

Department of Education
INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT
Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request

CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Appropriations Language | F-1 |
| Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes..... | F-3 |
| Appropriation, Adjustments, and Transfers | F-5 |
| Summary of Changes | F-6 |
| Authorizing Legislation..... | F-8 |
| Appropriations History..... | F-10 |
| Significant Items in FY 2018 Appropriations Reports..... | F-11 |
| Summary of Request | F-12 |
| Activities: | |
| Opportunity grants | F-15 |
| Education innovation and research..... | F-20 |
| Teacher and school leader incentive grants..... | F-29 |
| American history and civics education | F-37 |
| Supporting effective educator development | F-41 |
| School leader recruitment and support | F-46 |
| Charter schools grants..... | F-52 |
| Magnet schools assistance..... | F-63 |
| Ready to learn programming | F-68 |
| Arts in education..... | F-72 |
| Javits gifted and talented education..... | F-77 |

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

For carrying out activities authorized under this heading and by parts C and D and subpart 1 of part F of title IV of the ESEA, \$1,277,647,000: *Provided*, That \$597,647,000 shall be for parts C and D of title IV and shall be made available without regard to sections 4311 and 4409(a):¹ *Provided further*, That of the funds available for part C of title IV, the Secretary shall use not more than \$100,000,000 to carry out section 4304 and not more than \$150,000,000 to carry out section 4305, of which not more than \$25,000,000 shall be used to carry out the activities in section 4305(a)(3):² *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding section 301 of this Act, funds awarded to an eligible local education agency, or consortium of such agencies, under part D of title IV may be used for the purposes in section 4407(a)(9):³ *Provided further*, That \$180,000,000 shall be available through December 31, 2019 for subpart 1 of part F of title IV:⁴ *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 4611(a)(1)(A), the Secretary may establish priorities that apply to all funds awarded under section 4611:⁵ *Provided further*, That \$500,000,000 shall be available for grants, under such requirements as the Secretary may establish, that enable students to attend a school selected by their parents: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may award grants described in the preceding proviso to States, local educational agencies and nonprofit organizations to support the demonstration and evaluation of projects awarding scholarships to students from low-income families to attend a private school, including a private religious school: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may also award grants described in the sixth proviso to establish or expand public school open enrollment systems in local educational agencies that have entered into a demonstration agreement with the Secretary under part E of title I of the ESEA: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may reserve up to \$10,000,000 of the amount in the sixth proviso for national activities, including technical assistance, evaluation, and information dissemination.⁶

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

NOTES

A full-year 2018 appropriation for this account was not enacted at the time the budget was prepared; therefore, the budget assumes this account is operating under the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018 (Division D of P.L. 115–56, as amended). The amounts included for 2018 reflect the annualized level provided by the continuing resolution.

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

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

| Language Provision | Explanation |
|--|---|
| <p>¹ <u>Provided, That \$597,647,000 shall be for parts C and D of title IV and shall be made available without regard to sections 4311 and 4409(a):</u></p> | <p>This language provides funds for Charter Schools Grants and Magnet Schools Assistance without regard to the sections of the ESEA that specify the distribution of funds appropriated under Parts C and D of Title IV.</p> |
| <p>² <u>Provided further, That of the funds available for part C of title IV, the Secretary shall use not more than \$100,000,000 to carry out section 4304 and not more than \$150,000,000 to carry out section 4305, of which not more than \$25,000,000 shall be used to carry out the activities in section 4305(a)(3):</u></p> | <p>This language establishes, from the Charter Schools Grants appropriation, a maximum amount for facilities grants; a maximum total amount for Charter Management Organization grants, Developer grants, and national activities (collectively authorized under ESEA section 4305).</p> |
| <p>³ <u>Provided further, That notwithstanding section 301 of this Act, funds awarded to an eligible local education agency, or consortium of such agencies, under part D of title IV may be used for the purposes in section 4407(a)(9):</u></p> | <p>This language overrides language that prohibits the use of appropriated funds for the transportation of students or teachers in order to overcome racial imbalance in any school or school system, thereby allowing funding for this activity as authorized under the Magnet Schools Assistance program statute.</p> |
| <p>⁴ <u>Provided further, That \$180,000,000 shall be available through December 31, 2019 for subpart 1 of part F of title IV:</u></p> | <p>This language provides a specific funding amount for Education Innovation and Research and also extends the period of Federal availability 3 months beyond the year of appropriation.</p> |

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes—continued

| Language Provision | Explanation |
|--|--|
| <p>⁵ <u>Provided further, That notwithstanding section 4611(a)(1)(A), the Secretary may establish priorities that apply to all funds awarded under section 4611:</u></p> | <p>This language provides greater flexibility to the Department in making awards under the Education Innovation and Research program.</p> |
| <p>⁶ <u>Provided further, That \$500,000,000 shall be available for grants, under such requirements as the Secretary may establish, that enable students to attend a school selected by their parents: Provided further, That the Secretary may award grants described in the preceding proviso to States, local educational agencies and nonprofit organizations to support the demonstration and evaluation of projects awarding scholarships to students from low-income families to attend a private school, including a private religious school: Provided further, That the Secretary may also award grants described in the sixth proviso to establish or expand public school open enrollment systems in local educational agencies that have entered into a demonstration agreement with the Secretary under part E of title I of the ESEA: Provided further, That the Secretary may reserve up to \$10,000,000 of the amount in the sixth proviso for national activities, including technical assistance, evaluation, and information dissemination.</u></p> | <p>This language authorizes the Department to award grants to State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and nonprofit organizations for projects to enable students to attend a private selected by their parents. The language also allows funds to be used for grants to establish or expand open enrollment systems in local educational agencies that have entered into a Flexibility for Equitable Per-Pupil Funding demonstration agreement with the Department under Title I, Part E of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Finally, the language permits the Department to use up to \$10 million for national activities.</p> |

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Appropriation, Adjustments, and Transfers
(dollars in thousands)

| Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers | 2017 | 2018 Annualized CR | 2019 |
|---|-----------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Discretionary: | | | |
| Appropriation..... | \$887,575 | 0 | \$1,277,647 |
| Annualized CR (P.L. 115-56)..... | <u>0</u> | <u>\$881,548</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Total, discretionary appropriation..... | 887,575 | 881,548 | 1,277,647 |

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Summary of Changes
(dollars in thousands)

| | |
|--------------------------|------------------|
| 2018 Annualized CR | \$881,548 |
| 2019 | <u>1,277,647</u> |
| Net change..... | +396,099 |

| Increases: | 2018 Annualized <u>CR base</u> | Change from base |
|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------|
| <u>Program:</u> | | |
| Increase to create an Opportunity Grants program to support grants to State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and nonprofit organizations for projects to enable students to attend a private or public school selected by their parents. | 0 | +\$500,000 |
| Increase for the Education Innovation and Research program for activities to promote innovation and reform in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education and computer science. | \$99,321 | +80,679 |
| Increase for Charter Schools Grants to expand high-quality public educational options available to students, especially students from low-income families or attending low-performing schools, by creating and expanding effective charter schools. | 339,848 | +160,152 |
| Increase funding to reflect the President's Budget request to fund the Magnet Schools Assistance program at the FY 2017 enacted level. This amount would restore the cut resulting from the 0.6791 percent across-the-board reduction included in the FY 2018 Annualized CR Level. | 96,984 | <u>+663</u> |
| Subtotal, increases | | +741,494 |

| Decreases: | 2018 Annualized <u>CR base</u> | Change from base |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------|
| <u>Program:</u> | | |
| Eliminate funding for Teacher and School Leader Incentive Grants because program results have been disappointing and States and LEAs may use other Federal, State, and local resources, including Title I Grants to LEAs, for similar activities. | \$198,642 | -\$198,642 |

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Summary of Changes—continued

| | 2018 Annualized <u>CR base</u> | Change <u>from base</u> |
|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Decreases: | | |
| Eliminate funding for American History and Civics Education because the program has limited national impact and program activities can be supported with other Federal, State, local, or private funds. | \$3,491 | -\$3,491 |
| Eliminate funding for Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED) because the program supports activities that are core responsibilities for States, school districts, and institutions of higher education and can be supported with other Federal, State, and local funding. | 64,559 | -64,559 |
| Eliminate funding for School Leader Recruitment and Support because the program has demonstrated minimal national impact and other Federal funds are available to support school leadership activities in high-need schools. | 14,402 | -14,402 |
| Eliminate funding for Ready to Learn Programming (RTL) because with the rise of the internet and the ready availability of a wide range of digital games and devices that support early learning, the RTL program is less relevant and less necessary to providing high-quality digital learning resources for young children and their families. | 25,566 | -25,566 |
| Eliminate funding for Arts in Education because the program has limited impact and funds activities that are more appropriately supported with other Federal, State, local, or private funds. | 26,817 | -26,817 |
| Eliminate funding for Javits Gifted and Talented Education because the program has limited national impact and program activities can be supported with other Federal, State, local, or private funds. | 11,918 | -11,918 |
| Subtotal, decreases | | <u>-345,395</u> |
| Net change | | +396,099 |

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Authorizing Legislation (dollars in thousands)

| Activity | 2018 Authorized | 2018 Annualized CR | 2019 Authorized | 2019 Request |
|--|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Opportunity grants (<i>proposed legislation</i>) | 0 | 0 | To be determined | \$500,000 |
| Education innovation and research (<i>ESEA IV-F-1</i>) | (1) | \$99,321 | (1) | 180,000 |
| Teacher and school leader incentive grants (<i>ESEA II-B-1</i>) | (2) | 198,642 | (2) | 0 |
| American history and civics education (<i>ESEA II-B-3</i>) | (2) | 3,491 | (2) | 0 |
| Supporting effective educator development (SEED) (<i>ESEA II-B-4, section 2242</i>) | (2) | 64,559 | (2) | 0 |
| School leader recruitment and support (<i>ESEA II-B-4, section 2243</i>) | (2) | 14,402 | (2) | 0 |
| Charter schools grants (<i>ESEA IV-C</i>) | \$270,000 | 339,848 | \$300,000 | 500,000 |
| Magnet schools assistance (<i>ESEA IV-D</i>) | 99,820 | 96,984 | 102,387 | 97,647 |
| Ready to learn programming (<i>ESEA IV-F-4, section 4643</i>) | (1) | 25,566 | (1) | 0 |
| Arts in education (<i>ESEA IV-F-4, section 4642</i>) | (1) | 26,817 | (1) | 0 |
| Javits gifted and talented education (<i>ESEA IV-F-4, section 4644</i>) | (1) | <u>\$11,918</u> | (1) | <u>0</u> |
| Total definite authorization | \$369,820 | | \$402,387 | |
| Total appropriation | | 881,548 | | \$1,277,647 |
| Portion of request not authorized | | | | 788,440 |

¹ For Part F of Title IV, a total of \$200,741 thousand is authorized for fiscal year 2018 and a total of \$220,741 thousand is authorized for fiscal year 2019. For fiscal year 2018, 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 Education Innovation and Research program; 36 percent is authorized for Subpart 2; and 28 percent is authorized for Subpart 4, which includes the Arts in Education, Ready to Learn Programming, and Javits Gifted and Talented programs. For fiscal year 2019, of the funds appropriated for Part F, \$5,000 thousand is reserved for Subpart 3 and of the remainder 42 percent is authorized for the Education Innovation and Research program; 32 percent is authorized for Subpart 2; and 26 percent is authorized for Subpart 4.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Authorizing Legislation—continued (dollars in thousands)

² For Part B of Title II, a total of \$468,881 thousand is authorized for fiscal year 2018 and a total of \$469,168 is authorized fiscal year 2019. Of the funds appropriated for Part B, 49.1 percent is authorized for Subpart 1, the Teacher and School Leader Incentive program; 34.1 percent is authorized for Subpart 2; 1.4 percent is authorized for Subpart 3, of which not less than 26 percent is reserved for American History and Civics Academies; and 15.4 percent is authorized is authorized for Subpart 4, of which not less than 74 percent is reserved for Supporting Effective Educator Development, not less than 22 percent is reserved for School Leader Recruitment and Support, not less than 2 percent is reserved for technical assistance and national evaluation, and not more than 2 percent for the STEM Master Teacher Corps.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

| Year | Budget Estimate to Congress | House Allowance | Senate Allowance | Appropriation |
|--|-----------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 2010 Discretionary Rescission (PL 111-226) (Discretionary) | \$1,489,949 | \$1,347,363 | \$1,234,787 ¹ | \$1,378,365 (10,700) |
| 2011 Discretionary | 6,330,000 | 1,870,123 ² | 2,224,843 ¹ | 1,856,179 ³ |
| 2012 Discretionary | 4,995,000 | 821,411 ⁴ | 1,740,212 ⁴ | 1,527,536 |
| 2013 Discretionary | 4,332,166 | 799,133 ⁵ | 1,545,966 ⁵ | 1,447,637 |
| 2014 Discretionary | 5,335,000 | N/A ⁶ | 1,331,598 | 931,317 |
| 2015 Discretionary | 5,335,000 | N/A ⁶ | 868,721 ⁷ | 852,111 |
| 2015 Mandatory | 5,000,000 | N/A ⁶ | 0 ⁷ | 0 |
| 2016 Discretionary | 1,601,559 | 275,000 ⁸ | 694,616 ⁸ | 1,181,226 |
| 2016 Mandatory | 1,000,000 | 0 ⁸ | 0 ⁸ | 0 |
| 2017 Discretionary | 1,411,556 | 632,938 ⁹ | 942,743 ⁹ | 887,575 |
| 2017 Mandatory | 4,299,982 | 0 ⁹ | 0 ⁹ | 0 |
| 2018 Discretionary | 1,208,026 | 747,904 ¹⁰ | 880,375 ¹⁰ | 881,548 ¹⁰ |
| 2019 Discretionary | 1,277,647 | | | |

¹ The level for the Senate allowance reflects Committee action only.

² The level for the House allowance reflect the House-passed full-year continuing resolution.

³ The level for appropriation reflects the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 112-10).

⁴ The level for the House allowance reflects an introduced bill and the level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Committee action only.

⁵ 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.

⁶ The House allowance is shown as N/A because there was no Subcommittee action.

⁷ The level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Subcommittee action only.

⁸ The levels for the 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.

⁹ The levels for the House and Senate allowances reflect Committee action on the regular annual 2017 appropriation bill.

¹⁰ The levels for the House reflect floor action on an Omnibus appropriation bill; Senate allowances reflect Committee action on the regular annual 2018 appropriations bill; the Appropriation reflects the annualized Continuing Resolution level.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Significant Items in FY 2018 Appropriations Reports

Education Innovation and Research (EIR)

Senate: The Committee notes that the EIR program is authorized to fund evidence-based, field-initiated innovations to improve student achievement for high-need students. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Department to ensure that funds are used for projects in a range of topic areas, based on the needs of local communities as determined by field initiated proposals, and that funds are not focused or designated for any particular intervention.

Response: The Department plans to conduct a competition in fiscal year 2018 for EIR projects in a range of topic areas.

