

Department of Education
EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language	A-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	A-5
Appropriation, Adjustments and Transfers	A-10
Summary of Changes	A-11
Authorizing Legislation.....	A-12
Appropriations History.....	A-14
Significant Items in FY 2016 Appropriations Reports.....	A-16
Summary of Request	A-17
Activities:	
Grants to local educational agencies.....	A-19
School improvement grants.....	A-31
Comprehensive literacy development grants.....	A-37
Innovative approaches to literacy	A-42
State agency programs:	
Migrant	A-46
Neglected and delinquent.....	A-52
Special programs for migrant students	A-58
State Tables*	

*State tables reflecting final 2015 allocations and 2016 and 2017 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 and subpart 2 of part B of title II 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”), [~~\$16,016,790,000~~]\$16,043,790,000, of which [~~\$5,127,006,000~~]\$4,940,990,000 shall become available on July 1, [~~2016~~]2017, and shall remain available through September 30, [~~2017~~]2018, and of which \$10,841,177,000 shall become available on October 1, [~~2016~~]2017, and shall remain available through September 30, [~~2017~~]2018, for academic year [~~2016–2017~~]2017-18:¹ *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~~]\$5,000,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary of Education (referred to in this title as “Secretary”) on October 1, [~~2015~~]2016, 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 [~~\$3,544,050,000~~]\$3,769,050,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA:⁵ *Provided further*, That [~~\$3,544,050,000~~]\$3,769,050,000 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 \$450,000,000 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:⁸

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:⁹ *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 and well-implemented experimental or quasi-experimental study:¹⁰ *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:¹¹ *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:¹² *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:¹³ *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:¹⁴ *Provided further*, That \$190,000,000 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:¹⁵ *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:¹⁶ *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:]¹⁷ *Provided further, That one-half of the total amount of funds made available for part A of title I of the ESEA in excess of the amount authorized by section 1002(a) shall be allocated to States, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas on the basis*

of their respective shares of the remaining funds received under part A of title I and shall be used by each State in accordance with the requirements of section 1003(b) of the ESEA;¹⁸

Provided further, That \$217,000,000 shall be for carrying out subpart 2 of part B of title II;¹⁹

*Provided further, That \$44,623,000 shall be for carrying out section 418A of the HEA.*²⁰

(Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2016.)

NOTE

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 [\$5,127,006,000] \$4,940,990,000 shall become available on July 1, [2016]2017, and shall remain available through September 30, [2017]2018, and of which \$10,841,177,000 shall become available on October 1, [2016]2017, and shall remain available through September 30, [2017]2018, for academic year [2016–2017]2017-18:</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, and State Agency Migrant and Neglected and Delinquent. 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] \$5,000,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary of Education (referred to in this title as “Secretary”) on October 1, [2015]2016, 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, \$5 million 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 [\$3,544,050,000] \$3,769,050,000 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 [\$3,544,050,000] \$3,769,050,000 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. This language is no longer needed because the program was reauthorized.</p>
<p>⁸ [...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$450,000,000 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. This language is being deleted because the program is no longer authorized.</p>
<p>⁹ [...<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. This language is being deleted because the program is no longer authorized.</p>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>¹⁰ [...<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. This language is being deleted because the program is no longer authorized.</p>
<p>¹¹ [...<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. This language is being deleted because the program is no longer authorized.</p>
<p>¹² [...<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. This language is being deleted because the program is no longer authorized.</p>
<p>¹³ [...<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. This language is being deleted because the program is no longer authorized.</p>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>¹⁴ [...<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. This language is being deleted because the program is no longer authorized.</p>
<p>¹⁵ [...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$190,000,000 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. This language is no longer needed because the program was reauthorized.</p>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>¹⁶ [...<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. This language is no longer needed because the program was reauthorized.</p>
<p>¹⁷ [...<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. This language is no longer needed because the program was reauthorized.</p>
<p>¹⁸ <u><i>Provided further</i>, That one-half of the total amount of funds made available for part A of title I of the ESEA in excess of the amount authorized by section 1002(a) shall be allocated to States, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas on the basis of their respective shares of the remaining funds received under part A of title I and shall be used by each State in accordance with the requirements of section 1003(b) of the ESEA;</u></p>	<p>This language designates a portion of the funds appropriated in excess of the authorized amount for Title I Targeted Grants and Education Finance Incentive Grants to be used to provide additional support for school improvement activities by local educational agencies.</p>
<p>¹⁹ <u><i>Provided further</i>, That \$217,000,000 shall be for carrying out subpart 2 of part B of title II;</u></p>	<p>This language provides funding for Comprehensive Literacy Development Grants and Innovative Approaches to Literacy.</p>
<p>²⁰ <i>Provided further</i>, That \$44,623,000 shall be for carrying out section 418A of the HEA.</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	2015	2016	2017
Discretionary:			
Appropriation	\$15,536,107	\$16,016,790	\$16,043,790
Comparative transfer from:			
<u>Innovation and Improvement</u> for:			
Innovative approaches to literacy	--	27,000	0
Total, comparable appropriation	15,536,107	16,043,790	16,043,790
Advance:			
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	-10,841,177	-10,841,177	-10,841,177
Advance from prior year	10,841,177	10,841,177	10,841,177
Total, budget authority	15,536,107	16,043,790	16,043,790

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Changes

(dollars in thousands)

2016.....	\$16,043,790
2017.....	<u>16,043,790</u>
Net change	0

Increases:	<u>2016 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
Increase funding for <u>Title I Grants to LEAs</u> to help ensure that increasing numbers of students served by the program can meet challenging, college- and career-ready standards.	\$14,909,802	<u>+\$450,000</u>
Subtotal, increases		+450,000
 Decreases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
Eliminate funding for <u>School Improvement Grants</u> because program is no longer authorized.	450,000	<u>-450,000</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-450,000
Net change		0

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Authorizing Legislation

(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2016 Authorized	2016 Estimate	2017 Authorized	2017 Request
Grants to local educational agencies (ESEA-1-A):				
LEA grants formulas:	0 ¹		\$15,012,318	
Basic grants (Section 1124)	(2)	\$6,459,401	(2)	\$6,459,401
Concentration grants (Section 1124A)	(2)	1,362,301	(2)	1,362,301
Targeted grants (Section 1125)	(2)	3,544,050	(2)	3,769,050
Education finance incentive grants (Section 1125A)	(2)	3,544,050	(2)	3,769,050
School improvement grants (ESEA Section 1003(g), struck by P.L. 114-95)	0 ¹	450,000	0	0
Comprehensive literacy development grants (ESEA-II-B, Section 2222)	0 ¹	190,000	(3)	190,000
Innovative approaches to literacy (ESEA ESEA-II-B, Section 2226)	0 ^{1,4}	27,000	(3)	27,000
State agency programs:				
Migrant (ESEA I-C)	0 ¹	374,751	374,751	374,751
Neglected and delinquent (ESEA I-D)	0 ¹	47,614	47,614	47,614
Evaluation (ESEA sections 1002(e) and 8601)	0 ¹	0	0	0
Special Programs for Migrant Students (HEA IV-A-5)	0 ⁵	<u>44,623</u>	To be determined ⁶	<u>44,623</u>
Total definite authorization	0		15,434,683	
Total appropriation		15,536,107		16,043,790
Portion of request subject to reauthorization				44,623

A-12

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; the program was authorized in fiscal year 2016 through appropriations language.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Authorizing Legislation—continued

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 divided equally and distributed through the Targeted Grants and Educational Finance Incentive Grants formulas. In recent years, Congress specified the amounts to be distributed through each formula in the annual appropriations acts.

³ A total of \$468,881 thousand is authorized for Part B of Title II. Of the total amount appropriated for Title II, Part B, 34.1 percent is authorized for Subpart 2 programs.

⁴ Prior to fiscal year 2017, the program was authorized under ESEA V-D, Subpart 1, which was repealed by P.L. 114-95.

⁵ The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2015; the program was authorized in fiscal year 2016 through appropriations language. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2017.

