

Department of Education
INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT
Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language	F-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	F-2
Appropriation, Adjustments, and Transfers	F-4
Summary of Changes	F-5
Authorizing Legislation.....	F-7
Appropriations History.....	F-9
Significant Items in FY 2019 Appropriations Reports.....	F-10
Summary of Request	F-12
Activities:	
Education innovation and research.....	F-15
Teacher and school leader incentive grants.....	F-25
American history and civics education	F-33
Supporting effective educator development	F-37
Charter schools grants.....	F-42
Magnet schools assistance.....	F-55
Ready to learn programming	F-61
Arts in education.....	F-65
Javits gifted and talented education.....	F-70
Statewide family engagement centers	F-73

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

For carrying out activities authorized by [subparts] subpart 1 [, 3 and 4] of part B of title II, and parts C [,] and D [,] and [E and subparts] subpart 1 [and 4] of part F of title IV of the ESEA, [\$1,035,556,000] \$1,107,000,000: *Provided*, That [\$279,815,000] \$200,000,000 shall be for [subparts] subpart 1 [, 3 and 4] of part B of title II and shall be made available without regard to [sections] section 2201 [, 2231(b) and 2241]:¹ *Provided further*, That [\$625,741,000] \$907,000,000 shall be for parts C [,] and D [, and E] and subpart 4 of part F of title IV, and shall be made available without regard to sections 4311, 4409(a), and 4601 [of the ESEA]:² [*Provided further*, That section 4303(d)(3)(A)(i) shall not apply to the funds available for part C of title IV]:³ *Provided further*, That of the funds available for part C of title IV, the Secretary shall use not more than [\$55,000,000] \$125,000,000 to carry out section 4304 [, of which not more than \$10,000,000 shall be available to carry out section 4304(k),] and not more than \$185,000,000 to carry out section 4305, of which not more than \$15,000,000 shall be available to carry out section 4305(a)(2) and not more than \$20,000,000 shall be available to carry out the activities in section 4305(a)(3):⁴ *Provided further*, That the funds used to carry out section 4305(b) [\$135,000,000, to] shall remain available through March 31, [2020] 2021 [, to carry out section 4305(b), and not more than \$15,000,000 to carry out the activities in section 4305(a)(3)].⁵ *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 4601(b), [\$130,000,000] \$300,000,000 shall be available through December 31, [2019] 2020 for subpart 1 of part F of title IV:⁶ *Provided further*, That the Secretary may restrict eligibility under section 4611(b) to local educational agencies.⁷ (*Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2019.*)

NOTES

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 <i>Provided</i>, That [\$279,815,000] \$200,000,000 shall be for [subparts] <u>subpart 1 [3 and 4]</u> of part B of title II and shall be made available without regard to [sections] <u>section 2201 [2231(b) and 2241]</u>:</p>	<p>This language provides funding for Teacher and School Leader Incentive Grants, overriding the provisions of the ESEA that establish a particular distribution of funds appropriated under title II.</p>
<p>² <i>Provided further</i>, That [\$625,741,000] \$907,000,000 shall be for parts C [.] <u>and D [, and E]</u> and subpart 4 of part F of title IV, and shall be made available without regard to sections 4311, 4409(a), and 4601 [of the ESEA]:</p>	<p>This language provides funds for Charter Schools Grants, Magnet Schools Assistance, and Education Innovation and Research without regard to the sections of the ESEA that specify the distribution of funds appropriated under title IV of the ESEA.</p>
<p>³ [<i>Provided further</i>, That section 4303(d)(3)(A)(i) shall not apply to the funds available for part C of title IV:]</p>	<p>This language overrides the statutory provision under the Charter Schools Grants program that requires the Department to award at least 3 grants to State entities and to frontload funding for year 2 of those awards. This proviso is unnecessary because the Department expects to make at least 3 such grants under the program.</p>
<p>⁴ <i>Provided further</i>, That of the funds available for part C of title IV, the Secretary shall use <u>not more than [\$55,000,000] \$125,000,000</u> to carry out section 4304 [, of which not more than \$10,000,000 shall be available to carry out section 4304(k),] <u>and not more than \$185,000,000 to carry out section 4305, of which not more than \$15,000,000 shall be available to carry out section 4305(a)(2) and not more than \$20,000,000 shall be available 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 and a maximum total amount for Charter Management Organization grants, Developer grants, and national activities (collectively authorized under section 4305 of the ESEA), including maximums for Developer grants and for national activities.</p>