[Click here for accessible version](#)

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2019 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET
(in thousands of dollars)

| | Category Code | 2017 Appropriation | 2018 Annualized CR | 2019 President's Budget | 2019 President's Budget Compared to 2018 Annualized CR Amount | Percent |
|---|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---|----------|
| <i>Innovation and Improvement</i> | | | | | | |
| 1. Opportunity Grants (proposed legislation) | D | 0 | 0 | 500,000 | 500,000 | --- |
| 2. Education innovation and research (ESEA IV-F-1) | D | 100,000 | 99,321 | 180,000 | 80,679 | 81.23% |
| 3. Teacher and school leader incentive grants (ESEA II-B-1) | D | 200,000 | 198,642 | 0 | (198,642) | -100.00% |
| 4. American history and civics education (ESEA II-B-3) | D | 3,515 | 3,491 | 0 | (3,491) | -100.00% |
| 5. Supporting effective educator development (SEED) (ESEA II-B-4, section 2242) | D | 65,000 | 64,559 | 0 | (64,559) | -100.00% |
| 6. School leader recruitment and support (ESEA II-B-4, section 2243) | D | 14,500 | 14,402 | 0 | (14,402) | -100.00% |
| 7. Charter schools grants (ESEA IV-C) | D | 342,172 | 339,848 | 500,000 | 160,152 | 47.12% |
| 8. Magnet schools assistance (ESEA IV-D) | D | 97,647 | 96,984 | 97,647 | 663 | 0.68% |
| 9. Ready to learn programming (ESEA IV-F-4, section 4643) | D | 25,741 | 25,566 | 0 | (25,566) | -100.00% |
| 10. Arts in education (ESEA IV-F-4, section 4642) | D | 27,000 | 26,817 | 0 | (26,817) | -100.00% |
| 11. Javits gifted and talented education (ESEA IV-F-4, section 4644) | D | 12,000 | 11,918 | 0 | (11,918) | -100.00% |
| Total | D | 887,575 | 881,548 | 1,277,647 | 396,099 | 44.93% |

NOTES: D = discretionary program; M = mandatory program
Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Summary of Request

Programs in the Innovation and Improvement account support improving student achievement in two key ways: (1) providing parents with expanded public and private school options for the education of their children, including high-quality charter schools and magnet schools; and (2) helping State and local entities to test, evaluate, and expand innovative educational strategies and practices, particularly strategies related to improving science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education, including computer science. For fiscal year 2019, the Administration requests a total of \$1.3 billion for these activities. A full-year fiscal year 2018 appropriation was not enacted at the time the fiscal year 2019 Budget was prepared; therefore, the Budget assumes the Department is operating under the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–56, as amended). The amounts included for fiscal year 2018 reflect the annualized level provided by the continuing resolution.

Expanding Educational Options

The Administration requests \$500.0 million for **Opportunity Grants** that would enable students to attend a school selected by their parents. Funds would be used for grants to State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and nonprofit organizations to support the demonstration and evaluation of projects awarding scholarships to students from low-income families to attend a private school, including a private religious school. Additionally, funds may be used for grants to establish or expand open enrollment systems in local educational agencies that have entered into a Flexibility for Equitable Per-Pupil Funding demonstration agreement with the Department under Title I, Part E of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The request also includes \$500.0 million for **Charter Schools Grants**, an increase of \$160.2 million, or 47 percent, to support the opening of new charter schools and the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools. The proposed increase is a central element of the Administration's efforts to empower States and communities to increase the number of high-quality educational options available to meet the needs of students and their families, particularly those from underprivileged backgrounds. The request would also provide significant increases for grants to States and nonprofit entities to improve charter schools' access to facilities and for expanded national activities.

In addition, the Administration requests \$97.6 million for **Magnet Schools Assistance** to LEAs to establish and operate magnet schools that are part of an approved desegregation plan and that are designed to increase racial integration and expand the range of educational options available to parents and students.

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics

The request also includes \$180.0 million for the **Education Innovation and Research** program, an increase of \$80.7 to promote innovation and reform in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education, including computer science, reflecting the Administration's strong commitment, to expand the STEM workforce in order to maintain American economic competitiveness.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Summary of Request—continued

Discontinued Programs

The Administration is not requesting funding for **Teacher and School Leader Incentive Grants, American History and Civics Education, Supporting Effective Educator Development, School Leader Recruitment and Support, Ready to Learn Programming, Arts in Education, and Javits Gifted and Talented Education** because these programs are narrowly focused or fund activities that can be supported through other Federal, State, local, or private funds.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Opportunity grants

(Proposed legislation)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2019 Authorization: To be determined

Budget Authority:

| <u>2018</u> <u>Annualized CR</u> | <u>2019</u> | <u>Change from</u> <u>Annualized CR</u> |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|--|
| 0 | \$500,000 | +\$500,000 |

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The proposed Opportunity Grants program would significantly increase options that empower more families to choose a private or public school that meets the unique needs of their children, with a priority for grantees serving low-income students and students enrolled in low-performing schools identified for improvement under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The program would include two components: Scholarships for Private Schools and Open Enrollment Grants.

This program, coupled with expanded flexibility in the use of Title I funds to enhance public school choice and significant funding for the Charter Schools and Magnet School Programs, reflects a comprehensive approach to supporting the long-term goal of giving every student the chance to attend a school of his or her choice.

Scholarships for Private Schools

Scholarships for Private Schools (SPS) would make competitive grants for up to 5 years to State-based entities or non-profit organizations currently operating private school voucher programs in order to scale up and validate private school choice as a strategy for:

(1) expanding school choices for parents who wish to send their children to high quality private schools; (2) improving educational outcomes for students from low-income families or students enrolled in persistently low-performing schools; and (3) increasing competition in order to improve the quality and performance of all schools. While most funds would be used to cover the costs of attending private school for eligible students, grantees could also use funds for related activities such as developing or enhancing systems for sharing information on participating private schools, including performance data, and addressing obstacles that students or parents may face in taking advantage of available educational options (e.g., transportation).

SPS grantees would have considerable flexibility to integrate grant activities with existing private school choice programs, including vouchers, tax-credit scholarships and Education Savings Accounts used for private school tuition. These grantees would have to describe in their applications how they would: (1) give priority to low-income students and/or students in

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Opportunity grants

attendance areas where a high percentage of public schools are identified as low-performing under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, (2) ensure meaningful accountability for student outcomes, including public transparency related to such key metrics as student academic achievement and graduation rates that can help parents select the right school for their children, (3) rigorously evaluate the impact of their private school choice programs, and (4) ensure that participating schools comply with all applicable Federal civil rights laws. The Department also may give priority to States proposing to use Federal funds to expand private school options for students with disabilities and students in rural areas.

Open Enrollment Grants

Open Enrollment Grants (OEG) would make competitive awards to local educational agencies approved to operate Flexibility for Equitable Per-Pupil Funding pilots authorized by Part E of Title I of the ESEA. These pilots, which the Department expects to announce in early 2018, provide flexibility to LEAs to consolidate Federal funds together with State and local funds to generate weighted per-pupil allocations, better known as weighted student funding (WSF) systems. To receive this flexibility, an LEA must agree to allocate a significant portion of its total funding (based on school-level actual personnel and nonpersonnel expenditures, including staff salary differentials for years of employment) to schools through the WSF system. The WSF system must use weights that result in substantially higher per-pupil allocations for students from low-income families, English learners, and other disadvantaged students identified by the LEA, compared to other students. Under the statute, the LEA must ensure that, in its first year of flexibility, each high-poverty school receives more per-pupil funding for students from low-income families, and at least as much per-pupil funding for English learners, than in the prior year. The Department enters into initial flexibility agreements with LEAs for a period of up to 3 years and may waive any ESEA requirement that would prevent an LEA from using Federal funds in its system. Under the ESEA, the Department may approve up to 50 pilots for school year 2018-2019; this cap would be lifted beginning in school year 2019-2020.

The Administration's OEG proposal would provide grants to pilot participants that agree to combine the funding flexibility in Title I, Part E with an open enrollment policy to enhance public school choice. The grantees would establish or expand student-centered systems that: (1) differentiate funding based on student characteristics, providing disadvantaged students more funding on a per-pupil basis than other students; (2) offer students a range of viable public school options, which may include public charter schools, and enable the Federal, State, and local funds to follow a student to a public school of his or her choice; (3) make school performance and funding data easily accessible to parents; and (4) empower school leaders to use funds flexibly to address student and community needs. The Department would establish minimum requirements for open enrollment systems aimed at maximizing opportunities for all students, particularly those from low-income families, to select, attend, and succeed in a high-quality public school. Such requirements could include making school information available to parents in a clear and timely manner, demonstrating a capacity to enroll students in their preferred schools, supporting school integration efforts, arranging or paying for transportation to schools of choice, and giving priority to students from low-income families or students in schools identified for improvement under Title I. The Department also may give priority to applicants proposing to serve one or more rural schools or to consortia of LEAs that agree to provide inter-district choice to all students.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Opportunity grants

OEG grants would cover the period of applicants' initial flexibility agreements (up to 3 years). Funds would be used primarily for activities related to developing, implementing, and sustaining their open enrollment systems, which could include temporary payments to individual schools to offset reduced funding due to system transition, developing or enhancing systems for providing families with information on public school options, including performance data, and developing or enhancing administrative systems, needed to implement an open enrollment system. A portion of funds also could be used to refine or expand WSF systems.

Allocation of funds between SPS and OEG would be demand-driven, though the Department may set a floor for each component to ensure appropriate balance of public and private school choice projects are funded by Opportunity Grants. All grant funds must be used to supplement, not supplant, other Federal or State funds available to carry out allowable activities.

FY 2019 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2019, the Administration requests \$500 million for the proposed Opportunity Grants program that would support State and local efforts to create student-centered education systems that prioritize educational choices made by parents and students as a strategy to improve student academic and life outcomes, particularly for students from low-income families and students attending schools identified for improvement under the ESEA. In concert with other Federal education funds, including the Charter Schools and Magnet School programs and the \$15.5 billion Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program, the request would provide an initial investment toward the President's goal of making \$20 billion available annually to support school choice within the next 10 years. The Administration believes that expanding both public and private school choice through student-centered reforms is necessary to ensure that students from low-income families have access to a high-quality education that will prepare them for further education and entering the workforce. Opportunity Grants includes two components: Scholarships for Private Schools and Open Enrollment Grants.

Scholarships for Private Schools (SPS)

States have taken the lead in recent years in expanding school choice options to include private schools, with 14 States currently operating private school voucher programs, 17 States operating scholarship tax credit programs, and 5 States implementing Education Savings Account programs. Most of these programs are designed to serve students with disabilities, students from low-income backgrounds, or students attending underperforming schools. The SPS proposal would support the expansion of these existing programs, potentially enabling them to provide high-quality private school choice options to a significant proportion of students from low-income families, with a priority on students attending low-performing Title I schools.

The growing popularity of school choice programs, including private school voucher programs, is reflected in data showing that a larger percent of parents are happy with their child's school if they can choose the school. Specifically, the 2015 Digest of Education Statistics reported that in 2012, students who attended a private school had the highest percentage of parents who were very satisfied with their children's school. Gallup's Education and Work survey data published in 2016 showed that an average of 62 percent of parents who reported their oldest child attends a

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Opportunity grants

private school said they were completely satisfied with their oldest child's education, compared with 28 percent of public school parents; there was no difference by household income.

Other studies confirm that allowing students from low-income families to use vouchers to attend private schools can help improve both parent satisfaction with their children's schools and some student outcomes. For example, the Congressionally mandated evaluation of the DC Opportunity Scholarships Program (OSP), published in 2010, found that the program significantly improved students' rate of graduation from high school, even though it did not raise reading or math scores. Also, parents of participating students offered a scholarship reported that they were more satisfied with the schools and felt that the school was safer than did parents who were not offered a scholarship. Most recently, a report from the current evaluation of the OSP published in April 2017 found that, while the OSP had a statistically significant negative impact on mathematics achievement after 1 year, the program had a statistically significant positive impact on parents' perceptions of safety at the school their child attended in that first year. According to a 2012 evaluation of the Milwaukee Parental Choice program, the voucher program had a positive effect for reading scores for students who attended private schools for four years. A 2015 study of the New York City School Choice Scholarship Program found that receiving vouchers resulted in increased enrollment in college and bachelor's degree attainment for African-American students. While these studies indicate private school choice programs can produce positive student outcomes, further evaluations are needed to determine the most effective programs. Recent findings in private school choice programs in Louisiana and Ohio underscore the importance of identifying and funding models that work.

Open Enrollment Grants (OEG)

OEG is intended to support crucially needed, locally driven efforts to make public school choice a meaningful reality for more students, especially the poor and minority students that are the focus of Title I. The request reflects the Administration's commitment to placing the power to drive effective school reform back in the hands of students and their families. Although the number of LEAs that permit students to attend a school other than their assigned school has increased significantly in recent decades, school choice continues to exist for many students in name only, if at all. Under the Brookings Institution's 2016 Education Choice and Competition Index—which assigns letter grades to LEAs based on the extent of school choice in the LEA, the process by which parents become informed of their options and make choices, the degree to which LEA funding and management policies favor the growth of schools frequently chosen by families, and the availability to low-income families of transportation and other subsidies—only 37, or one-third, of the Nation's 112 largest LEAs received a grade of C or better.¹ Findings such as this suggest that more can be done to make real school choices available to all students. Moreover, persistent achievement gaps for poor and minority students demand that we provide more opportunities for students trapped in underperforming schools to enroll in high-quality schools capable of meeting their needs.

¹ See <https://www.brookings.edu/interactives/the-2016-education-choice-and-competition-index/>.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Opportunity grants

OEG would build on the funding flexibility enabled by the development and implementation of WSF systems under the Flexibility for Equitable Per-Pupil Funding pilot program by supporting the adoption of strong open enrollment policies such as those implemented by Minneapolis Public Schools, which allows parents to choose any school in the LEA upon kindergarten and high school entry and gives priority for seats in certain schools to low-income students residing in areas of concentrated poverty. Another example is the Hartford Region Open Choice Program, which allows students to move among schools in Hartford and surrounding suburban LEAs, with transportation provided to Hartford students at no cost. Funds could also help develop or replicate rigorous parent information activities and simplified school selection processes, such as the comprehensive Choices and Enrollment website of the New York City Department of Education and the common application for traditional and charter schools used in the District of Columbia.

The Administration's request includes language permitting the Department to reserve up to \$10 million for national activities including technical assistance, information dissemination, and evaluation.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

| <u>Output Measures</u> | <u>2019</u> |
|--|----------------|
| Amount for grants | \$489,000 |
| Range of awards | \$5,000–50,000 |
| Number of awards | 10–100 |
| Peer review of new award applications | \$1,000 |
| Technical assistance, dissemination, and evaluation | \$10,000 |

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Education innovation and research

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended, Title IV, Part F, Subpart 1)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2019 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾

Budget Authority:

| <u>2018</u> <u>Annualized CR</u> | <u>2019</u> | <u>Change from</u> <u>Annualized CR</u> |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|--|
| \$99,321 | \$180,000 | +\$80,679 |

¹ A total of \$220,741 thousand is authorized for Part F of Title IV. Of the total amount appropriated for Title IV, Part F, \$5,000 thousand is reserved to carry out Subpart 3, of the remainder, 42 percent is available for programs under Subpart 1.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Education Innovation and Research (EIR) program—the successor to the Investing in Innovation (i3) program—supports the creation, development, implementation, replication, and scaling up of evidence-based, field-initiated innovations designed to improve student achievement and attainment for high-need students. Like i3, the EIR program supports innovative and proven approaches that address persistent education challenges while also building knowledge of what works in education. The reauthorized program expanded the entities eligible to receive funds, created a new rural set-aside, and increased flexibility around matching funds. In particular, State educational agencies (SEAs) now are eligible to apply for funding.

The EIR program incorporates a tiered-evidence framework that supports larger awards for projects with the strongest evidence base as well as promising earlier-stage projects that are willing to undergo rigorous evaluation. Funds may be used for: (1) early-phase grants for the development, implementation, and feasibility testing of an intervention or innovation which prior research suggests has promise, in order to determine whether the intervention can improve student academic outcomes (similar to Development grants under i3); (2) mid-phase grants for implementation and rigorous evaluation of interventions that have been successfully implemented under early-phase grants or have met similar criteria for documenting program effectiveness (similar to Validation grants under i3); and (3) expansion and replication of interventions or innovations that have been found to produce a sizable impact under a mid-phase grant or have met similar criteria for documenting program effectiveness (similar to Scale-up grants under i3). All grantees must carry out a rigorous independent evaluation of the effectiveness of their project.