⁶ The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2015; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2017.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
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 ¹ (10,841,176) 13,000,000	15,735,884 ¹ (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 ² (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 ³ (10,841,176)	16,726,579 ² (10,841,176)	15,914,666 ⁴ (10,841,176) -(20,490)
2012 (2012 Advance for 2013)	16,253,026 (11,681,897)	15,949,319 ⁵ (13,279,177)	15,741,703 ⁵ (10,841,177)	15,741,703 (10,841,177)
2013 (2013 Advance for 2014)	15,558,649 (11,681,898)	15,208,151 ⁶ (10,841,177)	15,840,103 ⁶ (10,841,177)	14,921,636 (10,841,177)
2014 (2014 Advance for 2015)	15,683,649 (11,681,898)	N/A ⁷	15,875,231 ² (10,841,177)	15,552,693 (10,841,177)
2015 (2015 Advance for 2016)	15,377,965 (11,681,898)	N/A ⁷	15,566,226 ⁸ (10,841,177)	15,536,107 (10,841,177)
2016 (2016 Advance for 2017)	16,592,546 (10,841,177)	14,869,641 ⁹ (10,841,177)	15,455,802 ⁹ (10,841,177)	16,016,790 (10,841,177)
2017 (2017 Advance for 2018)	16,043,790 (10,841,177)			

¹ 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.

² The level for the Senate allowance reflects Committee action only.

³ The level for the House allowance reflects the House-passed full-year continuing resolution.

⁴ The level for appropriation reflects the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 112-10).

⁵ 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

⁶ 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.

⁷ The House allowance is shown as N/A because there was no Subcommittee action.

⁸ The level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Subcommittee action only.

⁹ The levels for House and Senate allowances reflect action on the regular annual 2016 appropriations bill, which proceeded in the 114th Congress only through the House Committee and Senate Committee.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Significant Items in FY 2016 Appropriations Reports

Striving Readers

Managers'

Statement: Not later than 30 days prior to the announcement or publication of any notice of proposed priorities or inviting applications for the Comprehensive Striving Readers Literacy program, the Department shall brief the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives, and Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate on its plans for this grant competition and related evaluation and technical assistance

Response: The Department expects to brief the Committees in early 2016.

Evaluation

Senate: The Department is required to provide the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Senate HELP Committee, and the House Education and Workforce Committee an operating plan describing the proposed uses of this evaluation authority as well as the source appropriation for such activities. In addition, not later than 45 days prior to the submission of the required operating plan, the Department shall brief the Committees above on the programs and activities being considered for inclusion in the plan. Further, the Committee expects the Department to continue to include in future CJs a discussion of its planned use of this authority.

Response: The Department will continue to comply with these requirements regarding the pooled evaluation authority.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2017 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET
(in thousands of dollars)

[Click here for accessible version.](#)

Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	2015 Appropriation	2016 Appropriation	2017 President's Budget	2017 President's Budget Compared to 2016 Appropriation Amount	Percent
Education for the Disadvantaged						
1. Grants to local educational agencies (ESEA I-A):						
(a) Basic grants (section 1124)						
Annual appropriation	D	3,568,625	4,068,625	4,518,625	450,000	11.06%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	2,890,776	2,390,776	1,940,776	(450,000)	-18.82%
Subtotal		6,459,401	6,459,401	6,459,401	0	0.00%
(b) Concentration grants (section 1124A)						
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	1,362,301	1,362,301	1,362,301	0	0.00%
(c) Targeted grants (section 1125)						
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	3,294,050	3,544,050	3,769,050	225,000	6.35%
(d) Education finance incentive grants (section 1125A)						
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	3,294,050	3,544,050	3,769,050	225,000	6.35%
Subtotal, Grants to LEAs		14,409,802	14,909,802	15,359,802	450,000	3.02%
Annual appropriation	D	3,568,625	4,068,625	4,518,625	450,000	11.06%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	10,841,177	10,841,177	10,841,177	0	0.00%
2. School improvement grants (ESEA section 1003(g); struck by P.L. 114-95)	D	505,756	450,000	0	(450,000)	-100.00%
3. Comprehensive literacy development grants (ESEA II-B-2, section 2222) ¹	D	160,000	190,000	190,000	0	0.00%
4. Innovative approaches to literacy (ESEA II-B-2, section 2226) ²	D	---	27,000	27,000	0	0.00%
5. State agency programs:						
(a) Migrant (ESEA I-C)	D	374,751	374,751	374,751	0	0.00%
(b) Neglected and delinquent (ESEA I-D)	D	47,614	47,614	47,614	0	0.00%
Subtotal		422,365	422,365	422,365	0	0.00%
6. Evaluation (ESEA sections 1002(e) and 8601)	D	710	0	0	0	---
7. Special programs for migrant students (HEA IV-A-5)	D	37,474	44,623	44,623	0	0.00%
Total, Appropriation ²	D	15,536,107	16,043,790	16,043,790	0	0.00%
Total, Budget authority ²	D	15,536,107	16,043,790	16,043,790	0	0.00%
Current		4,694,930	5,202,613	5,202,613	0	0.00%
Prior year's advance		10,841,177	10,841,177	10,841,177	0	0.00%

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

For most mandatory programs, the levels shown in the 2015 Appropriation column reflect the 7.3 percent sequester that went into effect October 1, 2014, and the levels shown in the 2016 Appropriation column reflect the 6.8 percent reduction that went into effect on October 1, 2015, pursuant to the Budget Control Act of 2011 (P.L. 112-25).

Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

¹ Prior to fiscal year 2017, the program was *Striving Readers*, as authorized by P.L. 107-110, ESEA I-E, section 1502.

² In the 2015 Appropriation column, funds are included in the Innovation and Improvement account in the Fund for the Improvement of Education Programs of National Significance. The 2016 Appropriation column, adjusted for comparability with the 2017 President's Budget, includes \$27,000 thousand that was appropriated in the Innovation and Improvement account.

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. Most of the programs in this account were reauthorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The fiscal year 2017 request would fund implementation of these programs as reauthorized. The Administration is requesting a total of \$16 billion in fiscal year 2017 for the programs in this account.

The \$15.4 billion request (\$450 million more than the 2016 level) for Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) would support States and districts in providing extra academic help to students in high-poverty schools. The increase proposed for 2017 recognizes the challenges that States, school districts, and schools continue to face in ensuring that an increasing number of students served under the program meet challenging new college- and career-ready standards. In addition, a portion of the funds requested above the program's authorized funding level would be used for additional awards to States to support school improvement activities authorized by section 1003(b) of the amended ESEA.

The \$190 million request for Comprehensive Literacy Development Grants would support competitive grants to SEAs to provide targeted, evidence-based literacy intervention in high-need schools. Grantees must subgrant funds to LEAs to support literacy interventions for children from birth through kindergarten entry and for students from kindergarten through grade 12.

The \$10 million request for Innovative Approaches to Literacy would fund competitive grants to LEAs, consortia of LEAs, the Bureau of Indian Education, or national nonprofit organizations, to promote literacy programs that support the development of literacy skills in low-income communities. Grantees would develop and implement school library programs and provide high-quality, developmentally appropriate, and up-to-date reading material to children and adolescents in low-income communities.

The request would fund the State agency Migrant and the State agency Neglected and Delinquent programs at the same level as in 2016, providing \$374.8 million for the Migrant program and \$47.6 million for the Neglected and Delinquent program. Under reauthorization, allocations for the Migrant program will be based on a new formula. In addition, a key change under the reauthorized Neglected and Delinquent program allows local grantees to use program funds for pay-for-success initiatives.

Finally, the request includes \$44.6 million for Special Programs for Migrant Students, the same amount as fiscal year 2016.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2017 Authorization: \$15,012,318

Budget authority:

	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>Change</u>
Basic grants	\$6,459,401	\$6,459,401	0
Concentration grants	1,362,301	1,362,301	0
Targeted grants	3,544,050	3,769,050	+\$225,000
Education finance incentive grants	<u>3,544,050</u>	<u>3,769,050</u>	<u>+225,000</u>
Total	14,909,802	15,359,802	+450,000
Annual appropriation	4,068,625	4,518,625	+450,000
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	10,841,177	10,841,177	0

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs), authorized by Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, provides supplemental education funding, especially in high-poverty areas, for local programs that provide extra academic support to help students in high-poverty schools meet college- and career-ready State academic standards. The program serves an estimated 23.9 million students in more than half of all public schools, including approximately two-thirds of the Nation's elementary schools.

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 students 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 students in a school. Schools serving attendance areas in which at least 40 percent of students are from low-income families or in which such students account for at least 40 percent of enrollment are eligible to operate schoolwide programs; under the reauthorized ESEA, States also may grant waivers to operate these programs to schools not meeting eligibility requirements. In the 2013-2014 school year, States reported that 43,482 schools, or 77 percent of all Title I schools, operated schoolwide programs, which accounted for approximately 95 percent of participating students.

