

Department of Education
SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language	D-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	D-2
Appropriation, Adjustments, and Transfers	D-3
Summary of Changes	D-4
Authorizing Legislation.....	D-5
Appropriations History.....	D-6
Summary of Request	D-7
Activities:	
School safety national activities	D-9
Elementary and secondary school counseling	D-18
Physical education program.....	D-21
Promise neighborhoods.....	D-27
Full-service community schools	D-32

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

For carrying out activities authorized by subparts 2 and 3 of part [A]E of title IV [and subparts 1, 2, and 10 of part D of title V] of the ESEA, [~~\$244,815,000~~]\$228,000,000: *Provided*, That [~~\$75,000,000~~]\$90,000,000 shall be available for [subpart 2 of part A of title IV] section 4631¹, of which up to \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for the Project School Emergency Response to Violence (“Project SERV”) program² [to provide education-related services to local educational agencies and institutions of higher education in which the learning environment has been disrupted due to a violent or traumatic crisis]³: Provided further, That [~~\$73,254,000~~]\$10,000,000 shall be available for section 4625⁴: *Provided further*, That \$128,000,000 shall be available through December 31, [2016 for Promise Neighborhoods] 2017 for section 4624⁵. (*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 appropriations language.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
¹ ... <u>[Provided, That [\$75,000,000]\$90,000,000</u> shall be available for <u>section 4631</u> ...	This language earmarks funds for Safe Schools National Activities (section 4631) in order to override the \$5 million reservation for School Safety National Activities in section 4601(b)(1) of the ESEA.
² ...of which up to \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for the Project School Emergency Response to Violence (“Project SERV”) program...	This language earmarks funds for Project SERV (under Safe Schools National Activities) and makes these funds available for obligation at the Federal level until they are expended.
³ ...[to provide education-related services to local educational agencies and institutions of higher education in which the learning environment has been disrupted due to a violent or traumatic crisis...]	This Project SERV language, which authorized the program through appropriations language in 2016, is deleted because in 2017, Project SERV is included under section 4631 of the reauthorized ESEA.
⁴ ... <u>Provided further, That [\$73,254,000]\$10,000,000</u> shall be available for <u>section 4625</u> ...	This language earmarks funds for Full-Service Community Schools in order to override the authorized level for the program under ESEA section 4601(b)(2)(B).
⁵ ... <u>Provided further, That \$128,000,000</u> shall be available through December 31, [2016 for Promise Neighborhoods] <u>2017 for section 4624</u> .	This language earmarks funds for the Promise Neighborhoods program in order to override the authorized level for the program under ESEA section 4601(b)(2)(B), and gives the Department an additional 3 months beyond the end of fiscal year 2016 to obligate them.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Appropriation, Adjustments, and Transfers

(dollars in thousands)

Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers	2015	2016	2017
Discretionary:			
Appropriation.....	\$223,315	\$244,815	\$228,000
Comparative transfer from:			
<u>Innovation and Improvement</u> for:			
Full-Service Community Schools	—	<u>+10,000</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, comparable appropriation	223,315	254,815	228,000

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Summary of Changes

(dollars in thousands)

2016.....	\$254,815	
2017.....	<u>228,000</u>	
Net change		-26,815

Increases:	<u>2016 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
<p>Increase for School Safety National Activities to support additional Project Prevent grants to communities suffering from chronic violence and for a new School Safety and Preparedness grants competition supporting the development and implementation of high-quality school emergency operations plans at the local level.</p>	\$75,000	+\$15,000
<p>Increase for Promise Neighborhoods to support significant new investments in grants to community-based organizations for the implementation of plans to provide a continuum of services and supports to children and youth in our most distressed communities, from cradle to career, in order to significantly improve their developmental, educational, and life outcomes.</p>	73,254	<u>+54,746</u>
Subtotal, increases		+69,746
Decreases:		
<u>Program</u>		
<p>Eliminate funding for the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling and Physical Education programs because with the enactment of the Every Student Succeeds Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) no longer includes these programs. The budget request includes funds for Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants which LEAs may use to carry out similar activities.</p>	96,561	-96,561
Subtotal, decreases		<u>-96,561</u>
Net change		-28,815

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Authorizing Legislation (dollars in thousands)

Activity	2016 Authorized	2016 Estimate	2017 Authorized	2017 Request
School safety national activities (<i>ESEA IV-F, Subpart 3, Section 4631</i>)	0 ^{1,2}	\$75,000	\$5,000 ³	\$90,000
Elementary and secondary school counseling (<i>ESEA V-D, Subpart 2</i>)	0 ¹	49,561	0 ⁴	0
Physical education program (<i>ESEA V-D, Subpart 10</i>)	0 ¹	47,000	0 ⁴	0
Promise neighborhoods (<i>ESEA IV-F, Subpart 2, section 4624</i>)	0 ^{1,5}	73,254	(6)	128,000
Full-service community schools (<i>ESEA IV-F, Subpart 2, section 4625</i>)	<u>0^{1,5}</u>	<u>10,000</u>	<u>(6)</u>	<u>10,000</u>
Total definite authorization	0		5,000	
Total appropriation		223,315		228,000

D-5

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

² Prior to fiscal year 2017, the program was Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities, as authorized by P.L. 107-110, ESEA IV-A, Subpart 2, section 4121.

³ A total of \$220,741 thousand is authorized for Part F of Title IV. Of the funds appropriated for Part F, \$5,000 thousand is reserved under section 4601(b)(1) to carry out the School Safety National Activities under Subpart 3 (section 4631). The budget request includes appropriations language to override the authorization level.

⁴ The authorization for the program was repealed, effective October 1, 2016, by P.L. 114-95.

⁵ Prior to fiscal year 2017, the program was authorized under ESEA V-D, Subpart 1, which was repealed by P.L. 114-95.

⁶ A total of \$220,741 thousand is authorized for Part F of Title IV. Of the funds appropriated for Part F, \$5,000 thousand is reserved for Subpart 3 and of the remainder, 36 percent is authorized for the Promise Neighborhoods and Full-Service Community Schools programs under Subpart 2. The budget request includes appropriations language to override the authorization level for Subpart 2.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2008	\$324,248	\$760,575	\$697,112	\$639,404
2009	281,963	714,481 ¹	666,384 ¹	690,370
2010	413,608	395,753	438,061 ²	393,053
2011	1,786,166	384,841 ³	426,053 ²	288,465 ⁴
2012	1,781,132	65,000 ⁵	270,463 ⁵	255,753
2013	1,447,539	108,487 ⁶	259,589 ⁶	242,375
2014	1,831,673	N/A ⁷	330,481 ²	270,892
2015	1,463,370	N/A ⁷	270,892 ⁸	223,315
2016	349,561	56,754 ⁹	120,314 ⁹	244,815
2017	228,000			

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; the level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Committee action only.