Eligible applicants include: (1) local educational agencies (LEAs); (2) SEAs; (3) the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE); (4) consortia of LEAs or SEAs; (5) nonprofit organizations; or (6) SEAs, LEAs, or the BIE in consortia with a nonprofit organization, a business, an educational service agency, or an institution of higher education. At least 25 percent of the funds appropriated for

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Education innovation and research

the program must be used for awards to serve rural areas, contingent on receipt of enough applications of sufficient quality. Grantees must provide matching funds equal to 10 percent of their grant award (in cash or in-kind) from Federal, State, local, or private sources. The Department may waive this requirement under certain circumstances. In addition, the Department may reserve up to 5 percent of program funds to provide technical assistance and disseminate best practices.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

| Fiscal Year | (dollars in thousands) |
|-------------|------------------------|
| 2014..... | \$141,602 |
| 2015..... | 120,000 |
| 2016..... | 120,000 |
| 2017..... | 100,000 |
| 2018..... | 99,321 |

FY 2019 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2019, the Administration requests \$180 million for the EIR program, an increase of \$80.7 million over the fiscal year 2018 annualized CR level. The request includes appropriations language that would focus all funds on a competition to promote innovation and reform in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education, including computer science. Consistent with the Presidential Memorandum on STEM education, the Budget provides a path forward to direct at least \$200 million to STEM education, across a broad range of activities that could include, for example, teacher professional development, personalized learning, and hands-on, project-based curricula, of which \$180 million is requested for EIR.

Supporting STEM education is imperative to better equip America's young people with the relevant knowledge and skills that would enable them to secure high-paying, stable jobs throughout their careers. As the role of technology grows in driving the American economy, many jobs increasingly require skills in STEM. However, not all students are on a pathway to acquire those skills and secure those jobs. In particular, women and other underrepresented groups are less likely to attain STEM degrees. For example, in academic year 2013-14, the percentages of STEM bachelor's degrees awarded to Black, Hispanic, Native American, and Pacific Islander students were lower than the percentage awarded to students overall. In addition, a lower percentage of bachelor's degrees in STEM fields were awarded to females than to males, even though a higher percentage of bachelor's degrees overall were awarded to females than to males.¹ Targeting the EIR program on STEM education is aimed at expanding access to evidence-based, effective STEM programs and increasing the participation of all Americans in STEM fields.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) projects that job opportunities in STEM occupations will grow faster over the next 10 years than the average for all occupations. In addition, wages in

¹ https://nces.ed.gov/programs/raceindicators/indicator_reg.asp

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Education innovation and research

STEM occupations are higher than the median for all occupations, and STEM jobs pay more at all levels of education compared with other occupations.¹ In particular, the BLS Occupational Outlook Handbook (<https://www.bls.gov/ooh/computer-and-information-technology/home.htm>) notes that employment in computer and information technology occupations is projected to grow 13 percent from 2016 to 2026, adding over 500,000 new jobs over that period and reflecting the strong growth of innovations such as cloud computing, big data, the “Internet of things,” and mobile computing. Moreover, the median annual wage for such jobs was \$82,860 in May 2016, compared to a median of \$37,040 for all occupations.

Importantly, the likelihood of students completing postsecondary education (including technical programs and industry-recognized certifications) that enable them to pursue STEM occupations starts with the quality of their education in STEM subjects in elementary and secondary education. A 2013 study published by the National Center for Education Statistics found that precollege academic preparation was one factor correlated with STEM attrition at the postsecondary level; i.e, students pursuing postsecondary STEM majors switching to non-STEM majors or leaving postsecondary education without attaining a degree or certificate.²

The EIR program is well-structured to provide the investment needed to improve elementary and secondary STEM education, including computer science education, because of its emphasis on the development and testing of new, innovative programs as well as the expansion of programs that have been determined to be effective.

Examples of projects funded under this program that focused on STEM education include the following:

- Teach to One: Math, led by New Classrooms Innovation Partners, Inc., in Elizabeth, New Jersey, is designed to expand and evaluate a personalized instructional math model to meet the needs of middle school students regardless of their current learning level.
- Distance Learning through Game-based 3D Virtual Learning Environments: Mission Hydro Science, led by the University of Missouri, is developing a virtual learning environment for distance learning (including in small and rural schools) and blended learning in middle-school STEM subjects focused on hydrological systems and scientific argumentation.
- Teaching English Learners Early Mathematics (TEEM), led by California State University, San Bernardino, is using interactive notebooks to help English Learners in pre-K through sixth-grade learn mathematics while also developing language and metacognitive skills. The second year evaluation report found that English learners who had participated in the treatment group for 2 years and were in grades 3-5 during the first year of the project made

¹ Vilorio, D. 2014. "STEM 101: Intro to Tomorrow's Jobs." Occupational Outlook Quarterly, Spring. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

² Che, X. (2013). "STEM Attrition: College Students' paths Into and Out of STEM Fields." (NCES 2014-0001). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Education innovation and research

small but statistically significant gains in mathematics and English/language arts assessments.

Identifying STEM education models that work, as determined through the rigorous project-level evaluations required under the EIR program, also would help States and school districts meet ESEA requirements to implement evidence-based interventions in schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement or targeted support and improvement. The 2019 request would support the twin goals of building the evidence base for improved STEM education and helping to ensure that LEAs have the tools they need to address the persistent challenges in their lowest-performing schools.

Consistent with the authorizing statute, the Department would reserve \$9 million in fiscal year 2019 for technical assistance, including technical assistance to help grantees develop and implement rigorous evaluations, and dissemination.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

| <u>Output Measures</u> | <u>2017</u> | <u>2018</u> | <u>2019</u> |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| EIR competition | | | |
| Amount for grants | \$95,278 | \$93,362 | \$169,200 |
| Number of new awards | 16 | 10-15 | 25-35 |
| Range of new awards | \$3,000–20,000 | \$3,000–20,000 | \$3,000–20,000 |
| Peer review of new award applications | \$630 | \$993 | \$1,800 |
| National activities | \$4,092 | \$4,966 | \$9,000 |

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years, and those requested in fiscal year 2019 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Performance measures

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

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

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Education innovation and research

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 80% | 40% |
| 2015 | 60 | 50 |
| 2016 | 66 | 66 |
| 2017 | 66 | |
| 2018 | 66 | |
| 2019 | 66 | |

Measure: The percentage of Scale-up grantees that reached the targeted number of students specified in the application by the end of the project.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2015 | 60% | 50% |
| 2016 | 65 | N/A |
| 2017 | 65 | |
| 2018 | 65 | |
| 2019 | 65 | |

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 60% | 57% |
| 2015 | 65 | 52 |
| 2016 | 68 | 52 |
| 2017 | 68 | |
| 2018 | 68 | |
| 2019 | 68 | |

Measure: The percentage of Validation grantees that reached the targeted number of students specified in the application by the end of the project.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2015 | 60% | 80% |
| 2016 | 65 | N/A |
| 2017 | 65 | |
| 2018 | 65 | |
| 2019 | 65 | |

Additional information: The source of the data is annual grantee performance reports and final performance reports submitted through March 2017. One of the goals of Validation and

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Education innovation and research

Scale-up grants is to expand the implementation of interventions for which there is evidence of effectiveness while continuing to evaluate it to ensure that it is implemented well and continues to be effective in a larger scale. Therefore, reaching the targeted number of students is an important measure of success for these projects.

Actual percentages are based on partial data; while all three Scale-up grants reported on students served, 21 of 23 Validation grants had complete data. The two Validation grants not included did not serve students in the reporting year. The Department will continue to develop and refine strategies for providing timely and useful technical assistance to grantees in order to improve the quality, completeness, and consistency of the data. Data for fiscal year 2017 will be available by December 2018.

No Scale-up grants ended their grants in the reporting period through March 2017, so there is no cumulative data on students served to report for Scale-up. Likewise, no Validation grants completed their grant projects by March 2017, so none are included in this measure.

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

Measure: The percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Scale-up grant with ongoing, well-designed and independent evaluations that will provide evidence of their effectiveness at improving student outcomes at scale and would meet the WWC Evidence Standards with or without reservations.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 80% | 100% |
| 2015 | 80 | 100 |
| 2016 | 83 | 100 |
| 2017 | 100 | |
| 2018 | 100 | |
| 2019 | 100 | |

Measure: The percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Validation grant with ongoing, well-designed and independent evaluations that will provide evidence of their effectiveness at improving student outcomes and would meet the WWC Evidence Standards with or without reservations.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 94% | 100% |
| 2015 | 75 | 97 |
| 2016 | 78 | 96 |
| 2017 | 100 | |
| 2018 | 100 | |
| 2019 | 100 | |

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Education innovation and research

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 96% | 99% |
| 2015 | 96 | 98 |
| 2016 | 96 | 98 |
| 2017 | 100 | |
| 2018 | 100 | |
| 2019 | 100 | |

Additional information: The source of the data is grantee evaluation plans. The Department will continue to develop and refine strategies for providing timely and useful technical assistance to grantees in order to improve the quality, completeness, and consistency of the data. Data for fiscal year 2017 will be available by December 2018.

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 80% | 100% |
| 2015 | 80 | 100 |
| 2016 | 83 | 100 |
| 2017 | 100 | |
| 2018 | 100 | |
| 2019 | 100 | |

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 90% | 100% |
| 2015 | 90 | 100 |
| 2016 | 93 | 96 |
| 2017 | 100 | |
| 2018 | 100 | |
| 2019 | 100 | |

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Education innovation and research

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 90% | 99% |
| 2015 | 90 | 99 |
| 2016 | 95 | 98 |
| 2017 | 100 | |
| 2018 | 100 | |
| 2019 | 100 | |

Additional information: The source of the data is grantee evaluation plans. The Department will continue to develop and refine strategies for providing timely and useful technical assistance to grantees in order to improve the quality, completeness, and consistency of the data. Data for fiscal year 2017 will be available by December 2018.

Efficiency measures

The Department established cost per student as the efficiency measure for the i3 program. Aggregate program costs were used to calculate costs per student due to inconsistencies in the data grantees reported. The Department developed a reporting format and provided technical assistance to grantees in order to improve the quality, completeness, and consistency of the data. Data for this measure are based on total project costs minus evaluation costs divided by the number of students served by all grantees. Separating the evaluation costs is critical because evaluation costs for projects under this program tend to be large due to the complexity of the evaluation designs and the goal of meeting WWC standards. Data for 2016 represent grants that submitted an annual performance report and include 3 out of 3 Scale-up grants, 21 out of 23 Validation grantees, and 50 out of 55 Development grants. Data for the second efficiency measure represent grantees that submitted a final performance report and are cumulative costs per student for the entire grant and include 15 out of 15 Validation grants and 26 out of 30 Development grants. Data for fiscal year 2017 will be available by December 2018.

Measure: The cost per student served by the Scale-up, Validation, or Development grant.

| Year | Cost per student, Scale-up grants | Cost per student, Validation grants | Cost per student, Development grants |
|------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 2013 | \$237 | \$181 | \$140 |
| 2014 | 201 | 21,463 | 633 |
| 2015 | 99 | 874 | 1,137 |
| 2016 | 135 | 5,329 | 1,887 |

Additional information: The increase in the cost per student served for 2016 for Scale-up grants is due to the fact that the 3 Scale-up grants were awarded in 2015, and cost per student is generally higher in the first year of project implementation as implementation gears up. The

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Education innovation and research

significant increase in the cost per student reported for 2016 for Validation grants is due to one project, which has significant cost per student because it is an internship program, and that the grant only reached 60 percent of its target number of students to be served. The cost per student reported for 2016 for Development grants is slightly higher than 2015 but within the same range.

Measure: The cost per student for the Scale-up, Validation, or Development grant for programs, practices, or strategies that were proven to be effective at improving educational outcomes for students.

| Year | Cost per student, Scale-up grants | Cost per student, Validation grants | Cost per student, Development grants |
|------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 2015 | \$375 | \$1,154 | \$928 |
| 2016 | N/A | N/A | 347 |

Additional information: No Scale-up or Validation projects ended in 2016, so this measure is not application for that year. For Development, 8 grant projects ended in 2016, and 6 have provided complete cost per student data. The cost per student for Development grants for 2016 reflects a much smaller number of grantees reporting these data than for 2015.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Teacher and school leader incentive grants

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, Title II, Part B, Subpart 1, Section 2212)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2019 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾

Budget Authority:

| <u>2018</u> <u>Annualized CR</u> | <u>2019</u> | <u>Change from</u> <u>Annualized CR</u> |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|--|
| \$198,642 | 0 | -\$198,642 |

¹ A total of \$469,168 thousand is authorized for Part B of Title II. Of the total amount appropriated for Title II, Part B, 49.1 percent is available for Subpart 1 activities.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Teacher and School Leader (TSL) Incentive Grants program was authorized by the Every Student Succeeds Act as the successor to the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF), which was operated under appropriations language authority from fiscal year 2006 to fiscal year 2016. The program makes competitive awards to help eligible entities develop, implement, improve, or expand human capital management systems or performance-based compensation systems in schools served by the grantees.

Eligible entities include local educational agencies (LEAs), including charter schools that are LEAs; State educational agencies or other designated State agencies; the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE); and partnerships of LEAs, State agencies, and the BIE with nonprofit or for-profit entities. The grant period is 3 years, with the option of renewal for an additional 1 or 2 years if the grantee demonstrates success. In making grants, the Department is required to give priority to applicants that support teachers, principals, and other school leaders in high-need schools and to ensure an equitable geographic distribution of grants, including the distribution of grants between rural and urban areas. An LEA is permitted to receive (whether individually or as part of a consortium) a grant under this program only twice.

The statute defines high-need schools as public elementary or secondary schools located in an area in which at least 30 percent of students are from low-income families. Human capital management systems (HCMSs) are defined as systems by which an LEA makes and implements human capital decisions, such as decisions on hiring, professional development, dismissal, tenure, and promotion and that include a performance-based compensation system. Performance-based compensation systems (PBCSs) mean systems of compensation for teachers, principals, or other school leaders that differentiate levels of compensation based in part on measureable increases in student academic achievement. The systems also may include differentiated levels of compensation for positions in hard-to-staff schools and subject areas, as well as for recognition of skills and knowledge of teachers, principals, and other

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Teacher and school leader incentive grants

school leaders demonstrated through additional responsibilities and evidence of professional achievement.

Grantees may use funds for a wide variety of activities designed to develop, implement, improve, or expand an HCMS or PBCS, including:

- Developing or improving evaluation and support systems that are based in part on demonstrated improvement in student achievement;
- Conducting outreach to gain information on how to construct evaluation and support systems;
- Providing principals with the tools necessary to make school-level decisions, including staffing decisions, in order to build high-performing instructional leadership teams for high-need schools;
- Implementing a differentiated salary structure for teachers who teach in high-needs schools or teach high-need subjects, raise student academic achievement, or take on additional leadership responsibilities, or for principals or other school leaders to serve in high-need schools and raise student academic achievement;
- Improving LEA processes for recruiting, selecting, placing, supporting, and retaining effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders in high-need schools; and
- Instituting career advancement opportunities that reward effective teachers, principals, or other school leaders in high-need schools.

Grantees must provide matching funds, in cash or in kind, from non-Federal sources equal to 50 percent of the amount of their grants. Grant funds must be used to supplement, not supplant, other Federal or State funds available to carry out activities.

The Department is required to submit an annual report to Congress that provides information on grant award amounts and grantee activities, as well as student academic achievement information for participating schools. In addition, the Institute for Education Sciences (IES) must evaluate the effectiveness of the program; the Department may reserve up to 1 percent of each year's appropriation for this purpose as well as to provide technical assistance to grantees.