The reauthorized ESEA encourages the use of Title I funds to strengthen the academic program of participating schools, including by establishing preschool programs for eligible children under 6 years of age and dual or concurrent enrollment programs for eligible secondary school

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

students that provide access to college-level coursework through partnerships with institutions of higher education. Schools also must provide ongoing professional development for staff working with disadvantaged students and carry out activities designed to increase parental engagement.

Title I Grants to LEAs provide the foundation for the ESEA's accountability system for all public schools, which emphasizes State and local responsibilities in the areas of challenging academic standards and aligned assessments, measuring annual student progress, and supporting school improvement. Under the ESSA's transition provisions, responsibilities described under "Standards and Assessments" below took effect upon the law's enactment, and those under "Accountability and School Improvement" will take effect beginning in the 2017-2018 school year with support from fiscal year 2017 funds. In the latter areas, States will continue to implement applicable provisions of the previous authorization of the ESEA or their ESEA flexibility requests through August 1, 2016, except that LEAs or schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under the previous authorization or as priority or focus schools under ESEA flexibility must continue to implement required interventions until the 2017-2018 school year or Department approval of the State's Title I, Part A plan under the reauthorized law.

Standards and Assessments

Under Title I, each State is required to have a system of challenging academic standards and aligned assessments that ensures students are prepared for college and careers, and LEAs must integrate these standards into local instruction. The State must adopt challenging content standards that describe what all students should know and be able to do in at least reading, language arts, mathematics, and science, as well as achievement standards that describe at least three levels of performance with respect to the State's content standards. The reauthorized ESEA requires that each State demonstrate alignment of its standards with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the State's system of higher education as well as relevant State career and technical education standards. The State must also adopt standards for English language proficiency and may adopt alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; both must be aligned with the State's challenging academic content standards.

States are also required to administer academic assessments that measure and provide coherent and timely information about the achievement of all students against State standards. States must administer reading and mathematics assessments annually to all students in grades 3-8 and once in high school, and must administer annual science assessments for at least 1 grade in each of 3 grade spans. These assessments must be valid and reliable, include measures that assess higher-order thinking skills and understanding of challenging content, enable achievement results to be disaggregated by major racial and ethnic groups, gender, and poverty, disability, English proficiency, and migrant status. States may permit LEAs to use State-approved nationally recognized high school assessments, if any, in lieu of the State's high school assessments. States must also annually assess the English language proficiency of English learners and may administer alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards to students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, provided that the number of

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

students taking these alternate assessments does not exceed 1 percent of all assessed students in the State.

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).

Accountability and school improvement

Under the amended Title I, State standards and assessments are used to hold LEAs and schools accountable for performance through State-determined accountability systems. These systems must include interim targets and long-term goals for, at a minimum, student proficiency on State assessments and high school graduation rates, for all students and disaggregated by each student subgroup, as well as progress in attaining English language proficiency for English learners. In addition, State systems must include indicators of: (1) academic achievement based on State assessments; (2) for high schools, 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rates; (3) for elementary and middle schools, another academic indicator (which may be a measure of student growth); (4) progress in achieving English language proficiency; and (5) at least one indicator, of the State's choosing, of school quality or student success. States must use these indicators to meaningfully differentiate school performance annually, with the first four indicators afforded substantial weight individually and much greater weight in the aggregate than indicators of school quality or student success.

The State's indicators are also used to identify, at least once every 3 years, a statewide category of schools for comprehensive support and improvement, which must include the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I schools and all high schools with graduation rates below 67 percent. LEAs, in partnership with stakeholders, must develop and implement plans for these schools that, among other things, include evidence-based interventions stemming from a needs assessment. The State must also notify LEAs annually of any schools with consistently underperforming student subgroups or with subgroups performing as poorly as schools in the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I schools. Similarly, these schools must develop and implement targeted support and improvement plans to improve outcomes for those particular subgroups of students using evidence-based interventions. Schools with subgroups performing as poorly as schools in the lowest-performing 5 percent and that have not improved after receiving targeted support and improvement for a State-determined number of years must be identified by the State for comprehensive support and improvement.

Under section 1003(a) of the amended ESEA, States must reserve funds to make subgrants on a formula or competitive basis to LEAs to support schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement or implementing targeted support and improvement plans. In fiscal year 2017, each State must reserve for this purpose the greater of: (1) 7 percent of its combined Title I, Part A allocations to its LEAs; or (2) the sum of its fiscal year 2016 section 1003(a) reservation (a maximum of 4 percent of its Title I, Part A allocations) and its fiscal year 2016 allocation under the School Improvement Grants program.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

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 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 2015 allocations were based on LEA poverty estimates for 2013. The Department transfers a small amount of funding from the annual Title I appropriation 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. Under the reauthorized ESEA, an LEA may lower the service threshold for high schools from 75 to 50 percent if it chooses.

Of the total appropriation for Title I Grants to LEAs, 0.7 percent is reserved for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Indian Education and 0.4 percent for the Outlying Areas (American

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Virgin Islands). The amount reserved for the Outlying Areas includes \$1 million for the Republic of Palau. In addition, States are permitted to reserve up to 1 percent, or \$400,000, whichever is greater, to cover State 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. Finally, under the reauthorized ESEA, a State may also reserve up to 3 percent of its allocation to make grants to LEAs to carry out direct student services, including participation in courses not otherwise available at the student's school and in advanced courses and exams, personalized learning approaches, credit recovery programs, and transportation to enable students to attend higher-performing schools.

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)

Fiscal Year	<u>Basic Grants</u>	<u>Concentration Grants</u>	<u>Targeted Grants</u>	<u>Education Finance Incentive Grants</u>
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
2016	6,459,401	1,362,301	3,544,050	3,544,050

FY 2017 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$15.4 billion for Title I Grants to LEAs in fiscal year 2017, an increase of \$450 million over the fiscal year 2016 level of \$14.9 billion. The requested increase would help States, LEAs, and schools address the challenges they continue to face in ensuring that the increasing numbers of students served by the program meet challenging college- and career-ready standards. The request includes appropriations language overriding the program's authorized funding level.

Turning around the Nation's lowest-performing schools remains an especially urgent challenge and warrants prioritized funding. Accordingly, the request also includes appropriations language allocating 50 percent of funds above the authorized funding level, or \$173.7 million, to States for school improvement activities consistent with section 1003(b) of the amended ESEA. These additional resources, which would be distributed on the basis of States' shares of remaining Title I funds, would buttress States' increased set-asides under section 1003(a) and help ensure that LEAs have the resources needed to implement proven or promising models for turning around the lowest-performing schools or providing targeted support in schools that are failing specific subgroups of students. In addition, the Administration proposes to eliminate the

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

LEA-level hold-harmless provision in section 1003(h) of the ESEA. Although this provision is not in effect for fiscal year 2017, the Administration believes that it should be repealed to ensure that States are able to reserve sufficient school improvement funding under section 1003(a) in fiscal year 2018 and beyond.

