to districtwide averages. The measure also examines the enrollment of schools in the 2010 cohort, not the applicant pool of those schools.

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

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

Year	FY 2007 Cohort Target	FY 2007 Cohort Actual	FY 2010 Cohort Target	FY 2010 Cohort Actual
2010	85%	49%		
2011			88.4%	57.3%
2012			92.2	54.5
2013			96.0	53.1

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

Year	FY 2007 Cohort Target	FY 2007 Cohort Actual	FY 2010 Cohort Target	FY 2010 Cohort Actual
2010	85%	54%		
2011			88.5%	56.7%
2012			92.3	54.3
2013			96.1	50.2

Additional information: These measures track the percentage of students in participating magnet schools who score at the proficient level or above on State assessments in reading and in mathematics. Targets for these measures for the 2007 and 2010 cohorts are based on the ESEA goal of all students being proficient in reading and mathematics by 2014.

The remaining performance measures focus on sustainability and examine the percentage of magnet schools in operation 3 years after Federal funding ends and the percentage of magnet schools that meet State adequate yearly progress standards at least 3 years after Federal funding ends. Analysis of the sustainability data for the 2004 cohort found that nearly 99 percent of magnet schools that received funding remained in existence in the 2009-10 school year and that 45 percent of those magnet schools made adequate yearly progress at the end of the 2009-10 school year, roughly the same percentage that made adequate yearly progress at the conclusion of the grant period (46 percent).

Efficiency Measure

The Department has developed a measure to assess the efficiency of Federal investments in supporting magnet schools. The measure is defined as the Federal cost per student in a magnet school receiving assistance. Data for the 2010 cohort show an average cost of \$753 per student in 2011, \$958 per student in 2012, and \$840 per student in 2013.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Magnet schools assistance

Other Performance Information

In 2008, following a year-long feasibility study, the Department initiated a national evaluation of magnet schools that focuses on a single category of schools receiving funding through the MSAP program: elementary schools that convert to whole-school magnets. The study is examining the relationship of magnet conversion to outcomes for resident students (those who live within a magnet school's attendance zone) and non-resident students (those who live outside the attendance zone but choose to attend the school). The evaluation involves fiscal year 2004 and 2007 grantees and uses a comparative interrupted time series design to examine the relationship between magnet school conversion and student achievement and other outcomes, including minority-group isolation in schools. The evaluation is also examining how factors related to student achievement vary according to characteristics of the magnet schools and comparison schools and includes principal and magnet school coordinator surveys. A final evaluation report is expected to be released in spring 2014.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: To be determined¹

<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$42,376	\$24,276	-\$18,100

¹The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing language is sought for FY 2015.
NOTE: The 2014 appropriation includes \$5 million for the Javits Gifted and Talented Students Education program.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Fund for the Improvement of education: programs of national significance

- Demonstrations of the effectiveness of programs under which school districts or schools contract with private management organizations to reform a school or schools.

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

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

In fiscal year 2014, the Department is using FIE funds to support the “Data Quality Initiative,” which began in 2006 and is designed to improve the quality, analysis, and reporting of Department of Education elementary and secondary program data. In addition, the Department is using approximately \$10 million in fiscal year 2014 funds to make new and continuation grants under the Full-Service Community Schools program. Fiscal year 2015 continuation costs for these grants would be provided under the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program in the Supporting Student Success account. In fiscal year 2014, FIE is also funding a new competition under the Innovative Approaches to Literacy initiative, which awards competitive grants to national nonprofit organizations and LEAs for provision of books and literacy activities to children and families in high-need communities.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2010	\$125,461 ¹
2011	12,009
2012	40,823
2013	38,280
2014	42,376

¹Includes \$88,791 thousand for congressional earmarks.

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is requesting \$24.3 million for the Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE) Programs of National Significance in 2015, \$18.1 million less than the 2014 level. The requested level of funding would allow the Department to support the following activities in 2015:

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Fund for the Improvement of education: programs of national significance

- \$10 million for a non-cognitive initiative, which would provide competitive grants to school district and researcher partnerships to develop and test interventions to improve students' non-cognitive skills in the middle grades, which are foundational to students' academic achievement and life success.