The predecessor program, TIF, also supported the development and implementation of performance-based compensation systems and human capital management systems that were designed to measure and improve educator effectiveness and provide effective educators with incentives to take on additional responsibilities and leadership roles. The reauthorized program places a greater focus on the development of comprehensive human capital management systems that include performance based compensation systems, while adding a new emphasis on the role principals and school leaders in promoting effective instruction in high-need schools.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Teacher and school leader incentive grants

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

| Fiscal Year | (dollars in thousands) |
|-------------|------------------------|
| 2014..... | \$288,771 |
| 2015..... | 230,000 |
| 2016..... | 230,000 |
| 2017..... | 200,000 |
| 2018..... | 198,642 |

FY 2019 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funding for the TSL program in fiscal year 2019. While the TSL program and its TIF predecessor have received strong support over the past decade due to the anticipated promise of performance-based compensation systems and human capital management systems for improving teacher and school leader effectiveness and student academic outcomes, the overall results have been mixed. Grantees have found it difficult to implement with fidelity the complex elements of a PBCS or HCMS, to explain the systems clearly to participating educators and obtain the buy-in necessary for creating meaningful incentives for improved instructional performance, and to build the capacity needed to sustain systems beyond the Federal grant period. Consequently, the program has delivered limited evidence of improved teaching or learning. In addition, States and LEAs may use other Federal, State, and local resources—including funds provided to nearly all school districts and more than 55,000 schools through the \$15.5 billion Title I Grants to LEAs program—to pilot or demonstrate the types of incentives and supports authorized under the TSL program.

The Department will use all fiscal year 2018 funds for continuation awards, but the 13 fiscal year 2016 grantees will not receive their final 2 years of funding in fiscal years 2019 and 2020 and the 14 fiscal year 2017 grantees will not receive their final year of funding scheduled for fiscal year 2019.

While the Department's usual practice is to avoid early termination of existing grants, given the limited evidence of effectiveness for the activities funded by TIF and TSL, the Administration is proposing program funding elimination in order to provide strong support for State formula grant programs while maintaining the fiscal discipline required to meet the President's deficit reduction goals. Moreover, the Department anticipates that many grantees will continue to benefit from the changes in performance-based compensation systems and human capital management systems made in the early years of their respective grant periods even if Federal funding is eliminated.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Teacher and school leader incentive grants

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

| <u>Output Measures</u> | <u>2017</u> | <u>2018</u> | <u>2019</u> |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|
| Project funding | | | |
| New awards | \$95,888 | 0 | 0 |
| Continuation awards | 101,803 | \$196,656 | 0 |
| Peer review of new award applications | 309 | 0 | 0 |
| Evaluation and technical assistance | <u>2,000</u> | <u>1,986</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Total | 200,000 | 198,642 | 0 |
| Grant Award Information | | | |
| Number of new awards | 14 | 0 | 0 |
| Range of new awards | \$535–\$12,880 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of continuation awards | 13 | 27 | 0 |
| Range of continuation awards | \$830–\$18,720 | \$799–\$14,576 | 0 |

NOTE: The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including Teacher and School Leader Incentive Grants, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. The Department did not reserve funds for this purpose in fiscal year 2017, but may do so in fiscal year 2018. The reauthorized ESEA includes separate authority for the Department to use up to 1 percent of TSL program funds for evaluation and technical assistance; any amount pooled under section 8601 would be part of this 1 percent.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance measures

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

The Department established four measures for the 2012 grant competition for use beginning in 2013; 35 applicants received awards and all were expected to report using these measures. The teacher and principal evaluation ratings for these measures are based, in significant part, on evidence of improved student outcomes. Selected information (e.g., data for only those teachers and principals rated at the highest level of effectiveness, and not at each level) are presented below. The Department collects these data from grantee annual performance reports, and the final year for which data will be available for the 2012 cohort of grantees is 2017.

The changes in performance data from year to year should be interpreted with caution. Grantees partner with LEAs for their projects, and although the number of grantees remained the same over time, the number of participating LEAs dropped from 169 in year 1 to 136 in year 2, and continued to decline to 90 in year 5. In addition, some grantees did not have data to report in the first 2 years of their projects because the participating LEAs did not have an

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Teacher and school leader incentive grants

evaluation system for either teachers or principals, or both. Thus, the data presented do not represent the same LEAs over time. Results for 2017 are expected to be available in the late spring 2018.

Measure: The percentage of teachers and principals who were rated at the highest level of effectiveness under their district's evaluation system.

| Year | Actual for Teachers | Actual for Principals |
|------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 2014 | 17% | 20% |
| 2015 | 21 | 26 |
| 2016 | 26 | 14 |
| 2017 | | |
| 2018 | | |

Additional information: The percentages rated at the highest level of effectiveness rose between 2014 and 2015 for both teachers and principals; between 2015 and 2016 the percentage rose for teachers but declined for principals. As noted above, changes may be due to the fact that different LEAs are included each year.

Measure: The percentage of teachers of high-need fields or subjects who were rated at the highest level of effectiveness under their district's evaluation system.

| Year | Actual |
|------|--------|
| 2014 | 13% |
| 2015 | 18 |
| 2016 | 17 |
| 2017 | |
| 2018 | |

Additional information: The percentage of teachers of high-needs fields or subjects who were rated at the highest level of effectiveness, like the percentage of all teachers, increased between 2014 and 2015. However, it dropped slightly in 2016. In each year, the percentage of teachers of high-need fields or subjects who were rated at the highest level of effectiveness was lower than the percentage of all teachers who were rated at that level. The gap was largest—9 percentage points—in 2016.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Teacher and school leader incentive grants

Measure: The percentage of school districts participating in a TIF grant that use educator evaluation systems to inform key personnel decisions.

| Personnel decision | 2014 Actual | 2015 Actual | 2016 Actual |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Recruitment | 81% | 79% | 80% |
| Hiring | 87 | 89 | 89 |
| Placement | 74 | 70 | 86 |
| Retention | 66 | 95 | 93 |
| Dismissal | 67 | 93 | 90 |
| Tenure | 17 | 43 | 33 |
| Career advancement | 89 | 87 | 90 |
| Professional development | 100 | 97 | 93 |
| All of the above | 7 | 30 | 28 |

Additional information: The Department assesses the use of educator evaluation systems to inform personnel decisions in eight areas. By 2016, the percentages were at or above 80 percent for all areas except tenure. Results for 2017 are expected to be available in the late spring 2018.

The Department developed measures for the 2016 TIF and 2017 TSL competitions that were published with the notices inviting applications. These measures are:

- The percentage of educators in all schools who earned performance-based compensation.
- The percentage of educators in all high-need schools who earned performance-based compensation.
- The gap between the retention rate of educators receiving performance-based compensation and the average retention rate of educators in each high-need school whose educators participate in the project.
- The number of school districts participating in a grant that use educator evaluation systems to inform recruitment, hiring, placement, retention, dismissal, professional development, tenure, and promotion.
- The percentage of performance-based compensation paid to educators with State, local, or other non-TIF or TSL Federal resources.
- The percentage of teachers and principals who receive the highest effectiveness rating.
- The percentage of teachers and principals in high-needs schools who receive the highest effectiveness rating.

The 2017 TSL competition included one additional measure, the number of high-need schools within districts participating in a TSL grant that use educator evaluation and support systems to inform recruitment, hiring, placement, retention, dismissal, professional development, tenure, and promotion.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Teacher and school leader incentive grants

Other performance information

The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) conducted two recent studies that provide information on effective practices:

The Impact Evaluation of Teacher and Leader Performance Evaluation Systems¹ examined districts' and educators' experiences with performance evaluation systems and their impact of classroom practice and student achievement in eight districts. The study, which cost \$21.5 million over 6 years, was completed in December 2017. The key findings were:

- The study's performance measures were implemented generally as planned. For instance, in both study years, teachers and principals received multiple rounds of ratings and feedback on their practices.
- While the study's measures provided some information to identify educators who needed support, they provided limited information to indicate the areas of practice most needing improvement.
- The intervention had a positive impact on teachers' classroom practice on one of the two observation measures, and it also had a positive impact on both of the principal leadership measures. However, there was limited impact on student achievement: there was no impact on reading/English language arts achievement in either study year, and there was a mathematics impact in only one of the two study years. The mathematics impact was the equivalent of about 4 weeks of learning.

The Impact Evaluation of the Teacher Incentive Fund² examined the characteristics of 144 districts participating in 2010 TIF grants during 2013–2014 school year and assessed the effect of pay-for-performance on educators in a subset of 10 districts. The study, which cost \$13.7 million over 8 years, ended in December 2017.

Key findings from all participating districts that were part of the 2010 grants are:

- Implementation was similar across the 4 years of the study, with most districts implementing at least three of the four required components for teachers (measures of teacher effectiveness, pay-for-performance bonuses, additional pay opportunities, and professional development) for teachers. Only about half implemented all four requirements.
- Many districts reported that sustaining their program was a major challenge, and slightly fewer than half planned to offer pay-for-performance bonuses after their grant ended. However, most districts reported that they planned to continue three key components of TIF: professional development based on teachers' performance ratings (90 percent), measures

¹ https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_performance.asp

² https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_incentive.asp

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Teacher and school leader incentive grants

of performance similar to those used in TIF (at least 80 percent), and additional pay for taking on extra roles or responsibilities (74 percent).

For the 10 districts that participated in the random assignment study:

- There was a small positive effect on student achievement. On average, pay-for-performance bonuses led to slightly higher reading and mathematics achievement (1 to 2 percentile points) in schools that offered such bonuses than in schools that did not. This difference was equivalent to a gain of 3 to 4 additional weeks of learning.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

American history and civics education

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, Title II, Part B, Subpart 3)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2019 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾

Budget Authority:

| <u>2018</u> <u>Annualized CR</u> | <u>2019</u> | <u>Change from</u> <u>Annualized CR</u> |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|--|
| \$3,491 | 0 | -\$3,491 |

¹Of the total amount appropriated for Title II, Part B (authorized at \$469,168 thousand), 1.4 percent is available for Subpart 3, of which not less than 26 percent is reserved for American History and Civics Academies.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

American History and Civics Education is designed to improve the quality of teaching and learning in American history, civics, and government. Funds support Presidential Academies for teachers, Congressional Academies for students, and National Activities to promote innovative instruction and professional development for teachers and school leaders.

American History and Civics Academies

The American History and Civics Academies program supports efforts to improve the quality of American history and civics education by providing intensive workshops for teachers and students. The Presidential Academies for the Teaching of American History and Civics offer workshops of at least 2 weeks to elementary and secondary school teachers to strengthen their knowledge through instruction and interaction with primary scholars and accomplished teachers in these fields. The Congressional Academies for Students of American History and Civics offer similar workshops to secondary school students to enrich their understanding of American history and civics.

The Department makes competitive awards for up to 5 years to institutions of higher education and nonprofit educational organizations, museums, libraries, and research centers with demonstrated expertise in historical methodology or the teaching of American history and civics. The Department may make no more than 12 grants in a fiscal year and must give priority for Presidential Academies grants to applicants that propose to use the resources of the National Parks and coordinate or align their projects with the National Park Service National Centennial Parks initiative. Grantees must provide matching funds from non-Federal sources in an amount equal to 100 percent of the grant amount.

To promote a seamless delivery of training and instruction and to maximize project benefits for participants, the Department has required that grantee projects include both a Presidential and a Congressional Academy.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

American history and civics education

National Activities

National Activities grants promote evidence-based instructional methods and professional development programs in American history, civics and government, and geography, particularly those methods and programs that benefit students from low-income families and underserved student populations. Grants support the development, implementation, expansion, evaluation, and dissemination of methods and programs that show potential to improve teaching and learning and demonstrate innovation, scalability, accountability, and a focus on underserved student populations. Grant projects may include civic engagement activities and educational programs on the history and principles of the Constitution and Bill of Rights. The Department makes competitive grants to institutions of higher education and other nonprofit or for-profit organizations with demonstrated expertise for an initial period of up to 3 years, and may renew grants for an additional 2 years.

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

| Fiscal Year | (dollars in thousands) |
|-------------|------------------------|
| 2014..... | 0 |
| 2015..... | 0 |
| 2016..... | \$1,815 |
| 2017..... | \$3,515 |
| 2018..... | \$3,491 |

FY 2019 BUDGET REQUEST

The request does not include funding for American History and Civics Education for fiscal year 2019. This program supports only a few awards, and American History and Civics Academies grants reach a very limited number of teachers and students each year: under the statute, an academy may select no more than 300 teachers or students for participation annually. The Administration believes that such small, narrowly targeted programs do not reflect an appropriate Federal role and are better supported with State, local, or private funding sources. In addition, local educational agencies (LEAs) can use funds from other Federal programs to improve instruction in American history and civics, including Title I Grants to LEAs.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

American history and civics education

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

| <u>Output Measures</u> | <u>2017</u> | <u>2018</u> | <u>2019</u> |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| American History and Civics Academies grants | | | |
| Amount for new awards | \$1,704 | \$1,398 | 0 |
| Number of new awards | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| National Activities grants | | | |
| Amount for new awards | \$1,780 | \$1,964 | 0 |
| Number of new awards | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Amount for supplemental awards | 0 | \$129 | 0 |
| Number of supplemental awards | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Peer review of new award applications | \$31 | 0 | 0 |

NOTES: The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including American History and Civics Education, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. The Department did not reserve funds from the program for this purpose in fiscal year 2017, but may do so in fiscal year 2018.

Consistent with the Administration's request to eliminate funding for this program in fiscal year 2019, the output measures for fiscal year 2018 reflect the use of fiscal year 2018 annualized CR funds to frontload new awards to pay, to the extent possible, the full costs of projects over the 5-year grant period for American History and Civics Academies grants and the initial 3-year grant period for National Activities grants.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information and results bases on GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Goal: To improve the quality of teaching and learning in American history, civics and government, and geography in elementary and secondary schools.

Objective: *Participants will demonstrate through pre- and post-assessments an increased understanding of American history and civics that can be directly linked to their participation in the Presidential or Congressional academy.*

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

American history and civics education

Measure: The average percentage gain on a teacher assessment after participation in a Presidential Academy.

Measure: The average percentage gain on a student assessment after participation in a Congressional Academy.

For the 2016 grantee, there was a 13 percent gain on teacher assessments after participation in a Presidential Academy and a 10 percent gain on student assessments after participation in a Congressional Academy in 2017.

Additional information: Data are from assessments created by the grantee's evaluator drawing on questions from nationally validated U.S. History tests. The Department will establish targets for future years for the 2016 grantee using 2017 data as the baseline. The 2018 data for these performance measures for the fiscal year 2017 grantee are expected to be available in fall 2018.

Objective: *Participants will demonstrate through pre- and post-assessments an increased understanding of American history, civics and government, and geography that can be directly linked to their participation in National Activities grant activities.*

Measure: The average percentage gain on an assessment after participation in National Activities grant activities.

The 2018 data for this performance measure for the fiscal year 2017 grantee are expected to be available in fall 2018.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Supporting effective educator development

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title II, Part B, Subpart 4, Section 2242)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2019 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾

Budget Authority:

| <u>2018</u> <u>Annualized CR</u> | <u>2019</u> | <u>Change from</u> <u>Annualized CR</u> |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|--|
| \$64,559 | 0 | -\$64,599 |

¹ A total of \$469,168 thousand is authorized for Part B of Title II. Of the total amount appropriated for Title II, Part B, 15.4 percent is available for Subpart 4, of which 74 percent must be used for Section 2242.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Supporting Effective Education Development (SEED) grant program was authorized from fiscal years 2011–2016 through appropriations language as a set-aside under the Title II, Part A Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program. Separate authority for SEED as a distinct program was added to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The program provides competitive grants to institutions of higher education (IHEs), national nonprofit entities, and the Bureau of Indian Education, or to partnerships of one or more IHEs and national nonprofit organizations with a for-profit entity, to:

- Support pathways that allow teachers, principals, or other school leaders with nontraditional preparation and certification to obtain employment in traditionally underserved local educational agencies (LEAs);
- Provide evidence-based professional development activities that address literacy, numeracy, remedial education, or other needs of LEAs and the students they serve;
- Provide professional development to improve instruction in dual enrollment programs or early college high school settings;
- Make services and learning opportunities freely available to LEAs, including through publicly accessible electronic means; or
- Provide teachers, principals, or other school leaders with evidence-based professional enhancement activities, which may include activities that lead to an advanced credential.