Lastly, the request includes \$5 million for Census Bureau preparation of LEA poverty estimates, an increase of \$1 million over the amount provided for this purpose in fiscal year 2016. Additionally, the increase includes \$500,000 to cover higher costs for maintaining current operations of the Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates program and \$500,000 to support annual (rather than biennial) LEA boundary updates and independent evaluations of methodology.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

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

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>
Allocations by LEA Poverty Rate:			
0-15%			
# of LEAs	4,836	5,002	5,002
Dollars	\$1,799,637	\$1,962,597	\$1,997,944
% of Total \$	12.72	13.40	13.41
# of Formula Eligible Children	1,695,467	1,785,216	1,785,216
0-15% \$ Per Formula Child	\$1,061	\$1,099	\$1,119
15-25%			
# of LEAs	4,568	4,656	4,656
Dollars	\$3,946,142	\$4,360,641	\$4,442,920
% of Total \$	27.90	29.78	29.81
# of Formula Eligible Children	3,390,689	3,614,176	3,614,176
15-25% \$ Per Formula Child	\$1,164	\$1,207	\$1,229
>25%			
# of LEAs	3,680	3,391	3,391
Dollars	\$8,397,719	\$8,319,541	\$8,463,331
% of Total \$	59.38	56.82	56.78
# of Formula Eligible Children	6,210,844	5,904,132	5,904,132
>25% \$ Per Formula Child	\$1,352	\$1,409	\$1,433
LEA Allocation Subtotal	\$14,143,555	\$14,642,779	\$14,904,195
BIA/Outlying Areas	144,058	149,058	166,992
School improvement reservation	0	0	173,742
N&D program (Part D, Subpart 2)	118,202	113,981	109,873
Census Updates	<u>3,984</u>	<u>3,984</u>	<u>5,000</u>
Grants to LEAs Total	14,409,802	14,409,802	15,359,802

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>
Number of Schools receiving Title I funds:			
Schoolwide programs	43,482	43,482	43,482
Targeted assistance programs	<u>13,053</u>	<u>13,053</u>	<u>13,053</u>
Total	56,535	56,535	56,535
Number of Students served (in millions):			
Schoolwide programs	22.8	22.8	22.8
Targeted assistance programs	1.1	1.1	1.1
Non-public and N&D programs	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.2</u>
Total	24.1	24.1	24.1

Note: Descriptive data related to number of schools receiving Title I funds are from the 2013-14 school year Common Core of Data (CCD). Descriptive data related to numbers of students served are from the Consolidated State Performance Report (school year 2013-14).

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 2017 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.

In 2014, due to field testing of new assessments aligned to college- and career-ready standards, some States did not test all students on their legacy State assessments to avoid double testing. As a result, 2014 data for these measures might not be comparable to data for prior years.

The 2015 data for these measures are expected to be available in summer 2016.

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.*

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

Measure: The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at or above the proficient level 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
2012	88.8%	59.7%
2013	94.4	54.5
2014	100.0	54.1
2015	100.0	
2016	100.0	
2017	100.0	

Measure: The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at or above the proficient level on State mathematics assessments.

Year	Target Percentage of Students Who Test At or Above Proficiency	Actual Percentage of Students Who Test At or Above Proficiency
2012	88.1%	58.0%
2013	94.0	51.9
2014	100.0	51.1
2015	100.0	
2016	100.0	
2017	100.0	

Measure: The difference between the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at or above the proficient level on State reading assessments and the percentage of all students in grades 3-8 scoring at or above the proficient level 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
2012	3.3%	10.6%
2013	1.6	11.1
2014	0.0	10.7
2015	0.0	
2016	0.0	
2017	0.0	

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 or above the proficient level on State mathematics assessments and the percentage of all students in grades 3-8 scoring at or above the proficient level on State mathematics 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
2012	3.2%	10.2%
2013	1.6	11.0
2014	0.0	11.1
2015	0.0	
2016	0.0	
2017	0.0	

Additional information: Performance targets for these measures were established based on the ESEA goal of 100 percent student proficiency in reading and mathematics by 2014. The Department is considering how best to revise the targets for 2016 and future years based on States' goals under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, and actual performance.

The decreases in the percentage of students scoring at or above proficiency on State assessments in 2013 and 2014 might be explained, in part, by States' transition to more rigorous assessments based on college- and career-ready standards.

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
2012	40.0	32.3
2013	40.0	50.5
2014	40.0	N/A
2015	40.0	N/A
2016	40.0	
2017	40.0	

Assessment of progress: This measure provides information on monitoring visits to States conducted by the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) under a traditional protocol covering the following Department formula grant programs: Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies, Title I Neglected and Delinquent, Education for Homeless Children and Youths, and Title III English Language Acquisition Grants. Since 2013, the Department has focused on implementing a new set of monitoring protocols for States receiving ESEA flexibility, resulting in only 3 monitoring visits under the traditional protocol in 2013 and no such visits in 2014 or 2015. Completion of reports under ESEA flexibility monitoring has generally taken

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

significantly longer than the target for reports under the traditional protocol, in part because the monitoring approach is less compliance-driven, more inquiry-based, and new for the Department and States. The Department is considering whether to revise the measure and the targets for 2016 and future years in light of changes made to these programs through reauthorization of the ESEA.

Other Performance Information

The Title I Program at a Glance

In the 2013-2014 school year, the most recent year for which complete data are available, the Title I program served approximately 23.9 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 table below.

Student Group	# of Students, All Schools	# of Students, Title I Schools	% of students served by Title I
All	50,473,414	23,940,402	47%
American Indian or Alaska Native	523,249	323,542	62
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,615,259	919,389	35
Black	7,822,588	5,153,395	66
Hispanic	2,854,707	8,754,565	68
White	25,148,419	8,153,719	31
Two or more races	1,509,192	635,792	42
Eligible for free or reduced-price lunch	26,185,766	15,984,636	61
English learners	4,947,594	3,730,139	75
Students with disabilities	5,839,652	3,259,012	56

Additional information: Descriptive data are from the National Center for Education Statistics' Common Core of Data (CCD), the Consolidated State Performance Reports, and other collections through the Department's *EDFacts* system for the 2013-14 school year. Total counts of students in Title I schools do not include students in non-public or Neglected and Delinquent programs.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

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, as indicated in the table below.

Concentration ranges of students eligible for free or 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

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, as in effect prior to enactment of the ESSA, required a comprehensive, multi-year national assessment of the implementation and impact of 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. Both reports, as well as other related Title I evaluation reports, are available on the Department of Education's Web site at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oepd/ppss/reports.html#title>. A national assessment of Title I Grants to LEAs is no longer required under the ESEA as amended; however, the ESEA now requires the publication of a report by the Institute of Education Sciences on the effectiveness of the four Title I, Part A allocation formulas in delivering funds to the most economically disadvantaged communities, with a particular emphasis on examining certain categories of LEAs, including small LEAs with relatively large concentrations of students in poverty, and the impact of number weighting and percentage weighting used within the Targeted Grants and Education Finance Incentive Grants formulas.

ESEA Flexibility Analysis

The Department has also supported 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 (available on the Department's State-specific ESEA flexibility Webpages at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/index.html>) are one tool that States can use

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local education agencies

to support continuous improvement, analyze whether their identification systems capture the lowest-performing schools and subgroups, and provide greater public transparency around accountability systems under ESEA flexibility. As noted above, all ESEA flexibility agreements expire on August 1, 2016.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2017 Authorization: 0¹

Budget authority:

<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$450,000	0	-\$450,000

¹ The authorization for this program was struck by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, which reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA), which reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), eliminated the School Improvement Grants (SIG) program, previously authorized by section 1003(g) of the ESEA. However, Congress provided a final appropriation of \$450 million for the program in fiscal year 2016 and, consistent with the transition provisions of the ESSA and the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2016, the Department will make a final round of SIG awards for fiscal year 2016.

Under the SIG program, the Department makes awards 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 SIG allocation to make competitive subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to assist their Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, and may use up to 5 percent for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance activities. 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. LEAs may receive up to \$2 million annually for each school served.

In October 2010, the Department established criteria for SEAs to use in implementing the statutory priorities for awarding SIG funds to LEAs. These 2010 requirements (at 75 FR 66363) were intended to ensure that the significant investments in the SIG program, including \$3 billion in one-time funding made available through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, were used to implement rigorous interventions in the Nation's persistently lowest-achieving schools. To determine greatest need, the 2010 requirements established three tiers of schools based on the statutory eligibility requirements and 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 generally included: (1) the State's

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

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. The 2010 requirements also defined “strongest commitment” as a commitment by an LEA to use SIG funds to implement fully and effectively one of four rigorous school intervention models (the Turnaround, Restart, Closure, and Transformation models) in each of its persistently lowest-achieving schools.

In February 2015, in response to program changes made by Congress through appropriations language, the Department issued new requirements to encourage the adoption of evidence-based models for school improvement and to increase flexibility for SEAs and LEAs under the program. Among other things, the 2015 requirements (at 80 FR 7224) allow SEAs to extend the SIG award period from 3 to 5 years and LEAs to implement reform strategies beyond the four intervention models in the 2010 requirements, including evidence-based whole-school reform strategies and an alternative State-determined whole-school reform model. The 2015 requirements also required an SEA implementing ESEA flexibility to use its lists of priority and focus schools as its list of SIG-eligible schools.

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.

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:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2012.....	\$533,552
2013.....	505,756
2014.....	505,756
2015.....	505,756
2016.....	450,000

FY 2017 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration does not request fiscal year 2017 funding for the SIG program because the program is no longer authorized under the ESEA as amended by the ESSA.