An emerging body of research indicates that non-cognitive interventions, which improve factors like self-control and social and emotional skills, can have as much, if not more, impact on their grades and perseverance in school than academic interventions. Academic perseverance, which is defined as persisting in the pursuit of academic goals despite challenges and setbacks, requires multiple non-cognitive skills, and is one of the important non-cognitive factors that determine students' success. However, relatively little is known about how schools can implement efforts to improve non-cognitive skills in a comprehensive fashion, integrating them into classroom practices and school culture. This initiative would develop and test various approaches (including both professional development for teachers and comprehensive models that include interventions for students) to non-cognitive skills development during the middle grades. The middle grades are a critical time in students' academic trajectories; during this period, many children lose interest in, engagement with, and motivation for academic work, increasing their likelihood of dropping out of high school. Grants would be structured so that researchers assist in program development, provide ongoing feedback in a continuous improvement framework, document lessons learned, and conduct a rigorous evaluation. These grants would enable districts to lead innovation and development in this area and provide models for districts and schools around the country. Grants would be for \$1-2 million over a 4-year time period that includes a planning year and a final evaluation.

- \$8 million for a Disconnected Youth Initiative, which would strengthen services and improve outcomes for disconnected youth (often defined as individuals, ages 14-24, who are neither employed nor enrolled in an educational institution or who are at high-risk of dropping out of high school). This initiative may include activities to support the development and implementation of Performance Partnerships pilots, which would give States and localities enhanced flexibility in administering Federal youth-serving programs in exchange for greater accountability for results, as well as Pay for Success projects and evaluations. Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2014 provided authority to carry out up to 10 Performance Partnership Pilots in fiscal year 2014. The Interagency Forum on Disconnected Youth (IFDY), led by the Department of Education and representing all involved agencies, is currently working to implement this authority. The 2015 Budget proposes establishing up to 10 additional pilots and expanding their scope to include programs in the Department of Justice.

The IFDY will continue to work across Federal agencies and with States, regions and localities to test cross-sector, outcome-focused strategies for improving outcomes for disconnected youth. The Department would use the funds provided in FIE to address issues such as (1) our limited knowledge of which program models are most effective in helping disconnected youth achieve positive outcomes; (2) a relative lack of attention to this population at the Federal, State, and local levels; and (3) the need for more comprehensive approaches to meeting the multi-faceted needs of youth who may have educational deficits,

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Fund for the Improvement of education: programs of national significance

unstable housing, health challenges, and histories of involvement with the criminal justice system.

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

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

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

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Full-Service Community Schools grants:			
2010 grantees (11 awards)	\$5,344	\$5,344	0
2014 grantees	<u>0</u>	<u>4,656</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	5,344	10,000	0
Non-Cognitive Initiative	0	0	\$10,000
Disconnected Youth Initiative	0	0	8,000
Youth Data Pilot	0	0	5,000

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Fund for the Improvement of education: programs of national significance

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Innovative Approaches to Literacy	\$27,567	\$25,000	0
Data Quality Initiative	1,276	1,276	\$1,276
Education Facilities Clearinghouse	974	984	0
Javits Gifted and Talented Students Education	0	5,000	0
Peer review of new award applications	2	100	0
Other	<u>3,119</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	38,280	42,376	24,276

NOTES: In fiscal year 2013 \$407 thousand was reprogrammed to Advanced Placement to cover a shortfall in the Advanced Placement Test Fee program.

In fiscal year 2015, Full-Service Community Schools continuation costs of approximately \$4,656 thousand would be provided under the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program in the Supporting Student Success account.

In fiscal year 2015, Innovative Approaches to Literacy continuation costs of approximately \$25,000 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program in the Education Improvement Programs account.

In fiscal year 2015, Education Facilities Clearinghouse continuation costs of approximately \$994 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program in the Supporting Student Success account.

In fiscal year 2015, Javits Gifted and Talented Students Education program continuation costs of approximately \$5,000 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program in the Education Improvement Programs account.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act contains specific accountability provisions for FIE grantees. Each application for funds must include clear objectives for the project that are based on scientifically-based research and must describe the activities to be carried out to meet those objectives. In addition, recipients must evaluate the effectiveness of their funded programs and submit evaluations to the Department. The Department has not established general performance measures for the program, but does establish measures for specific grant competitions and monitors the progress of the grantees against these measures.