Grants may be awarded for up to 3 years and may be renewed for one additional 2-year period if the grantee demonstrates success. To the extent practicable, the Department must ensure that grants are distributed among eligible entities that will serve geographically diverse areas. The statute requires grantees to use non-Federal sources, in cash or in kind, to cover at least

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Supporting effective educator development

25 percent of project costs each year. The Department may waive or modify this cost-sharing requirement in cases of demonstrated financial hardship.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

| Fiscal Year | (dollars in thousands) |
|-------------|------------------------|
| 2014 | \$46,997 |
| 2015 | 54,046 |
| 2016 | 93,993 |
| 2017 | 65,000 |
| 2018 | 64,559 |

FY 2019 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funding for the SEED program in fiscal year 2019. Teacher recruitment, training, placement, and ongoing professional development are core responsibilities for States, school districts, and institutions of higher education, which are best positioned to identify and respond to local and regional needs for effective educators. In the Federal context, SEED duplicates and has a much more limited impact than, for example, the Title I Grants to LEAs program, which makes available \$15.5 billion annually to more than 14,000 LEAs and 55,000 schools that can be used for all SEED-authorized activities. The Administration expects many providers previously or currently funded by the SEED program will likely continue their activities by marketing their services to States and LEAs, which can pay for such services with other Federal, State, or local funds. In particular, LEAs can be expected to turn to providers of evidence-based teacher quality supports when implementing the evidence-based school improvement plans required by the ESEA and supported by more than \$1 billion in annual Title I school improvement funding. For this reason, and consistent with the fiscal discipline required to maintain support for higher priority State formula grant programs serving the most vulnerable student populations while meeting the President's deficit reduction goals, the request would terminate funding for the SEED program.

Grants awarded in fiscal year 2017 under the authority provided in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) will receive a proportional share of their remaining continuation costs in 2018; at the 2018 annualized continuing resolution level, this will amount to nearly 87 percent of the original continuation amount. This amount should be sufficient to allow them to carry out the main activities of their grants. (The two grants awarded in fiscal year 2017 under authority provided under bill language included in the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2016, were fully funded using fiscal year 2016 funds and will not need continuation funding in fiscal years 2018 or 2019.)

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Supporting effective educator development

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

| <u>Output Measures</u> | <u>2017</u> | <u>2018</u> | <u>2019</u> |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Project Funding: | | | |
| New awards | \$28,484 | 0 | 0 |
| Continuation awards | 36,290 | \$64,559 | 0 |
| Peer review of new applications | <u>226</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Total | 65,000 | 64,559 | 0 |
| Grant Award Information | | | |
| Number of new awards | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Range of new awards | \$580–\$5,906 | NA | NA |
| Number of continuation awards | 9 | 13 | 0 |
| Range of continuation awards | \$1,918–\$6,734 | \$3,171–\$9,339 | 0 |

NOTE: The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including Supporting Effective Educator Development, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. The Department did not reserve funds in fiscal year 2017 but may do so in fiscal year 2018.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance measures

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

The Department first conducted a competition for SEED grants in fiscal year 2012 and established two performance measures for the program, the first of which was applicable to grantees addressing the priorities on recruitment, selection, and preparation and on professional development, and the second of which was applicable to grantees addressing the priority on advanced certification and advanced credentialing:

- The percentage of teacher and principal participants who serve concentrations of high-need students, are highly effective, and serve for at least two years, and the cost per such participant (for grantees addressing priorities on teacher and principal recruitment, selection, and preparation and on professional development for teachers of English language arts).
- The percentage of teacher participants who receive advanced certification or advanced credentialing and are highly effective, and the cost per such participant (for grantees addressing the priority on advanced certification and advanced credentialing).

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Supporting effective educator development

Three grantees received awards in 2012, all of which addressed the first two priorities. Establishing measures that can be used across very different types of projects is difficult, and due to differences in interpretation of the terms used (e.g., what constituted effectiveness) and the length of some of the grants, performance data for these grantees are limited. All participants in one project served concentrations of high-need students, and nearly two-thirds of participants in the second project served such students. Seventeen percent of the participants in this project served high concentrations of high-need students and were highly effective.

The same performance measures were used in the 2013 competition, which resulted in five awards. Again, due to differences in reporting and grant length, data are limited. However, data for all five grantees suggest that most participants serve schools with concentrations of high-need students, with percentages (across grantees and reporting years) ranging from 58 to 100 percent. Data on the percent serving high-need students who were highly effective were available for two grantees, which reported values of 31 and 54 percent.

The Department published four performance measures in the notice inviting applications for fiscal year 2015 SEED grantees:

- The percentage of teacher and principal participants who serve concentrations of high-need students;
- The percentage of teacher and principal participants who serve concentrations of high-need students and are highly effective;
- The percentage of teacher and principal participants who serve concentrations of high-need students, are highly effective, and serve for at least 2 years; and
- The cost per participant who was highly effective and who taught in high need schools for 2 years.

Year 1 data are available for this cohort of grantees. Nine of the 13 grantees from 2015 provided data on both the number of participants and the number of participants who served concentrations of high-need students. These grantees served a total of 8,170 participants (with a range of 3 to 4,100), 6,956 of whom were in schools with concentrations of high-need students (range of 2 to 4,100), for an overall percentage of 85 percent. Across grants, the percentage ranged from 67 to 100 percent. The largest of these grantees (in terms of participants served) reported that 28 percent of the participants served in schools with concentrations of high-need students and were highly effective. Additional grantees are expected to report on this measure next year. Data are not yet available for the remaining two measures.

The four measures used in the 2015 competition also were used in the 2017 competitions. In addition, the 2017 competition that was held under the reauthorized ESEA included an additional measure, the number of grantees with evaluations that meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with reservations. Information for the 2017 grantees is expected to be available in late 2019.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Supporting effective educator development

Additional information should be available in late 2018 from 2-year evaluation extension awards made in 2016 to three of the 2013 grantees, the National Writing Project, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

School leader recruitment and support

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, Title II, Part B, Subpart 4, Section 2243)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2019 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾

Budget Authority:

| <u>2018</u> <u>Annualized CR</u> | <u>2019</u> | <u>Change from</u> <u>Annualized CR</u> |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|--|
| \$14,402 | 0 | -\$14,402 |

¹ A total of \$469,168 thousand is authorized for Part B of Title II. Of the total amount appropriated for Title II, Part B, 15.4 percent is authorized for Subpart 4, of which 22 percent must be used for Section 2243.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

School Leader Recruitment and Support grants fund activities to improve the recruitment, preparation, placement, support, and retention of effective principals and other school leaders in high-need schools. The program is the successor to the School Leadership program. Activities may include:

- Developing or implementing leadership training programs designed to prepare and support principals or other school leaders in high-need schools, including through new or alternative pathways or school leader residency programs;
- Developing or implementing programs or activities for recruiting, selecting, and developing aspiring or current principals or other school leaders to serve in high-need schools;
- Developing or implementing programs for recruiting, developing, and placing school leaders in schools implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities and targeted support and improvement activities required by section 1111(d) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA);
- Providing continuous professional development for principals and other school leaders in high-need schools;
- Developing and disseminating information on best practices and strategies for effective school leadership in high-need schools; and
- Developing other evidence-based programs or activities focused on principals or other school leaders in high-need schools that can be used by State educational agencies (SEAs) and local educational agencies (LEAs) implementing Title II Supporting Effective Instruction State grants.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

School leader recruitment and support

Funds are awarded competitively to eligible entities, which include LEAs that serve high-need schools, SEAs, the Bureau of Indian Education, or any of those entities in consortia with nonprofit organizations or institutions of higher education (IHEs). For this program, high-need schools are defined as elementary schools with at least 50 percent of enrolled students from families below the poverty line or secondary schools with at least 40 percent of enrolled students from families below the poverty line.

In awarding grants, the Department must give priority to applicants that will implement evidence-based activities and that have a demonstrated ability to prepare or develop principals who (1) have improved school-level student outcomes, (2) have become principals in high-need schools, and (3) remain principals in such schools for multiple years. The Department also must ensure that, to the extent practicable, grants are distributed among eligible entities that will serve geographically diverse areas, including urban, suburban, and rural areas. Grants are awarded for up to 5 years, with an optional 2-year extension. Entities may receive only one grant during a single competition.

The statute requires cost sharing and grantees must use non-Federal sources, in cash or in kind, to cover at least 25 percent of the project costs each year. The Department may waive or modify the cost-sharing requirement in cases of demonstrated financial hardship. Federal grant funds must be used to supplement, not supplant, non-Federal funds that would otherwise be used for such activities.

Under the antecedent School Leadership program, high-need LEAs, nonprofit organizations, and IHEs could receive grants to recruit and retain individuals to serve as principals in high-need LEAs by (1) providing financial incentives to aspiring new principals, (2) providing stipends to principals who mentor new principals, (3) carrying out professional development programs in instructional leadership and management, and (4) providing incentives for teachers or individuals from other fields who want to become principals.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

| Fiscal Year | (dollars in thousands) |
|-------------|------------------------|
| 2014..... | \$25,763 |
| 2015..... | 16,368 |
| 2016..... | 16,368 |
| 2017..... | 14,500 |
| 2018..... | 14,402 |

FY 2019 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funds for the School Leader Recruitment and Support Program in fiscal year 2019. The program supports a small number of grantees and has minimal national impact. While school leadership is important, other Federal funds are available to support improved leadership in high-need schools. In particular, both regular Title I Grants to Local educational agencies (LEAs) and Title I funds reserved for school improvement, which are available to more than 14,000 school districts and 55,000 public elementary and secondary

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

School leader recruitment and support

schools, may be used to recruit, prepare, support, and retain effective principals and other school leaders in Title I participating schools.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

| <u>Output Measures</u> | <u>2017</u> | <u>2018</u> | <u>2019</u> |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Funding for continuation awards | \$14,500 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of continuation awards | 18 | 0 | 0 |
| Range of continuation awards | \$212–\$2,208 | 0 | 0 |
| Funding for new awards | 0 | \$14,302 | 0 |
| Number of new awards | 0 | 3–5 | 0 |
| Range of new awards | 0 | \$2,500–\$5,000 | 0 |
| Peer review of new grant applications | | 100 | 0 |

NOTE: The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including School Leader Recruitment and Support, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. The Department did not reserve funds from the program for this purpose in fiscal year 2017 but may in fiscal year 2018 if the program is funded.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance measures

This section presents selected program performance information and results based on GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The information provided is for the antecedent School Leadership program (SLP). Grantees report data for each year of their 5-year projects. Data are reported by participant year cohort and updated annually. For example, for the 2013 grants (i.e., the 20 grants awarded in fiscal year 2013), all of a grantee's participants who first received services in the first year of the grant (school year 2013-2014) are reported the "year 1" cohort. All participants first receiving services in the second year of the grant (school year 2014-2015) are the "year 2" cohort; and so forth through the final year of the grant (school year 2017-2018). The Department summarizes the data across participant cohorts. Thus, the 2014 information in the tables below includes information for only the "year 1" cohort, the 2015 information includes data for the "year 1" and "year 2" cohorts, and the 2016 information includes data for the "year 1", "year 2", and "year 3" cohorts. The Department did not establish targets for these measures.

Each year, the grantees provide updates for each participant cohort, and the Department calculates updated percentages for each cohorts. Thus, for example, if a grantee had 10 participants who began working towards certification in school year 2013-2014 and 4 completed their work in that year, the grantee would have had a 2014 cohort completion

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

School leader recruitment and support

percentage of 40 percent at the end of the first year. However, if another three participants completed certification in the second year, the 2014 cohort completion rate would have increased to 70 percent. Grantees continue to track participants and update information throughout the project.

Not all performance measures are relevant for all grantees, and not all grantees report data for all years. (For example, a grantee may not enroll new participant cohorts in each year of the project.)

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

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

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

| Year | 2013 Grantee Target | 2013 Grantee Actual |
|------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 2014 | | 75% |
| 2015 | | 71 |
| 2016 | | 74 |
| 2017 | | |
| 2018 | | |

Additional information: This measure is based on the cumulative number of participants who sought certification to become a principal or assistant principal and the number who became certified. No targets were set for this measure.

Fifteen grantees reported both the number of grantees seeking certification and the number meeting certification requirements for at least one participant cohort. Based on data for cohorts where both values were reported, 350 of 474 participants, or 74 percent, were certified by the end of year 3. The numbers of participants per grant ranged from 6 to 162, with completion percentages of 0 to 100 percent.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

School leader recruitment and support

Measure: The percentage of participants who are certified through the funded projects and hired as a principal or assistant principal in a high-need LEA.

| Year | 2013 Grantee Target | 2013 Grantee Actual |
|------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 2014 | | 27% |
| 2015 | | 43 |
| 2016 | | 52 |
| 2017 | | |
| 2018 | | |

Additional information: Based on data for 11 grantees that reported on the number of participants who met certification requirements and who were hired by a high-need LEA, 52 percent (100 out of 193) of such participants were hired by a high-need LEA by the end of the third year. Data for this measure include only grantees reporting on both certification and hiring, and where the number reported being hired was less than or equal to the number certified. Participants generally take 18 to 24 months to attain certification, although this varies by grantee, so additional participants may gain certification and find employment in high-need LEAs during the remainder of the grant projects. No targets were set for this measure.

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

Most grantees have not yet reported this information. The data will be available at a later date.

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

Measure: The percentage of principals and assistant principals who complete the SLP-funded professional development program and whose schools demonstrate positive change, no change, or negative change based on pre- and post-school site measures, of which one measure must include, if available, student growth (e.g., students advance at least one grade level in an academic year).

This measure tracks participants who are enrolled in grant-funded professional development activities designed to support individuals currently serving as principals and assistant principals in high-need LEAs. By the end of the 3rd year of the grants, there were 1,634 such participants across 15 grants; pre- and post-school site data were available for 1,023 participants (63 percent). Grantees were asked to report on the number of participants whose schools demonstrated positive change, no change, or negative change based on pre- and post-school site measures. Data were further screened to eliminate grantee cohorts for which information was incomplete or inconsistent (i.e., where the numbers in each category did not equal the total number reported), complete information was available for 689 participants in 19 cohorts across 11 grantees. Based on data for this subset of participants, 87 percent of participants in these cohorts (598 out of 689) were in school sites that showed an increase in student performance.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

School leader recruitment and support

Measure: The percentage of program graduates who are rated “effective” or “highly effective” as measured by a State or local principal evaluation system, if available

Additional information: At the end of the third reporting year, data were available for 13 participant cohorts across 6 grantees. These grantees reported that 77 percent of participants (199 out of 257) were rated as “effective” or “highly effective”. In 10 of the 13 cohorts, all participants were rated as “effective” or “highly effective”; the percentages for the other three were 9 percent, 13 percent, and 75 percent.

