

Department of Education
EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED
Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language.....	A-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	A-4
Appropriation, Adjustments and Transfers.....	A-9
Summary of Changes.....	A-10
Authorizing Legislation.....	A-11
Appropriations History.....	A-12
Significant Items in FY 2015 Appropriations Reports.....	A-14
Summary of Request.....	A-15
Activities:	
Grants to local education agencies.....	A-19
School improvement grants.....	A-33
Striving readers.....	A-43
State agency programs:	
Migrant.....	A-48
Neglected and delinquent.....	A-54
Evaluation.....	A-60
Special programs for migrant students.....	A-65
State tables.....	A-74

*State tables reflecting 2015 allocations and 2016 estimates are posted on the Department's Web page at:
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/statetables/index.html>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

For carrying out [title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (referred to in this Act as “ESEA”) and] section 418A of the Higher Education Act of 1965 [(referred to in this Act as “HEA”), \$15,536,107,000, of which \$4,652,762,000 shall become available on July 1, 2015, and shall remain available through September 30, 2016, and of which \$10,841,177,000 shall become available on October 1, 2015, and shall remain available through September 30, 2016, for academic year 2015–2016:¹ *Provided*, That \$6,459,401,000 shall be for basic grants under section 1124 of the ESEA:² *Provided further*, That up to \$3,984,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary of Education (referred to in this title as “Secretary”) on October 1, 2014, to obtain annually updated local educational agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census:³ *Provided further*, That \$1,362,301,000 shall be for concentration grants under section 1124A of the ESEA:⁴ *Provided further*, That \$3,294,050,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA:⁵ *Provided further*, That \$3,294,050,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A of the ESEA:⁶ *Provided further*, That funds available under sections 1124, 1124A, 1125 and 1125A of the ESEA may be used to provide homeless children and youths with services not ordinarily provided to other students under those sections, including supporting the liaison designated pursuant to section 722(g)(1)(J)(ii) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, and providing transportation pursuant to section 722(g)(1)(J)(iii) of such Act:⁷ *Provided further*, That \$710,000 shall be to carry out sections 1501 and 1503 of the ESEA:⁸ *Provided further*, That \$505,756,000 shall be available for school improvement grants under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, which shall be allocated by the Secretary through the formula described in section 1003(g)(2) and shall be used consistent with the requirements of section 1003(g), except that State and local educational agencies may use such funds to serve any school eligible to receive assistance under part A of title I that has not made adequate yearly progress for at least 2 years or is in the State’s lowest

quintile of performance based on proficiency rates and, in the case of secondary schools, priority shall be given to those schools with graduation rates below 60 percent:⁹ *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 1003(g)(5)(C) of the ESEA, the Secretary may permit a State educational agency to establish an award period of up to 5 years for each participating local educational agency:¹⁰ *Provided further*, That funds available for school improvement grants for fiscal year 2014 and thereafter may be used by a local educational agency to implement a whole-school reform strategy for a school using an evidence-based strategy that ensures whole-school reform is undertaken in partnership with a strategy developer offering a whole-school reform program that is based on at least a moderate level of evidence that the program will have a statistically significant effect on student outcomes, including at least one well-designed or well-implemented experimental or quasi-experimental study:¹¹ *Provided further*, That funds available for school improvement grants may be used by a local educational agency to implement an alternative State-determined school improvement strategy that has been established by a State educational agency with the approval of the Secretary:¹² *Provided further*, That a local educational agency that is determined to be eligible for services under subpart 1 or 2 of part B of title VI of the ESEA may modify not more than one element of a school improvement grant model:¹³ *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 1003(g)(5)(A), each State educational agency may establish a maximum subgrant size of not more than \$2,000,000 for each participating school applicable to such funds:¹⁴ *Provided further*, That the Secretary may reserve up to 5 percent of the funds available for section 1003(g) of the ESEA to carry out activities to build State and local educational agency capacity to implement effectively the school improvement grants program:¹⁵ *Provided further*, That \$160,000,000 shall be available under section 1502 of the ESEA for a comprehensive literacy development and education program to advance literacy skills, including pre-literacy skills, reading, and writing, for students from birth through grade 12, including limited-English-proficient students and students with disabilities, of

which one-half of 1 percent shall be reserved for the Secretary of the Interior for such a program at schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Education, one-half of 1 percent shall be reserved for grants to the outlying areas for such a program, up to 5 percent may be reserved for national activities, and the remainder shall be used to award competitive grants to State educational agencies for such a program, of which a State educational agency may reserve up to 5 percent for State leadership activities, including technical assistance and training, data collection, reporting, and administration, and shall subgrant not less than 95 percent to local educational agencies or, in the case of early literacy, to local educational agencies or other nonprofit providers of early childhood education that partner with a public or private nonprofit organization or agency with a demonstrated record of effectiveness in improving the early literacy development of children from birth through kindergarten entry and in providing professional development in early literacy, giving priority to such agencies or other entities serving greater numbers or percentages of disadvantaged children:¹⁶ *Provided further*, That the State educational agency shall ensure that at least 15 percent of the subgranted funds are used to serve children from birth through age 5, 40 percent are used to serve students in kindergarten through grade 5, and 40 percent are used to serve students in middle and high school including an equitable distribution of funds between middle and high schools:¹⁷ *Provided further*, That eligible entities receiving subgrants from State educational agencies shall use such funds for services and activities that have the characteristics of effective literacy instruction through professional development, screening and assessment, targeted interventions for students reading below grade level and other research-based methods of improving classroom instruction and practice:¹⁸ *Provided further*, That \$37,474,000 shall be for carrying out section 418A of the HEA.] \$44,623,000.¹⁹ (*Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2015*.)

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, appropriations language 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.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>¹ [...of which \$4,652,762,000 shall become available on July 1, 2015, and shall remain available through September 30, 2016, and of which \$10,841,177,000 shall become available on October 1, 2015, and shall remain available through September 30, 2016, for academic year 2015–2016:]</p>	<p>This language provides for funds to be appropriated on a forward-funded basis for the Title I Basic Grants, Concentration Grants, Targeted Grants, Education Finance Incentive Grants, School Improvement Grants, State Agency Migrant and Neglected and Delinquent, and Striving Readers programs. The language also provides that a portion of the funds is available in an advance appropriation that becomes available for obligation on October 1 of the following fiscal year.</p>
<p>² [...<i>Provided</i>, That \$6,459,401,000 shall be for basic grants under section 1124 of the ESEA:]</p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Basic Grants.</p>
<p>³ [...<i>Provided further</i>, That up to \$3,984,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary of Education (referred to in this title as “Secretary”) on October 1, 2014, to obtain annually updated local educational agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census:]</p>	<p>This language makes available, on a current-funded basis, \$3,984,000 from Basic Grant funds to support continued work by the Census Bureau to update LEA-level poverty data.</p>
<p>⁴ [...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$1,362,301,000 shall be for concentration grants under section 1124A of the ESEA:]</p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Concentration Grants.</p>
<p>⁵ [...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$3,294,050,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA:]</p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Targeted Grants.</p>
<p>⁶ [...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$3,294,050,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A of the ESEA:]</p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Education Finance Incentive Grants.</p>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>⁷ [...<i>Provided further</i>, That funds available under sections 1124, 1124A, 1125 and 1125A of the ESEA may be used to provide homeless children and youths with services not ordinarily provided to other students under those sections, including supporting the liaison designated pursuant to section 722(g)(1)(J)(ii) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, and providing transportation pursuant to section 722(g)(1)(J)(iii) of such Act:</p>	<p>This language allows funds under Title I Part A of the ESEA to be used to provide homeless children and youths with services not ordinarily provided to other students under that program, including (1) supporting the local liaisons who are responsible for coordinating services to ensure that homeless children and youth enroll in school and have the opportunity to succeed academically under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; and (2) providing transportation as required under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to permit homeless students to remain in their schools of origin despite their residential instability.</p>
<p>⁸ [...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$710,000 shall be to carry out sections 1501 and 1503 of the ESEA:]</p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Evaluation.</p>
<p>⁹ [...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$505,756,000 shall be available for school improvement grants under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, which shall be allocated by the Secretary through the formula described in section 1003(g)(2) and shall be used consistent with the requirements of section 1003(g), except that State and local educational agencies may use such funds to serve any school eligible to receive assistance under part A of title I that has not made adequate yearly progress for at least 2 years or is in the State's lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates and, in the case of secondary schools, priority shall be given to those schools with graduation rates below 60 percent:]</p>	<p>This language expands eligibility for participation in the School Improvement Grants (SIG) program to schools that are eligible for but do not receive Title I Part A funds and meet certain requirements. The language also establishes a priority for secondary schools that have graduation rates below 60 percent.</p>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>10 [...<i>Provided further</i>, That notwithstanding section 1003(g)(5)(C) of the ESEA, the Secretary may permit a State educational agency to establish an award period of up to 5 years for each participating local educational agency:]</p>	<p>This language allows State educational agencies to make SIG awards of up to 5 years to local educational agencies.</p>
<p>11 [...<i>Provided further</i>, That funds available for school improvement grants for fiscal year 2014 and thereafter may be used by a local educational agency to implement a whole-school reform strategy for a school using an evidence-based strategy that ensures whole-school reform is undertaken in partnership with a strategy developer offering a whole-school reform program that is based on at least a moderate level of evidence that the program will have a statistically significant effect on student outcomes, including at least one well-designed or well-implemented experimental or quasi-experimental study:]</p>	<p>This language allows local educational agencies to use SIG funds to implement, in partnership with a strategy developer, whole school reform strategies that meet specific standards of evidence of effectiveness.</p>
<p>12 [...<i>Provided further</i>, That funds available for school improvement grants may be used by a local educational agency to implement an alternative State-determined school improvement strategy that has been established by a State educational agency with the approval of the Secretary:]</p>	<p>This language allows local educational agencies to use SIG funds to implement an alternative school improvement strategy that has been established by the State educational agency and approved by the Secretary.</p>
<p>13 [...<i>Provided further</i>, That a local educational agency that is determined to be eligible for services under subpart 1 or 2 of part B of title VI of the ESEA may modify not more than one element of a school improvement grant model:]</p>	<p>This language allows local educational agencies that are eligible to receive funds and services under the Rural Education program to modify not more than one element of a SIG model.</p>
<p>14 [...<i>Provided further</i>, That notwithstanding section 1003(g)(5)(A), each State educational agency may establish a maximum subgrant size of not more than \$2,000,000 for each participating school applicable to such funds:]</p>	<p>This language overrides the statutory cap on the maximum per-school subgrant size for subgrants made by States under the SIG program.</p>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>¹⁵ [...<i>Provided further</i>, That the Secretary may reserve up to 5 percent of the funds available for section 1003(g) of the ESEA to carry out activities to build State and local educational agency capacity to implement effectively the school improvement grants program:]</p>	<p>This language authorizes the Secretary to reserve up to 5 percent of the funds appropriated for the SIG program for capacity-building.</p>
<p>¹⁶ [...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$160,000,000 shall be available under section 1502 of the ESEA for a comprehensive literacy development and education program to advance literacy skills, including pre-literacy skills, reading, and writing, for students from birth through grade 12, including limited-English-proficient students and students with disabilities, of which one-half of 1 percent shall be reserved for the Secretary of the Interior for such a program at schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Education, one-half of 1 percent shall be reserved for grants to the outlying areas for such a program, up to 5 percent may be reserved for national activities, and the remainder shall be used to award competitive grants to State educational agencies for such a program, of which a State educational agency may reserve up to 5 percent for State leadership activities, including technical assistance and training, data collection, reporting, and administration, and shall subgrant not less than 95 percent to local educational agencies or, in the case of early literacy, to local educational agencies or other nonprofit providers of early childhood education that partner with a public or private nonprofit organization or agency with a demonstrated record of effectiveness in improving the early literacy development of children from birth through kindergarten entry and in providing professional development in early literacy, giving priority to such agencies or other entities serving greater numbers or percentages of disadvantaged children:]</p>	<p>This language provides funding for a Striving Readers program that serves students from birth through grade 12; provides a portion of the funds to the Department of Interior/Bureau of Indian Education and the Outlying Areas; establishes the amount the Department may reserve for national activities; and establishes the amount the Department must distribute through competitive awards to States. The language also specifies the amount of funds that States receiving competitive awards may reserve for State leadership activities and the amount of funds that they award through subgrants to local educational agencies or to nonprofit organizations that provide early childhood education services.</p>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>¹⁷ [...<i>Provided further</i>, That the State educational agency shall ensure that at least 15 percent of the subgranted funds are used to serve children from birth through age 5, 40 percent are used to serve students in kindergarten through grade 5, and 40 percent are used to serve students in middle and high school including an equitable distribution of funds between middle and high schools:]</p>	<p>This language establishes that States must use particular amounts of Striving Readers funds to support projects serving children in specific age groups or grades.</p>
<p>¹⁸ [...<i>Provided further</i>, That eligible entities receiving subgrants from State educational agencies shall use such funds for services and activities that have the characteristics of effective literacy instruction through professional development, screening and assessment, targeted interventions for students reading below grade level and other research-based methods of improving classroom instruction and practice:</p>	<p>This language establishes requirements for the types of activities that entities may conduct with their Striving Readers funds.</p>
<p>¹⁹ <i>Provided further</i>, That \$37,474,000 shall be for carrying out section 418A of the HEA.] <u>\$44,623,000.</u></p>	<p>This language provides funding for Special Programs for Migrant Students.</p>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriation, Adjustments and Transfers
(dollars in thousands)

Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers	2014	2015	2016
<hr/>			
Discretionary:			
Appropriation	\$15,552,693	\$15,536,107	\$16,592,546
Advance:			
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	-10,841,177	-10,841,177	-10,841,177
Advance from prior year.....	<u>10,841,177</u>	<u>10,841,177</u>	<u>10,841,177</u>
Total, budget authority.....	15,552,693	15,536,107	16,592,546

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Changes
(dollars in thousands)

2015.....	\$15,536,107
2016.....	<u>16,592,546</u>
Net change	+1,056,439

Increases:	<u>2015 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
Increase funding for <u>Title I Grants to LEAs</u> to increase State and district capacity and support for statewide reforms.	\$14,409,802	+\$1,000,000
Increase funding for <u>School Improvement Grants</u> for new grants to States based on their records of making subgrants to LEAs for evidence-based interventions; States would in turn use the funds for new subgrants for such interventions or for school closures.	505,756	+50,000
Increase funding for <u>Special Programs for Migrant Students</u> to expand the number of new High School Equivalency and College Assistance Migrant projects and increase the number of migrant individuals obtaining a high school equivalency certificate or completing their first year of postsecondary education.	37,474	<u>+7,149</u>
Subtotal, increases		+1,057,149
 Decreases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
Eliminate separate funding for <u>Evaluation</u> in favor of expanding the ESEA pooled evaluation authority first authorized in the fiscal year 2014 appropriations act for the Department of Education and continued in fiscal year 2015.	710	<u>-710</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-710
Net change		+1,056,439

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Authorizing Legislation

(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2015 Authorized	2015 Estimate	2016 Authorized	2016 Request
Grants to local educational agencies (<i>ESEA-1-A</i>):				
LEA grants formulas:	0 ¹		To be determined ¹	
Basic grants (<i>Section 1124</i>)	(2)	\$6,459,401	(2)	\$6,459,401
Concentration grants (<i>Section 1124A</i>)	(2)	1,362,301	(2)	1,362,301
Targeted grants (<i>Section 1125</i>)	(2)	3,294,050	(2)	3,794,050
Education finance incentive grants (<i>Section 1125A</i>)	(2)	3,294,050	(2)	3,794,050
School improvement grants (<i>ESEA Section 1003(g)</i>)	0 ¹	505,756	To be determined ¹	555,756
Striving Readers	0 ¹	160,000	To be determined	160,000
State agency programs:				
Migrant (<i>ESEA I-C</i>)	0 ¹	374,751	To be determined ¹	374,751
Neglected and delinquent (<i>ESEA I-D</i>)	0 ¹	47,614	To be determined ¹	47,614
Evaluation (<i>ESEA I-E-1501 and 1503</i>)	0 ¹	710	To be determined ¹	0
Special Programs for Migrant Students (<i>Higher Education Act 418A</i>)	<u>Indefinite</u>	<u>37,474</u>	<u>To be determined³</u>	<u>44,623</u>
 Total definite authorization	 0		 0	
 Total appropriation		 15,536,107		 16,592,546
Portion of request subject to reauthorization		15,498,633		16,592,546

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought for fiscal year 2016.

² Of the total funds appropriated for Grants to LEAs, an amount equal to the fiscal year 2001 appropriation of \$7,397,690 thousand is to be distributed through the Basic Grants formula. An amount equal to the fiscal year 2001 appropriation of \$1,365,031 thousand is to be distributed through the Concentration Grants formula. Amounts appropriated in excess of the fiscal year 2001 appropriation are to be distributed through the Targeted Grants formula. In recent years, Congress specified the amounts to be distributed through each formula in the annual appropriations acts.

³ The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2015; reauthorizing legislation is sought for fiscal year 2016.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2007 (2007 Advance for 2008)	\$16,469,541 (7,383,301)	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	\$14,725,593 (7,383,301)
2008 (2008 Advance for 2009)	16,689,090 (7,383,301)	\$15,969,818 (8,136,218)	\$15,867,778 (8,867,301)	15,489,476 (7,934,756)
2009 (2009 Advance for 2010) Recovery Act Supplemental (PL 111-5)	16,917,059 (7,934,756) 0	15,788,285 ² (10,841,176) 13,000,000	15,735,884 ² (8,893,756) 12,400,000	15,760,086 (10,841,176) 13,000,000
2010 (2010 Advance for 2011)	16,431,632 (10,841,176)	15,938,215 (10,841,176)	15,891,132 ³ (10,841,176)	15,914,666 (10,841,176)
2011 (2011 Advance for 2012) Rescission (P.L. 112-74)	15,912,193 (11,681,897)	15,914,666 ⁴ (10,841,176)	16,726,579 ³ (10,841,176)	15,914,666 ⁵ (10,841,176) -(20,490) ⁶
2012 (2012 Advance for 2013)	16,253,026 (11,681,897)	15,949,319 ⁷ (13,279,177)	15,741,703 ⁷ (10,841,177)	15,741,703 (10,841,177)
2013 (2013 Advance for 2014)	15,558,649 (11,681,898)	15,208,151 ⁸ (10,841,177)	15,840,103 ⁸ (10,841,177)	14,921,636 (10,841,177)
2014 (2014 Advance for 2015)	15,683,649 (11,681,898)	N/A ⁹	15,875,231 ³ (10,841,177)	15,552,693 (10,841,177)
2015 (2015 Advance for 2016)	15,377,965 (11,681,898)	N/A ⁹	15,566,226 ¹⁰ (10,841,177)	15,536,107 (10,841,177)
2016 (2016 Advance for 2017)	16,592,546 (10,841,177)			

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

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

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

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

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

⁶ The level for rescission reflects the continuing resolution (P.L. 111-322) passed December 22, 2010.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriations History—continued

⁸ 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.

⁹ The House allowance is shown as N/A because there was no Subcommittee action.

¹⁰ The level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Subcommittee action only.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Significant Items in FY 2015 Appropriations Reports

School Improvement Grants

Manager's
Statement:

With regard to the School Improvement Grants (SIG) program, the Department's proposed implementation of bill language that allows local educational agencies (LEAs) to implement a State-determined school improvement strategy falls short of Congressional intent. Several new bill language provisions provide flexibility from the existing prescriptive SIG requirements, so that LEAs will have the opportunity to implement alternative strategies beyond those previously required by the Department. However, the Department's Notice of Proposed Requirements would require a State-determined intervention strategy to be aligned with turnaround principles, as well as impose seven additional requirements on the State-determined strategy. The Department shall ensure that any Final Requirements for the SIG program strictly adhere to bill language which stipulates that LEAs may implement an alternative State-determined school improvement strategy that has been established by a State educational agency (SEA) with the approval of the Secretary. In addition, not later than 15 days prior to the publication of a Notice Inviting Applications to submit State-determined school improvement strategies, the Department shall brief the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, Committee on Education and the Workforce, and Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions on the Final Notice Inviting Applications.

Response:

The Department continues to consult with the Committees and is taking steps to ensure that the final requirements for the SIG program, which we expect to publish by February 2015, are consistent with Congressional intent as described.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2016 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

[Click here for accessible version.](#)

(in thousands of dollars)

Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	2014 Appropriation	2015 Appropriation	2016 President's Budget	2016 President's Budget Compared to 2015 Appropriation Amount	Percent
Education for the Disadvantaged						
1. Grants to local educational agencies (ESEA I-A):						
(a) Basic grants (section 1124)						
Annual appropriation	D	3,543,625	3,568,625	4,568,625	1,000,000	28.022%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	2,915,776	2,890,776	1,890,776	(1,000,000)	-34.593%
Subtotal		6,459,401	6,459,401	6,459,401	0	0.000%
(b) Concentration grants (section 1124A)						
Annual appropriation	D	0	0	0	0	---
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	1,362,301	1,362,301	1,362,301	0	0.000%
Subtotal		1,362,301	1,362,301	1,362,301	0	0.000%
(c) Targeted grants (section 1125)						
Annual appropriation	D	0	0	0	0	---
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	3,281,550	3,294,050	3,794,050	500,000	15.179%
Subtotal		3,281,550	3,294,050	3,794,050	500,000	15.179%
(d) Education finance incentive grants (section 1125A)						
Annual appropriation	D	0	0	0	0	---
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	3,281,550	3,294,050	3,794,050	500,000	15.179%
Subtotal		3,281,550	3,294,050	3,794,050	500,000	15.179%
Subtotal, Grants to LEAs		14,384,802	14,409,802	15,409,802	1,000,000	6.940%
Annual appropriation	D	3,543,625	3,568,625	4,568,625	1,000,000	28.022%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	10,841,177	10,841,177	10,841,177	0	0.000%
2. School improvement grants (ESEA section 1003(g)):						
	D	505,756	505,756	555,756	50,000	9.886%
3. Striving readers (ESEA I-E, section 1502)						
	D	158,000	160,000	160,000	0	0.000%

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

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.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2016 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

[Click here for accessible version.](#)

Education for the Disadvantaged (continued)

4. State agency programs:						
(a) Migrant (ESEA I-C)	D	374,751	374,751	374,751	0	0.000%
(b) Neglected and delinquent (ESEA I-D)	D	47,614	47,614	47,614	0	0.000%
Subtotal		422,365	422,365	422,365	0	0.000%
5. Evaluation (ESEA sections 1501 and 1503)	D	880	710	0	(710)	-100.000%
6. Special programs for migrant students (HEA IV-A-5)	D	34,623	37,474	44,623	7,149	19.077%
7. High school graduation initiative (ESEA I-H)	D	46,267	0	0	0	---
Total, Appropriation	D	15,552,693	15,536,107	16,592,546	1,056,439	6.800%
Total, Budget authority	D	15,552,693	15,536,107	16,592,546	1,056,439	6.800%
Current		4,711,516	4,694,930	5,751,369	1,056,439	22.502%
Prior year's advance		10,841,177	10,841,177	10,841,177	0	0.000%

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

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.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Request

The programs in the Education for the Disadvantaged account provide the foundation for school improvement efforts needed to ensure that all children receive a high-quality education. The Administration is requesting a total of \$16.6 billion in fiscal year 2016 for the programs in this account. Most of the programs in the account are authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and are, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year.

The \$15.4 billion request (\$1 billion more than the 2015 level) for Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) would provide support to States and districts to increase their capacity to implement key reforms. The increase also recognizes the challenges that States, school districts, and schools have faced in recent years in ensuring that an increasing number of students served under the program meet challenging new college- and career-ready standards (CCR). In addition, the request would build State capacity, through an increase in the State-level set-aside of Title I funds from 1 percent to 3 percent, to lead critical reforms, primarily under the ESEA flexibility requests that more than 40 States are implementing in the areas of CCR standards and aligned assessments, rigorous systems of differentiated accountability and support for low-performing schools, and educator evaluation systems. Finally, the request includes an Equity and Outcomes Pilot that would allow up to 10 districts to use Title I and other Federal formula funds more flexibly at the district level to support comprehensive, evidence-based plans to improve achievement and outcomes for their lowest-achieving students in their high-poverty schools. In exchange for this flexibility, districts would have to demonstrate that they are equitably distributing State, local, and Federal dollars—based on actual expenditures—to their highest poverty schools.

The 2016 request also includes \$555.8 million for School Improvement Grants, which primarily provides formula funding to States to assist LEAs in implementing rigorous intervention models in schools that, in general: (1) are in the bottom 5 percent of schools in the State in terms of student achievement; or (2) in the case of secondary schools, have graduation rates below 60 percent. Formula funds would be used by States primarily to continue subgrants made under new program requirements which, among other things, allow LEAs to implement intervention models beyond those currently authorized, including evidence-based whole-school reform models, a State-determined model approved by the Department, and models that include a focus on early learning. The request for School Improvement Grants also includes \$50 million in new competitive funding that would be awarded to States based on their records of making subgrants to LEAs for evidence-based interventions, and States would in turn use the funds for new subgrants for such interventions or for school closures.

The \$160.0 million request for Striving Readers would support grants to LEAs to provide targeted, evidence-based literacy intervention for children from birth through grade 8. Grantees would implement interventions to increase student literacy achievement in high-need schools in at least two grades, based on a required needs assessment.