⁶ The level for the House and Senate allowances reflect action on the regular annual 2013 appropriations bill, which proceeded in the 112th Congress only through the House Subcommittee and the Senate Committee.

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.

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
Safe Schools and Citizenship Education						
1. School safety national activities (ESEA IV-F-3, section 4631) ¹	D	70,000	75,000	90,000	15,000	20.00%
2. Elementary and secondary school counseling (ESEA V-D, subpart 2; repealed by P.L. 114-95) ²	D	52,509	49,561	0	(49,561)	-100.00%
3. Physical education program (ESEA V-D, subpart 10; repealed by P.L. 114-95) ²	D	44,052	47,000	0	(47,000)	-100.00%
4. Promise neighborhoods (ESEA IV-F-2, section 4624)	D	56,754	73,254	128,000	54,746	74.73%
5. Full-service community schools (ESEA IV-F-2, section 4625) ³	D	---	10,000	10,000	0	0.00%
Total	D	223,315	254,815	228,000	(26,815)	-10.52%

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

Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

¹ Prior to fiscal year 2017, the program was Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities, as authorized by P.L. 107-110, ESEA IV-A-2, section 4121.

² Reflects a one-time reprogramming in fiscal year 2015 of \$2,948 thousand from the Physical Education Program to Elementary and Secondary School Counseling.

³ 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 \$10,000 thousand that was appropriated in the Innovation and Improvement account.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Summary of Request

The programs in the Safe Schools and Citizenship Education account support activities to improve students' safety and well-being, improve significantly the educational and developmental outcomes of children within some of the Nation's most distressed communities, and provide comprehensive academic, social, and health services for students, students' family members, and community members that promote improved educational outcomes for children.

Funding in the account is requested for the following three programs:

- \$90 million for School Safety National Activities, an increase of \$15 million over the 2016 level, focused on key initiatives in "Now Is The Time," the President's common-sense plan to make our schools safer and protect our children from gun violence. These include \$46.5 million for School Climate Transformation Grants continuation awards to SEAs and LEAs, and related technical assistance, to help schools train their teachers and other school staff to implement evidence-based behavioral intervention strategies to improve school climate; \$24.5 million (of which \$10 million would support an estimated 15 new awards) for Project Prevent grant awards to LEAs to help schools in communities with pervasive violence break the cycle of violence; and \$10 million for new School Safety and Preparedness awards to LEAs to support the development and implementation of high-quality school emergency operations plans at the local level. Funds would also be used to help LEAs and IHEs recover from emergencies under Project SERV (School Emergency Response to Violence), and for dissemination, outreach, and related forms of technical assistance.
- \$128 million for the Promise Neighborhoods program, a \$55 million increase, to support grants to community-based organizations for comprehensive neighborhood programs and supports designed to combat the effects of poverty and improve educational and life outcomes for children and youth. Funds would support an estimated 15 new implementation grants and 6 continuation awards and, to ensure that grantees under the program continue to use and build evidence, expanded technical assistance to grantees in the use of data collection and analysis in their decision-making and to evaluate the implementation and impact of program activities.
- Level funding of \$10 million for the Full-Service Community Schools program, which provides grants to LEAs supporting local efforts to focus resources and streamline duplicative or disconnected programs into "place-based" services in the school setting that provide needed academic, social, and health supports, thereby yielding better coordinated strategies that can more meaningfully impact neighborhoods with high rates of poverty, childhood obesity, academic failure, and involvement of community members in the justice system. The 2017 request would support continuation awards to nine grantees.

No funds are requested for the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling or Physical Education programs because these programs no longer are authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

School safety national activities

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part F, Subpart 3, Section 4631)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2017 Authorization: \$5,000¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$75,000	\$90,000	+\$15,000

¹ A total of \$220,741 thousand is authorized for Part F of Title IV. Of the funds appropriated for Part F, \$5,000 thousand is reserved under section 4601(b)(1) to carry out the School Safety National Activities under Subpart 3 (section 4631).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA) reauthorized the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) National Activities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) into a broad discretionary authority that authorizes activities to improve students' safety and well-being, during and after the school day. Prior to the reauthorization, these activities were more generally limited to those designed to prevent the illegal use of drugs and violence among, and promote safety and positive school environments for, students. Activities under the reauthorized program may be carried out through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements with public and private organizations or individuals, or through agreements with other Federal agencies.

The reauthorization also incorporated the longstanding Project School Emergency Response to Violence (Project SERV) program into the ESEA. Project SERV, which previously was authorized through appropriations language, provides education-related services—including counseling and referral to mental health services as needed—to local educational agencies and institutions of higher education in which the learning environment has been disrupted by a violent or traumatic crisis.

In recent years SDFSC National Activities, in addition to Project SERV, have included:

- Schools Climate Transformation grants to State educational agencies (SEAs) and local educational agencies (LEAs) to develop and adopt, or expand to more schools, a multi-tiered decision-making framework that guides the selection, integration, and implementation of the best evidence-based behavioral practices for improving school climate and behavioral outcomes for all students.
- Project Prevent awards to LEAs to help schools in communities with pervasive violence break the cycle of violence by offering students: (1) access to school-based counseling services, or referrals to community-based counseling services, for trauma or anxiety

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

School safety national activities

(including post-traumatic stress disorder); (2) social and emotional supports (such as enhancing coping skills) to help address the effects of violence; (3) conflict resolution and other school-based strategies to prevent future violence; and (4) a safer and improved school environment, which may include activities to decrease the incidence of harassment, bullying, violence, and gang involvement.

- Grants to SEAs and technical assistance to help LEAs and schools develop, implement, and improve their emergency management plans.
- Safe and Supportive Schools grants to SEAs for projects that take a systematic approach to improving student safety and reducing drug abuse through measurement systems that assess conditions for learning, which must include school safety, and the implementation of programmatic interventions that address problems identified by data.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2012	\$64,877
2013	61,484
2014	90,000
2015	70,000
2016	75,000

FY 2017 BUDGET REQUEST

The 2017 request includes \$90 million for School Safety National Activities, an increase of \$15 million over the 2016 level, to expand key elements of the President's Now is the Time initiative (NITT). The Administration's request also includes appropriations language overriding the authorization level for the program. The requested increase would be used for (1) a new round of Project Prevent grants to communities suffering from chronic violence and (2) a new School Safety and Preparedness grants competition supporting the development and implementation of high-quality school emergency operations plans at the local level.