Other Performance Information

The Department began an impact evaluation of support for principals in 2014.¹ The study, which will cost \$12.2 million over 5 years, is addressing key questions about the effectiveness of principal professional development programs and their ability to improve leadership skills and school quality, including:

- What are the professional development experiences of principals?
- What are the initial impacts on school climate and educator behaviors of providing principals structured and intensive professional development?
- What are the impacts on teacher retention, the effectiveness of instructional staff, and student achievement of providing principals with structured and intensive professional development?

The study includes 100 elementary schools within 10 districts; schools were randomly assigned to treatment and control groups. Treatment group principals were offered intensive professional development by the University of Washington's Center for Educational Leadership (CEL) during the 2015–2016 and 2016–2017 school years. CEL was competitively selected to provide the professional development for this study, which involves a heavy emphasis on instructional leadership activities such as conducting school walkthroughs and classroom observations with constructive feedback to facilitate teacher growth focused on improving student achievement. Control group principals will receive supports normally offered by the district. Data collection will include information about the professional development delivered and experienced by the participating principals; teacher and principal surveys and periodic logs of principal daily activities to document intermediate outcomes such as principal behaviors and school climate; and administrative records to document student and teacher outcomes. A report is scheduled to be released in spring 2019.

¹ https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/tq_principals.asp

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, Title IV, Part C)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2019 Authorization: \$300,000

Budget Authority:

| <u>2018</u> <u>Annualized CR</u> | <u>2019</u> | <u>Change from</u> <u>Annualized CR</u> |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|--|
| \$339,848 | \$500,000 | +\$160,152 |

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Charter schools play a critical role in American public education by increasing educational options for families and driving innovative instructional practices that can benefit students across a range of school settings. Research shows that charter schools—which, in exchange for stricter accountability, are generally exempt from many of the State and local requirements governing other public schools—can deliver impressive results for our Nation’s students, including those living in poverty or at risk for educational failure.

Through Charter Schools Grants, the Department supports the startup of new charter schools and the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools serving students in prekindergarten through grade 12. Funds also support grants to improve charter schools’ access to facilities and information dissemination and evaluation activities.

Grants for the Opening of New Charter Schools and the Replication and Expansion of High-Quality Charter Schools

State Entity Grants

Section 4303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) authorizes the Department to make competitive grants to State educational agencies (SEAs), State charter school boards, State governors, and statewide charter school support organizations. Recipients of State Entity grants must use not less than 90 percent of grant funds to make subgrants to charter school developers to enable them to open new charter schools or to replicate or expand high-quality charter schools, not less than 7 percent to provide technical assistance to developers and to conduct activities to improve the quality of charter school authorizing and oversight, and not more than 3 percent for administrative costs. Developers—individuals and public and private nonprofit entities, which may include charter management organizations (CMOs)—may receive subgrants for up to 5 years, of which they may use not more than 18 months for planning and program design, including hiring and compensating school leaders and instructional staff. Developers may also use funds for activities such as providing professional development, making necessary renovations to school buildings, acquiring equipment and supplies, engaging the community, and developing student transportation systems.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

The Department must use 65 percent of the annual program appropriation to support State Entity grants, make at least 3 new grants each year, and fully fund the first 2 years of each grant (which may be for a period of up to 5 years) with the initial award. In making awards, the Department must give priority to State entities that support charter schools for at-risk students and that ensure all charter school authorizers implement recognized school approval and monitoring standards and procedures. In addition, priority must be given to State entities in States that: (1) have charter school authorizers that are not local educational agencies (LEAs) or, if only LEAs are authorizers, have an appeals process for prospective charter schools that initially fail to gain approval from the LEA; (2) ensure equitable funding for charter and other public schools; (3) provide funding or other support for charter school facilities; and (4) use best practices from charter schools to support traditional school and LEA improvement.

Developer Grants

If no State entity in a State receives a grant, charter school developers in the State may apply directly to the Department for Developer grants. Under section 4305(a)(2) of the ESEA, the Department must reserve not more than 2.025 percent of the annual program appropriation to support these grants, which are awarded under the same terms and conditions as for State Entity subgrants to start up new charter schools or replicate or expand high-quality charter schools. The Department may also make Developer grants with any State Entity grant funds that remain after making required new and continuation awards.

CMO Grants

The Department must reserve up to 18 percent of program funds to make competitive grants to nonprofit CMOs to replicate and expand high-quality charter schools, as authorized under section 4305(b) of the statute. Priority for these awards must be given to CMOs that: (1) plan to operate schools with racially and socioeconomically diverse student bodies; (2) demonstrate success in working with schools identified by the State for comprehensive support and improvement under Title I, Part A of the amended ESEA; (3) propose to replicate or expand schools serving high school students; or (4) propose to operate schools that focus on dropout recovery and academic reentry. As with Developer grants, CMO grants are awarded under the same terms and conditions as for State Entity subgrants, including requirements that the schools to be replicated or expanded have demonstrated success in increasing student achievement and (where applicable) graduation rates, for all students and for each student subgroup, and have no significant compliance issues in the areas of student safety or school financial or operational management.

Facilities Grants

Section 4304 authorizes two programs through which the Department makes grants to improve charter schools' access to high-quality facilities: Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities (Credit Enhancement) and State Facilities Incentive grants. The Department must reserve 12.5 percent of the Charter Schools Grants appropriation for the facilities grants, of which not less than 50 percent (or 6.25 percent of the total appropriation) must be used for Credit Enhancement grants.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

Credit Enhancement Grants

The Department makes annual competitive Credit Enhancement grants to public and private nonprofit entities (such as finance authorities and community development financial institutions) that assist charter schools in acquiring, constructing, and renovating facilities by enhancing the availability of loan or bond financing. Grantees must deposit grant funds into a reserve account that is used to, among other things, guarantee and insure debt to finance charter school facilities and guarantee and insure leases of personal and real property. These credit enhancements are intended to reduce risk to lenders, thereby creating access to credit or lowering interest rates and costs of borrowing for charter schools.

Grantees must invest reserve account funds in low-risk securities, and any earnings on such investments must be re-invested. Grantees continue to implement their projects until funds have been fully expended for grant purposes (such as to cover debt obligations of charter school borrowers in the event of default) or until financing facilitated by the grant has been retired, whichever occurs later.

State Facilities Incentive Grants

Authorized under section 4304(k) of the ESEA, the competitive State Facilities Incentive grants help States establish or enhance programs that provide dedicated State per-pupil funding for charter school facilities. The Department makes State Facilities Incentive awards for a period of up to 5 years, over which States pay an increasing share of program costs. States may partner with other organizations to provide up to 50 percent of the State share of costs.

National Activities

Under section 4305(a)(3), the Department must use at least 2.475 percent of the program appropriation to provide technical assistance to State entities in awarding subgrants and to recipients of facilities grants; disseminate best practices regarding charter schools; and evaluate the impact of Charter Schools Grants, including on student achievement. Consistent with this authority, the Department currently uses national activities funds to, among other things, support a National Charter School Resource Center and administer National Leadership Activities grants, through which SEAs, charter school authorizers, and nonprofit organizations with charter school expertise can receive funds to disseminate information on issues of national significance and scope.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

| Fiscal Year | (dollars in thousands) |
|-------------|------------------------|
| 2014..... | \$248,172 |
| 2015..... | 253,172 |
| 2016..... | 333,172 |
| 2017..... | 342,172 |
| 2018..... | 339,848 |

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

FY 2019 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$500 million for Charter Schools Grants for fiscal year 2019, an increase of \$160 million over the fiscal year 2018 annualized Continuing Resolution level (CR level). The request is a central element of the Administration's efforts to empower States and communities to increase the number of high-quality educational options available to meet the varied needs of students and their families, particularly those from underprivileged backgrounds.

The request includes appropriations language that would override both the authorized fiscal year 2019 funding level and the ESEA's within-program funding allocations and allow the Department to use funds as follows:

- Not less than \$250 million for State Entity grants, a minimum increase of \$50 million over the amount the Department would use for these grants under the CR level.¹ The increase would help support new, potentially larger awards consistent with the expanded program authority in the reauthorized ESEA, which, among other things, requires State Entity grantees to use between 7 and 10 percent of grant funds to provide technical assistance to improve charter school developer and authorizer quality, allows grantees to make subgrants for the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools in addition to subgrants to open new schools, increases the maximum subgrant period from 3 to 5 years, and broadens the range of allowable subgrantee activities to include necessary building renovations and transportation startup costs.
- Up to \$100 million for facilities grants, a maximum increase of \$35 million over the amount the Department would use for these grants under the CR level.² The request would provide the Department flexibility to direct significantly more funding than in prior years to Credit Enhancement and State Facilities Incentive grants, both of which are designed to support cost-effective investments of Federal funds in charter school facility finance activities. Specifically, the request would increase the number of new Credit Enhancement grants, further leveraging capital and expanding charter school access to facility loans and bonds, while providing new support for the startup of dedicated State charter school facility funding streams for the first time since fiscal year 2014.
- Up to \$150 million for Developer grants, CMO grants, and national activities (collectively authorized under section 4305 of the ESEA), of which up to \$25 million may be used for national activities. This represents a maximum increase of \$75 million over the amount the Department would use for these purposes under the CR level.³ The request would maintain increased support for Developer grants, which the Department will award in

¹ Appropriations language in fiscal years 2017 and 2018 would override the ESEA's within-program funding allocations but not specify the amount the Department must use for State Entity grants.

² Appropriations language in fiscal years 2017 and 2018 would require the Department to use not less than \$26 million for facilities grants, of which not more than \$10 million may be used for State Facilities Incentive grants.

³ Appropriations language in fiscal years 2017 and 2018 would require the Department to use up to \$100 million for CMO grants and not less than \$11 million for national activities; it would not specify the amount the Department must use for Developer grants.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

fiscal year 2018 for the first time under the expanded program authority in the reauthorized ESEA allowing developers to receive grants for the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools as well as for opening new schools. The request would also enable significant new investment in CMO grants, for which the Department intends to conduct rulemaking beginning in spring 2018.¹ The rulemaking would, among other things, build on the statutory priorities for CMO grants and help ensure that funds are targeted on applicants with experience serving concentrations of students from low-income families. Finally, the request would support a strengthened set of national activities, which could include: enhanced technical assistance to promote greater competition for State Entity and facilities grants; additional new National Leadership Activities grants on priority topics for the Administration, which may include identifying effective charter school authorizing practices and models for providing charter schools with access to high-quality facilities; and new, rigorous evaluation studies.

Charter Schools Grants have supported a significant percentage of the charter schools in operation today.² However, there is clearly room for growth and strong demand from families for more options. According to the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, parents of approximately 2 million students would choose to enroll their children in a charter school if they could.³ The requested increase for Charter Schools Grants would help ensure that more of these students can enroll in a high-quality public school of their choice by providing critical support for the startup and expansion of charter schools and for the acquisition of affordable, high-quality charter school facilities. At the request level, new State Entity, Developer, and CMO grants would support the startup or expansion of an estimated 475 schools serving 190,000 students.

Consistent with the authority provided in the reauthorized ESEA, the Department would use fiscal year 2019 funds to continue grants made under the previous authorization of the ESEA under the terms of those awards.

¹ The Department does not anticipate completing rulemaking in time to make new CMO grants prior to the end of fiscal year 2018.

² See <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/charter/cspdata.pdf>.

³ See <http://www.publiccharters.org/press/national-alliance-statement-presidents-fy2018-budget/>.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

| <u>Output Measures</u> | <u>2017</u> | <u>2018</u> | <u>2019</u> |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| State Entity grants | | | |
| Amount for new awards | \$144,681 | \$93,682 | \$120,641 |
| Number of new awards | 9 | 3–8 | 3–8 |
| Amount for continuation awards | \$17,864 | \$105,666 | \$128,609 |
| Number of continuation awards | 16 | 20 | 17–22 |
| Developer grants | | | |
| Amount for new awards | \$349 | \$15,000 | \$15,000 |
| Number of new awards | 1 | 30–45 | 30–45 |
| Amount for continuation awards | \$3,277 | \$1,783 | 0 |
| Number of continuation awards | 15 | 8 | 30–45 |
| CMO grants | | | |
| Amount for new awards | \$52,412 | 0 | \$53,641 |
| Number of new awards | 17 | 0 | 15–20 |
| Amount for continuation awards | \$45,447 | \$46,650 | \$56,359 |
| Number of continuation awards | 37 | 53 | 43 |
| Credit Enhancement grants | | | |
| Amount for new awards | \$56,250 | \$55,000 | \$75,000 |
| Number of new awards | 8 | 5–10 | 7–11 |
| State Facilities Incentive grants | | | |
| Amount for new awards | 0 | 0 | \$25,000 |
| Number of new awards | 0 | 0 | 2–6 |
| Amount for continuation awards | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | 0 |
| Number of continuation awards | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Peer review of new award applications | \$594 | \$500 | \$750 |
| National activities | \$11,297 | \$11,567 | \$25,000 |

NOTE: The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including Charter Schools Grants, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. The Department did not reserve funds for this purpose from Charter Schools Grants in fiscal year 2017, but may do so in fiscal years 2018 and 2019.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information and results based on GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

in fiscal year 2019 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department is considering revising the performance measures for Charter Schools Grants to more effectively assess performance under the reauthorized law.

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

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

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 7,070 | 6,463 |
| 2015 | 7,540 | 6,752 |
| 2016 | 8,010 | 6,859 |
| 2017 | 8,480 | |
| 2018 | 8,950 | |
| 2019 | 9,420 | |

Additional information: Data on the total number of charter schools in operation, including those funded by Charter Schools Grants, are provided annually by SEAs and are verified by the Department. The Department is considering revising the targets for this measure due to slower-than-anticipated growth in the number of schools in operation in recent years. The 2017 data for this measure are expected to be available in spring 2018.

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 69.2% | 63.4% |
| 2015 | 74.2 | 48.3 |
| 2016 | 79.2 | |
| 2017 | 84.2 | |
| 2018 | 89.2 | |
| 2019 | 94.2 | |

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

Measure: The percentage of fourth-grade charter school students who are achieving at or above the proficient level on State assessments in mathematics.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 66.4% | 58.9% |
| 2015 | 71.4 | 44.1 |
| 2016 | 76.4 | |
| 2017 | 81.4 | |
| 2018 | 86.4 | |
| 2019 | 91.4 | |

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

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 71.6% | 67.1% |
| 2015 | 76.6 | 52.3 |
| 2016 | 81.6 | |
| 2017 | 86.6 | |
| 2018 | 91.6 | |
| 2019 | 96.6 | |

Measure: The percentage of eighth-grade charter school students who are achieving at or above the proficient level on State assessments in mathematics.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 58.7% | 54.2% |
| 2015 | 63.7 | 39.4 |
| 2016 | 68.7 | |
| 2017 | 73.7 | |
| 2018 | 78.7 | |
| 2019 | 83.7 | |

Additional information: Performance targets for these measures were revised in 2014 to reflect the elimination, for the large majority of States that adopted ESEA flexibility agreements, of the 100 percent proficiency requirement established by the No Child Left Behind Act. The new targets for 2014 and future years are based on actual performance in 2013.

The decreases in the percentage of students scoring at or above the proficient level in 2015 can be explained, in part, by States' transition to more rigorous assessments based on college- and career-ready standards. Analysis of the data has found notable variation in performance among funded schools. The 2016 data for these measures are expected to be available in early spring 2018.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

Efficiency Measures

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

| Year | 2009 Cohort Target | 2009 Cohort Actual | 2014 Cohort Target | 2014 Cohort Actual |
|------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 2014 | 6.3 : 1 | 6.5 : 1 | | 4.3 : 1 |
| 2015 | | | 4.3 : 1 | 5.3 : 1 |
| 2016 | | | 4.3 : 1 | 7.3 : 1 |
| 2017 | | | 4.3 : 1 | 7.3 : 1 |
| 2018 | | | 4.3 : 1 | |

Additional information: The leveraging ratio is the total funds available (the Federal grant and the State match) divided by the Federal grant for a given year.