- For the Education Facilities Clearinghouse, the performance measure is the percentage of recipients of clearinghouse onsite training or technical assistance that implement one or more changes to improve their education facility based upon clearinghouse recommendations within 6 months of the training or technical assistance. Baseline data (corresponding to the 2012 performance period for the Clearinghouse grantee) include: 62.5 percent of recipients of clearinghouse onsite training or technical assistance implemented one or more changes to improve their education facility based on clearinghouse recommendations within 6 months of the training or technical assistance. More specifically, 100 percent (2 out of 2) of recipients of clearinghouse onsite training met this measure, and 50 percent (3 out of 6) recipients of clearinghouse technical

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Fund for the Improvement of education: programs of national significance

assistance met this measure. Data for the 2013 performance period will be available later in 2014.

- For Full-Service Community Schools, the measure is the percentage of individuals targeted for services who receive services during each year of the project period. All grantees must submit an annual performance report documenting their contribution in assisting the Department in measuring the performance of the program against this indicator, as well as performance on project-specific indicators. In 2008, 96.3 percent of targeted individuals received services. In 2009, 100 percent of targeted individuals received services. In 2010, 98 percent of targeted individuals for the 2008 cohort received services; 100 percent of targeted individuals for the 2010 cohort received services. In 2011, 91 percent of targeted individuals for the 2008 cohort received services; additionally, 84 percent of targeted individuals for the 2010 cohort received services in 2011. In 2011, some grantees served more than their targeted number of individuals.
- For the Innovative Approaches to Literacy initiative, the performance measures are: (1) the percentage of 4-year-old children participating in the project who achieve significant gains in oral language skills; (2) the percentage of participating 3rd-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on State reading or language arts assessments; (3) the percentage of participating 8th-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on State reading or language arts assessments; and (4) the percentage of participating high school students who meet or exceed proficiency on State reading or language arts assessments. The target for all grantees on all performance measures was 70 percent. In 2012, on Performance Measure 1, 52.4 percent of grantees met the target. On Performance Measures 2 through 4, 18.2 percent of grantees, 38.5 percent of grantees, and 18.2 percent of grantees, respectively, met the target. Note that grantees were only required to report on measures applicable to the populations served, and, therefore, not all grantees reported on each performance measure.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Recognizing education success, professional excellence, and collaborative teaching (Proposed legislation)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: To be determined

Budget Authority:

<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
0	\$5,000,000	+\$5,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Recognizing Education Success, Professional Excellence, and Collaborative Teaching (RESPECT) Project would provide significant, one-time support for educators across the country to directly address the needs identified by educators in a changing school environment, including support for transitioning to new college- and career-ready (CCR) standards while adapting to new educator evaluation systems. With so many demands placed on teachers and school leaders, districts, States, and the Federal Government must do more to meet educators' needs at important stages of their careers. Educators are making clear that, to be successful, they need greater support that is both comprehensive and targeted to their needs.

RESPECT would support competitive grants to States and districts—alone or in partnership with nonprofit organizations, including teacher and administrator organizations, or institutions of higher education (IHEs)—that propose ambitious plans to address needs educators are asking for: improving teacher and principal preparation and support early in their careers; providing career ladders and other opportunities for educators to take on leadership roles as they transition to CCR standards; and creating conditions in schools that support effective teaching, including great school leadership and time for collaboration.

The Department would reserve up to 0.5 percent of RESPECT funds to provide technical assistance and share best practices on recruitment, preparation, early career support, master educator positions, school leadership, and professional collaboration. These efforts would be coordinated with existing resources, such as the Comprehensive Centers, the Teacher Incentive Fund's technical assistance centers, and the Reform Support Network, and proposed programs like Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants, ConnectEDucators, and the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund. The RESPECT proposal also builds on existing reforms initiated through Race to the Top, the Teacher Incentive Fund, and ESEA flexibility activities. These reforms have already increased the focus on the importance of supporting educators across their careers so they can perform their best for students.

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Recognizing education success, professional excellence, and collaborative teaching

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is proposing to authorize \$5 billion in one-time mandatory funding for the RESPECT Project, which was developed following extensive outreach with educators and listening sessions in schools and communities across the country that identified the highest priority needs for transforming the teaching profession. RESPECT would focus on improving preparation and early career assistance; ensuring that educators have opportunities to develop, advance, and lead as they transition to CCR standards; and ensuring that teachers have a supportive work environment.