The request for Special Programs for Migrant Students provides a \$7.1 million increase for the program in recognition of strong program performance supported by improvements in the areas of data quality and program management over the past several years. The increase would not only support a larger number of new grant awards for two successful programs but also would allow the Department to bring parity to the base amount of funds used for each program.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Request - continued

The request would fund the other programs in this account at the same level as in 2015, providing \$374.8 million for the State agency Migrant program and \$47.6 million for the State agency Neglected and Delinquent program.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2016 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget authority:

	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>Change</u>
Basic grants	\$6,459,401	\$6,459,401	0
Concentration grants	1,362,301	1,362,301	0
Targeted grants	3,294,050	3,294,050	+\$500,000
Education finance incentive grants	<u>3,294,050</u>	<u>3,294,050</u>	<u>+500,000</u>
Total	14,409,802	15,409,802	0
Annual appropriation	3,568,625	4,568,625	+1,000,000
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	10,841,177	10,841,177	0

¹The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2016.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) provide supplemental education funding, especially in high-poverty areas, for local programs that provide extra academic support to help raise the achievement of students at risk of educational failure or, in the case of schoolwide programs, to help all students in high-poverty schools meet challenging State academic standards. The program serves an estimated 23.8 million students in 84 percent of school districts and more than half of all public schools—including 68 percent of the Nation’s elementary schools.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) gives school districts and schools considerable flexibility in using Title I dollars to support instructional strategies and methods that best meet local needs. Title I schools help students reach challenging State standards through one of two models: a “targeted assistance” model that supplements the regular education program for individual children deemed most in need of special assistance, or a “schoolwide” model that allows schools to use Title I funds—in combination with other Federal, State, and local funds—to improve the overall instructional program for all children in a school. Schools in which poor children account for at least 40 percent of enrollment are eligible to operate schoolwide programs, and in the 2012-2013 school year States reported that 40,632 schools, or 74 percent of all Title I schools, operated these programs, which accounted for approximately 94 percent of participating students.

The ESEA encourages the use of Title I funds for effective educational practices. Both schoolwide and targeted assistance programs must employ effective methods and instructional

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

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

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

STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

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

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

States must administer their reading and mathematics assessments annually to all students in grades 3-8 and once in high school. States also are required to assess annually the English proficiency of English Learner (EL) students, while science assessments must be administered annually in each of three grade spans specified in the law. Finally, to provide a uniform benchmark for comparing student achievement gains nationwide, the ESEA requires biennial State participation in the reading and mathematics assessments for 4th- and 8th-graders conducted by the National Assessment of Educational Progress.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Under the statute, State assessments are used to hold LEAs and schools accountable for making adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward State standards for proficiency in reading and math, with the goal of ensuring that all students are proficient in both subjects by the end of the 2013-2014 school year. For a school to make AYP, all students, including those in statutorily specified groups—economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and EL students—must meet the same annual statewide measurable objectives. However, the Department has taken a number of actions, most recently through ESEA Flexibility, to give States additional flexibility regarding AYP determinations, in

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

part because such determinations are no longer meaningful when 100 percent of students must be proficient to make AYP.

Similarly, the statutory Title I accountability and school improvement provisions, which require rigidly escalating improvement measures over time for schools that continue to miss AYP targets, have become increasingly unworkable because they no longer differentiate meaningfully between schools that miss performance targets in one or two areas (e.g., one subject, grade, or subgroup) and those that miss AYP for nearly all subjects, grades, and subgroups. It makes little sense to subject both sets of schools to the same restructuring requirements (the final stage of improvement), yet that is the reality under NCLB for any school that consistently misses AYP, whether by an inch or by a mile. Moreover, none of the three stages of improvement under NCLB—improvement, corrective action, or restructuring—have demonstrated much success in turning around low-performing schools. Similarly the public school choice and supplemental educational services (SES), or tutoring, options provided to certain students in schools identified for improvement under NCLB have not proven effective, with few students taking advantage of choice options and few students seeing achievement gains following participation in SES. States also have struggled to use the required 4 percent reservation for school improvement effectively, particularly as the rapidly growing number of identified schools in recent years encouraged States to spread available funds thinly across many LEAs and schools.

HQT REQUIREMENTS

The highly qualified teacher (HQT) requirements of NCLB also are increasingly outdated and obsolete. Since the 2002-2003 school year, all newly hired teachers must be certified by the State (which may be through an alternative route to certification), hold at least a bachelor's degree, and pass a rigorous State test on subject knowledge and teaching skills. Veteran teachers were required to meet similar requirements. However, nearly all States have reported very high percentages of teachers (e.g., 98 percent) as highly qualified for the past several years, with little if any impact on student achievement.

ESEA FLEXIBILITY

The ESEA was scheduled for reauthorization in 2007 and is well into its second decade without modification to reflect State progress in implementing the law or new evidence about what works and what does not in State and local education reform policies. For example, the 2014 deadline under current law for ensuring that 100 percent of students are proficient in reading and mathematics meant that States would have been forced to identify nearly all of their Title I schools as missing adequate yearly progress targets and take punitive action under the law's school improvement designations. In addition, by 2011, 45 States and DC were engaged in transitioning to "next-generation accountability systems" based on college- and career-ready academic standards, new assessments aligned with those standards, differentiated approaches to LEA and school accountability that target resources to the lowest-performing LEAs and schools and those with the largest achievement gaps, and new systems for evaluating and supporting teachers and principals that are based in part on student growth.

In recognition of these challenges, and to support action already underway in many of the States, in September 2011, the Administration invited all States to request "ESEA flexibility," which offers States voluntary waivers of key provisions of current law in exchange for a

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

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

As of January 2015, 42 States, D.C., and Puerto Rico are approved for ESEA flexibility. Thirty-four of the approved States and D.C. began implementing new ESEA accountability systems that are more fair, flexible, and focused on students most at risk beginning in the 2012-2013 school year while the remaining States began implementation in the 2013-2014 or 2014-2015 school year. Waivers for all States currently approved for ESEA flexibility, other than Illinois, will expire at the end of the 2014-2015 school year, and the Department will begin processing requests in early 2015 for renewal of previously approved ESEA flexibility requests for up to an additional 4 years. Additional information on ESEA flexibility is available at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/index.html>.

ALLOCATIONS

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

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

In addition, the statute includes a separately authorized and funded Education Finance Incentive Grants (EFIG) formula. This formula uses State-level "equity" and "effort" factors to make allocations to States that are intended to encourage States to spend more on education and to

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

improve the equity of State funding systems. Once State allocations are determined, sub-allocations to the LEA level are based on a modified version of the Targeted Grants formula.

In determining allocations under each of the four formulas, the statute requires the use of annually updated Census Bureau estimates of the number of children from low-income families in each LEA. There is roughly a 2-year lag between the income year used for LEA poverty estimates and the fiscal year in which those estimates are used to make Title I allocations. For example, the fiscal year 2014 allocations were based on LEA poverty estimates for 2012. The Department transfers a small amount of funding from the annual Title I appropriation (approximately \$4.0 million) to the Census Bureau to finance the preparation of these LEA poverty estimates.

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

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

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)			
	<u>Basic Grants</u>	<u>Concentration Grants</u>	<u>Targeted Grants</u>	<u>Education Finance Incentive Grants</u>
2011	\$6,579,151	\$1,359,726	\$3,252,025	\$3,252,025
2012	6,577,904	1,365,031	3,288,126	3,288,126
2013	6,232,639	1,293,919	3,116,831	3,116,831
2014	6,459,401	1,362,301	3,281,550	3,281,550
2015	6,459,401	1,362,301	3,294,050	3,294,050

FY 2016 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is seeking an increase of \$1 billion (for a total of \$15.4 billion) for Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies in fiscal year 2016, or almost 7 percent over the 2015 level of \$14.4 billion. In its first 6 years, this Administration emphasized the importance of

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

competitive funding as a driver of systemic change, while at the same time supporting significant funding for Title I. Today, because of the partnership among districts, States, and the Federal Government, States across the Nation are pursuing important and difficult efforts to lift standards, support teachers, strengthen student assessments, and improve low-performing schools. These efforts require new resources across the Nation.

STRENGTHENING STATE CAPACITY

The request also includes changes designed to strengthen the Title I program. In particular, the Administration will seek appropriations language that would permit States to reserve up to 3 percent of their Title I, Part A allocations for State-level support of such activities as: (1) implementing rigorous standards and high-quality assessments, including helping teachers teach to the new standards; (2) using data more effectively to identify local needs and improve student outcomes; (3) improving capacity at the State and district levels to use technology to improve instruction; (4) coordinating with early learning programs to improve school readiness; and (5) carrying out effective family engagement strategies.

While most States approved for ESEA flexibility have made good progress in implementing their reform plans, their efforts have also highlighted the need for increased State capacity in key areas. For example, full and effective implementation of college- and career-ready standards and aligned assessments requires substantial support and intensive professional development for teachers and school leaders, who often report that they feel unprepared to teach to the new standards. States and districts are working to use new teacher and principal evaluation and support systems to identify and provide the resources and assistance educators need to ensure that students are learning to high standards, but this is hard work that requires constant adjustment and improvement. States and LEAs also need to build capacity in the area of school turnaround, including the identification and recruitment of principals ready to handle the specific challenges of running a turnaround school, the use of data systems to measure and guide turnaround efforts, and effective use of expanded learning time. States and LEAs can address some of these challenges by redirecting and improving the use of existing Federal, State, and local resources, but there also is a need for new funding to fill gaps in services and to provide support for the growing numbers of educationally disadvantaged students struggling to meet college- and career-ready standards.

EQUITY IN STATE AND LOCAL ALLOCATIONS

Improving equity in the distribution of education funding has been an important goal of Title I since it was first authorized in 1965. Research has consistently shown that districts with high concentrations of poverty face unique challenges in enabling all their children to succeed. For this reason, Title I provides additional funding targeted to high-poverty districts.

Title I funds are intended to add to an equitable base of State and local education funding for all public schools, including high-poverty schools. However, the effectiveness of the “comparability” requirement that is intended to ensure an equitable base of State and local funding is often undermined by the statutory exclusion of salary differentials based on years of employment in calculating personnel expenditures. Research has consistently shown that this exception allows districts to meet the Title I comparability requirement while providing a lower level of State and

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

local resources—as measured by actual expenditures—to high-poverty schools than to low-poverty schools. To end this inequity, the Administration proposes that Title I districts be required to ensure that each of their high-poverty schools receive per pupil State and local funding (based on actual personnel and non-personnel expenditures) at least equal to the average per-pupil amount provided to their low poverty schools. Districts would implement this change over a multi-year period.

EQUITY AND OUTCOMES PILOTS

Finally, to promote further a more equitable distribution of education resources as well as more effective uses of formula funds, the Administration will seek appropriations language to establish an Equity and Outcomes Pilot for up to 10 school districts. Districts that demonstrate fairness in the distribution of real dollars across schools would receive relief from fiscal and reporting requirements that can impede innovation in improving student outcomes. This will allow districts to focus their funding decisions on whether their efforts are closing achievement gaps and improving outcomes in high-poverty schools, rather than being driven by fiscal and other reporting requirements.

Participating districts would be required to demonstrate a commitment to equitably distribute dollars to their highest poverty schools, by showing that each Title I school receives \$X more per student than the average per pupil expenditures in non-Title I schools, where X is the school's Title I, Part A allocation divided by the number of students enrolled in the school. In effect, this test would require early adoption of the new, strengthened comparability requirement described above for State and local dollars, which would otherwise be phased in. In exchange, participating districts would receive broad flexibility from fiscal requirements, including a supplement-not-supplant requirement, for all of their schools, and could combine all sources of Federal formula funds to support a districtwide plan focused on improving outcomes for their lowest-achieving students. In addition, participating districts could request waivers of monitoring and reporting requirements that they believe interfere with their ability to promote improved student outcomes. This proposal is designed to incentivize and reward equity in the allocation of State and local education resources, and to respond to research suggesting that existing, complex fiscal and use-of-funds requirements encourages a “compliance culture” that can inhibit local flexibility and innovation.

For example, in many districts the majority of Title I funds are used for the same activities each year, in part because such expenditures may be easily tracked for accounting purposes and because they have been approved by auditors in the past, and not necessarily because the spending is part of a comprehensive plan to meet the educational needs of the lowest-achieving students Title I is intended to serve. Equity and Outcomes Pilots would allow district leaders who are committed to equity to focus on student outcomes by identifying and implementing evidence-based interventions in response to the needs of students rather than auditors. Pilot participants would identify, collect, and annually report on a robust range of performance measures linked to key student outcomes, such as student achievement and academic growth, closing achievement gaps, and high school graduation rates. Participating districts would also have the capacity to link these outcomes to expenditures at the school level to ensure their investments are serving the lowest-achieving students effectively.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

Districts that are selected to participate in the Equity and Outcomes Pilot would receive priority in the proposed Leveraging What Works competition, described in the Innovation and Improvement account, to accelerate implementation of evidence-based approaches that improve educational outcomes.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

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

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>
Allocations by LEA Poverty Rate:			
0-15%			
# of LEAs	4,862	4,828	4,828
Dollars	\$1,733,738	\$1,798,413	\$1,922,597
% of Total \$	12.28	12.71	12.70
# of Formula Eligible Children	1,719,237	1,741,709	1,741,709
0-15% \$ Per Formula Child	\$1,008	\$1,033	\$1,104
15-25%			
# of LEAs	4,655	4,583	4,583
Dollars	\$3,910,215	\$3,966,782	\$4,235,526
% of Total \$	27.71	28.04	27.99
# of Formula Eligible Children	3,492,301	3,487,419	3,487,419
15-25% \$ Per Formula Child	\$1,120	\$1,137	\$1,215
>25%			
# of LEAs	3,617	3,666	3,666
Dollars	\$8,469,898	\$8,378,908	\$8,974,861
% of Total \$	60.01	59.23	59.31
# of Formula Eligible Children	6,465,162	6,316,938	6,316,938
>25% \$ Per Formula Child	\$1,310	\$1,326	\$1,421
LEA Allocation Subtotal	\$14,113,851	\$14,144,103	\$15,132,984
BIA/Outlying Areas	143,808	144,058	154,058
N&D program (Part D, Subpart 2)	123,159	117,657	118,776
Census Updates	<u>3,984</u>	<u>3,984</u>	<u>3,984</u>
Grants to LEAs Total	14,384,802	14,409,802	15,409,802
Number of Schools receiving Title I funds:			
Schoolwide programs	40,632	40,632	40,632
Targeted assistance programs	<u>14,077</u>	<u>14,077</u>	<u>14,077</u>
Total	54,709	54,709	54,709
Number of Students served (in millions):			
Schoolwide programs	22.4	22.4	22.4
Targeted assistance programs	1.2	1.2	1.2
Non-public and N&D programs	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.2</u>
Total	23.8	23.8	23.8

Note: Descriptive data related to number of schools receiving Title I funds are from the 2012-13 school year Common Core of Data (CCD). Data on Title I status for NY are from the 2011-12 school year. Descriptive data related to numbers of students served are from the Consolidated State Performance Report (school year 2012-13).