NITT was released in January 2013 following the Sandy Hook Elementary School shootings in Newtown, Connecticut, which took the lives of 20 children and 6 teachers. The initiative included common-sense proposals designed to protect our children and our communities by reducing gun violence, making schools safer, and increasing access to mental health services. Some of the NITT proposals were based, in part, on the findings of the Safe Schools Initiative, a collaboration between the U.S. Secret Service and the Department of Education in the wake of the 1999 Columbine tragedy that resulted in a guide published in July 2004, on managing threatening situations and creating safe school climates (<https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/safety/threatassessmentguide.pdf>). This report includes evidence that keeping students safe in school requires a positive school climate in which students and staff feel supported socially and emotionally, are engaged in activities that promote achievement and development, and have open lines of communication within the school as well as between the school and the community.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

School safety national activities

One of the activities the Department funded in 2014 under NITT was \$13 million in grants to 25 State educational agencies (SEAs) to increase their capacity to assist local educational agencies (LEAs) through training and technical assistance in the development and implementation of high-quality and comprehensive school emergency operations plans (EOPs). The Department learned through its administration of the State EOP grants that many LEAs lack the capacity to provide the support needed to develop and implement school-level EOPs. In the event of an emergency, an effective school-level EOP can literally be a matter of life and death for those involved.

In addition, under NITT, the Administration developed a new generation of related resources that would have a much greater impact if disseminated more broadly to LEAs and schools. These resources include a Guide for Developing High-Quality School EOPs and assessment tools that LEAs and schools can use to measure (1) their emergency management capacity and (2) the quality and comprehensiveness of their EOPs. For fiscal year 2017, the Administration is proposing a new School Safety and Preparedness grants competition of nearly \$10 million for LEAs that would highlight the availability of these resources and provide direct support to approximately 60 LEAs (and to hundreds of schools) in using them.

The new competition would focus on building local capacity to create and sustain school-level EOPs as an essential element of effective school safety practices. In addition to direct grant assistance, the Budget includes \$2.5 million to continue the Readiness and Emergency Management for Schools Technical Assistance Center that provides training and technical assistance to grantees and non-grantees alike, supporting emergency management efforts for schools, LEAs, and IHEs.

As part of NITT, the Department also funded Project Prevent grants to LEAs to help schools in communities with pervasive violence to break the cycle of violence. Research shows that both direct and indirect exposure to community violence can impact children's mental health and development and can increase the likelihood that these children will later commit violent acts themselves. Being the victim of, or being exposed to, community violence in childhood is also associated with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Project Prevent addresses this problem by supporting the deployment of resources and technical assistance through local projects that increase the capacity of LEAs to identify, assess, and serve students exposed to pervasive violence, helping to ensure that affected students are offered mental health services for trauma or anxiety; support conflict resolution programs; and implement other school-based violence prevention strategies in order to reduce the likelihood that these students will later commit violent acts.

The Department made Project Prevent grants to 22 high-need communities in fiscal year 2014. Unfortunately, recent events demonstrate the strong, continuing need for additional Project Prevent assistance, with many cities across the country experiencing record increases in homicides and other violence during 2015, with potentially traumatic effects on students and schools in the communities experiencing this violence. The budget request includes a total of \$24.5 million for Project Prevent—\$14.5 million in continuation awards for the 2014 cohort, and \$10 million for a new cohort of an estimated 15 grantees.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

School safety national activities

Other activities included in the 2017 request are designed to improve school climate and to restore the learning environment following a violent or traumatic incident. Key activities include the following:

- \$46.5 million for School Climate Transformation Grant continuation awards, and related technical assistance, to help schools train their teachers and other school staff to implement evidence-based strategies to improve school climate. School Climate Transformation Grants, first awarded in fiscal year 2014, build on the development and testing of evidence-based, multi-tiered decision-making frameworks, such as Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, which provide differing levels of support and interventions to students based on their needs. The 2017 request would fund the fourth year of 5-year grants to State educational agencies and local educational agencies, which are used for such activities as implementing data tracking systems; selecting the most appropriate programs to address students' needs; implementing the selected programs with fidelity; and purchasing associated programmatic materials.
- \$3 million for Project SERV (School Emergency Response to Violence) to replenish a longstanding reserve fund that supports the provision of education-related services to LEAs and IHEs in which the learning environment has been disrupted due to a violent or traumatic crisis. Consistent with previous appropriations for this activity, funds for Project SERV are requested on a no-year basis, to remain available for obligation at the Federal level until expended.
- \$3.5 million for the National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments (NCSSE), an increase of \$1 million over the 2016 level. The NCSSE provides technical assistance to SEAs and LEAs, as well as to institutions of higher education, relating to alcohol and drug use and violence prevention at the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary levels; supports the collection and dissemination of information and best practices on improving school climate; provides technical assistance to the Project Prevent grantees to strengthen the implementation of their projects; and will provide technical assistance to LEAs and schools that utilize the model school climate survey, to be released by the National Center for Education Statistics in 2016, in selecting and implementing programs, policies, and practices that are responsive to the survey results. The increased funding would be focused on technical assistance to LEAs on the selection and implementation of evidence-based substance abuse prevention programs.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

School safety national activities

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>
School Safety and Preparedness Activities			
Grant award funds (new)	0	0	\$9,742
Peer review of new award applications	0	0	150
Technical assistance center	<u>\$2,500</u>	<u>\$2,250</u>	<u>2,500</u>
Total	2,500	2,250	12,392
Number of LEA awards	0	0	60
Range of awards	0	0	\$100-\$500
Average award	0	0	\$162
Project Prevent			
Grant award funds (new)	0	0	\$9,900
Grant award funds (continuation)	\$14,625	\$14,574	14,521
Supplemental grant award funds for arts education activities	0	500	0
Peer review of new award applications	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>100</u>
Total	14,625	15,074	24,521
Number of LEA awards (new)	0	0	15
Number of LEA awards (continuation)	22	22	22
Range of awards	\$291-\$1,000	\$291-\$1,000	\$291-\$1,000
Average award	\$665	\$685	\$660
School Climate Transformation Grants			
SEA grant award funds (continuation)	\$7,422	\$7,529	\$7,581
LEA grant award funds (continuation)	36,193	36,449	35,881
Technical assistance (continuation)	<u>3,080</u>	<u>3,080</u>	<u>3,000</u>
Total	46,695	47,058	46,461
Number of SEA awards (continuation)	12	12	12
Range of SEA awards	\$252-\$750	\$256-\$750	\$259-\$750
Average SEA award	\$619	\$627	\$632
Number of LEA awards (continuation)	71	70	70
Range of LEA awards	\$161-\$750	\$186-\$750	\$178-\$750
Average LEA award	\$510	\$521	\$513

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

School safety national activities

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>
School Emergency Response to Violence (Project SERV)	\$2,626	\$2,592	\$3,000
Evaluation	\$500	0	0
Other Activities			
National Center for Safe Supportive Learning Environments	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$3,500
Grants to Assist Communities with Significant Civil Unrest	0	5,000	0
Other data collection, dissemination, outreach, and assistance	<u>554</u>	<u>525</u>	<u>125</u>
Total	3,054	8,025	3,625

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 School Safety National Activities 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, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program. Unless stated otherwise the source of these GPRA data is grantee annual and final performance reports.