Although it eliminates the SIG program, the reauthorized ESEA maintains support for school improvement. Among other things, it increases the amount of Title I, Part A funds that SEAs must reserve for this purpose and requires this dedicated funding to be targeted on the lowest-performing schools. Specifically, under section 1003(a) of the ESEA as amended, in fiscal year 2017, an SEA must reserve the greater of: (1) 7 percent of its combined Title I, Part A

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

allocations to its LEAs; or (2) the sum of its fiscal year 2016 section 1003(a) reservation (a maximum of 4 percent of its Title I, Part A allocations) and its fiscal year 2016 allocation under the School Improvement Grants program. SEAs must use reserved funds to make subgrants to LEAs to support schools that are identified for comprehensive support and improvement (i.e., are among the lowest-achieving schools) or implementing targeted support and improvement plans (i.e., have consistently underperforming student subgroups) under section 1111(d) of the amended ESEA. Further, in making subgrants, SEAs must give priority to LEAs that serve high numbers or percentages of these schools, that demonstrate the greatest need for funds as determined by the State, and that demonstrate the strongest commitment to using the funds to improve outcomes.

The Administration's fiscal year 2017 budget includes additional resources to help ensure that local school improvement efforts can be successful. Specifically, 50 percent of the funds requested for Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies above the program's authorized funding level would be allocated to States on the basis of their shares of remaining Title I funds and used for school improvement activities consistent with section 1003(b) of the reauthorized law. In addition, the Administration proposes to eliminate the LEA-level hold-harmless provision in section 1003(h) of the ESEA. While this provision is not in effect for fiscal year 2017, the Administration believes that it should be repealed to ensure that States are able to reserve sufficient school improvement funding under section 1003(a) in fiscal year 2018 and beyond.

Finally, the Department has determined that, under the applicable transition provisions of the ESSA, SEAs that make, or have made, multi-year SIG awards to LEAs initially with funds from fiscal year 2016 or prior years may use funds reserved in fiscal year 2017 and future years under section 1003(a) of the ESEA, as amended, to continue those awards under the terms and conditions that were in effect prior to enactment of the ESSA.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>
Amount to States	\$475,958	\$423,469	0
Range of State awards	\$1,103-\$59,541	\$998-\$53,300	0
Average State award	\$9,153	\$8,144	0
Amount to BIE	\$3,187	\$2,808	0
Amount for Outlying Areas	\$1,323	\$1,223	0
National activities	\$25,288	\$22,500	0

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

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 schools 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.

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. They 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 early spring 2016.

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 purposefully 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 award 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 and November 2014, an evaluation brief focusing on case study schools that are rural and two briefs on schools 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 remote locations and large catchment areas, including challenges in the recruitment or retention of teachers and, to a lesser extent, parent involvement. The first brief on case study 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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

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 to be located in districts that reportedly provided expertise and an explicit focus on English learners within the SIG context. The second brief (at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20154004/pdf/20154004.pdf>) focused on efforts to improve teacher capacity to serve English learners, notably finding that teachers in schools that reported a greater focus on developing teachers to serve these students were generally more likely to report that participation in professional development activities improved their effectiveness.

Outcomes of SIG Grants

In October 2015, the Department published results of an analysis of achievement, graduation rate, and leading indicator data for schools receiving SIG funding from the fiscal year 2009, 2010, and 2011 competitions. Comparing, where data permit, schools' proficiency rates on State assessments in the 2012-2013 school year to their rates in the year prior to receiving SIG funds, the analysis found that nearly 40 percent of schools receiving SIG awards in fiscal year 2009 experienced double-digit gains in mathematics proficiency rates over their 3-year grant period, and a third also saw double-digit gains in reading proficiency over that time. The analysis also found the following average increases in proficiency:

- Eight percentage points in mathematics and 6 percentage points in reading for 2009 cohort schools over the 3-year grant period;
- For 2010 cohort schools, 5 percentage points in mathematics and 4 points in reading over a 2-year period; and
- For 2011 cohort schools, 2 points in mathematics and 1 point in reading in 1 year.

In addition, nearly half of 2009 cohort high schools and 38 percent of 2010 cohort high schools increased their adjusted cohort graduation rates by 6 or more percentage points between school years 2010-11 and 2012-13, compared to a quarter of all public high schools nationally during that time. Similarly, nearly half of 2011 cohort high schools increased graduation rates by 4 or more percentage points from 2011-2012 to 2012-13, compared with approximately a quarter of all schools. These gains contributed to an all-time high national graduation rate of 81 percent in 2012-13, which has increased to 82 percent in 2013-14.

The Department is also conducting a formal evaluation of the implementation and 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 focuses on: (1) RTT and SIG implementation; (2) the relationship between receipt of RTT funds and student outcomes; (3) the impact of SIG funds on student outcomes in the lowest-achieving schools; and (4) the relationship between the four original school turnaround models (and related improvement strategies) and student outcomes and school performance. The Department released its implementation report from this study in September 2015 (available at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20154018/>). The report notably found that schools implementing a SIG-funded model used more practices promoted by SIG than low-performing schools not implementing SIG models in the areas of comprehensive instructional reforms,

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

teacher and principal effectiveness, learning time and community-oriented schools, and operational flexibility and support. The report also showed that usage of practices promoted by SIG was highest in the comprehensive instructional reform area and lowest in the operational flexibility and support area. A final report on the impact of the RTT and SIG programs is slated for release in September 2016.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title II, Part B, Subpart 2, Section 2222)

FY 2017 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾

Budget Authority:

	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$190,000	\$190,000	0

¹ A total of \$468,881 thousand is authorized for Part B of Title II. Of the total amount appropriated for Title II, Part B, 34.1 percent is authorized for the Comprehensive Literacy Development and Innovative Approaches to Literacy Grants programs under Subpart 2.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Comprehensive Literacy Development Grants program provides competitive grants to State educational agencies (SEAs) that then award subgrants to eligible entities to support efforts to improve literacy instruction in high-need schools or early childhood education programs. The reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act by the Every Student Succeeds Act changed the name of this program from Striving Readers.

In awarding Comprehensive Literacy Development Grants, the Department is required to give priority to SEAs that will use grant funds for evidence-based activities. Each SEA that receives a grant must use at least 95 percent of its allocation to make competitive subgrants to one or more local educational agencies (LEAs) or, for the purposes of providing early literacy services, to one or more early childhood education programs. LEAs or early childhood education programs that receive subgrants from SEAs under this program must serve a high percentage of disadvantaged children, such as children from low-income families, children with disabilities, or English learners, and must represent diverse geographical areas. Early childhood education programs that receive subgrants must have a demonstrated record of providing comprehensive literacy instruction for children aged birth through 5. SEAs are also required to 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 grades 6 through 12. Further, States must equitably distribute funds among grades within the kindergarten through grade 5 and grades 6 through 12 bands.

An SEA may reserve up to 5 percent of its allocation for activities related to implementing its comprehensive literacy plan and administering subgrants, including providing technical assistance to subgrantees to design and implement their literacy programs, coordinating with institutions of higher education to enhance pre-service courses for students preparing to teach in early childhood education programs or elementary and secondary schools, reviewing and updating State literacy licensure or certification standards, sharing information on promising literacy instructional practices, training literacy coaches, and evaluating grant-funded activities. Eligible entities receiving subgrants must use program funds for services and activities that have the characteristics of effective, evidence-based comprehensive literacy instruction, as defined

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

by the statute. Allowable activities may include professional development and training for early childhood educators and related school staff, coordinating activities designed to increase family engagement in children’s literacy development, and other research-based methods of improving classroom instruction and practice.

The Department also is required to reserve: (1) one-half of 1 percent for the Department of the Interior to carry out comprehensive literacy programs in schools operated or funded by the Bureau of Indian Education and (2) one-half of 1 percent for the Outlying Areas. The Department may reserve up to 5 percent for national activities, which includes a national evaluation, technical assistance and training, data collection, and reporting.

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

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2012	\$159,698
2013	151,378
2014	158,000
2015	160,000
2016	190,000

FY 2017 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration’s fiscal year 2017 request includes \$190.0 million for Comprehensive Literacy Development Grants, the same as the fiscal year 2016 appropriation for Striving Readers. The request includes appropriations language that would override the combined authorization level for this program and the Innovative Approaches to Literacy program. All funds would be used to pay continuation costs and related support for the final cohort of new 5-year Striving Reader grants, which will be awarded in fiscal year 2016.