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2016 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

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

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

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

Year	Target Percentage of Students Who Test At or Above Proficiency	Actual Percentage of Students Who Test At or Above Proficiency
2011	83.2%	61.3%
2012	88.8	59.7
2013	94.4	54.5
2014	100.0	
2015	100.0	
2016	100.0	

Additional information: Assessment data for 2013 show that the average proficiency rate in reading/language arts for economically disadvantaged students has continued to decline from the previous years. At this rate, less than half of economically disadvantaged students will be proficient in reading in 2014, well short of the ESEA’s current goal of 100 percent proficiency. The Department will support States in adjusting or replacing future years’ targets, as the more than 40 States implementing new systems of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support under ESEA flexibility transition to more rigorous standards and assessments.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

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

Year	Target Percentage of Students Who Test At or Above Proficiency	Actual Percentage of Students Who Test At or Above Proficiency
2011	82.1%	61.1%
2012	88.1	58.0
2013	94.0	51.9
2014	100.0	
2015	100.0	
2016	100.0	

Additional information: Assessment data for 2013 show that the average proficiency rate in mathematics for economically disadvantaged students has continued to decline from previous years. At this rate, less than half of economically disadvantaged students will be proficient in mathematics in 2014, well short of the ESEA's current goal of 100 percent proficiency. The Department will support States in adjusting or replacing future years' targets, as the more than 40 States implementing new systems of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support under ESEA flexibility transition to more rigorous standards and assessments.

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

Year	Target Gap in Proficiency Percentage Between Economically Disadvantaged Students and All Students	Actual Gap in Proficiency Percentage Between Economically Disadvantaged Students and All Students
2011	4.9%	10.7%
2012	3.3	10.6
2013	1.6	11.1
2014	0.0	
2015	0.0	
2016	0.0	

Additional information: The 2013 results show that the reading achievement gap is not on track to elimination by 2014, the year by which the current ESEA calls for all student groups to be proficient in reading/language arts (thus reducing the gap to zero). The Department will support States in adjusting or replacing future years' targets, as the more than 40 States implementing new systems of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support under ESEA flexibility transition to more rigorous standards and assessments.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

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

Year	Target Gap in Proficiency Percentage Between Economically Disadvantaged Students and All Students	Actual Gap in Proficiency Percentage Between Economically Disadvantaged Students and All Students
2011	4.8%	9.9%
2012	3.2	10.2
2013	1.6	11.0
2014	0.0	
2015	0.0	
2016	0.0	

Additional information: The 2013 results show that the mathematics gap continues to rise, all but ensuring the existence of a gap in 2014, the year by which the ESEA calls for all student groups to be proficient in math (thus reducing the gap to zero). The Department will support States in adjusting or replacing future years' targets, as the more than 40 States implementing new systems of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support under ESEA flexibility transition to more rigorous standards and assessments.

Efficiency Measure

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

Year	Target Number of Days	Actual Number of Days
2011	40.0	35.2
2012	40.0	32.3
2013	40.0	57.3
2014	40.0	
2015	40.0	
2016	40.0	

Assessment of progress: In 2012, the Department continued to outperform its target of completing State monitoring reports within 40 days of the conclusion of a site visit. Data for 2013 represent 3 monitoring visits under the traditional Title I, Part A monitoring protocol. The Department conducted an additional 35 monitoring reviews under ESEA flexibility (Part A monitoring) and those reports were completed in an average of 108.4 days. The increase in the average number of business days to complete monitoring reports was generally due to a more inquiry-based approach for ESEA flexibility monitoring, which was new for the Department and States. The Department will revise targets for future years once this transition is complete.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

Other Performance Information

The Title I Program at a Glance

In the 2012-2013 school year, the most recent year for which complete data are available, the Title I program served approximately 23.8 million students, or about 47 percent of the total student population. More detailed program information, compared to the overall public school population, is displayed in the tables below.

2012-2013 School Year

Student Group	# of Students, All Schools	# of Students, Title I Schools	% of students served by Title I
All	50,205,727	23,575,543	47%
American Indian	533,409	326,493	61
Asian/Pacific Islander	2,543,466	949,986	37
Black	7,798,620	5,141,834	66
Hispanic	12,498,176	8,604,609	69
White	25,367,182	7,967,842	31
Two or More Races	1,390,514	584,7779	42
Economically disadvantaged	25,587,412	16,931,250	66
English Learners	4,854,470	3,657,969	75
Students with disabilities	6,893,085	3,126,309	45

Additional information: In addition, data on the concentration of students eligible for free and reduced-price lunch show that Title I funds seem to be reaching the target schools and students. There are 20,480 schools where between 81 and 100 percent of the student population qualify for free or reduced-price lunch; 87 percent of those schools are served by Title I. Descriptive data related to counts of students from all schools are from the CCD, 2012-13 school year. Descriptive data related to counts of students in Title I Schools are from the Consolidated State Performance Report, 2012-13 school year. Total counts of students in Title I schools do not include students in non-public or Neglected and Delinquent programs.

2012-2013 School Year

Concentration ranges of students eligible for free and reduced-price lunch	# of Schools	# of Title I Schools	% Title I Schools
0-20%	13,688	3,081	23%
21-40%	18,014	5,842	32
41-60%	22,401	12,248	55
61-80%	20,634	15,194	74
81-100%	20,480	17,724	87

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

Additional information: Descriptive data related to the number of schools receiving Title I funds are from the CCD, 2012-13 school year. Data on Title I status for NY are from the 2011-12 school year.

National Assessment of Title I: Final Report

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

ESEA Flexibility Analysis

The Department also supports the development of State profiles, which are data analyses of States’ accountability systems under ESEA flexibility. The profiles examine the characteristics of schools identified by each SEA’s differentiated accountability system for the 2012-13 and 2013-14 school years, including the performance of all students and all subgroups based on, respectively, 2011-12 and 2012-13 student achievement and graduation rate data. The profiles are one tool that States can use to support continuous improvement, analyze whether their identification systems capture the lowest-performing schools and subgroups, and also will be used to provide greater public transparency around accountability systems under ESEA flexibility.

The Department released State profiles to 19 States, with 23 more profiles to be distributed by the end of February, 2015. Following a State review period, the Department will post the profiles on its Web site by March 2015.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2016 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget authority:

<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$505,756	\$555,756	+\$50,000

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2016.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) authorizes the Department to award grants to each State educational agency (SEA) based on the SEA's proportionate share of funds under ESEA Title I, Parts A, C, and D. Each SEA must use at least 95 percent of its allocation to make competitive subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to assist their Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under ESEA section 1116. In making subgrants, SEAs must give priority to LEAs demonstrating the greatest need for school improvement funding and the strongest commitment to providing the resources needed to help their lowest-performing schools successfully implement improvement plans. SEAs may use up to 5 percent of their School Improvement Grant (SIG) allocations for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance activities.

Since fiscal year 2012, appropriations acts have authorized the Department to reserve up to 5 percent of SIG funds to carry out activities to build SEA and LEA capacity to implement the SIG program effectively.

NEW SIG PROVISIONS IN FY 2014 AND 2015 APPROPRIATIONS ACTS

Through the fiscal year 2014 and 2015 appropriations acts, Congress made certain changes to the SIG program to encourage the adoption of evidence-based models for school improvement and to increase flexibility for SEAs and LEAs. Specifically, the acts allow an LEA to use SIG funds to implement (in addition to the four intervention models in current requirements described in more detail below): (1) a whole-school reform strategy in partnership with a strategy developer for which there is at least moderate evidence of effectiveness; or (2) an alternative State-determined school improvement strategy established by the SEA and approved by the Department. The appropriations acts also allow an LEA that is eligible for assistance under the Rural Education Achievement programs to modify one element of a SIG intervention model. In addition, they allow an SEA to establish an award period for its LEAs receiving SIG funds of up to 5 years. In September 2014, the Department proposed new requirements to implement the appropriations provisions, allow an additional intervention model designed to improve student outcomes by offering a high-quality preschool program and full-day kindergarten as part of an

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

integrated school turnaround strategy, and make other changes reflecting lessons learned from 5 years of SIG implementation under the current requirements (79 FR 53254).

The Department expects to publish final requirements by February 2015. In these final requirements, the Department intends to make two changes from the proposed requirements based on language in the fiscal year 2015 appropriations bill enacted in December 2014 and the accompanying Manager's Statement. First, the Department will align the requirement for evidence of effectiveness in the evidence-based, whole-school reform model with the definition of "moderate level of evidence" in the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), specifically by requiring that evidence of effectiveness include at least one study that meets the What Works Clearinghouse evidence standards, rather than two such studies. Second, the Department will provide more flexibility under the alternative State-determined model by requiring that an SEA's proposed model meet the definition of "whole-school reform model," rather than meet the turnaround principles under ESEA flexibility and include increased learning time.

2010 REQUIREMENTS

Congress first funded the SIG program in fiscal year 2007 with an initial appropriation of \$125 million, followed by a large increase to \$491 million in fiscal year 2008 and \$546.6 million in the regular 2009 appropriation. In addition, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act) provided \$3 billion for the SIG program, for a 2009 total of just over \$3.5 billion. The current SIG requirements, issued in final form in October 2010 (75 FR 66363), were aimed primarily at ensuring that the historic Recovery Act investment in the SIG program was used to implement rigorous school intervention models in the Nation's persistently lowest-achieving schools, including a significant number of high schools with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years.

DEFINING GREATEST NEED

A key purpose of the 2010 requirements was to establish criteria for SEAs to use in implementing the statutory priorities for awarding SIG funds to LEAs that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to ensuring that the funds are used to provide adequate resources to enable the lowest-performing schools to raise substantially the achievement of their students. To drive school improvement funds to LEAs with the greatest need, the SIG requirements incorporated the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" developed for use in the reporting required by the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund and in State plans for turning around their lowest-performing schools under Race to the Top. Persistently lowest-achieving schools are defined generally as: (1) the State's bottom 5 percent, in terms of academic achievement, of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; (2) the bottom 5 percent, in terms of academic achievement, of secondary schools in each State that are eligible for, but that do not receive, Title I, Part A funds; and (3) Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with graduation rates below 60 percent and other Title I-eligible secondary schools with graduation rates below 60 percent. In identifying schools in categories (1) and (2), States must take into account the academic achievement of the "all students" group in each school in terms of proficiency on ESEA reading/language arts and mathematics assessments combined, as well as that group's lack of progress on those

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

assessments. The “bottom 5 percent,” as used in the definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools, must include at least five schools.

To determine greatest need for the purposes of the SIG program, the 2010 requirements established three tiers of schools based on the definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools and the eligibility requirements of ESEA section 1003(g). Under the requirements, States have some flexibility in assigning schools to the three tiers, but in general must adhere to the following guidelines:

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

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

DEFINING STRONGEST COMMITMENT

SEAs also must determine which LEAs have the strongest commitment to using SIG funds for interventions that are most likely to turn around their lowest-performing schools and produce improved student outcomes. The 2010 requirements defined “strongest commitment” as a commitment by an LEA to use SIG funds to implement fully and effectively one of the following four school intervention models in each of its Tier I and Tier II schools. As discussed above, in September 2014, the Department proposed new requirements that would define “strongest commitment” as a commitment by an LEA to use SIG funds to implement in these schools, in addition to any one of these four intervention models, an evidence-based whole-school reform strategy, an alternative State-determined model, or an early learning model.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

The school intervention models in the 2010 requirements were as follows:

- The Turnaround model, which involves, among other things, replacing the principal and retaining no more than 50 percent of a school's staff, adopting a new governance structure, and implementing an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next, as well as aligned with a State's academic standards.
- The Restart model, which requires an LEA to convert a school to a charter school or close and reopen it under the management of a charter school operator, a charter management organization, or an education management organization that has been selected through a rigorous review process.
- School Closure, which involves closing a school and enrolling its students in other, higher-achieving schools in the LEA.
- The Transformation model, which addresses four specific areas critical to transforming the lowest-performing schools, including developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness (including by replacing the principal), comprehensive instructional reform strategies, increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools, and providing operational flexibility and sustained support.