Goal: To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by increasing the capacity of LEAs to improve behavioral and learning outcomes of students through the implementation of multi-tiered behavioral frameworks.

Objective: *LEA School Climate Transformation grantees will demonstrate substantial progress in decreasing disciplinary actions and increasing attendance through the use of multi-tiered behavioral frameworks.*

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

School safety national activities

Measure: The number and percentage of schools annually that are implementing the multi-tiered behavioral framework with fidelity.

Year	Number Target	Number Actual	Percentage Target	Percentage Actual
2015		512		45%
2016	589		52%	
2017	677		59%	

Additional information: Targets represent an annual increase of 15 percent

The Department will have 2015 data later in 2016 on the following additional measures for the 2014 cohort of LEA School Climate Transformation Grants:

- The number and percentage of schools that report an annual decrease in office disciplinary referrals.
- The number and percentage of schools that report an annual improvement in the attendance rate.
- The number and percentage of schools that report an annual decrease in suspensions and expulsions, including those related to possession or use of drugs or alcohol.

Goal: To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by increasing the capacity of SEAs to support LEAs to improve behavioral and learning outcomes of students through the implementation of multi-tiered behavioral frameworks.

Objective: SEA School Climate Transformation grantees will demonstrate substantial progress in increasing the capacity of LEAs in implementing a multi-tiered behavioral framework.

Measure: The number of training and technical assistance events provided by the SEA School Climate Transformation Grant Program to assist LEAs in implementing a multi-tiered behavioral framework.

Year	Target	Actual
2015		374
2016	449	
2017	539	

Additional information: Targets represent an annual increase of 20 percent. Numbers in the chart reflect trainings only.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

School safety national activities

The Department will have 2015 data later in 2016 on the following additional measures for the 2014 cohort of SEA School Climate Transformation Grants:

- The number and percentage of LEAs provided training or technical assistance by the SEA School Climate Transformation Grant Program that report an improvement in knowledge and understanding of the implementation of a multi-tiered behavioral framework.
- The number and percentage of schools in LEAs provided training or technical assistance by the SEA School Climate Transformation Grant Program that implement a multi-tiered behavioral framework.

Goal: To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by increasing the capacity of LEAs in communities with pervasive violence to better address the needs of affected students and to break the cycle of violence.

Objective: Project Prevent grantees will demonstrate substantial progress in decreasing student violent and related behavior, increasing student access to mental health services, and increasing student engagement.

The Department will have baseline data later in 2016 on the following measures for the 2014 cohort of Project Prevent Grants:

- The percentage of grantees that report a measurable decrease in violent, aggressive, and disruptive behavior in schools served by the grant.
- The percentage of grantees that report a measurable increase in the number of students in schools served by the grant receiving school-based and community mental health services to address student needs resulting from exposure to violence.
- The percentage of grantees that report a measurable increase in the school engagement of students served by the grant.

Goal: To help ensure that SEAs increase their capacity to assist LEAs to develop high-quality emergency operations plans.

Objective: SEA Emergency Management grantees will demonstrate substantial progress in increasing the number of LEAs with high-quality emergency operations plans.

The Department will have data later in 2016 on the following measures for the 2014 cohort of Grants to States for Emergency Management:

- The number of LEAs with high-quality emergency operations plans (EOPs) at the start of the grant compared to the number of LEAs with high-quality EOPs at the end of the grant.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

School safety national activities

Other Performance Information

In fiscal year 2015, the Department initiated a study to examine how States and school districts that participate in the School Climate Transformation Grant programs are coordinating services and supports with grantees funded through the Department of Health and Human Services' Project Advancing Wellness and Resilience in Education (Project AWARE) and the Department of Justice's Keeping Kids in School and Out of Court programs. The study is informed by telephone interviews with State and local grantees, and will report on ways in which grantees coordinate services, the benefits they experience from coordination, and challenges and lessons learned. A final report is scheduled for completion in fall 2017.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Elementary and secondary school counseling

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2017 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$49,561	0	-\$49,561

¹ The authorization for the program was repealed, effective October 1, 2016, by P.L. 114-95.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, which reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, did not reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling (ESSC) program. However, the 2016 Department of Education Appropriations Act included a final appropriation for the ESSC program that will be sufficient to fully fund continuation costs for all current grantee projects in fiscal year 2016.

The ESSC program provided grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to establish or expand elementary and secondary school counseling programs. In awarding grants, the Department gave consideration to applications that demonstrated the greatest need for services, proposed the most promising and innovative approaches, and showed the greatest potential for replication and dissemination. The Department awarded grants for up to 3 years that provided up to \$400,000 annually and were required to supplement, not supplant, existing counseling and mental health services. The statute required the Department to use the first \$40 million in annual appropriations for elementary school counseling programs; appropriations exceeding \$40 million could be used to support elementary or secondary school counseling programs.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2012	\$52,296
2013	49,561
2014	49,561
2015	49,561
2016	49,561

FY 2017 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funding for the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling program for fiscal year 2017, consistent with the elimination of this program by the Every Student Succeeds Act. Instead, the activities that have been funded under ESSC, along

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Elementary and secondary school counseling

with others promoting the health and well-being of students, are included as authorized activities under Part A of Title IV (Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants) of the reauthorized ESEA.

The Administration recognizes the importance of supporting school counselors. The presence of counselors in schools provides benefits for both students and teachers by helping to create a safe school environment, improve teacher effectiveness and classroom management, increase academic achievement, and promote student well-being and healthy development. States and LEAs may choose to dedicate resources to address these issues through flexible funding received under the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants program for which the Administration is requesting \$500 million in fiscal year 2017.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>
Grant award funding (new)	\$24,954 ¹	0	0
Grant award funding (continuations)	\$27,555	\$49,561	0
Number of new awards	70	0	0
Number of continuations	76	110	0
Average grant award	\$361	\$361	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 and 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 Elementary and Secondary School Counseling program under this authority in fiscal year 2015, it may do so in fiscal year 2016.

¹ Reflects a one-time reprogramming of \$2,948 thousand from the Physical Education Program.