Improving Teacher and Principal Preparation and Early Career Support

Surveys and other feedback make clear that most educators leave their preparation programs ill-prepared for the classroom, with much professional development taking place on-the-job without adequate support and mentorship. This all too common sink-or-swim experience helps explain why it is particularly difficult to find talented teachers and leaders in certain schools and subjects, since such support and mentorship is least likely to be available in high-poverty districts and schools or in high-need subjects like mathematics and science. RESPECT would help States and districts address these problems through better preservice preparation, including the development and expansion of high-quality pathways into teaching and school leadership that provide sufficient clinical experiences, such as residency programs. The program also would provide incentives for States to eliminate or improve low-performing teacher preparation programs, as informed by educator evaluation ratings and alumni feedback. Another potential reform would be better aligning educator preparation program standards and educator evaluation systems so that educators are prepared and evaluated using the same criteria centered on instruction and student learning. Grantees could also partner with IHEs and nonprofit organizations to recruit and prepare educators to better provide instruction aligned with CCR standards, use student data to inform instruction, and address local shortages of effective teachers and leaders (for example, the need for highly qualified mathematics teachers or principals trained to turn around low-performing schools) so that preparation programs are aligned with the needs of schools and districts. RESPECT grantees could also propose comprehensive ways to support teachers and leaders early in their careers through induction and mentoring programs that provide new educators with personalized support and development, including sufficient in-school time for planning, collaboration, and reflection.

Strengthening Support for Implementation of CCR Standards

Teachers and principals are working hard to implement more rigorous standards for their students, but if CCR standards are going to succeed, educators will need to have more opportunities to take on leadership roles. RESPECT will support State and district efforts to create instructional leadership positions for effective educators who help other teachers improve student outcomes by delivering high-quality instruction aligned with CCR standards. These master teachers would take on additional responsibilities in their schools by designing and leading professional development, identifying high-quality instructional materials aligned with CCR standards, modeling strong lessons, working with data to help teachers understand student outcomes, and observing and providing feedback to help teachers improve. Teachers recruited to be master teachers would excel at teaching curriculum aligned with CCR standards,

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Recognizing education success, professional excellence, and collaborative teaching

especially in high-need settings, and would be provided with personalized training to ensure that they can effectively help other teachers improve instruction. Master teachers would be responsible for supporting other teachers in their schools to become more effective and, in return, would have opportunities to be recognized and rewarded for those additional responsibilities. Funding would also support States' and districts' efforts to provide teachers with personalized support and development opportunities in implementing CCR standards that are designed and driven by educators and informed by student and teacher data. Finally, RESPECT would support the development and implementation of new opportunities for educators to provide input into local curriculum and assessment choices, and to incorporate high-quality digital learning tools into instruction in order to improve practice and student learning.

Providing More Supportive Work Environments

Teachers often point to non-financial factors, such as a lack of strong school leadership, as reasons for leaving the education profession. In addition, teachers have articulated a need for more professional collaboration around shared challenges in their classrooms. RESPECT would support State and local efforts to improve working conditions in schools so that teachers and leaders can thrive in a cohesive, collaborative, and supportive environment that promotes respect and focuses on student learning. This would translate into stronger school leadership that supports effective teaching, increased opportunities for meaningful professional collaboration, and other necessary resources to foster teacher and student success. For example, States and districts could use RESPECT grant funds to improve school leadership by implementing leadership structures that allow principals to focus on improving instruction while allowing teachers to contribute to important decisions about their school, including staffing, professional development, and the structure of the school day. Another form of support for strong leadership could be coaching for school leaders to improve the educator evaluation process so that teachers' classroom observations are reflective of and aligned with actual practice and student learning, and that feedback for teachers is specific, actionable, and accompanied with relevant professional development opportunities that help teachers improve. RESPECT grants could also be used to help schools redesign the school day, week, and year to allow for increased planning and collaboration time for educators, hire coaches to foster collaborative work between teacher teams, and connect educators to communities of practice to improve instruction and retain highly effective educators.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>
Amount for new awards	\$4,975,000
Number of new awards	500-1000
Range of new awards	\$5,000-\$50,000
Number of teachers served	1,600,000
Technical assistance, training, outreach, and evaluation	\$25,000

INNOVATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

Recognizing education success, professional excellence, and collaborative teaching

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

The Department will establish goals and performance indicators to assess the impact of the RESPECT Project. The new goals and indicators would be aligned with information collected through State Report Cards under the Effective Teachers and Leaders State Grants program and focus on measures concerning educator preparation, support, retention of effective educators, and working conditions.