The Department also tracks the amount of funds leveraged and the number of schools served under Credit Enhancement grants. In 2016, Credit Enhancement grants leveraged \$407 million in facilities financing for 60 schools. Between program inception and 2016, Credit Enhancement funds have helped enable approximately \$4.8 billion in financing for facilities of 685 charter schools.

The Department also developed a measure to assess the cost efficiency, across States, of the Federal investment in supporting charter school start-ups. The measure is defined as the Federal cost per student of launching a successful school (defined as a school in operation for 3 or more years). Data for 2014 an average cost of \$1,100, for 2015 an average cost of \$1,129, and for 2016 an average cost of \$1,173. Data for this measure, collected through grantee annual performance reports, assist the Department in understanding the different costs per student for different types of charter schools.

Other Performance Information

2015 Charter Schools Grants Data Analysis

In December 2015, the Department released an analysis of data on grantees and subgrantees under the State Entity, Developer, and CMO competitions.¹ Using data from grantee annual performance reports and the Department's Common Core of Data and Civil Rights Data Collection, the analysis found, among other things, that:

- Of the 6,467 charter schools in operation in the 2013-2014 school year, 2,676 (or 41 percent) had received funding under the competitions between the 2006-2007 and 2013-2014 school years;

¹ See <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/charter/cspdata.pdf>

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

- Of the 4,582 charter schools that opened between the 2006-2007 and 2013-2014 school years, 2,626 (or nearly 60 percent) had received funding; and
- Compared to traditional public schools, schools that received funding served higher percentages of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, Black students, and Hispanic students, and similar percentages of students with disabilities and English learners.

The Department expects to release an updated data analysis, with data through the 2016-2017 school year, in spring 2018.

2013 CREDO National Charter School Study

The “National Charter School Study 2013,” a study by researchers at Stanford University’s Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO) that updated and expanded CREDO’s 2009 study “Multiple Choice: Charter School Performance in 16 States,” examined longitudinal student-level data from a sample of 3,620 charter schools across 25 States, the District of Columbia, and New York City (NYC) (treated separately from the rest of the State) to determine whether students who attend charter schools performed better academically than if they had attended a traditional public school.¹ The researchers found that 29 percent of charter schools in the sample demonstrated significantly higher growth in mathematics achievement and 25 percent demonstrated significantly higher growth in reading compared to traditional public schools in the sample while 31 percent of charter schools in the sample posted mathematics gains and 19 percent posted reading gains that were significantly below what those students would have seen if enrolled in a traditional public school. Overall, the students in sample charter schools have shown improvement over the results from 2009 and steady progress over the past 5 years, with the average student gaining an additional 8 days of learning each year in reading, compared with the loss of 7 days reported in 2009. The study also showed, on average, no gap in learning days for mathematics for students in sample charter schools, whereas in 2009 these students posted an average of 22 fewer days of mathematics learning than their peers in traditional public schools. Among the group of 16 States from the original study in 2009, the rise in performance was attributed in part to the closure of poorly performing charter schools and by declining performance in traditional public schools over the same period of time.

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

¹ See <http://credo.stanford.edu/research-reports.html> for links to reports from the CREDO studies.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

2015 CREDO Urban Charter School Study

In March 2015, CREDO published a report focusing on the performance of charter schools in urban areas. The Urban Charter School Study used a similar “virtual peer” methodology as in the 2013 CREDO national study to compare the performance of charter schools and traditional public schools in 41 major urban areas in 22 States over a 5-year period from school years 2006–07 to 2011–2012. The researchers found that charter schools produced positive impacts over traditional public schools in mathematics in 63 percent of the areas, and in 56 percent of the areas in reading, compared to 27 and 23 percent of areas in which charter schools lagged traditional public schools in mathematics and reading, respectively. In the aggregate, charter schools in the study provided approximately 40 more days of learning in mathematics and 28 more days in reading per year than their traditional public school counterparts. The report also mirrored the findings of the national study with respect to student characteristics, showing that charter school gains were larger for low-income students, Black students, Hispanic students, and students with disabilities.

2013 and 2017 CREDO Charter School Growth and Replication Studies

In January 2013, CREDO also released findings from “Charter School Growth and Replication,” which examined, in charter schools across 25 States, the District of Columbia, and NYC, changes in school performance in the years following a school’s opening and the implications of these changes for school replication. The study found, among other things, that schools with initial high performance with respect to student achievement tended to stay high performers over time, while the performance of initially low-performing schools remained low. The study also found that schools opened by a CMO typically performed at a level similar to the average of the other schools operated by the CMO, and that CMO schools on average produced stronger results for minority students and students from low-income families than did independently operated charter schools.

CREDO released a second volume of this study in June 2017, largely affirming previous findings and providing additional analyses, including on student academic growth by type of school network management structure. The study found that academic growth, relative to that in traditional public schools, was higher on average for students in networks of charter schools operated by a CMO (i.e., networks of schools for which the charter holder is also the management entity) than for students in networks operated by a contracted vendor.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Magnet schools assistance

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2019 Authorization: \$102,387

Budget Authority:

| | <u>2018</u> <u>Annualized CR</u> | <u>2019</u> | <u>Change from</u> <u>Annualized CR</u> |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------|--|
| | \$96,984 | \$97,647 | +\$663 |

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP) provides Federal resources to assist eligible local educational agencies (LEAs) in the desegregation of schools by providing high-quality educational options to the students they serve.

Grantees establish and operate magnet schools that are part of court-ordered, agency-ordered, or federally approved voluntary desegregation plans. The ultimate goal is to eliminate, reduce, or prevent minority group isolation in elementary and secondary schools while strengthening students' knowledge of academic subjects and equipping them with college- and career-ready skills. The program accomplishes this goal by supporting the creation of magnet schools that: (1) increase the options that parents and families have when determining the type of school that will best serve their children; and (2) offer special curricula or instructional programs that appeal to parents and students from diverse backgrounds.

Grantees receive awards for up to 5 years and may not receive more than \$15 million over the course of the project. Funds must be used for activities that will improve academic achievement and may be used for planning and promotional activities; acquiring books, materials, and equipment; and paying the salaries of effective teachers and other instructional personnel. Grantees may spend no more than 50 percent of project costs in the first year and 15 percent in the second and third years on planning activities. Additionally, the ESEA authorizes grantees to use funds to transport students enrolled in magnet schools, provided the costs do not consume a significant portion of the grant award and that the transportation strategy is sustainable at the end of the grant period.

By statute, the Department gives priority to applicants that: (1) demonstrate the greatest need for assistance; (2) propose to carry out new, evidence-based magnet school programs, significantly revise existing programs using evidence-based methods and practices, or replicate an existing magnet school program with a demonstrated record of success of increasing student achievement and reducing racial isolation; (3) use methods other than academic examinations (such as a lottery) to admit students; and (4) increase racial integration by designing and implementing magnet school programs that increase socioeconomic diversity. Applicants that did not receive a grant the previous year receive priority for any funds appropriated above

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Magnet schools assistance

\$75 million. In addition, the Department may use up to 1 percent of funds to provide technical assistance and disseminate best practices.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

| Fiscal Year | (dollars in thousands) |
|-------------|------------------------|
| 2014..... | \$91,647 |
| 2015..... | 91,647 |
| 2016..... | 96,647 |
| 2017..... | 97,647 |
| 2018..... | 96,984 |

FY 2019 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$97.6 million for fiscal year 2019 for Magnet Schools Assistance, an increase of \$663,000 from the 2018 annualized Continuing Resolution level, to restore funding to the fiscal year 2017 level. The request also includes appropriations language that would override a decades-old general provision in the Department’s appropriations acts that prohibits the use of funds on transporting students to overcome a racial imbalance or carry out a racial desegregation plan. This prohibition conflicts with the reauthorization of the Magnet Schools program, which explicitly allows program funds to be used for transportation.

Magnet schools help to expand the range of high-quality educational options for parents and students, putting more decision-making power in the hands of students and their families. At the request level, the Department would make 32 continuation awards for grants awarded in the 2017 competition and one partial continuation award to a grantee from the 2016 competition—the Department fully frontloaded all but one project in 2016 due to limited funds. The Department also would use up to 1 percent of appropriated funds to provide technical assistance to grantees and disseminate best practices. For example, in previous years, MSAP has used its national activities authority to maintain a technical assistance website, publish white papers on topics of interest to the magnet schools community, and aggregate and analyze program- and project-level performance data. The Department intends to use its funds available for technical assistance to conduct similar activities in 2019.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

| <u>Output Measures</u> | <u>2017</u> | <u>2018</u> | <u>2019</u> |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Amount for awards | \$96,120 | \$96,014 | \$96,671 |
| Number of new awards | 32 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of continuation awards | 1 | 33 | 33 |
| Peer review of new award applications | \$551 | 0 | 0 |
| National activities | \$976 | \$970 | \$976 |

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Magnet schools assistance

NOTE: The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including Charter Schools Grants, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. The Department did not reserve funds for this purpose from the Magnet Schools Assistance Program in fiscal year 2017, but may do so in fiscal years 2018 and 2019.

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 2019 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The 2017 data for these measures for the 2013 cohort are expected to be available in spring 2018.

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

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

Measure: Percentage of magnet schools receiving assistance reporting enrollment data demonstrating success in reducing, eliminating, or preventing minority-group isolation.

| Year | Target | 2013 Cohort Actual | 2016 Cohort Actual |
|------|--------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 2014 | 100.0% | 44.1% | |
| 2015 | 100.0 | 26.0 | |
| 2016 | 100.0 | 23.5 | |
| 2017 | 100.0 | | 39.0% |
| 2018 | 100.0 | | |
| 2019 | 100.0 | | |

Additional information: The data for this performance measure are collected from annual performance reports. Descriptive characteristic data for each school are also collected to provide context for the performance measure.

Fourteen out of 36 schools served by the 2016 cohort met their annual minority group isolation targets in the first year of their projects. Many schools were beginning to implement their magnet programs as well as market the programs to the community, and generally did not have sufficient time to promote their schools in the first year of the grant before the enrollment period ended.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Magnet schools assistance

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

Measure: Percentage of students in magnet schools receiving assistance who score at the proficient level or above on State assessments in reading/language arts.

| Year | Target | 2013 Cohort Actual | 2016 Cohort Actual |
|------|--------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 2014 | 100.0% | 48.9% | |
| 2015 | | 40.3 | |
| 2016 | | 43.5 | |
| 2017 | | | 35.4% |
| 2018 | | | |
| 2019 | | | |

Measure: Percentage of students in magnet schools receiving assistance who score at the proficient level or above on State assessments in mathematics.

| Year | Target | 2013 Cohort Actual | 2016 Cohort Actual |
|------|--------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 2014 | 100.0% | 41.8% | |
| 2015 | | 34.5 | |
| 2016 | | 36.0 | |
| 2017 | | | 34.1% |
| 2018 | | | |
| 2019 | | | |

Additional information: Targets for these measures through the 2014 reporting year are based on the former ESEA goal of all students being proficient in reading and mathematics by 2014. Despite transition to the reauthorized ESEA in 2017, the Department has elected to not set aggregate performance targets for these measures in future years. Grantees report their data at different levels (e.g., at the grantee level, at the school level), making aggregate targets less meaningful and more difficult to set. The program continues to work with grantees through technical assistance contractors in order to move toward more uniform reporting.

In 2017, a total of 5,037 out of 14,224 students in programs supported by 2016 grants (who participated in State reading assessments) scored proficient or above on State assessments in reading/language arts. A total of 4,871 out of 14,281 students in programs supported by 2016 grants (who participated in State mathematics assessments) scored proficient or above on such assessments in mathematics.

Efficiency Measure

The Department developed a measure to assess the efficiency of Federal investments in supporting magnet schools. The measure is defined as the Federal cost per student in a magnet school receiving assistance.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Magnet schools assistance

| Year | 2013 Cohort | 2016 Cohort |
|------|-------------|-------------|
| 2014 | \$767 | |
| 2015 | 1,122 | |
| 2016 | 916 | |
| 2017 | | \$722 |
| 2018 | | |
| 2019 | | |

Additional information: To determine the average cost per student for the program, the analysis sample was established by identifying the project schools that reported both the annual funds expended and student enrollment as of October 1, 2016. The amount of funds expended at each project school was summed across all schools in the analysis sample to produce a total program-wide dollar amount expended for the grant year. The total dollar amount expended was divided by the total number of schools in the analysis sample to produce an average dollar amount expended at funded schools. This average dollar amount is the numerator. In addition, the number of students served at each project school was summed across the schools in the analysis sample to produce the number of total students served by the program. This number was divided by the total number of schools in the analysis sample to produce the average number of students served at a funded school. The average number of students is the denominator. To calculate the average cost-per-student ratio, the average dollar amount expended was divided by the average number of students served.

In grant year 1, the average dollar amount expended per school was \$453,452, and the average number of students served was 587 students. The average dollar amount expended was divided by the average number of students served to produce an average cost per student of \$772.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Ready to learn programming

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part F, Subpart 4)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2019 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾

Budget Authority:

| <u>2018</u> <u>Annualized CR</u> | <u>2019</u> | <u>Change from</u> <u>Annualized CR</u> |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|--|
| \$25,566 | 0 | -\$25,566 |

¹ Of the funds appropriated for Title IV, Part F (which is authorized at \$220,741 thousand), \$5,000 thousand is reserved for Subpart 3; of the remainder, 26 percent is reserved for Subpart 4 activities, which includes the Ready to Learn program.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Ready to Learn (RTL) Programming is designed to facilitate student academic achievement by supporting the development and distribution of educational video programming for preschool and elementary school children and their parents, caregivers, and teachers. At least 60 percent of the funding must be used to:

- Develop educational television programming for preschool and elementary school children and the accompanying support materials and services that can be used to promote the effective use of such programming;
- Develop television programming (and digital content, such as applications and online educational games, containing RTL-based children's programming) that is specifically designed for nationwide distribution over public television stations' digital broadcasting channels and the Internet, along with accompanying resources for parents and caregivers; and
- Support contracts with public telecommunications and related entities to ensure that programs are widely distributed.

Remaining funds may be used to develop and disseminate education and training materials, including interactive programs that are designed to promote school readiness through the effective use of educational video programs.

Funds are awarded competitively and only public telecommunications entities are eligible to receive awards. Applicants must have the capacity to: develop and distribute high-quality educational and instructional television programming that is accessible to disadvantaged preschool and elementary school children; contract with the producers of children's television programming; negotiate these contracts in a manner that returns to the grantee an appropriate

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Ready to learn programming

share of income from sales of program-related products; and target programming and materials to meet specific State and local needs, while providing educational outreach at the local level.

Grantees are required to consult with the Departments of Education and Health and Human Services on strategies for maximizing the use of quality educational programming for preschool and elementary school children. Grantees must also coordinate activities with other Federal programs that have major training components related to early childhood development.

The Department awarded two 5-year grants in 2015:

- Twin Cities Public Television is using RTL funds to produce Superhero School, using narrative storytelling and interactive media, across multiple platforms, to engage children ages 5 to 8 from low-income families in building key science content and thinking skills, learning related academic vocabulary, improving their reading and writing abilities, and gaining experience using new technology.
- The Corporation for Public Broadcasting, in partnership with the Public Broadcasting Service, is creating a comprehensive media initiative to support the learning needs of children in low-income communities. The project's primary goal is to improve science and literacy learning outcomes for young children, especially those from low-income families, in order to prepare them for success in school and in life.