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

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

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

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Elementary and secondary school counseling

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

Year	2011 Cohort Target	2011 Cohort Actual	2012 Cohort Target	2012 Cohort Actual	2013 Cohort Target	2013 Cohort Actual	2014 Cohort Target	2014 Cohort Actual
2012	100%	84%						
2013	100	88	100%	93%				
2014	100		100	95	100%	77%		
2015			100		100	94	100	97
2016					100		100	
2017							100	

Additional information: Performance data for the 2011 cohort will be available later in 2015. This is due to the fact that the Department granted many grantees in year 3 of their awards a 1-year, no-cost extension to complete their projects. The Department expects to have 2014 cohort data available in fall 2015.

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

Year	2011 Cohort Target	2011 Cohort Actual	2012 Cohort Target	2012 Cohort Actual	2013 Cohort Target	2013 Cohort Actual	2014 Cohort Target	2014 Cohort Actual
2012	1,200	1,152						
2013	1,037	690		1,589				
2014			1,430	1,493	1,169	1,106		
2015					1,007	988	1,096	1,615
2016					908		1,552	
2017								

Additional information: Performance data are collected through annual grantee reports. The Department plans to establish performance targets for the 2015 cohort once grantees submit baseline data.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Physical education program

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2017 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$47,000	0	-\$47,000

¹ The authorization for the program was repealed, effective October 1, 2016, by P.L. 114-95.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA), which reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, did not reauthorize the Physical Education Program (PEP). PEP provides competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) and community-based organizations (CBOs) to pay the Federal share of the costs of initiating, expanding, and improving physical education (PE) programs, including after-school programs, for students in kindergarten through 12th grade, in order to help those students make progress toward meeting State standards for PE. Funds may be used to provide equipment and support to enable students to participate actively in PE activities and for training and education for teachers and staff. Awards are competitive, typically run for 3 years, and the Federal share of the total program cost may not exceed 90 percent for the first year of the project and 75 percent for each subsequent year. Funds must be used to supplement, and may not supplant, other Federal, State, and local funding for PE activities.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2012	\$78,693
2013	74,577
2014	74,577
2015	47,000
2016	47,000

FY 2017 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funding for PEP for fiscal year 2017. With the enactment of the Every Student Succeeds Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) no longer includes authorization for PEP. The 2016 Department of Education Appropriations Act included a final appropriation for PEP that will be sufficient to fully fund all current grantee projects, including those with project periods extending beyond fiscal year 2016.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Physical education program

The activities that have been funded under PEP, along with others promoting the health and well-being of students, are included as authorized activities under Part A of Title IV (Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants) of the reauthorized ESEA.

The Administration recognizes the importance of PE, improved nutrition, and fitness. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), childhood obesity has more than doubled in children and quadrupled in adolescents in the past 30 years, a major cause for concern since obese youth are more likely than their peers to develop high blood pressure, high cholesterol, type 2 diabetes, and breathing problems as adults. More than one third of children and adolescents were overweight or obese in 2012. According to the 2011-12 National Survey of Children's Health conducted by the CDC, over one-third of children ages 6-17 engaged in vigorous physical activity 3 or fewer days per week. States and LEAs may choose to dedicate resources to address these issues through flexible funding received under the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants program for which the Administration is requesting \$500 million in fiscal year 2017.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>
Grant award funding (new)	0	\$23,724	0
Grant award funding (continuations)	\$44,052 ¹	23,276	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	0	0
Number of new grant awards	0	15 ²	0
Number of continuation grant awards	126	67	0
Average grant award	\$350	\$420	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 Administration did not reserve funds from PEP under this authority in fiscal year 2015, it may do so in fiscal year 2016.

¹ Reflects a one-time reprogramming of \$2,948 thousand to the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling program.

² The Department intends to frontload, or fully fund from fiscal year 2016 appropriations, any new awards it makes in fiscal year 2016, consistent with transition requirements in section 4(a)(1)(A)(i) of the ESSA.

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

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Physical education program

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

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

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

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

Year	2010 Cohort Target	2010 Cohort Actual	2011 Cohort Target	2011 Cohort Actual	2012 Cohort Target	2012 Cohort Actual	2013 Cohort Target	2013 Cohort Actual	2014 Cohort Target	2014 Cohort Actual
2012		68%		46%		30%				
2013	69%	55		42		34		31%		
2014			45%		35%	39		42		34%
2015					38	41	45%	45		35
2016							49		38%	
2017									40	

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

Year	2010 Cohort Target	2010 Cohort Actual	2011 Cohort Target	2011 Cohort Actual	2012 Cohort Target	2012 Cohort Actual
2012		55%		44%		56%
2013	57%	59		47		59
2014			49%		60%	62
2015					64	66

Measure: The percentage of students served by the grant who meet the standard of a healthy fitness zone as established by the assessment for the Presidential Youth Fitness Program in at least five of the six fitness areas of that assessment.

Year	2013 Cohort Target	2013 Cohort Actual	2014 Cohort Target	2014 Cohort Actual
2013		24%		
2014		30		25%
2015	32%	37		27
2016	34		30%	
2017	38		33	

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Physical education program

Additional information: In the fiscal year 2013 competition, the Department revised one of the measures. The new measure is replacing the second measure regarding age-appropriate cardiovascular fitness level, with a more comprehensive measure of fitness: the percentage of students served by the grant who meet the standard of a healthy fitness zone as established by the assessment for the Presidential Youth Fitness Program in at least five of the six fitness areas of that assessment.

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

Year	2010 Cohort Target	2010 Cohort Actual	2011 Cohort Target	2011 Cohort Actual	2012 Cohort Target	2012 Cohort Actual	2013 Cohort Target	2013 Cohort Actual	2014 Cohort Target	2014 Cohort Actual
2012		41%		39%		25%				
2013	43%	42		53		30		28%		
2014			55%		32%	38		41		15%
2015					35	41	44%	48		18
2016							48		22%	
2017									26	

Additional information: The Department expects to have final data for the 2011 cohort for the above measures in early 2016. The lag in reporting data is due to the fact that, each year, the Department provides many grantees in year 3 of their awards a 1-year, no-cost extension to complete their projects. Starting with the 2012 cohort, the Department required grantees to report full performance data at the end of year 3, which eliminated the lag in reporting each cohort's year 3 aggregated data. Data for 2016 for the 2013 and 2014 cohorts are expected in late 2016.

Efficiency Measure

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

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

Year	2010 Cohort Target	2010 Cohort Actual	2011 Cohort Target	2011 Cohort Actual	2012 Cohort Target	2012 Cohort Actual	2013 Cohort Target	2013 Cohort Actual	2014 Cohort Target	2014 Cohort Actual
2011		\$884								
2012		880		\$811						
2013	\$750	800		425		\$347				
2014			\$400		\$300	328		\$488		
2015					280	231	\$450	409		\$541
2016							400		\$500	
2017									450	

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Physical education program

Additional information: The calculation for this measure includes both Federal and non-Federal funding. Unlike the performance measures in the above tables, there is no baseline figure for each cohort because there are no costs to report at the start of the grant.