AWARDING SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS TO LEAS

In awarding a SIG grant to an eligible LEA, an SEA must provide sufficient funding to the LEA to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA applies to serve, as well as for any participating Tier III schools the LEA seeks to serve. Further, an SEA must award funds for each Tier I and Tier II school that its LEA applies for and has the capacity to serve before it awards funding to LEAs to serve Tier III schools. LEAs may receive up to \$2 million annually for each school it will serve with SIG funds; implementing the School Closure model generally requires only modest funding (e.g., \$50,000 to \$100,000) and is implemented in just 1 year.

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

SIG UNDER ESEA FLEXIBILITY

Through ESEA flexibility, the Department has provided 42 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico with flexibility from key requirements of the ESEA in exchange for implementing rigorous reforms designed to increase academic achievement and improve teaching for all students. Among other commitments an SEA must make, an SEA with ESEA flexibility must commit to identifying a group of low-achieving schools as "priority schools" and to ensuring that their LEAs implement rigorous interventions in those schools. Both the schools that are

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

identified as priority schools and the interventions they must implement are closely aligned with the SIG program. In particular, a priority school must be: (1) a Title I school in the State's bottom five percent based on academic achievement; (2) a SIG-served Tier I or Tier II school; or (3) a Title I-participating or Title I-eligible secondary school that has had a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years. The interventions a priority school must implement are closely aligned with the transformation model, but include some additional flexibility (for example, under specific circumstances and after SEA review, the school may not be required to replace the principal).

In recognition of the close relationship between priority schools in ESEA flexibility and SIG, the Department has granted a waiver to a number of SEAs that are implementing ESEA flexibility to allow them to replace their lists of SIG Tier I, II, and III schools, for the purpose of making new SIG awards, with their lists of priority schools under ESEA flexibility and to provide funds to LEAs to carry out one of the SIG intervention models in those schools. The proposed requirements that were issued in September 2014 would also require an SEA with ESEA flexibility to use its lists of priority and focus schools (generally, schools with the largest achievement gaps) as its list of SIG-eligible schools.

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

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

	(dollars in thousands)
2011	\$534,562
2012	533,552
2013	505,756
2014	505,756
2015	505,756

FY 2016 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$555.8 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year 2016, an increase of \$50 million over the fiscal year 2015 level. The additional funds would support new competitive grants that build on Congress's support for the use of evidence-based interventions in the SIG program. Specifically, the Department would award additional funds to SEAs based on the extent to which they have made or are making SIG subgrants to LEAs to support implementation of strategies that fit within the tiered evidence framework in EDGAR. This framework has four tiers of evidence: strong evidence of effectiveness, moderate evidence of effectiveness, evidence of promise, and the high potential of effectiveness as reflected in a strong theory. The Department would give priority to SEAs supporting strategies with at least moderate evidence of effectiveness, and, in particular, evidence-based whole-school reform models as authorized by Congress. SEAs would use their awards to make new subgrants to LEAs to implement these strategies or school closures in their lowest-achieving schools. The

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

Department would also give priority to SEAs that seek funds to serve high schools with persistently low graduation rates.

The Administration's support for evidence-based interventions in SIG reflects a larger commitment to evidence-based policymaking across the President's Budget. In the context of SIG, the record is now clear that some approaches work better than others. SIG funds can support, for example, reforms demonstrated to have positive impacts through research that meets What Works Clearinghouse evidence standards, including the KIPP charter schools¹ in Memphis and New Orleans, the small schools of choice² created in New York City and elsewhere, and the Success for All reform model.³ The purpose of the competitive add-on is to further encourage the use of these effective methods, with both existing and new funding.

The request also includes \$505.8 million, the same as the 2015 level, for the State formula grant program. These formula grants continue to play a critical role in efforts to implement rigorous interventions in the Nation's lowest-performing schools. Funds would be used by SEAs primarily to continue subgrants made with fiscal year 2014 or 2015 funds under new program requirements consistent with the fiscal year 2014 and 2015 appropriations acts.

The Department would continue to use up to 5 percent of SIG formula grant funds to support a range of national activities to improve State and local capacity to implement the program. For example, the Department may use a portion of fiscal year 2016 national activities funds to make new awards under the Turnaround School Leaders program, which the Department initiated in 2014 using fiscal year 2013 SIG national activities funds and which provides 3-year grants to LEAs to help ensure that leaders of schools eligible for or receiving SIG funds possess the specialized skills needed to drive successful efforts to turn those schools around. The Department may also use a portion of the national activities funds to support rapid-cycle evaluation to determine the effectiveness of low-cost, technology-based interventions, such as the use of text messages designed to increase parent engagement and student achievement by notifying parents about their students' attendance patterns or school assignments.

¹ Tuttle, C. C., Gill, B., Gleason, P., Knechtel, V., Nichols-Barrer, I., & Resch, A. (2013). KIPP middle schools: Impacts on achievement and other outcomes, final report. Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research.

² Howard S. Bloom, Saskia Levy Thompson, Rebecca Unterman. "Transforming the High School Experience: How New York City's New Small Schools Are Boosting Student Achievement and Graduation Rates." New York, NY: MDRC, June 2010.

³ Borman, G. D., Slavin, R. E., Cheung, A., Chamberlain, A., Madden, N., & Chambers, B. (2006). Final reading outcomes of the national randomized field trial of Success for All. Retrieved from Success for All website: http://www.successforall.net/images/pdfs/Third_Year_Results_06.doc.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>
State Formula Grants			
Amount to States	\$475,958	\$475,958	\$475,958
Range of State awards	1,093-59,959	1,096-59,464	1,104-59,274
Average State award	9,153	9,153	9,153
Amount to BIE	3,091	3,187	3,200
Amount to Outlying Areas	1,419	1,323	1,329
Evidence-Based Competitive Grants			
Amount for awards	0	0	\$49,500
Number of awards	0	0	5
Peer review of new award applications	0	0	\$500
National activities	\$25,288	\$25,288	\$25,288

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The regulatory requirements for the SIG program include reporting metrics intended to help the Department, States, and LEAs evaluate the effectiveness of the required interventions and to inform technical assistance activities. States must report to the Department on the LEAs that received SIG awards, the size of the awards, and the schools served by each LEA with SIG funds (including the level of support provided to each participating school). States also must report certain school-level information for each Tier I or Tier II school that is served with SIG funds, such as the intervention implemented in the school, student achievement levels, graduation and dropout rates, and data on teacher performance and school climate. The Department collects these data through its *EDFacts* system.

NUMBERS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR AND RECEIVING SIG GRANTS

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

According to the study, in the fiscal year 2009 SIG competitions, States funded 514 Tier I schools, 312 Tier II schools, and 402 Tier III schools. Of the total of 1,228 schools served,

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

32 percent were elementary schools, 22 percent were middle schools, 40 percent were high schools, and 5 percent were “non-standard.” States made just over half of SIG awards to urban schools, about one-quarter to suburban schools, and about one-quarter to rural schools. High schools were particularly likely to be funded, receiving 40 percent of SIG awards while constituting just 19 percent of eligible schools. Rural schools also competed successfully, receiving almost a quarter of awards despite constituting only one-fifth of eligible schools. The following table compares SIG-eligible and SIG-awarded schools by grade range and school locale:

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

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

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

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

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

competitions was \$2.84 million, an increase of \$300,000 over the average for the first cohort; the average award among Tier III schools saw a similar increase, from \$520,000 for the first cohort to \$810,000 for the second.

In addition to the combined 1,303 Tier I and II schools served in the fiscal year 2009 and 2010 competitions, States reported awarding new grants to about 500 Tier I, Tier II, or priority schools in their 2011, 2012, and 2013 competitions. Consequently, as of the 2014-2015 school year, approximately 1,800 of the Nation's lowest-achieving schools that have implemented or are implementing rigorous interventions with the support of SIG funds.

IMPLEMENTATION OF SIG GRANTS

In November 2014, the Department began publishing, at <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/sigprofiles/index.html>, a set of quick-release profiles designed to accelerate dissemination of promising practices in the school turnaround field. These profiles are informed by interviews of selected States, LEAs, and schools receiving SIG funds and analyses of implementation data and address topics such as turnaround leadership, data-based decision-making, school climate, community engagement, and capacity building. A profile of Kit Carson International Academy in Las Vegas, Nevada, for instance, showed that efforts to increase learning time and make strategic improvements in literacy instruction have contributed to a 30 percentage point increase in proficiency on State reading assessments for the school over just 3 years. Remaining profiles are expected to be released on a rolling basis through April 2015.

The Department is also conducting a series of more detailed case studies of SIG implementation. The studies are designed to provide descriptively rich information on a carefully selected sample of 25 schools that began implementing SIG interventions in the 2010-2011 school year. A report with initial findings from the schools' first implementation year was published in May 2014 and is available at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20144015/pdf/20144015.pdf>. This report showed that the schools for which respondents described improvements in the greatest number of areas had higher levels of principal strategic leadership (referring to the ability of principals to formulate a strategy for school improvement and translate that strategy into concrete priorities and specific actions) and were more likely to have experienced a disruption from past practices (defined as visible changes on at least four of eight indicators relating to school operation); however, for most of the schools, respondents did not perceive their SIG grant as the primary impetus for the change strategies that had been adopted. In addition, the report found that the three improvement actions noted by respondents in the greatest number of schools were expanding professional development activities, replacing the principal, and increasing learning time.

The Department also released, in April 2014, two evaluation briefs focusing on case study schools that are rural or that serve high percentages of English learners. The brief on rural case study schools (available at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20144013/pdf/20144013.pdf>) indicated, among other things, that rural SIG schools faced challenges beyond those also reported by non-rural schools (such as low student motivation and staff morale) due to these schools' remote locations and large catchment areas, including challenges in the recruitment or retention of teachers and, to a lesser extent, parent involvement in the schools. The brief on case study

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

schools serving English learners (at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20144014/pdf/20144014.pdf>) found that the schools' approaches to improvement during initial implementation tended to include only limited to moderate attention to the unique needs of these students and that schools that appeared to provide stronger attention were more likely to report having school staff dedicated to English learner needs and more likely to be located in districts that reportedly provided expertise and an explicit focus on English learners within the context of SIG.

OUTCOMES OF SIG GRANTS

In February 2014, the Department published an analysis of State assessment results for schools receiving SIG funding from the fiscal year 2009 and 2010 competitions. Comparing, where data permit, schools' average proficiency rates in the 2011-2012 school year (the second year of SIG implementation for schools receiving fiscal year 2009 grants and the first implementation year for schools in the 2010 cohort) to their rates in the year prior to receiving SIG funds, the analysis found that, when compared to all schools nationally, 2009 cohort SIG schools showed slightly larger increases in proficiency rates in both reading/language arts and mathematics, while 2010 cohort schools showed slightly larger increases in reading/language arts but similar increases in mathematics. It is possible that the different rates of achievement reflect different baseline characteristics of the schools (e.g., SIG schools begin from lower levels of achievement) rather than the results of the SIG interventions. Consistent with the above-noted findings regarding disruption, the 2009 and 2010 cohort data also indicate that schools using the turnaround and restart models achieved greater math gains than schools using the transformation model, though the difference is modest and the cause is not clear.

The Department is also conducting a formal evaluation of the impact of school turnaround efforts in both the Race to the Top (RTT) and SIG programs. This evaluation involves collecting data from all 50 States and DC, as well as roughly 60 LEAs and 525 schools. The study will focus on (1) the implementation of RTT and SIG; (2) the relationship between receipt of RTT funds and student outcomes; (3) the impact of the receipt of SIG funds on student outcomes in the lowest-achieving schools; and (4) the relationship between the four school turnaround models (and related improvement strategies) and student outcomes and school performance. The Department released an initial brief from this evaluation in October 2014 (accessible at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20154001>) examining the adoption by SIG and non-SIG schools of improvement practices promoted under the program. According to the brief, schools implementing a SIG intervention model were more likely than low-performing schools not implementing a model to adopt practices for developing and increasing teacher and principal effectiveness, increasing learning time, and creating community-oriented schools. The first full evaluation report is scheduled for release in spring 2015.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2016 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$160,000	\$160,000	0

¹The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; reauthorizing language is sought for FY 2016.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Striving Readers program provides grants to eligible entities to support efforts to improve literacy instruction in high-need schools. In fiscal year 2010, Congress enacted appropriations language that changed Striving Readers from an adolescent literacy program to a comprehensive literacy development and education program intended to advance the literacy skills, including pre-literacy, reading, and writing skills, of students from birth through grade 12.

The 2010 appropriation included funding for both formula and competitive grants. From the appropriation, \$10 million supported formula grants to States for the establishment or support of a State Literacy Team with expertise in literacy development and education for children from birth through grade 12 to assist the State in developing a comprehensive literacy plan. Most remaining funds, or about \$176 million, were used to make competitive 5-year awards to six States: Georgia, Louisiana, Montana, Nevada, Pennsylvania, and Texas. The fiscal year 2011 appropriations act did not include funding for the Striving Readers program. The fiscal year 2012 appropriations act continued the program but did not include State formula grant funding. Fiscal year 2015 will be the fifth and final year of funding for the 2010 cohort of six States.