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, in 2015, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reported that more than 60 percent of 4th- and 8th-grade students are not reading at grade level. Reading achievement for 4th-grade students had not changed significantly from what NAEP reported in 2013, and reading achievement for 8th-grade students actually worsened. In particular, 8th-grade reading scores decreased from 2013 to 2015 for students from low-income families (as defined by eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch) and students with disabilities. The results also show continued, wide achievement gaps in reading between students from low-income families and students from higher-income families: 4th-grade students from higher-income families scored, on average, almost 30 points higher than 4th-grade students from low-income families. Further, 52 percent of 4th-grade students from higher-income families scored Proficient or Advanced in 2015, compared to 21 percent of 4th-grade students from low-income families. While 8th-grade reading achievement worsened across the board in 2015, students from higher-income families still scored more than 20 points higher than students from low-income families on reading assessments. In 2015, 47 percent of 8th-grade students from higher-income families scored Proficient or Advanced, compared to 20 percent of 8th-grade students from low-income families.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

Research also shows that students who fail to read well by 4th-grade have a greater likelihood of dropping out of school, leading to a lifetime of diminished earnings. Further, the differences in the reading skills, including pre-literacy 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, 2003). Research also shows that these early differences in children's skills persist over time. The NCES "Early Childhood Longitudinal Study," which followed the academic progress of children from kindergarten through 5th grade, 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.

Research on the Striving Readers program itself yielded useful information about the program's effectiveness—a summary of research on adolescent literacy interventions carried out by the program's 2006 and 2009 cohorts found that 15 studies produced reliable evidence (i.e., the evidence was found to meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards) on adolescent literacy interventions (Boulay & Goodson, 2015). The grantees from the 2006 and 2009 cohorts implemented 10 distinct literacy interventions, and in its review the What Works Clearinghouse found that four interventions had positive, potentially positive, or mixed effects on reading achievement. The Administration will draw on this research to strengthen the use of evidence in the fiscal year 2016 Striving Readers competition.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>
Funding for new awards	0	\$176,700	0
Number of new awards	0	17	0
Funding for continuation awards	\$157,655	0	\$178,600
Number of continuation awards	6	0	17
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$1,900	0
Amount for Bureau of Indian Education	\$800	\$950	\$950
Amount for Outlying Areas	\$800	\$950	\$950
National activities (including evaluation)	\$745	\$9,500	\$9,500

NOTE: Appropriations language for fiscal years 2015 and 2016 authorized the Department to pool evaluation funds reserved under section 9601 of the ESEA and use those pooled funds to evaluate any ESEA program. Similar authority was included in the ESEA as reauthorized by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (section 8601) and would provide the same flexibility in fiscal year 2017. While the Department did not reserve funds from the Striving

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

Readers program under this authority in fiscal year 2015, it may do so from the Comprehensive Literacy Development program in fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2017 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

All States are required to report on the 1st performance measure. States have the option of either reporting on the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th performance measures, 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.

Objective: *To advance literacy skills, including pre-literacy skills, reading, and writing, for students from birth through grade 12, including English learners and students with disabilities.*

Measure: The percentage of participating 4-year-old children who achieve significant gains in oral language skills.

Year	Target	Actual
2013	Set baseline	68%
2014	68%	63
2015	68	61
2016	68	
2017	68	

Additional information: The Department defines “significant gains” as a positive change in assessment score for which the effect size was at least .20 standard deviations. This approach allows the Department to report standard performance data across States with varying assessments. Four-year-old children who are eligible for testing are children in early childhood education classrooms participating in a Striving Readers subgrant program.

Measure: The percentage of participating 5th-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on State English language arts assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2013	Set baseline	75%
2014	75%	77
2015	75	72

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive literacy development grants

Year	Target	Actual
2016	75	
2017	75	

Additional information: Data reflect cumulative data across States for all students who participated in the Striving Readers program, completed pre- and post- assessments and met or exceeded proficiency levels on the State English language arts assessments. In the most recent reporting year, no States opted to report on alternative measures of adequate student growth.

Measure: The percentage of participating 8th-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on State English language arts assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2012	Set baseline	76%
2013	76%	81
2014	76	71
2015	76	60
2016	76	
2017	76	

Additional information: Data reflect cumulative data across States for all students who participated in the Striving Readers program, completed pre- and post- assessments and met or exceeded proficiency levels on the State English language arts assessments. In the most recent reporting year, no States opted to report on alternative measures of adequate student growth.

Measure: The percentage of participating high school students who meet or exceed proficiency on State English language arts assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2012	Set baseline	75%
2013	75%	72
2014	75	65
2015	75	62
2016	75	
2017	75	

Additional information: Data reflect cumulative data across States for all students who participated in the Striving Readers program, completed pre- and post- assessments and met or exceeded proficiency levels on the State English language arts assessments. In the most recent reporting year, no States opted to report on alternative measures of adequate student growth.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Innovative approaches to literacy

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title II, Part B, Subpart 2, Section 2226)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2017 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾

Budget Authority:

<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$27,000	\$27,000	0

¹ A total of \$468,881 thousand is authorized for Part B of Title II. Of the total amount appropriated for Title II, Part B, 34.1 percent is authorized for the Innovative Approaches to Literacy and Comprehensive Literacy Development Grants programs under Subpart 2.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, which reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, included a separate authorization for the Innovative Approaches to Literacy (IAL) program. The IAL program, which previously was operated under the broad authority of the Fund for the Improvement of Education, supports projects that develop and enhance school libraries and support professional development for school librarians, provide early literacy services to young children, and provide high-quality books to children and adolescents in low-income communities. The program may award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to (1) one or more local educational agencies in which at least 20 percent of the students are from low-income families, (2) the Bureau of Indian Education, or (3) eligible national non-profit organizations to promote programs that develop literacy skills in low-income communities. Grantees may use IAL funds to develop or enhance existing school library programs by providing professional learning opportunities to school librarians or refreshing library materials in high-need schools; early literacy services, including conducting outreach to parents of young children to ensure that families have access to developmentally appropriate materials and are encouraged to read aloud to their young children; and distribute high-quality books to children and adolescents to increase students' reading motivation, performance, and frequency.

In an effort to ensure that projects funded under this program are effective, the Administration has given priority in past fiscal years, including in fiscal year 2016, to projects that are supported by scientifically valid research.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Innovative approaches to literacy

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

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2012	\$28,600
2013	27,567
2014	24,528
2015	23,109
2016	27,000

FY 2017 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration's fiscal year 2017 request includes \$27 million for Innovative Approaches to Literacy, the same as the fiscal year 2016 appropriation. The request includes appropriations language that would override the combined authorized funding level for this program and the Comprehensive Literacy Development program. All requested funds would be used for continuation awards for grants first funded in fiscal year 2016.

Many schools and districts across the Nation do not have school libraries that deliver high-quality literacy programming to children and their families, especially those that serve students from low-income families. Additionally, many schools do not have qualified library media specialists or sufficient library facilities. Where facilities do exist, they may lack adequate books and other materials and resources. In many communities, high-need students, and particularly students from low-income families, have limited access to developmentally appropriate reading material in their homes. In light of these challenges, Innovative Approaches to Literacy grants support research-based activities and book distribution efforts that are designed to increase student achievement and motivation in reading. For example, in 2015 one grantee distributed over 150,000 books, with plans to distribute an additional 150,000 in 2016, to children through community book fairs, summer story hours at local libraries, and end-of-school events. The grantee organizes events where volunteers work with parents to model how to read with a child, and also provides incentives to children to read with their families for specific lengths of time. Another current grantee partnered with a resource center and a local library to provide developmentally appropriate books for young children, encouraged parents to read with their children, and provided a health and wellness presentation in a low-income community.