Other Performance Information

In February 2015, the Department released an implementation study of the 2010 cohort of PEP grantees. The report can be accessed at: <http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/other/physical-education/carol-m-white-2015-full-report.pdf>. Key findings included the following:

Physical Activity and Nutrition Policies

Most grantees focused on improving the implementation of, and enhancing, existing policies rather than developing new ones. Grantees reported implementing activities and policy actions that addressed physical activity (including PE) more often than nutrition activities and policy actions. Most common among grantee activities was making significant changes to physical activity policies concerning the use of a standards-based sequential PE curriculum and to policies involving recommendations or offers of physical activity through before- or after-school programs. Approximately one-third of grantees made significant changes to nutrition policies aimed at reducing the availability of foods of minimal nutritional value, restricting the marketing of unhealthy foods at school, and requiring the adoption and implementation of strong nutritional standards for all foods sold and served in schools. Many grantees reported revisiting, during the course of their PEP grants, the results from the CDC self-assessment tools to further hone project plans and address areas of concern.

Partnerships

The vast majority of the grantees developed multi-party partnerships in their communities, at least partly because of competitive preference points for such partnerships in the 2010 competition. The majority of grantees that formed partnerships reported that their community partners were most involved in providing nutrition-related support. Most grantees that formed partnerships reported that their PEP community partnerships were valuable, with the most common benefits being access to additional (nonmonetary) resources and the ability to learn from their partners. Grantees also found that partnerships helped by: strengthening and improving communication among existing relationships; increasing student engagement; networking and providing access to resources and information; and extending the reach of health, physical fitness, and nutrition activities and knowledge. The two most common challenges with partnerships were difficulty coordinating meetings and activities, and the diversion of time and resources away from other priorities or obligations of the PEP grant.

Body Mass Index Data

The vast majority of PEP grantees in the 2010 cohort had also applied under a competitive preference priority for project plans that included aggregate body mass index (BMI) data collection to monitor their student populations' weight status over time as part of a comprehensive assessment of student health and fitness. Most grantees reported using, or planning to use, BMI data in the aggregate to assess the weight status of the student population

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Physical education program

over time, to assess project outcomes, and to inform physical activity and nutrition program planning. Grantees also used BMI data as a screening tool. A majority of grantees that collected BMI data provided, or planned to provide, parents with information about their children's BMI to help them take appropriate action, but experienced some challenges in communicating data to parents. According to case study interviews, stakeholders, including parents, students, and PEP project personnel, had mixed views about the BMI, ranging from support to doubts about the validity of the measure. The Department is no longer including BMI in the PEP grant competition, but some LEAs still choose to use BMI.

Challenges

The most common implementation challenge experienced by grantees involved using the required data collection instruments (e.g., pedometers, student self-reports) to address the performance measures. The most commonly reported challenges in collecting the performance measures were the lack of proper data collection or reporting by students, malfunctioning/faulty equipment, and loss or theft of equipment. Grantees described strategies to address these challenges related to data collection, including limiting the use of pedometers to school instead of allowing students to take them home, developing clear data collection protocols and time lines, and involving other staff members to facilitate data collection. Grantees generally acknowledged the importance of and made efforts toward increasing buy-in from students, parents, teachers, and partners. The study also found that Congressional Budget Office grantees reported greater difficulty implementing various components of their PEP projects than district grantees.

Conclusion

The study's findings suggest that grantees might benefit from additional support and technical assistance with (1) data collection; (2) communicating and coordinating with partners; (3) promoting healthy eating and nutrition; and (4) using BMI data, including communicating with parents.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Promise neighborhoods

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part F, Subpart 2, Section 4624)
(dollars in thousands)

FY 2017 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾

Budget Authority:

<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$73,254	\$128,000	+\$54,746

¹ A total of \$200,741 thousand is authorized for Part F of Title IV. Of the total amount appropriated for Title IV, Part F, 36 percent is available for the Promise Neighborhoods and Full-Service Community Schools Grants programs under Subpart 2.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Promise Neighborhoods program provides competitive grants to support distressed communities in implementing a comprehensive, effective continuum of coordinated services designed to improve the academic and developmental outcomes for children, youth, and their families from birth through college. The program is authorized by Subpart 2 of Part F of Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA). Prior to enactment of the ESSA, the program was funded under the broad authority of Title V, Part D, Subpart 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Fund for the Improvement of Education).

The program makes 5-year awards that enable grantees to provide continua of services and supports appropriate to the needs of children and youth within the target neighborhood, specifically in neighborhoods with high rates of poverty, childhood obesity, academic failure, and involvement of community members in the justice system. The program also gives priority to neighborhoods with schools implementing comprehensive or targeted improvement activities under Title I, Part A of the ESEA. Grants may be extended an additional 2 years. Required activities for grantees include: (1) planning activities to develop and implement pipeline services; (2) implementing those pipeline services; and (3) continuously evaluating and improving their programs based on outcome data. "Pipeline services" means a continuum of coordinated supports, services, and opportunities for children from birth through entry into and success in postsecondary education and career attainment, and includes, at a minimum: high-quality early childhood programs; high-quality school and out-of-school programs and strategies; transition support for children between elementary and middle school, middle and high school, and high school and postsecondary education and the workforce; family and community engagement support; activities that prepare students for postsecondary education and the workforce, such as job training, internships, and career counseling; support for students that encourages continued connection to their communities; social, health, nutrition, and mental health services and supports; and juvenile crime prevention and rehabilitation programs.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Promise neighborhoods

Grantees must use at least 50 percent of their first-year awards, and at least 25 percent of their second-year awards, for planning activities to develop and implement pipeline services.

Eligible organizations for Promise Neighborhoods grants are institutions of higher education (IHEs), Indian tribes or tribal organizations, or one or more non-profit organizations in partnership with a high-need local educational agency, IHE, local government, or an Indian tribe or tribal organization.

In awarding Promise Neighborhoods grants, the Department gives priority to applicants that incorporate evidence-based activities into their proposals. To ensure that grantees under this program continue to use and build evidence, the Administration reserves up to 5 percent of the Promise Neighborhoods appropriation for technical assistance and to evaluate the implementation and impact of program activities. In addition, grantees are required to report publicly information about their projects, including the number and percentage of children participating in their programs and progress on performance metrics.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2012	\$59,887
2013	56,754
2014	56,754
2015	56,754
2016	73,254

FY 2017 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$128 million in fiscal year 2017 for Promise Neighborhoods, an increase of \$54.7 million over the 2016 appropriation. The request includes appropriations language that would override the combined authorization level for this program and the Full-Service Community Schools program. Fiscal year 2017 funds would support an estimated 15 new grants as well as 5 continuation awards for the 2016 cohort of implementation grantees. Funds would also be used to expand technical assistance to grantees.