Each State educational agency (SEA) that receives a competitive grant must award at least 95 percent of its allocation competitively to local educational agencies (LEAs) or, for the purposes of providing early literacy services, to LEAs or other nonprofit providers of early childhood education that partner with a public or private nonprofit organization or agency with a demonstrated record of effectiveness in improving the early literacy development of children from birth through kindergarten entry and in providing professional development in early literacy. SEAs are required to: (1) give priority to such agencies or other entities serving greater numbers or percentages of disadvantaged children; and (2) ensure that at least 15 percent of the subgranted funds are used to serve children from birth through age 5, 40 percent to serve students in kindergarten through grade 5, and 40 percent to serve students in middle and high school. Further, States must equitably distribute funds between middle and high schools.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

An SEA may reserve up to 5 percent of its allocation for leadership activities, including technical assistance and training, data collection, reporting, and administration. Eligible entities receiving subgrants must use Striving Readers funds for services and activities that have the characteristics of effective literacy instruction; specific activities may include professional development, screening and assessment, targeted interventions for students reading below grade level, and other research-based methods of improving classroom instruction and practice.

The Department is required to reserve: (1) one-half of 1 percent for grants to the Department of the Interior/Bureau of Indian Education and one-half of 1 percent for the Outlying Areas, and may reserve up to 5 percent for national activities.

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

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

	(dollars in thousands)
2011.....	0
2012.....	\$159,698
2013.....	151,378
2014.....	158,000
2015.....	160,000

FY 2016 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration's fiscal year 2016 request includes \$160.0 million for Striving Readers, the same amount as the fiscal year 2015 level. In fiscal year 2016, the Administration will seek appropriations language allowing the Department to make competitive grants to LEAs, rather than SEAs, to support targeted, evidence-based literacy interventions in high-need schools. The 2016 request would support high-quality literacy programs aligned with college- and career-ready English language arts standards and would provide more flexible support for locally designed efforts to increase student achievement in high-need LEAs and schools. The Administration believes that its 2016 request would allow grantees to better meet local needs through the implementation of high-quality, developmentally appropriate literacy instruction.

The request also would allow the Department to make larger, more focused awards that would enable LEAs to provide the intensive required to ensure that students in high-need schools are reading at grade level. Grantees would have flexibility to target interventions based on local needs, but must serve at least two grades to increase the program's impact within selected schools, and may propose school-wide interventions. Grantees also must propose interventions that (1) meet the moderate evidence of effectiveness standard in the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) and (2) are aligned with the State's college- and career-ready English language arts standards.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

Research and assessment data provide strong justification for a continued Federal investment in a large-scale reading program based on scientific reading research. For example, according to the results of the 2013 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), nearly two-thirds of students in both fourth and eighth grades are not reading at grade level. The results also show wide achievement gaps in reading between students from low-income families (as defined by eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch) and students from higher-income families: 51 percent of fourth-grade students from higher-income families scored at or above the proficient reading level, compared with 18 percent of fourth-grade students eligible for free lunch and 30 percent of fourth-grade students eligible for reduced-price lunch. Similarly, for eighth-grade reading, 48 percent of students from higher-income families scored at or above the proficient reading level, compared with 19 percent of students eligible for free lunch and 30 percent of students eligible for reduced-price lunch.

Research also shows that students who fail to read well by fourth grade have a greater likelihood of dropping out and of a lifetime of diminished success. Further, the differences in the reading skills and knowledge of children from low-income families as compared to the skills and knowledge of children from higher-income families are dramatic. For example, the size of the working vocabulary of 4-year-old children from low-income families is approximately one-third that of children from middle-income families (Hart & Risley, 1995). Perhaps even more alarming, these early differences in children's skills persist over time. The NCES "Early Childhood Longitudinal Study," which follows the academic progress of children from kindergarten through 5th grade, has found, for example, that differences in children's reading skills and knowledge that are usually seen in later grades appear to be present as children begin school and persist after 1 or 2 years of school. In addition, because NAEP and other data clearly show that many students are reaching the later grades without having learned to read at the level necessary for understanding higher-level content, the Department believes that a new Striving Readers competition in fiscal year 2016 would continue to support efforts to improve adolescent literacy that respond to local needs.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>
Funding for continuation awards	\$155,667	\$155,662	0
Number of continuation awards	6	6	0
Funding for new awards	0	0	\$150,400
Number of new awards	0	0	15
Peer review of new award applications	0	0	\$1,600

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>
Amount for Bureau of Indian Education	\$790	\$800	\$800
Amount for Outlying Areas	\$790	\$800	\$800
National activities (including evaluation)	\$753	\$758	\$8,000

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents 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 2016 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

For awards made in fiscal year 2016, the Department would establish performance measures related to student academic growth on literacy assessments, disaggregated by subgroup.

The Department established the following performance measures for the 2010 Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy grant program: (1) the percentage of participating 4-year-old children who achieve significant gains in oral language skills; (2) the percentage of participating 5th-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.

All States are required to report on Performance Measure 1 above. States have the option of either reporting on Performance Measures 2, 3, and 4 above, or reporting proficiency rates for those same measures that include students who demonstrate adequate growth under the State's Department-approved growth model and are counted as meeting or exceeding proficiency for purposes of accountability determinations.

In 2013, 72 percent of participating 5th-grade students, 73 percent of participating 8th-grade students, and 69 percent of participating high school students met or exceeded proficiency on State reading or language arts assessments. The Department will have data on the first performance measure later in 2015.

Other Performance Information

Prior to 2010, when the program was an adolescent literacy program, all 16 Striving Readers adolescent literacy grantees conducted rigorous experimental evaluations of their supplemental literacy interventions for struggling readers. The eight 2006 grantees also conducted

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

experimental or quasi-experimental evaluations of their whole-school literacy-throughout-the-curriculum models for all students. In fall 2011, the Department released the year-4 evaluation reports for the 2006 grantees, which provided results from 4 years of implementation, including impact findings. Five of the eight evaluations found that 1 year of a targeted intervention had statistically significant positive impacts on achievement for either middle or high school students.

None of the four evaluations examining interventions that could serve struggling readers for up to 3 years found positive impacts after 2 or 3 years of the interventions. None of the five evaluations that examined the effectiveness of the whole-school models found a statistically significant impact on student reading achievement. The evaluation reports are available at: <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/strivingreaders/performance.html>.

In September 2012, the Department released the final year-5 evaluation reports for the adolescent literacy program covering all 5 years of data collection and updated the cross-site summary tables and project profiles to include the final results of the evaluations of the 2006 grants. The Department also released the project profiles and summaries of evaluation reports from the 2009 grants. These materials are posted on the program's Web site:

<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/strivingreaders/performance.html>.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2016 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$374,751	\$374,751	0

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2016.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

The Department may set aside up to \$10 million from the annual MEP appropriation for contracts and grants to improve inter- and intra-State migrant coordination activities, including academic credit accrual and exchange programs for migrant students. The Department is required to consult with States receiving allocations of \$1 million or less about whether they can

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

increase the cost-effectiveness of their programs by entering into inter-state consortium arrangements. By law, the Department may reserve up to \$3 million a year from coordination funds for incentive grants of not more than \$250,000 to such consortia.

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

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2011	\$393,981
2012	393,236
2013	372,751
2014	374,751
2015	374,751

FY 2016 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2016, the Administration requests \$374.8 million for the Title I Migrant program, the same amount as the 2015 appropriation. The fiscal year 2016 appropriation would continue to support activities that identify highly mobile migratory children and youth, provide them comprehensive services that address their specific needs, and promote coordination of the Federal resources available to serve this population.

Migrant students represent an especially disadvantaged, hard-to-serve group due to multiple risk factors. In particular, the high mobility of these children across school district and State boundaries (sometimes within the school term or year) means that, in general, no single school district or State has ongoing responsibility for the education of these students, thus creating a need for Federal support to assist in the coordination of services to meet their educational needs. The high mobility also creates additional challenges for both students and the school systems serving them.

Moreover, the characteristics of the migrant population create a need for educational services that go well beyond services traditionally supported with State and local education budgets. In addition to being highly mobile, migrant students tend to live in poverty, have limited English proficiency, and belong to families that are likely to experience food and job insecurity and poor health and housing conditions. Almost one-third (32.7 percent) of the children and youth eligible to receive services under the program during school year 2012-2013 had moved within the previous 12 months. In addition, 38.1 percent of eligible children and youth were limited English proficient and 6.5 percent of eligible children and youth were eligible to receive services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

Migrant children and youth may also help their families perform agricultural work, and a growing number of migrant “emancipated youth” travel without a parent or guardian to obtain migratory work in the fields and in processing plants. A significant proportion of migrant individuals eligible for services under the program (11.4 percent of the eligible population in 2012-2013) are school-aged youth who do not attend school.

Data for 2012-13 indicate that the program provided services to 214,428 migrant students during the regular school year and 109,521 during the summer or intersessions. Program funds supported 3,133 projects that operated during the school day, 525 projects that provided an extended school day during the regular school year, 181 summer or intersession projects, and 1,056 year-round projects. The program served 3,607 children aged birth through 2; 21,803 children aged 3 through 5; 203,847 children and youth in kindergarten through grade 12; and 16,925 out-of-school youth. Services provided included supplemental instruction in reading, math, and other academic areas, family literacy and preschool instruction, and high school credit accrual. Program funds were also used to provide such support services as counseling, health and nutrition services, advocacy and referrals for migrant students with disabilities, and (especially in the summer) transportation.

The Department would reserve approximately \$10 million from the fiscal year 2016 appropriation for migrant coordination and national activities, including \$3 million for consortium incentive grants. The remainder of the funds would be used for activities related to inter- and intra-State coordination, primarily for maintenance and operation of the Migrant Student Exchange System (MSIX), including for technical assistance to States as they continue to implement their systems for collecting and exchanging data on migrant students.

The Administration believes that the current, outdated funding formula for the Migrant program includes provisions that are cumbersome, difficult to interpret, and prevent allocations from responding to shifts in State counts of migrant students since 2001. For these reasons, the Administration’s request includes appropriations language that would revise this funding formula to improve targeting of services to migrant students and address problems identified in program reviews and audit findings.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>
Number of eligible children	375,000	375,000	375,000
SEA program:			
Amount for State grants	\$364,751	\$364,751	\$364,751
Range of State awards	0-\$128,658	\$66-\$128,260	\$66-\$128,260
Coordination activities:			
Consortium incentive grants	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000
Migrant student information exchange and related coordination activities	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years, in FY 2016 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

In 2014, the Department adopted new performance measures for the program: (1) the percentage of migrant students in grades 3-8 who scored at the proficient level or above in reading/language arts assessments; (2) the percentage of migrant students in grades 3-8 who scored at the proficient level or above in mathematics assessments; (3) the percentage of migrant students in grades 7-12 who graduated from high school or were promoted to the next grade level; and (4) the percentage of migrant students who entered the 11th grade who had received full for credit for taking Algebra I. Previous measures focused on the number of States reporting that 50 percent or more of migrant students scored at the proficient level in certain grades. The new measures are focused on student performance and attainment in reading/language arts and mathematics; student success in progressing through school; and success in Algebra, a critical subject for helping students become college- and career-ready.

The Department will not be able to start collecting data for the grade promotion/graduation and Algebra I measures until school year 2015-16, when changes in the MSIX will enable the Department to collect the data take effect.

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

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

Measure: The percentage of migrant students in grades 3-8 who scored at the proficient level or above on reading/language arts assessments.

Year	Target Percentage	Actual Percentage
2013	Baseline	44.1%
2014	44.1%	
2015	44.1	
2016	44.1	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

Measure: The percentage of migrant students in grades 3-8 who scored at the proficient level or above on mathematics assessments.

Year	Target Percentage	Actual Percentage
2013	Baseline	47.6%
2014	47.6%	
2015	47.6	
2016	47.6	

Additional information: The source of the data is the Consolidated State Performance Reports that States submit to the Department. States are currently making changes to their standards and assessments systems to make them more rigorous. However, since these changes have been associated with decreases in student performance during this transition period, current performance targets are static. The Department plans to re-set targets once data for school years 2015-16 are available. Data for 2014 will be available in summer 2015.

Efficiency Measures

The Department established an efficiency measure associated with the transfer of migrant student records through the MSIX system. The MSIX integrates procedures designed to achieve efficiencies and cost reductions by linking separate State and local efforts to transfer health and education records into a single system that can be used within and across all States.

Initially the Department assessed annual changes in the percentage of actively migrating students for which MSIX contained consolidated records that reflect a complete history of school and health information. As of 2012, MSIX contains consolidated records for migrant students who have enrolled in school in more than one State. The Department is now tracking how many States are collecting the three types of data elements collected in MSIX for migrant students: basic student information, student assessment data, and credit accrual information for secondary students.

Measure: The number of States collecting all the types of data elements collected in MSIX.

Year	Target	Actual
2013	Baseline	31
2014	31	34
2015	31	
2016	35	

Additional information: At the end of fiscal year 2014, 34 out of 47 States participating in the migrant education program were collecting all the types of data elements collected in MSIX. The Department developed a three-phase plan to help States fully participate in MSIX. Under phase one, States were to collect and make available all data elements for basic student information, which is required for all migrant students. Under phase two, States would add student assessment data, which is required only for migrant students taking State assessments. Under phase three, States would add credit accrual information for secondary students. At this

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

time, State participation in MSIX is voluntary. Once the Department issues regulations requiring States to collect and share data through MSIX, targets will be adjusted to reflect the expectation that all States participating in the MEP will collect all three types of data elements. A Notice of Proposed Rulemaking containing requirements for States pertaining to entering student data into and using student data in MSIX was published on December 27, 2013, and the comment period ended on February 25, 2014. The Department anticipates that the Notice of Final Rulemaking will be published by the end of calendar year 2015.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2016 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$47,614	\$47,614	0

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2016.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2011	\$50,326
2012	50,231
2013	47,614
2014	47,614
2015	47,614

FY 2016 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2016, the Administration requests \$47.6 million, the same as the 2015 level, for the Neglected and Delinquent (N and D) program. The activities supported with this funding would help an estimated 98,000 N and D students return to and complete school and obtain employment after they are released from State institutions.