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

| Fiscal Year | (dollars in thousands) |
|-------------|------------------------|
| 2014..... | \$25,741 |
| 2015..... | 25,741 |
| 2016..... | 25,741 |
| 2017..... | 25,741 |
| 2018..... | 25,566 |

FY 2019 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funding for Ready to Learn (RTL) Programming in fiscal year 2019, \$25.6 million less than the fiscal year 2018 annualized CR level. With the rise of the internet and the ready availability of a wide range of digital games and devices that support early learning, the RTL program is less relevant and less necessary. Private corporations increasingly produce and disseminate programming, online games, and “apps” that are both educational and entertaining without Federal support.

RTL programming is more appropriately supported with other Federal, State, local, and private funds. Public television networks and stations may tap private and non-profit sources of funding to continue their work or apply for funding under other Federal programs. Such entities have a demonstrated ability to raise funds from non-Federal sources, as Federal funding made up just 16 percent of public television's total revenue in 2015.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Ready to learn programming

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

| <u>Output Measures</u> | <u>2017</u> | <u>2018</u> | <u>2019</u> |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Number of continuation awards | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Continuation award funding | \$27,681 | \$25,516 | 0 |
| Evaluation (review of grant products) | <u>\$50</u> | <u>\$50</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Total | 27,741 ¹ | 25,566 | 0 |

NOTE: The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including the RTL program, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. While the Department did not reserve funds from RTL for this purpose in fiscal year 2017, it may do so in fiscal year 2018.

¹ Includes \$2,000 thousand transferred from the Student Aid Administration account as required by P.L. 115-31.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents selected program performance information and results bases on GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Performance Measures

In 2012, the Department revised the performance measures for the RTL program to better measure both RTL's effectiveness in improving what children learn and the number of children RTL is reaching. The revised measures are:

- (1) the percentage of summative experimental or quasi-experimental research studies that demonstrate positive and statistically significant gains in math or literacy skills when RTL transmedia properties, such as applications and online educational games, are compared to similar non-RTL-funded digital properties or to other more traditional educational materials;
- (2) the percentage of educational transmedia products, along with necessary supporting materials, that are deemed to be of high-quality in promoting learning of math or literacy by an independent panel of expert reviewers; and
- (3) the number of children who use RTL-produced educational media products, disaggregated by individual product, as determined by appropriate industry standard metrics or, when available, by tracking tools.

The two 2015 grantees planned a total of four experimental or quasi-experimental research studies, to be conducted beginning in year 4 of the grant. The results of these studies provide

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Ready to learn programming

data on the first performance measure. The Department expects to receive the first of the studies in 2019.

For the second performance measure, the Department asked expert panel members to review a random sample of current RTL transmedia products and provide a quality rating using criteria developed by the Department. The panel members rated products on a 5-point scale. In order for any particular product to achieve a rating of “high-quality,” a product had to secure an average score of 3.8 across the panel members. In 2017, the Department received two transmedia product suites from one grantee to review. One of the transmedia product suites reviewed was of high-quality, with a score of 4.41. The other suite received a score of 3.74, just under the cutoff for high-quality.

For the third performance measure, grantees reported on the number of children who used RTL-produced products, by type of product. The Department expects to have initial data on the third performance measure in summer 2018.

Efficiency Measure

The Department developed a single efficiency measure for the RTL program: dollars leveraged from non-Federal sources over 5 years (the length of each grant award) per Federal dollar dedicated to core non-outreach program activities. High-quality children’s television programs are expensive to develop, produce, and distribute. Prior to 2010, Federal support for new programming through the RTL programs was typically used by grantees to attract additional revenue from the private sector and program quality was directly affected by the extent to which grantees succeed in using Federal dollars to leverage additional funds from alternate sources. Therefore, the Department designed this measure to compare the relative success of RTL grantees in leveraging non-Federal investments for the development and production of new children’s television programs and other digital media products.

Because of changes instituted to the program in 2010, grantees have been producing fewer television shows and instead focusing on the creation and distribution of digital media products such as applications and online educational games. This makes it easier and less expensive to release content and requires fewer external funds to be leveraged in support of television production. In the second year of the 2015 grants, the two grantees leveraged \$6.9 million of non-Federal support compared to \$19.9 million in Federal dollars spent on production, or \$0.35 of non-Federal dollars for every Federal dollar spent. Grantees did not report on the efficiency measure for the first year of the grant.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Arts in education

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part F, Subpart 4)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2019 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾

Budget Authority:

| <u>2018</u> <u>Annualized CR</u> | <u>2019</u> | <u>Change from</u> <u>Annualized CR</u> |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|--|
| \$26,817 | 0 | -\$26,817 |

¹ Of the funds appropriated for Title IV, Part F (which is authorized at \$220,741 thousand), \$5,000 thousand is reserved for Subpart 3; of the remainder 26 percent is reserved for Subpart 4 activities which include the Arts in Education program.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Arts in Education program supports national demonstration and Federal leadership activities to promote arts education for students, including disadvantaged students and students who are children with disabilities. The program includes the following allowable activities: (1) professional development for arts educators, teachers, and principals; (2) development and dissemination of accessible instructional materials and arts-based educational programming, including online resources, in multiple arts disciplines; and (3) national and community outreach activities that strengthen and expand partnerships among schools, local educational agencies (LEAs), communities, or centers for the arts, including national centers for the arts.

The program supports a number of arts education activities through 4-year grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) in which 20 percent or more of the students are from low-income families; State educational agencies (SEAs); national nonprofit organizations; institutions of higher education; organizations with expertise in the arts; museums or cultural institutions; the Bureau of Indian Education; and partnerships of these entities.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

| Fiscal Year | (dollars in thousands) |
|-------------|------------------------|
| 2014..... | \$25,000 |
| 2015..... | 25,000 |
| 2016..... | 27,000 |
| 2017..... | 27,000 |
| 2018..... | 26,817 |

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Arts in education

FY 2019 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funding for the Arts in Education program in fiscal year 2019, a reduction of \$26.8 million below the fiscal year 2018 Continuing Resolution level. The Administration is proposing to eliminate funding for this program because it has limited impact, does not sufficiently target services to the highest-need students, and funds activities that are more appropriately supported with other Federal, State, local, and private funds. The program also duplicates activities that may be supported through other Federal programs, such as the \$15.5 billion Title I Grants to LEAs program, under which LEAs and schools may support integrated arts instruction as part of a schoolwide Title I program. Title I also makes available \$1 billion in funding for school turnaround plans, a portion of which may be used to support the use of arts instruction and related activities.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

| <u>Output Measures</u> | <u>2017</u> | <u>2018</u> | <u>2019</u> |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <i>Arts Development and Dissemination</i> | | | |
| Total funds available | \$7,672 | \$800 | 0 |
| Amount for continuation awards | \$7,322 | \$450 | 0 |
| Number of continuation awards | 19 | 1 | 0 |
| Interagency transfer to support the Arts Education Partnership | \$350 | \$350 | 0 |
| <i>Professional Development for Arts Educators (PDAE)</i> | | | |
| Total funds available | \$12,208 | \$23,820 | 0 |
| Amount for new awards | 6,878 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of new awards | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| Amount for continuation awards | \$5,060 | \$23,820 | 0 |
| Number of continuation awards | 16 | 20 | 0 |
| Peer review of new award applications | \$270 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>National Arts in Education Program (AENP)</i> | | | |
| Total funds available | \$6,700 | 0 | 0 |
| Amount for new awards | 0 | \$1,409 | 0 |
| Number of new awards | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Amount for continuation awards | \$6,700 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of continuation awards | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Peer review of new award applications | 0 | \$270 | 0 |

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Arts in education

| <u>Output Measures</u> | <u>2017</u> | <u>2018</u> | <u>2019</u> |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <i>Evaluation</i> | \$420 | \$518 | 0 |

NOTES: The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including Arts in Education, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. While the Department did not reserve funds from the Arts in Education program for this purpose in fiscal year 2017, it may do so in fiscal year 2018.

Consistent with the President's request to eliminate funding for this program in fiscal year 2019, the output measures for fiscal year 2018 reflect the use of fiscal year 2018 funds to pre-pay continuation costs to allow existing grantees to complete their planned projects and/or frontload new grants to pay, to the extent possible, the full costs of newly funded projects over the proposed grant period.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information and results based GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program. Targets for 2019 are not included because this program is proposed for elimination.

Goal: To help ensure that all program participants meet challenging State academic content standards in the arts.

Objective: Activities supported with Federal funds will improve the quality of standards-based arts education for all participants.

Measure: The percentage of teachers participating in the Professional Development for Arts Educators program who receive professional development that is sustained and intensive.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|-------------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 45% | 60% |
| 2015 | 50 | 19 |
| 2016 | 55 | 58 |
| 2017 | 60 | 74 |
| 2018 | 65 | |
| 2019 | | |

Additional Information: In 2011, the Department defined sustained and intensive professional development for the PDAE program as completion of 40 or more of the professional development hours offered by the PDAE-funded project during the reporting period; completion of 75 percent of the total number of professional development hours offered by the PDAE-funded project during the reporting period; and completion of these professional development hours over at least a 6-month period during the reporting period.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Arts in education

In 2014, five PDAE grantees from the fiscal year 2012 cohort reported data. In 2015, 19 PDAE grantees from the fiscal year 2011, fiscal year 2012, and fiscal year 2014 cohorts reported data. The decline in 2015 is likely explained by the fact that fiscal year 2014 cohort grantees reported on the progress made in the first year of their award, which focused on planning activities rather than provision of professional development.

Measure: The percentage of PDAE projects in which teachers show a statistically significant increase in content knowledge in the arts.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 100% | 100% |
| 2015 | 100 | 100 |
| 2016 | 100 | 86 |
| 2017 | 100 | 100 |
| 2018 | 100 | |
| 2019 | | |

Additional Information: The Department requires that grantees administer a pre-test and a post-test of teacher content knowledge in the arts and include those data in their annual performance reports. The 2016 actual is based on the 14 of 17 PDAE grantees who reported on this measure.

Measure: The percentage of students participating in Model Arts programs who demonstrate proficiency in mathematics compared to those in control or comparison groups.

| Year | Treatment | Control |
|------|-----------|---------|
| 2014 | 43% | 36% |
| 2015 | 39 | 35 |
| 2016 | 35 | 32 |
| 2017 | 38 | 31 |
| 2018 | 27 | |
| 2019 | | |

Measure: The percentage of students participating in Model Arts programs who demonstrate proficiency in reading compared to those in control or comparison groups.

| Year | Treatment | Control |
|------|-----------|---------|
| 2014 | 45% | 45% |
| 2015 | 43 | 40 |
| 2016 | 39 | 38 |
| 2017 | 40 | 36 |
| 2018 | 31 | |
| 2019 | | |

The Department also developed the following four measures for the Arts in Education National Program (AENP). Targets for these measures are set annually by the AENP grantee.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Arts in education

Measure: The total number of students who participate in standards-based arts education sponsored by the grantee.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|-----------|-----------|
| 2014 | 788,324 | 1,138,491 |
| 2015 | 859,273 | 1,245,824 |
| 2016 | 2,100,000 | 2,140,365 |
| 2017 | 1,820,000 | 1,823,785 |
| 2018 | | |
| 2019 | | |

Measure: The total number of students from low-income families who participate in standards-based arts education sponsored by the grantee.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|---------|---------|
| 2014 | 268,350 | 568,631 |
| 2015 | 322,020 | 769,397 |
| 2016 | 800,000 | 806,092 |
| 2017 | 660,000 | 666,399 |
| 2018 | | |
| 2019 | | |

Measure: The total number of students with disabilities who participate in standards-based arts education sponsored by the grantee.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|---------|---------|
| 2014 | 92,963 | 274,450 |
| 2015 | 100,028 | 221,859 |
| 2016 | 200,000 | 219,316 |
| 2017 | 160,000 | 165,870 |
| 2018 | | |
| 2019 | | |

Measure: The percent of teachers participating in the grantee's program who receive professional development that is sustained and intensive.

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2014 | 25% | 61% |
| 2015 | 28 | 48 |
| 2016 | 50 | 52 |
| 2017 | 55 | 54 |
| 2018 | | |
| 2019 | | |

Additional Information: Data for 2014, 2015, and 2016 is based on teacher participation in the Changing Education Through the Arts program administered by the Kennedy Center.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Javits gifted and talented education

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part F, Subpart 4, Section 4644)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2019 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾

Budget Authority:

| <u>2018</u> <u>Annualized CR</u> | <u>2019</u> | <u>Change from</u> <u>Annualized CR</u> |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|--|
| \$11,918 | 0 | -11,918 |

¹ Of the funds appropriated for Title IV, Part F (which is authorized at \$220,741 thousand), \$5,000 thousand is reserved for Subpart 3; of the remainder 26 percent is reserved for Subpart 4 activities which include Javits Gifted and Talented Education.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Javits Gifted and Talented Education supports a coordinated program of research, demonstration projects, innovative strategies, and other activities to build and enhance the capacity of elementary and secondary schools to identify gifted and talented students and meet their special educational needs. The Department makes grant or contract awards to State educational agencies (SEAs), local educational agencies, the Bureau of Indian Education of the Department of the Interior, institutions of higher education (IHEs), and other public and private agencies and organizations to carry out projects to fulfill this purpose, including an award to one or more IHEs or SEAs to establish a National Research Center for the Education of Gifted and Talented Children.

Award recipients may use funds to: conduct research on methods and techniques for identifying and teaching gifted and talented students and on applying gifted and talented educational methods to all students, including low-income and at-risk students; establish and operate gifted and talented education programs, including innovative methods and strategies for identifying and teaching students traditionally underserved in such programs; and provide technical assistance and disseminate information. Funds may also be used for personnel training.

By statute, the Department gives priority in making awards to projects that include evidence-based activities or that develop new information to improve the capacity of schools to operate gifted and talented education programs or to assist schools in identifying and serving traditionally underserved students.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Javits gifted and talented education

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

| Fiscal Year | (dollars in thousands) |
|-------------|------------------------|
| 2014..... | \$5,000 |
| 2015..... | 10,000 |
| 2016..... | 12,000 |
| 2017..... | 12,000 |
| 2018..... | 11,918 |

FY 2019 BUDGET REQUEST

The request does not include funding for Javits Gifted and Talented Education for fiscal year 2019. The Administration appreciates the importance of engaging and developing the unique skills of high-ability learners but believes that limited Federal education program dollars should be focused on improving outcomes for our Nation’s most educationally disadvantaged children, consistent with the longstanding Federal role in elementary and secondary education and the core purpose of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Javits Gifted and Talented Education has limited impact, and programs serving gifted and talented students are more appropriately supported with State, local, or private resources. In addition, the Department can support research on gifted and talented education through funding for the Institute of Education Science’s Research, Development, and Dissemination program, including research on identifying and serving students traditionally underrepresented in gifted and talented programs.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

| <u>Output Measures</u> | <u>2017</u> | <u>2018</u> | <u>2019</u> |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Amount for new awards | \$5,237 | \$440 | 0 |
| Number of new awards | 13 | 1 | 0 |
| Amount for continuation awards | \$5,667 | \$10,478 | 0 |
| Number of continuation awards | 21 | 25 | 0 |
| National Research Center for the Education of Gifted and Talented Children and Youth | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | 0 |
| Peer review of new award applications | \$96 | 0 | 0 |

NOTE: The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including Javits Gifted and Talented Education, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. The Department did not reserve funds from the program for this purpose in fiscal year 2017, but may do so in fiscal year 2018.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Javits gifted and talented education

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information and results based on GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department established three performance measures for Javits Gifted and Talented Education focusing on the quality of project designs, professional development, and academic achievement of targeted student populations. The Department reports data for these measures twice over the grant period (at the middle and end of the period) after convening an expert panel of scientists and practitioners to review information from a sample of annual performance reports and self-evaluations prepared by grantees. The first data reports for the 2014 cohort, which received 5-year grants, and for the 2015 cohort, which received 3-year grants focusing on professional development, are expected to be available in spring 2018.