Promise Neighborhoods supports the goal of providing all children and youth in high-need communities with access to a continuum of ambitious, rigorous, and comprehensive education reforms, effective community services, and strong systems of family and community support, with high-quality schools at the center of these community-based efforts.

Research studies and data have shown that children in poverty, especially concentrated poverty, are more likely than their more affluent peers to face mental and physical health challenges; to have poor nutrition and exercise habits; to move homes and change schools; to attend high-poverty, low-performing schools; and to live in neighborhoods where safety is a concern. These factors are known to lead to negative educational, social, and economic outcomes. Promise Neighborhoods grants help such communities develop and implement a concentrated and comprehensive approach to surmounting these challenges, instead of the

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Promise neighborhoods

typically fragmented approach taken by other Federal, State, and local anti-poverty and social welfare programs.

The Promise Neighborhoods program was modeled after the Harlem Children's Zone (HCZ) project—a comprehensive, place-based, anti-poverty program begun in the 1990s that is achieving impressive results for disadvantaged children and youth living in a 97-block zone in New York City. Evidence suggests that HCZ's Promise Academy schools are central to students achieving at significantly higher levels in reading and math than similarly situated students that receive HCZ's family and community supports, but do not attend an Academy. The HCZ reports that its students are also showing success in their college-acceptance and college attendance rates, as well as in their ability to obtain financial aid in the form of full scholarships and grants. (Go to <http://hcz.org/results/> for more information.)

While HCZ results reflect over 20 years of work, the first Promise Neighborhoods implementation grantees began implementing their approved plans in 2010. Still, grantees report early successes as they work to establish the necessary systems, programs, and infrastructure for wide-scale improvement in outcomes within their neighborhoods. Many grantees report increased efforts to (1) engage parents in the communities, (2) improve the health and environmental conditions for community members, (3) coordinate high-quality early childhood services, and (4) establish programs that create a bridge between high school and postsecondary educational and career opportunities.

The demand for Promise Neighborhood grants has greatly exceeded available funding, and the fiscal year 2016 appropriation included the first increase (+\$16.5 million) in funding since fiscal year 2012. The 2017 request would build on this renewed commitment to addressing deep-rooted educational, social, health, and economic challenges in some of our Nation's poorest and most distressed communities. In particular, the almost 40 communities that have received planning grants, but not implementation grants, represent a pool of potential high-quality candidates for implementation grants in fiscal year 2017. The Administration also believes that a larger Federal investment in Promise Neighborhoods will help attract non-Federal financial support from philanthropies, private sources, and other governmental entities, all of which previously have demonstrated support for the Promise Neighborhoods model.

Additionally, to maximize benefits from existing Federal funding, the Department has begun work with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to ensure coordination within communities that intend to apply for both Promise Neighborhoods and HUD's Choice Neighborhoods planning grants. Specifically, the Department intends to invest a small portion of its fiscal year 2016 appropriation in joint planning grants with Choice Neighborhoods, while still retaining the focus on awarding the majority of funding to new implementation grants.

Promise Neighborhoods is a cornerstone program of the Administration's Promise Zones initiative. This initiative brings together the work of 13 Federal agencies, and is intended to lead to the revitalization of many of America's highest poverty urban, rural, and tribal communities by creating jobs, attracting private investment, increasing economic activity, expanding educational opportunity, and reducing violent crime, among other locally defined goals. Designated areas receive proposed tax incentives to stimulate economic activity and create jobs, intensive Federal technical assistance aimed at breaking down regulatory barriers and using existing

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Promise neighborhoods

Federal funds in effective ways, and competitive preference points for other Federal discretionary grant programs that will contribute to the Promise Zones goal attainment. The President launched the Promise Zones initiative in January 2014, by designating five Promise Zones. Another eight Zones were designated in April 2015, and the Administration will designate the final seven Zones in 2016, selecting high-poverty communities demonstrating high capacity to engage partners and leverage resources. Promise Zones identify a set of cross-sector goals for their proposed Zone and its residents, and then develop inter-sector strategies, leverage private investment, and work with Federal liaisons to align Federal, State, local, and Tribal resources to achieve their defined goals.

Beginning in fiscal year 2014, the Department developed a priority for programs and projects that support activities in designated Promise Zones. The Department will use this priority in the fiscal years 2016 and 2017 Promise Neighborhoods competitions. In addition, the Department has previously given priority to applicants proposing to work in rural communities and to those proposing to work in tribal communities. Beginning in fiscal year 2017, the Department will require that at least 15 percent of funding for new awards made under Title IV, Part F, Subpart 2 (which includes Promise Neighborhoods and Full-service Community Schools) supports projects in rural areas, assuming that these programs receive applications of sufficient number and quality from applicants in rural areas.

The Department would retain up to 5 percent of the annual appropriation to provide technical assistance and evaluate the implementation and impact of grant activities.

The Department would also continue support for technical assistance for the Building Neighborhood Capacity Program (BNCP). The goal of BNCP is to provide support for low-income neighborhoods to build the infrastructure and access the resources needed to improve individual and family outcomes in areas such as education, employment, safety, and housing. BNCP helps neighborhoods develop the knowledge, skills, relationships, interactions and organizational resources that enable residents, civic leaders, the public and private sectors, and local organizations to create and pursue results-driven neighborhood revitalization plans. Established in 2011, BNCP continues to grow, catalyzing community-driven change in neighborhoods that have historically faced barriers to revitalization. BNCP launched in eight neighborhoods in August 2012 and expanded to an additional four in January 2015.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>
Grants			
Number of new awards	0	5	15
Funding for new awards	0	\$29,799	\$86,720
Number of continuing awards	12	7	6
Funding for continuing awards	\$54,480	37,060	33,600
Joint Planning Grants with HUD	0	\$2,000	0

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Promise neighborhoods

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>
Evaluation			
Technical assistance	\$1,200	\$1,360	\$2,950
BNCP	0	500	500
Data and evaluation assistance	1,074	1,802	2,950
Peer review of new award applications	0	733	1,280

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

The Administration established 15 performance measures for implementation grantees in previous competitions. Data from the first cohort of implementation grantees became available in May 2013, but inconsistent data collection practices among the grantees limited the validity and reliability of these data. The Administration's release of a guidance document for data collection, bolstered by additional technical assistance, led to much-improved data for year 2 of the first cohort of grantees, and the second cohort of implementation grantees has benefitted greatly from this guidance and technical assistance. In particular, the second cohort of implementation grantees has been able to report baseline data following its first year of project implementation, and most grantees are now able to provide comparable data on the measures for student proficiency on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics; average daily attendance; and chronic absenteeism. Specifically, the second cohort of implementation grantees has made positive progress on five of the eight measures for which aggregate data are available. The efforts of implementation grantees from the second cohort may have led to the following impacts from 2013 to 2014: an increase of 5 percentage points in English/language arts scores in high school grades; an increase of 10 percentage points in math scores in elementary grades; a decrease of 6 percentage points in chronic absenteeism for students attending schools within a Promise Neighborhood; a decrease of 5 percentage points in student mobility in schools within a Promise Neighborhood; and an increase of 5 percentage points in parents residing in a Promise Neighborhood who reportedly encourage their children to read.