The population served by the N and D program is extremely disadvantaged and isolated. Research has shown that the youth served are up to 3 years behind in grade level and generally lack job skills. A study by Harris, Baltodano, Bal, Jolivette, and Malcahy (2009) of youth incarcerated in three long-term correctional facilities found low levels of reading achievement among this population, with significantly lower levels for certain ethnic and racial groups and for students in special education. The longstanding nature of this problem is demonstrated by a 1996 study from the Educational Testing Service showing that while most of the inmates in America's prisons would eventually be paroled, two-thirds did not have the literacy skills needed to function in society. The findings of these reports show the importance of programs focused on improving educational outcomes for neglected and delinquent youth and preparing these students for further education or to enter the workforce.

With few exceptions, these young people will reenter our communities, schools, and postsecondary institutions. High-quality correctional education can help equip them with the skills needed to successfully reenter their communities and either continue their education or join the workforce.¹ In short, educating these youth is crucial for reducing re-incarceration rates, supporting future success, and strengthening communities.

In December 2014, the Departments of Education and Justice released new guidance and technical assistance materials to help State and local leaders provide high-quality education to youth in juvenile justice facilities.² This guidance built on the Task Force Report to the President

¹ Lois M. Davis et al., "How Effective Is Correctional Education, and Where Do We Go from Here? The Results of a Comprehensive Evaluation" (2014); Lois M. Davis et al., "Evaluating the Effectiveness of Correctional Education: A Meta-Analysis of Programs That Provide Education to Incarcerated Adults" (2013).

² <http://www.ed.gov/correctionaled>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

for the My Brother's Keeper initiative, which aimed to address persistent opportunity gaps faced by boys and young men of color and ensure that all young people have the opportunity to reach their full potential.³ In addition, in a June 2014 letter to Chief State School Officers and State Attorneys General, the Secretary of Education and the Attorney General noted several ongoing Federal initiatives in this area.⁴

The fiscal year 2014 appropriations act authorized the Department to pool evaluation funds reserved under section 9601 of the ESEA and use those pooled funds to evaluate any ESEA program. With funds available under this new authority, the Department is also beginning an implementation evaluation of the N and D program to study correctional education services provided to children in State and local facilities and institutions. Initial funding will support a review of existing administrative and performance data, site visits, and a feasibility study to inform further research.

From the 2016 request, the Department would reserve approximately \$1.2 million to continue to provide technical assistance and other services through the National Evaluation and Technical Assistance Center for Children who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk. Some of the Center's activities include: (1) developing a national model for evaluating the effectiveness of N and D programs; (2) collecting and disseminating information on tools and effective practices that can be used to support N and D youth; and (3) providing technical assistance, using experts and practitioners, to State agencies.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>
Number of participating institutions	727	727	727
Estimated number of students served	98,495	98,495	98,495
Average Federal contribution per child (whole dollars)	\$483	\$483	\$483
Range of awards to States	\$103-\$2,780	\$107-\$2,818	\$107-\$2,805
Average State award	\$893	\$893	\$893
National activities	\$1,190	\$1,190	\$1,190

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

³ http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/053014_mbk_report.pdf

⁴ <http://www.ed.gov/blog/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/doj-dod-ltr.pdf>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2016 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2011	14.1%	12.8%
2012	13.8	13.0
2013	14.8	14.9
2014	15.8	
2015	16.8	
2016	17.8	

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2011	60.9%	55.6%
2012	56.6	52.3
2013	57.6	58.1
2014	58.6	
2015	59.6	
2016	60.6	

Additional information: This measure includes students between the ages of 13 and 21 in neglected, juvenile detention, and juvenile correctional institutions, and not students in adult correctional institutions. The Department revised the performance targets in 2013 to better align with recent performance.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

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

Year	Target	Actual
2011	97.2%	70.4%
2012	71.4	71.1
2013	72.4	64.4
2014	73.4	
2015	74.4	
2016	75.4	

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

Year	Target	Actual
2011	88.4%	71.9%
2012	72.9	71.9
2013	73.9	65.4
2014	74.9	
2015	75.9	
2016	76.9	

Additional information: Student counts are based on the number of long-term students (those enrolled in a participating program or facility for 90 or more consecutive calendar days) who complete pre- and post-testing in reading and mathematics. These are not the same as the State assessments required under ESEA Title I and do not necessarily reflect State proficiency levels. The Department revised the performance targets in 2013 to better align with recent performance. A number of factors may have contributed to the reduction in the percentage of students showing improvement in reading and mathematics from 2012 to 2013. In particular, States reported serving significantly fewer students, who often had greater academic challenges, as they implement efforts to move students out of institutions and back into communities. Also, several States with high student counts changed reporting systems, leading to fluctuations in their reported results.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

Efficiency Measure

Measure: The cost per high school diploma or equivalent.

Year	Target	Actual
2011	\$3,515	\$4,566
2012	4,520	4,891
2013	4,475	4,873
2014	4,430	
2015	4,386	
2016	4,341	

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Evaluation

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2016 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$710	0	-\$710

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

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

The ESEA required a comprehensive, multi-year national assessment on the implementation and impact of the Title I Grants to LEAs. Data from the multi-year national assessment are included in two reports. The first, a 2009 report entitled "Title I Implementation: Update on Recent Evaluation Findings," provides a summary of findings from Title I evaluation studies that have become available after the publication of the National Assessment of Title I final report in 2007. The second report, "State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, Volume IX-Accountability Under NCLB: Final Report," was published in 2010 and provides updated information on State, district, and school implementation of NCLB provisions concerning accountability and school improvement. Funding under this program also supported nine volumes of reports on the "State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)" as well as a series of reports on specialized topics. Some of those specialized topics include analyses of States' accountability provisions; implementation and outcome findings in districts that received waivers to serve as supplemental educational services providers, despite being districts identified for improvement; an evaluation of the growth model pilot project, a project initiated to allow States to experiment with adjustments to the NCLB status accountability system, which informed the Administration's future decisions on accountability under ESEA flexibility; and an examination of the Title I comparability requirement, which included the first national data collection on school-level expenditures. These reports, as well as other related Title I evaluation reports, are available in full on the Department of Education's Web site at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/opepd/ppss/reports.html#title>.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Evaluation

Ongoing studies under way in fiscal year 2015 include the following:

- The implementation of ESEA Title I and Title II program initiatives. This study will examine the implementation of policies promoted through the ESEA at the State, district and school levels in four core areas: State content standards, aligned assessments, accountability and school turnaround, and developing effective teachers and leaders. The study will address changes since the previous national assessment of Title I (in 2006) as well as ESEA flexibility. The study will include a survey of all 50 States and DC, as well as a nationally representative sample of 570 school districts, 1,300 schools, and 9,100 teachers.
- Early childhood language development. Data from 83 Title I schools, collected during the 2011-2012 school year, will be analyzed to estimate the associations between instructional programs and programs for students in preschool through grade 3 and the outcomes for those students.
- Case studies of the implementation of school turnaround models. These case studies, involving approximately 60 schools in 6 States, will focus on the change process in schools implementing school turnaround models and examine leading indicators of successful implementation of the models to provide information useful to both policy-makers and practitioners. Descriptive analyses of State SIG applications and SIG-eligible and SIG-awarded schools are available for the first and second cohorts of SIG grantees (fiscal year 2010 and 2011 competitions).¹
- Early implementation of ESEA flexibility. This study of 12 States and 24 school districts that have begun the first full year of implementing provisions under ESEA flexibility will provide reports of early implementation of ESEA flexibility to policy-makers as they continue to refine policy and technical assistance to States on issues related to the flexibility provisions.
- Feasibility Study on Improving the Quality of School-Level Expenditure Data. This feasibility study will explore options for improving the completeness, consistency, and accuracy of school-level expenditure reporting by interviewing fiscal staff in five States and districts that have finance systems that track school-level financial data and then collecting and analyzing available school-level expenditure data in the selected States and districts.

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

	(dollars in thousands)
2011	\$8,151
2012	3,194
2013	3,028
2014	880
2015	710

¹ <http://ies.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=NCEE20114019> and <http://ies.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=NCEE20124060>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Evaluation

FY 2016 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for Title I Evaluation in fiscal year 2016. Instead, the Administration would seek appropriations language expanding the ESEA pooled evaluation authority first authorized in the fiscal year 2014 appropriations act for the Department of Education and continued in fiscal year 2015. This authority allows the Department to reserve up to 0.5 percent of the funds appropriated for each ESEA program, except those in Titles I and III, and pool those funds in order to fund high-priority evaluations of all ESEA programs (including Titles I and III). The 2016 request would modify the existing authority to include Titles I and III, except that the Department would be permitted to pool 0.1 percent of the Title I, Part A appropriation. These changes are consistent with the *Strengthening Education Through Research Act*, which would reauthorize the *Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002* and which was passed by the House of Representatives and approved by the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee in the 113th Congress. The larger set-aside would ensure that sufficient funds are available to support comprehensive evaluations of the implementation, outcomes, impact, and cost-effectiveness of all ESEA programs. The actual amount of funds reserved each year would depend on the funding requirements of the annual evaluation plan described below.

Education improvement is an on-going process of building our knowledge about what works in improving practice and results for students. Understanding how ESEA programs are being implemented and whether they achieve their intended outcomes is essential for improvement. In addition, rigorous evaluation of the impact of interventions that may be funded with Federal education funds is essential both for ensuring the optimal use of taxpayer-provided resources and for providing effective technical assistance and guidance to the Department's State and local partners. However, the current fragmentation of evaluation authorities and funding hampers effective evaluation and the development of effective performance management strategies. The proposed cross-cutting reservation of funds would provide resources to conduct rigorous, objective evaluations of ESEA programs, policies, and practices, while also supporting performance measurement essential for program improvement. In addition, the new authority would enable the Department to provide increased technical assistance on evaluation to States and LEAs in order to promote quality and comparability of evaluation results.

Under the current pooled evaluation authority, the Department is required to develop and submit to the Congress an evaluation plan every year describing proposed evaluation activities, including Title I evaluation activities, the reservations required to fund this plan, and the impact of those reservations on existing programs. In 2016, the evaluation plan would identify the Department's key priorities for evaluations and related knowledge-building activities, such as strengthening performance measures and improving grantee evaluations, within and across program offices. The plan would support appropriate resource allocation and help ensure that evaluations generate usable knowledge that informs program improvement, policy development, and budget decision-making for Federal, State, and local decision-makers. The Department anticipates using a portion of the funds reserved for evaluation to conduct impact studies that employ experimental designs and other methodologies that support causal inferences.

In addition to evaluation and impact studies, the Department would carry out analyses of data from evaluations and other sources intended to inform policy-making and promote continuous

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Evaluation

program improvement. A recent example of this kind of activity is the policy brief published in November 2011, entitled: "The Potential Impact of Revising the Title I Comparability Requirement to Focus on School-Level Expenditures," which was based on a study of school-level expenditures conducted in response to a requirement in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. The currently funded study of ESEA flexibility is another example of a quick turnaround study with the same overarching goal of informing policy-making and promoting continuous program improvement.

Under the pooled evaluation authority in the fiscal year 2014 Department of Education Appropriations Act, the Department developed an operating plan that includes five studies that address specific provisions in Title I programs or allowable interventions under the programs. Fiscal year 2014 pooled funds total \$4.5 million and will support these studies, all scheduled to begin in fiscal year 2015. They are:

- A Title I implementation evaluation on schoolwide program models to identify which strategies are being used to address the needs of low-achieving students and subgroups and how such strategies compare to approaches used in targeted assistance program models. This evaluation is supported with \$1 million from the 2014 pooled funds and would also receive support from fiscal year 2015 pooled evaluation funds.
- A Title I evaluation to determine the feasibility of conducting a randomized control trial evaluation on whole-school reform within several districts in order to build impact evidence on commonly used whole-school reform models. Pooled funding totaling \$600,000 will support this evaluation. The results of this study will determine whether a randomized control trial evaluation on whole-school reform would be supported with pooled evaluation funds in 2016.
- An impact evaluation of interventions aimed at improving student understanding and use of academic language (defined as the language used in textbooks, in classrooms, and on tests) in order to improve the effectiveness of local programs supported through Titles I and III, costing nearly \$2.4 million from the 2014 pooled funds. This study would also be supported with pooled evaluation funds from fiscal years 2016 and 2017 as well as funding from the evaluation set-aside under the Language Acquisition State Grants program.
- An implementation evaluation of the Title I, Part D Neglected and Delinquent program to study correctional education services provided to children in State and local facilities and institutions; initial funding of \$500,000 would support a review of existing administrative and performance data, site visits, and a feasibility study to inform further research. This evaluation would also be supported with fiscal year 2015 pooled evaluation funds.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Evaluation

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>
Implementation of Title I and Title II Program Initiatives	\$502	\$610	0
Study of Early Childhood Language Development	50	50	0
Early Implementation of ESEA Flexibility	50	0	0
School Expenditure Study	104	0	0
Data Analysis and Support	<u>174</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	880	710	0

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

(Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part A, Subpart 5, Section 418A)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2016 Authorization: Indefinite¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$37,474	\$44,623	+ \$7,149

¹The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2015; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2016.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Special Programs for Migrant Students provide 5-year grants to institutions of higher education (IHEs) and private nonprofit organizations to support educational programs designed for students who are engaged in, or whose families are engaged in, migrant and other seasonal farmwork.