In fiscal year 2016, the program may give priority to applicants that propose to support students' literacy achievement in rural communities or in schools with high percentages of students from low-income families. The Department is also considering ways to encourage applicants to incorporate technology into their efforts.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Innovative approaches to literacy

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>
Funding for new awards	\$1,014	\$26,636	0
Number of new awards	2	35	0
Funding for continuation awards	\$22,095	\$94	\$27,000
Number of continuation awards	32	2	35
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$270	0

NOTE: Appropriations language for fiscal years 2015 and 2016 authorized the Department to pool evaluation funds reserved under section 9601 of the ESEA and use those pooled funds to evaluate any ESEA program. Similar authority was included in the ESEA as reauthorized by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (section 8601) and would provide the same flexibility in fiscal year 2017. While the Department did not reserve funds from the Innovative Approaches to Literacy program under this authority in fiscal year 2015, it may do so in fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2017 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Administration established the following performance measures for grantees under this program:

Measure: The percentage of 4-year-old children participating in the project who achieve significant gains in oral language skills.

Year	Target	Actual
2013	70%	56%
2014	70	70
2015	70	76
2016	70	
2017	70	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Innovative approaches to literacy

Measure: The percentage of participating 3rd-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on State reading or language arts assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2013	70%	65%
2014	70	52
2015	70	46
2016	70	
2017	70	

Measure: The percentage of participating 8th-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on State reading or language arts assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2013	70%	81%
2014	70	53
2015	70	61
2016	70	
2017	70	

Measure: The percentage of participating high school students who meet or exceed proficiency on State reading or language arts assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2013	70%	84%
2014	70	61
2015	70	61
2016	70	
2017	70	

Note that grantees were required to report only on measures applicable to the populations served, and, therefore, not all grantees reported on each performance measure. In fiscal year 2017, the Administration may revise these performance measures to align better with the reauthorized ESEA.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2017 Authorization: \$374,751

Budget Authority:

<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$374,751	\$374,751	0

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 high school equivalency 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 that results 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.

The Every Student Succeeds Act reauthorized the ESEA and made several changes to the MEP. Major changes to the program include revising the allocation formula to include current data; more clearly defining student eligibility (e.g., including moves that result in obtaining agricultural work even if that was not the original purpose of the move); and clarifying that migratory children who made a qualifying move in the previous year and children who have dropped out of school should receive priority for services under the program.

Eligible children are children of migratory agricultural workers or migratory fishers, or who are migratory agricultural workers or fishers themselves, and who have made a "qualifying move" within the last 3 years. A move is considered to be a qualifying move if it is a change of residence due to economic necessity and (1) involves crossing school district boundaries; (2) is made in order to obtain, or resulted in, temporary or seasonal work in agriculture or fishing; and (3) was made in the preceding 36 months.

Funds are allocated through a statutory formula based on each State's per-pupil expenditure for education, its average count of eligible migratory students aged 3 through 21 residing within the State in the preceding 3 years, and its count of students who received services in summer or intersession programs provided by the State during the previous year. Under a hold-harmless

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

provision, States are assured at least 90 percent of their previous years' allocations for fiscal years 2017 through 2019.

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 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:

Fiscal year	(dollars in thousands)
2012	\$393,236
2013	372,751
2014	374,751
2015	374,751
2016	374,751

FY 2017 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2017, the Administration requests \$374.8 million for the Title I Migrant program, the same amount as the fiscal year 2016 level. The fiscal year 2017 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 districts 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, such as the need to provide support to students to help them overcome the effects of disruptions in their education and helping high school students accrue credits towards high school graduation when they change schools often.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

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 (33.2 percent) of the children and youth eligible to receive services under the program during school year 2013-2014 had moved within the previous 12 months. In addition, 37.1 percent of eligible children and youth were English learners and 6.9 percent of eligible children and youth were eligible to receive services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

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 (10.8 percent of the eligible population in 2013-2014) are school-aged youth who do not attend school.

Data for 2013-14 indicate that the 347,634 children were identified as eligible under the program, and States and local entities provided services to 235,388 migrant students during the regular school year and 102,551 during the summer or intersessions. Program funds supported 3,122 projects that operated during the school day, 472 projects that provided an extended school day during the regular school year, 134 summer or intersession projects, and 904 year-round projects. The program served 3,779 children aged birth through 2; 19,451 children aged 3 through 5; 196,855 children and youth in kindergarten through grade 12; and 15,303 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 expects to support a similar level of services using fiscal year 2017 funds.

The Department would reserve approximately \$10 million from the fiscal year 2017 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.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>
Number of eligible children	347,634	347,634	347,634
SEA program:			
Amount for State grants	\$364,751	\$364,751	\$364,751
Range of State awards	0-\$128,657	0-\$128,657	\$78-\$116,209
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

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

In 2014, the Department adopted new performance measures 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 attain high school diplomas and enroll in postsecondary education or training. Specific measures include: (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.

The Department will start collecting data for the grade promotion/graduation and Algebra I measures in school year 2016-17, when changes in the MSIX take effect that will enable the Department to collect these data.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

Objective: *Along with other Federal programs and State and local reform efforts, the Migrant Education Program 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%	49.6
2015	44.1	
2016	44.1	
2017	44.1	

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%	49.5
2015	47.6	
2016	47.6	
2017	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 fluctuation in student performance during this transition period, current performance targets are static. The Department plans to reset targets once data for school years 2016-17 are available. Data for 2015 will be available in summer 2016.

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.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

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	36
2016	35	
2017	37	

Additional information: At the end of fiscal year 2015, 36 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 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 Department anticipates that the Notice of Final Rulemaking will be published by spring 2016.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2017 Authorization: \$47,614

Budget Authority:

	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$47,614	\$47,614	0

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.

The N and D program is authorized by Part D of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as reauthorized by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015. Major changes to the program under the reauthorization include emphasizing the attainment of regular high school diplomas as the preferred program outcome; improving transitions for youth between correctional facilities and local education programs and schools, particularly to provide for educational continuity, to ensure credit accrual, and to support the successful completion of high school and pathways into postsecondary education and the workforce; expanding the programs to better include students served by the Bureau of Indian Education or tribal schools; focusing on the unique needs of children who have interacted with both the child welfare system and the justice system; and allowing local programs to use funds for pay-for-success initiatives.

Like other Title I programs, the N and D program requires institutions receiving funds to gear their services to the same college- and career-ready State academic standards that all children are expected to meet under the ESEA. 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 N and D program 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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

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 technical assistance to help build the capacity of State agency programs.

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:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2012	\$50,231
2013	47,614
2014	47,614
2015	47,614
2016	47,614

FY 2017 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2017, the Administration requests \$47.6 million, the same as the 2016 level, for the Neglected and Delinquent (N and D) program. The activities supported with this funding would help an estimated 90,000 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. This problem was documented as early as 1996, when a study from the Educational Testing Service showed 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.

Furthermore, a large number of youth in correctional settings are students with disabilities. The 2013 count of students with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act showed that over 15,000 children and youth served under that program were in correctional settings. In addition, for school year 2013-14, grantees under the N and D program reported that over 25,000 youth served in State-operated juvenile detention and correction facilities and over 71,000 youth served in locally operated juvenile detention and correction facilities were students with disabilities. The overrepresentation of students with disabilities poses additional

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

challenges for institutions who serve these students, who require additional support and attention to be successful in school and beyond.

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.

The reauthorized ESEA further emphasizes the importance of providing high-quality education services to incarcerated youth, especially the provision of supports and planning regarding youth's transition from facilities back to local education programs. Additionally, the inclusion of pay-for-success initiatives as an allowable use of funds provides the option for locally operated and State-run facilities to take advantage of this promising strategy to improve outcomes for at-risk, neglected, and delinquent youth who are served by this program.

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 (<http://www.ed.gov/correctionaled>). This guidance built on the Task Force Report to the President 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 (http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/053014_mbk_report.pdf). 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 to appropriately serve youth in confinement and provide them support as they transition back to their communities (<http://www.ed.gov/blog/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/doj-dod-ltr.pdf>).

In 2016, the Department will begin an implementation evaluation of the N and D program to study correctional education services provided to children in State and local facilities and institutions. The study will conduct surveys of State grantees and local subgrantees to examine the types of services and strategies that N and D funds support, how State and local agencies assist students in transitioning back to schools, how State correctional facilities implement institution-wide N and D projects, and how grantees assess the educational outcomes of participating students. The final report is due at the end of calendar year 2017 and will be used to inform continuous program improvement, increase the research base, and improve outcomes for students served by this and other similar education programs.

In 2017, 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. Center activities

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).