Through its data and evaluation assistance contract, the Department will continue providing assistance to grantees on data collection and reporting. This assistance includes refining and improving grantee performance measures, data collection strategies, data analyses, and meeting reporting requirements. Beginning in 2014, all implementation grantees are using the Promise Neighborhoods Scorecard to report their data and information on the solutions they are implementing. By the end of 2015, all grantees put in place data plans to address critical issues like parental consent and Institutional Review Boards. In addition, beginning in fiscal year 2017, grantees will be required to report publicly information about their projects, including the number and percentage of children participating in their programs and progress on performance metrics.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Full-service community schools

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part F, Subpart 2, Section 4625)
(dollars in thousands)

FY 2017 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾

Budget Authority:

<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$10,000	\$10,000	0

¹ A total of \$200,741 thousand is authorized for Part F of Title IV. Of the total amount appropriated for Title IV, Part F, 36 percent is available for the Full-Service Community Schools and Promise Neighborhoods programs under Subpart 2.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Full-Service Community Schools program, which previously operated under the broad authority of the Fund for the Improvement of Education, is authorized under Title IV, Part F of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as reauthorized by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015. The program provides grants to (1) local educational agencies (LEAs) or (2) the Bureau of Indian Education, in partnership with community-based organizations, nonprofit organizations, or other public or private entities. Full-service community schools provide comprehensive academic, social, and health services for students, students' family members, and community members that will result in improved educational outcomes for children. Full-Service Community Schools grantees can enhance the impact of their services by focusing resources and integrating programs to implement coordinated strategies that can impact neighborhoods with high rates of poverty, childhood obesity, academic failure, and involvement of community members in the justice system.

Schools that receive program funds provide a base of support for students and their families by attending to academic, social, and health needs in the school setting. The Full-Service Community Schools program supports public elementary or secondary schools that provide such supports to children and families in high-poverty schools. Beginning in fiscal year 2017, the Department will require that at least 15 percent of funds awarded under Title IV, Part F, Subpart 2 (which includes Full-service Community Schools and Promise Neighborhoods) support projects in rural areas, assuming that these programs receive applications of sufficient number and quality from applicants in rural areas.

To ensure meaningful partnership with community-based organizations, nonprofit organizations, and other public or private entities, grantees under this program must secure matching funds from non-Federal sources to amplify and sustain project activities. The Department may not require that an applicant secure matching funds in an amount that exceeds the amount of the grant award, and the Department cannot consider an applicant's ability to secure matching funds when making funding decisions. To increase the probability of positive impacts on target

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Full-service community schools

populations, grantees under this program must implement evidence-based activities, evaluate the effectiveness of their projects, and comply with any evaluations of the Full-Service Community Schools program conducted by the Institute of Education Sciences.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2012	\$10,094
2013	5,344
2014	10,649
2015	9,710
2016	10,000

NOTE: Funds were provided under the Fund for the Improvement of Education Programs of National Significance.

FY 2017 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$10 million in fiscal year 2017 for Full-Service Community Schools, the same as the 2016 level. This request includes appropriations language that would override the combined authorized funding level for this program and the Promise Neighborhoods program. All requested funds would be used to pay continuation costs for prior-year grantees.

The Harvard Family Research Project has cited compelling evidence that, when schools partner with families and community-based organizations, these partnerships may improve children's development and school success (Harris & Wilkes, 2013). Building on this premise, Full-Service Community Schools grantees work to improve family and community engagement in school activities to improve student academic outcomes. For example, one 2010 grantee in Indiana used a research-based family engagement strategy called "Mind in the Making," which involves a series of training sessions for family members that actively involves them in their children's cognitive development and school readiness. This grantee also implemented a program that focused on family literacy—parents received support to improve their own reading skills, and in some cases earn high school equivalency certifications, while simultaneously helping their children learn to read. Another 2010 grantee implemented a set of strategies collectively referred to as "Baby University" that provided parents and caregivers of young children with culturally relevant, age-appropriate tools to prepare their children to be Kindergarten-ready. Fiscal year 2017 continuation awards would support 21 grantees that are implementing similar strategies to effect meaningful change for children and students in their communities.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Full-service community schools

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>
Number of new awards	12	0	0
Funding for new awards	\$5,590	0	0
Number of continuing awards	9	21	21
Funding for continuing awards	\$4,020	\$10,000	\$10,000
Peer review of new award applications	100	0	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 Full-Service Community Schools 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 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 has established the following performance measure for grantees:

Measure: The percentage of individuals targeted for services who receive services during each year of the project period.

Year	2008 cohort	2010 cohort
2012	164%	166%
2013		Not available
2014		104
2015		
2016		
2017		

Additional information: All grantees must submit an annual performance report documenting their contribution in assisting the Department in measuring the performance of the program against this indicator, as well as performance on project-specific indicators. The term “individuals targeted for services” is specific to each project; Full-Service Community Schools

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Full-service community schools

grantees may choose among 12 services to provide in their communities, and may target a different combination of students, parents, or community members depending on the services they provide. In 2012, 164 percent of targeted individuals for the 2008 cohort received services, meaning that grantees served targeted individuals in addition to individuals who had not previously been targeted. One grantee from the 2008 cohort served more than four times the number of targeted individuals; the lowest percentage of targeted individuals for any grantee in the 2008 cohort was 95 percent. Data from one grantee from the 2008 cohort were not available. One hundred sixty-six percent of targeted individuals from the 2010 cohort received services in 2012; one grantee provided services to more than three times the number of targeted individuals, and all but one grantee surpassed their targets. Data from one grantee from the 2010 cohort were not available. Aggregate data from 2013 were not available. In 2014, the 2010 cohort again served more than 100 percent of the targeted individuals; this is due, in part, to one grantee serving more than four times the number of individuals it had originally targeted.