Projects funded under the High School Equivalency Program (HEP) recruit migrant students aged 16 and over and provide academic and support services (including counseling, health services, stipends, and placement) to help those students obtain a high school equivalency certificate and subsequently to gain employment or admission to a postsecondary institution or training program.

Projects funded by the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) provide tutoring, academic assistance, and counseling services, as well as stipends, tuition, and room and board, to first-year undergraduate migrant students and assist those students in obtaining student financial aid for their remaining undergraduate years.

HEP projects, located in college or university settings, operate residential and commuter programs of instructional services for out-of-school migrant youth; some HEP projects employ a commuter model in which students attend GED classes after work. Most CAMP projects use an on-campus residential design and provide a high level of support services in order to assist participants, virtually all of whom have had no prior contact with a college campus, to adjust to life at an institution of higher education. In making awards under both programs, the Department is required to consider applicants' prior experience in operating HEP and CAMP projects.

The Department may reserve up to one half of 1 percent of the funds appropriated for Special Programs for Migrant Students for outreach, technical assistance, and professional development activities. If the total amount appropriated is below \$40 million, the remaining funds are to be distributed between the two programs in the same proportion as the amounts available for each program the previous year. If the appropriation is over \$40 million, 45 percent of the remaining

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

funds must be used for HEP and 45 percent for CAMP, and the remainder may be used for either program, based on the number, quality, and promise of applications received.

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

	(dollars in thousands)
2011	\$36,595
2012	36,526
2013	34,623
2014	34,623
2015	37,474

FY 2016 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2016, the Administration requests a total of \$44.6 million for the Special Programs for Migrant Students, a \$7.1 million increase over the 2015 appropriation. The proposed increase recognizes strong program performance supported by improvements in the areas of data quality and program management over the past several years. For the HEP program, the average rate of participants attaining a high school equivalency credential was approximately 69.4 percent between 2009 and 2013, and the average rate of those participants who attained a high school equivalency credential and then entered postsecondary education or training programs, upgraded employment, or entered the military was 76.6 percent during the same period. In comparison, the average percentage of adults participating in adult basic education programs who had a high school completion goal and earned a high school diploma or equivalency credential was 62.1 percent over the same period. For the CAMP program, the average percentage of CAMP participants who completed their first academic year in a postsecondary program was 86 percent between 2009 and 2013. In addition, of those students who completed their first year of postsecondary education, 93.2 percent continued their postsecondary education. In contrast, data from the National Center of Education Statistics show that the retention rate of first-time degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates at Title IV institutions was 71.8 percent from 2011 to 2012.

These results are due, in part, to strong program management practices. More specifically, Department staff continuously improve data collection and analysis practices to increase the accuracy, validity, and reliability of data used for providing technical assistance, monitoring grantees, holding grantees accountable for substantial progress, developing and implementing improvement plans at the grantee and program levels, and informing decisions on continuation or termination of grants.

The requested increase would not only support a larger number of new grant awards for two successful programs but also would allow the Department to bring parity to the base amount of funds used for each program. Under the statute, if the total amount appropriated is below \$40 million, the funds remaining after one half of 1 percent of the appropriation is reserved for outreach, technical assistance, and professional development activities are to be distributed between the two programs in the same proportion as the amounts available for each program the previous year, making the funding level for HEP programs higher than the funding level for CAMP programs since the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act in 2008. At the request

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

level, the statute would require the Department to use 45 percent of the funds not reserved for outreach, technical assistance, and professional development for HEP, 45 percent for CAMP, and the remainder for either program, based on the number, quality, and promise of applications received.

The migrant youth these programs serve are particularly at risk for poor educational, employment, and earnings outcomes. According to the US Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service (ERS) report, *Profile of Hired Farmworkers, a 2008 Update*, farmworkers tend to be younger, less educated, and less likely to speak English than other wage and salary workers in the United States. Individuals aged 15-21 constituted 15.1 percent of farmworkers in 2006, and 30.0 percent of farmworkers had attained less than a 9th-grade education. Further, an ERS analysis of data from the US Department of Labor's *National Agricultural Workers Survey* (NAWS) showed that, over the period 1989-2006, the average median years of education for migrant farmworkers was 6, compared to 9 for nonmigrant farmworkers. In addition, 66.2 percent of migrant farmworkers had no knowledge of English, compared to 27.1 percent for nonmigrant farmworkers. Migrant farmworkers are also more likely to have lower hourly wages than nonmigrant farmworkers, and their limited education affects their ability to pursue postsecondary education or obtain skilled work that pays higher wages.

A substantial number of migrant youth are living on their own. The 2002-03 NAWS found that migrant youth working in farmwork and living on their own constituted 11 percent of the total farm labor force. Their likelihood of being able to support themselves for an extended period of time through farmwork is poor. The ERS 2008 Profile reported that unemployment rates of farmworkers are double those of all wage and salary workers; that farmworkers earned less than other workers; and that the rate of poverty among farmworkers was more than double that of all wage and salary employees.

The HEP and CAMP programs provide participants with assistance that can enable them to improve their earnings potential dramatically. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2014-15 Edition, the median hourly wage for agricultural workers in 2012 was \$9.09, and these types of workers are often paid based on how much they do instead of how many hours they work. By comparison, the National Center for Education Statistics reports in *The Condition of Education 2014* that in 2012 the median earnings for full-time, full-year wage and salary workers aged 25-34 with a high school diploma or equivalent were \$30,000 (equivalent to \$14.42 per hour) and the median was \$35,700 for a person with an associate's degree (equivalent to \$17.16 per hour).

HEP and CAMP programs focus on finding and assisting migrant youth who have not been able to complete high school or go on to postsecondary education due to limited or inconsistent educational opportunity. HEP and CAMP projects emphasize services to out-of-school-youth and other eligible individuals by conducting extensive outreach in locations where these youth live and work (e.g., farms, production facilities, and labor camps) and providing services at locations and times that meet the needs of an out-of-school, working population.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>
Outreach, technical assistance, and professional development	\$171	\$187	\$223
HEP:			
Number of students served	5,165	5,374	5,500
Number of awards:			
First year	14	14	12
Second year	0	14	14
Third year	5	0	14
Fourth year	10	5	0
Fifth year	<u>13</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	42	43	45
Funding:			
New awards	\$6,007	\$6,841	\$5,138
Peer review of new award applications	36	100	100
Continuation awards	12,791	13,445	16,962
Average grant award	447	463	465
Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars)	3,615	3,774	4,000
CAMP:			
Number of students served	1,882	1,914	2,496
Number of awards:			
First year	12	13	19
Second year	0	12	13
Third year	9	0	12
Fourth year	6	9	0
Fifth year	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>
Total	37	39	53
Funding:			
New awards	\$4,975	\$5,460	\$8,158
Peer review of new award applications	36	100	150
Continuation awards	10,488	11,339	13,892
Average grant award	423	422	425
Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars)	8,216	9,002	8,834

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program information, including, for example, goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data consistent with the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA); 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 2016 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Goal: To assist migrant and seasonal farmworker students in obtaining the equivalent of a high school diploma, and, subsequently, in beginning postsecondary education, entering military service, or obtaining employment.

Objective: *An increasing percentage of HEP participants will receive their General Educational Development (GED) credential.*

Measure: The percentage of High School Equivalency Program participants receiving a General Educational Development credential.

Year	Target	Actual
2011	69%	74%
2012	69	67.4
2013	69	74.5
2014	69	
2015	69	
2016	69	

Additional information: The source of data is grantee performance reports. Data collected for fiscal year 2014 will be available in the spring of 2015.

Objective: *An increasing percentage of HEP recipients of the GED will enter postsecondary education programs, upgraded employment, or the military.*

Measure: The percentage of HEP GED credential recipients who enter postsecondary educational programs, career positions, or the military.

Year	Target	Actual
2011	80%	75%
2012	80	79.3
2013	80	80.1
2014	80	
2015	80	
2016	80	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

Additional information: The source of data is grantee performance reports. Data for this measure are based on actual placement after receipt of a GED credential. The Department is providing technical assistance to grantees on collecting data on program participants after they are no longer receiving program services. Data for 2014 will be available in the spring of 2015.

Goal: Assist migrant and seasonal farmworker students in successfully completing their first academic year of college and in continuing their postsecondary education.

Objective: All CAMP students will complete their first academic year at a postsecondary institution in good standing.

Measure: The percentage of College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) participants completing the first year of their postsecondary program.

Year	Target	Actual
2011	86%	89%
2012	86	85.5
2013	86	85.1
2014	86	
2015	86	
2016	86	

Additional information: The source of data is grantee performance reports. Data for projects completing their first year of implementation are not included in the data for any given year because projects receive their initial funding in the fall, after the school year may have already started. Thus, the measure reflects the percentage of participants completing the first year of their postsecondary program between the second and fifth year of the project. In 2009, the Department adjusted its methods for calculating performance data for recipients that serve more students than they projected at the beginning of their grant period. Data collected for fiscal year 2014 will be available in the spring of 2015.

Objective: A majority of CAMP students who successfully complete their first academic year of college will continue in postsecondary education.

Measure: The percentage of College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) participants who, after completing the first academic year of college, continue their postsecondary education.

Year	Target	Actual
2011	85%	95%
2012	85	96.7
2013	85	95.0
2014	85	
2015	85	
2016		

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

Additional information: The source of data is grantee performance reports. Data for this measure are based on actual placement after completion of the first year of college. The Department is providing technical assistance to grantees on collecting data on program participants once the participants are no longer receiving program services. Data for 2014 will be available in the spring of 2015.

Efficiency measures

The Department established a cost-per-participant outcome measure to assess program efficiency for HEP and CAMP. For HEP, the measure is the cost per participant earning a GED credential and, for CAMP, it is the cost per participant who completes his or her first year of postsecondary education and then continues that postsecondary education. The Department established different costs for programs serving participants who commute, programs serving participants who reside at the institution of higher education where the program is based, and programs with both types of participants. Targets are based on actual costs in 2011 (the baseline year), multiplied by an estimated rate of inflation for college-associated costs and then decreased by an expected improvement in efficiency annually of 1 percent. Data for 2014 will be available in the spring of 2015.

HEP Efficiency Measures

Measure: Cost per participant earning a GED, commuter programs.

Year	Target Cost Per Participant Earning a GED	Actual Cost Per Participant Earning a GED
2011	Baseline	\$7,529
2012	\$7,910	5,766
2013	8,306	5,409
2014	8,718	
2015	9,104	
2016	9,509	

Measure: Cost per participant earning a GED, residential programs.

Year	Target Cost Per Participant Earning a GED	Actual Cost Per Participant Earning a GED
2011	Baseline	\$14,753
2012	\$15,459	11,201
2013	16,195	9,667
2014	16,962	
2015	17,719	
2016	18,511	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

Measure: Cost per participant earning a GED, programs with both commuting and resident students.

Year	Target Cost Per Participant Earning a GED	Actual Cost Per Participant Earning a GED
2011	Baseline	\$11,923
2012	\$12,502	11,160
2013	13,104	7,589
2014	13,732	
2015	14,344	
2016	14,984	

CAMP Efficiency Measures

Measure: Cost per participant completing the first year of postsecondary education and continuing postsecondary education, commuter programs.

Year	Target Cost Per Participant Completing the First Year of Postsecondary Education and Continuing Postsecondary Education	Actual Cost Per Participant Completing the First Year of Postsecondary Education and Continuing Postsecondary Education
2011	Baseline	\$11,486
2012	\$12,003	9,111
2013	12,543	10,686
2014	13,107	
2015	13,697	
2016	14,314	

Measure: Cost per participant completing the first year of postsecondary education and continuing postsecondary education, residential programs.

Year	Target Cost Per Participant Completing the First Year of Postsecondary Education and Continuing Postsecondary Education	Actual Cost Per Participant Completing the First Year of Postsecondary Education and Continuing Postsecondary Education
2011	Baseline	\$18,408
2012	\$19,236	14,860
2013	20,102	14,534
2014	21,007	
2015	21,952	
2016	22,940	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

Measure: Cost per participant completing the first year of postsecondary education and continuing postsecondary education, programs with both commuting and resident students.

Year	Target Cost Per Participant Completing the First Year of Postsecondary Education and Continuing Postsecondary Education	Actual Cost Per Participant Completing the First Year of Postsecondary Education and Continuing Postsecondary Education
2011	Baseline	\$13,998
2012	\$14,628	11,748
2013	15,286	10,701
2014	15,974	
2015	16,693	
2016	17,444	

State tables