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

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>Output Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>
Number of participating institutions	676	676	676
Estimated number of students served	90,262	90,262	90,262
Average Federal contribution per child (whole dollars)	\$528	\$528	\$528
Range of awards to States	\$123-\$2,775	\$125-\$2,762	\$125-\$2,763
Average State award	\$899	\$898	\$899
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 the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2017 and future years, and 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 students will improve academic and vocational skills needed to further their education.*

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

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
2012	13.8%	13.0%
2013	14.8	14.9
2014	15.8	13.3
2015	16.8	
2016	17.8	
2017	18.8	

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
2012	56.6%	52.3%
2013	57.6	58.1
2014	58.6	53.2
2015	59.6	
2016	60.6	
2017	61.6	

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. A number of factors may have contributed to the decreases in performance for these measures from 2012 to 2013 or 2013 to 2014. 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. The Department revised the performance targets in 2013 to better align with recent performance.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2012	71.4%	71.1%
2013	72.4	64.4
2014	73.4	67.8
2015	74.4	
2016	75.4	
2017	76.4	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

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
2012	72.9%	71.9%
2013	73.9	65.4
2014	74.9	68.6
2015	75.9	
2016	76.9	
2017	77.9	

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 decreases in performance for these measures from 2012 to 2013 or 2013 to 2014. 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.

Efficiency measures

Measure: The cost per high school diploma or equivalent.

Year	Target	Actual
2012	\$4,520	\$4,891
2013	4,475	4,873
2014	4,430	5,283
2015	4,386	
2016	4,341	
2017	4,298	

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 increase in cost for 2014 may be due to decreases in the number of students served under the program. The Department revised the performance targets in 2013 to better align with recent performance.

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 2017 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$44,623	\$44,623	0

¹The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2015; reauthorizing legislation is sought for fiscal year 2017.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

of the remaining 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:

Fiscal Years	(dollars in thousands)
2012	\$36,526
2013	34,623
2014	34,623
2015	37,474
2016	44,623

FY 2017 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2017, the Department requests a total of \$44.6 million for the Special Programs for Migrant Students, the same amount as the fiscal year 2016 level. The request would support continued implementation of programs that have demonstrated success in helping migrant youth who are particularly at risk for poor educational, employment, and earnings outcomes. In fiscal year 2016, program funding was increased by \$7.1 million, which enabled the Department to increase significantly the funding for CAMP awards due to statutory provisions regarding the distribution of funds for each program at an appropriation level of at least \$40 million. In fiscal year 2017, at the requested level, the statutory provisions will continue to allow a portion of the funds to be used for either program based on the number, quality, and promise of applications received. Projects supported by HEP and CAMP funds have provided critical services to migrant students, leading to significantly improved outcomes in terms of education and employment. Funding the Special Programs for Migrant Students at the request level would be an investment in programs proven to work and that serve to multiply the positive impact these programs have had on high-needs migrant students.

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 or do not attend school. 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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

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. Furthermore, State educational agencies reported that 10.8 percent of the population eligible to receive services under the Migrant Education program authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (37,538 youths in school year 2013-14) were school-aged youth who do not attend school.

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," 2016-17 Edition, the median hourly wage for agricultural workers in 2014 was \$9.30, and these types of workers are often paid based on how much they do instead of how many hours they work. Furthermore, the "Occupational Outlook Handbook" indicates that farming, fishing, and forestry occupations were one of the lowest paid occupational groups in the country. By comparison, the National Center for Education Statistics reports in "The Condition of Education 2015" that in 2013, 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 \$37,500 for a person with an associate's degree (equivalent to \$18.03 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. Program performance data show that the programs' academic and support services are successful at helping participants attain their high school equivalency credentials or complete their first academic year in a postsecondary program. Program outcomes compare favorably with outcomes for the general population. For example, 96.2 percent of the CAMP participants who completed their first academic year in a postsecondary program continued their postsecondary education. In contrast, data from the National Center of Education Statistics' "The Condition of Education 2015" show that the retention rate of first-time degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates at Title IV institutions was 80 percent from 2012 to 2013.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>
Outreach, technical assistance, and professional development	\$187	\$223	\$223
HEP:			
Number of students served	5,374	5,236	5,236
Funding for new awards	\$6,855	\$4,183	\$2,338
Number of new awards	16	9-12	5-7
Peer review of new award applications	\$89	\$100	\$100
Average new grant award	\$463	\$452	\$452
Funding for continuation awards	\$13,445	\$15,697	\$17,542
Number of continuation awards	29	35	39
Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars)	\$3,774	\$3,797	\$3,797
CAMP:			
Number of students served	1,866	2,209	2,209
Funding for new awards	\$5,470	\$5,508	\$3,816
Number of new awards	13	13-16	9-11
Peer review of new award applications	\$89	\$100	\$100
Average new grant award	\$422	423	423
Funding for continuation awards	\$11,339	\$14,372	\$16,064
Number of continuation awards	27	34	38
Peer review of new award applications	\$89	\$100	\$100
Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars)	\$9,002	\$9,000	\$9,000
Remainder for either program based on quality and quantity of applications:			
Amount for new awards	0	\$4,440	\$4,440
Number of new awards	0	10-15	10-15

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 2017 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 high school equivalency credential.*

Measure: The percentage of HEP participants receiving a high school equivalency credential.

Year	Target	Actual
2012	69.0%	67.4%
2013	69.0	74.5
2014	69.0	66.6
2015	69.0	
2016	69.0	
2017	69.0	

Additional information: The source of data is grantee performance reports. The source of data is grantee performance reports. Over the last 5 years, changes to State academic standards for elementary and secondary education have driven changes to adult education standards and high school equivalency assessments. However, since these changes have been associated with fluctuation in student performance during this transition period, current performance targets are static. The Department plans to reset targets once data for school years 2015-16 are available. Data collected for fiscal year 2015 will be available in the spring of 2016.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

Objective: *An increasing percentage of HEP recipients of a high school equivalency credential will enter postsecondary education programs, upgraded employment, or the military.*

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

Year	Target	Actual
2012	80.0%	79.3%
2013	80.0	80.1
2014	80.0	79.9
2015	80.0	
2016	80.0	
2017	80.0	

Additional information: The source of data is grantee performance reports. Data for this measure are based on actual placement after receipt of a high school equivalency credential. Upgraded employment means a move to a job that provides more hours (and, as a result, increased pay); a job with increased benefits; a move to a supervisory position; a move to a new job with predefined career ladder, regardless of wage change (for example, becoming a management trainee or entering a formal apprenticeship); or a move to a job with higher hourly wages, or a higher salary. Participants who were unemployed prior to participation in a HEP program and who obtain a job after participation and attainment of a high school equivalency credential are also included in this measure. The Department is providing technical assistance to grantees on collecting data on program participants after they are no longer receiving program services. Data for 2015 will be available in the spring of 2016.

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 CAMP participants completing the first year of their postsecondary program.

Year	Target	Actual
2012	86.0%	85.5%
2013	86.0	85.1
2014	86.0	86.7
2015	86.0	
2016	86.0	
2017	86.0	

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

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. Data collected for fiscal year 2015 will be available in the spring of 2016.

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

Measure: The percentage of CAMP participants who, after completing the first academic year of college, continue their postsecondary education.

Year	Target	Actual
2012	85.0%	96.7%
2013	85.0	95.0
2014	85.0	96.2
2015	85.0	
2016	85.0	
2017	85.0	

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 2015 will be available in the spring of 2016.

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 2015 will be available in the spring of 2016.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

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
2012	\$7,910	\$5,766
2013	8,306	5,409
2014	8,718	5,985
2015	9,104	
2016	9,509	
2017	9,931	

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

Year	Target Cost Per Participant Earning a GED	Actual Cost Per Participant Earning a GED
2012	\$15,459	\$11,201
2013	16,195	9,667
2014	16,962	12,750
2015	17,719	
2016	18,511	
2017	19,338	

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
2012	\$12,502	\$11,160
2013	13,104	7,589
2014	13,732	7,433
2015	14,344	
2016	14,984	
2017	15,653	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Special programs for migrant students

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
2012	\$12,003	\$9,111
2013	12,543	10,686
2014	13,107	10,170
2015	13,697	
2016	14,314	
2017	14,958	

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
2012	\$19,236	\$14,860
2013	20,102	14,534
2014	21,007	12,521
2015	21,952	
2016	22,940	
2017	23,972	

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
2012	\$14,628	\$11,748
2013	15,286	10,701
2014	15,974	11,512
2015	16,693	
2016	17,444	
2017	18,229	