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes—continued

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>⁵ <u>Provided further, That the funds used to carry out section 4305(b) [\$135,000,000, to] shall remain available through March 31, [2020] 2021</u>, to carry out section 4305(b), and not more than \$15,000,000 to carry out the activities in section 4305(a)(3);</p>	<p>This language extends the period of availability 6 months beyond the year of the appropriation for the funds available for Charter Management Organization grants.</p>
<p>⁶ <u>Provided further, That notwithstanding section 4601(b), [\$130,000,000] \$300,000,000 shall be available through December 31, [2019] 2020</u> for subpart 1 of part F of title IV:</p>	<p>This language provides a specific funding amount for Education Innovation and Research (EIR) overriding the authorized level. It also extends the period of Federal availability 3 months beyond the year of appropriation.</p>
<p>⁷ <u>Provided further, That the Secretary may restrict eligibility under section 4611(b) to local educational agencies:</u></p>	<p>This language allows the Secretary to restrict EIR competitions to local educational agencies.</p>

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Appropriation, Adjustments, and Transfers
(dollars in thousands)

Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers	2018	2019	2020
Discretionary:			
Appropriation.....	<u>\$982,256</u>	<u>\$1,035,556</u>	<u>\$1,107,000</u>
Total, discretionary appropriation.....	982,256	1,035,556	1,107,000

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Summary of Changes (dollars in thousands)

2019	\$1,035,556
2020	<u>1,107,000</u>
Net change.....	+71,444

Increases:	<u>2019 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
Increase for the Education Innovation and Research program for activities to improve the quality and effectiveness of classroom instruction by empowering teachers to select their own professional development activities, and to promote innovation and reform in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education, including computer science.	\$130,000	+170,000
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.	440,000	+60,000
Subtotal, increases		+230,000

Decreases:	<u>2019 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
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.	\$4,815	-\$4,815
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.	75,000	-75,000

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Summary of Changes—continued

Decreases:	<u>2019 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
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.	\$27,741	-\$27,741
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.	29,000	-29,000
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.	12,000	-12,000
Eliminate funding for Statewide Family Engagement Centers because the program has limited impact and duplicates much larger Federal resources available to promote family engagement, including the \$15.9 billion Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program.	10,000	-10,000
Subtotal, decreases		<u>-158,556</u>
Net change		<u>+71,444</u>

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Authorizing Legislation

(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2019 Authorized	2019 Estimate	2020 Authorized	2020 Request
Education innovation and research (<i>ESEA IV-F-1</i>)	\$90,611 ¹	\$130,000	\$90,611 ¹	\$300,000
Teacher and school leader incentive grants (<i>ESEA II-B-1</i>)	230,361 ²	200,000	229,909 ²	200,000
American history and civics education (<i>ESEA II-B-3</i>)	6,568 ²	4,815	6,848 ²	0
Supporting effective educator development (SEED) (<i>ESEA II-B-4, section 2242</i>)	53,466 ²	75,000	53,574 ²	0
Charter schools grants (<i>ESEA IV-C</i>)	300,000	440,000	300,000	500,000
Magnet schools assistance (<i>ESEA IV-D</i>)	102,387	107,000	108,530	107,000
Ready to learn programming (<i>ESEA IV-F-4, section 4643</i>)	(1)	27,741	(1)	0
Arts in education (<i>ESEA IV-F-4, section 4642</i>)	(1)	29,000	(1)	0
Javits gifted and talented education (<i>ESEA IV-F-4, section 4644</i>)	(1)	12,000	(1)	0
Statewide family engagement centers (<i>ESEA IV-E</i>)	<u>10,000</u>	<u>10,000</u>	<u>10,000</u>	<u>0</u>
Total definite authorization	793,394		799,472	
Total appropriation		1,035,556		1,107,000
Portion of request not authorized				409,389

¹ For Part F of Title IV, a total of \$220,741 thousand is authorized for fiscal years 2019 and 2020. For fiscal years 2019 and 2020, 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, which includes the Ready to Learn Programming, Arts in Education, and Javits Gifted and Talented Education programs.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Authorizing Legislation—continued (dollars in thousands)

² For Part B of Title II, a total of \$469,168 thousand is authorized for fiscal year 2019 and a total of \$489,168 thousand is authorized for fiscal year 2020. Of the funds appropriated for Part B: for Subpart 1, the Teacher and School Leader Incentive program, 49.1 percent is authorized for fiscal year 2019 and 47 percent is authorized for fiscal year 2020; for Subpart 2, 34.1 percent is authorized for fiscal year 2019 and 36.8 percent is authorized for fiscal year 2020; for Subpart 3, 1.4 percent is authorized for fiscal years 2019 and 2020, of which not less than 26 percent is reserved for American History and Civics Academies; for Subpart 4, 15.4 percent is authorized for fiscal year 2019 and 14.8 percent is authorized for fiscal year 2020, 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
2011 Discretionary	\$6,330,000	\$1,870,123 ¹	\$2,224,843 ²	\$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	757,904 ¹⁰	880,375 ¹⁰	982,256 ¹⁰
2019 Discretionary	1,777,647	1,058,441 ¹¹	1,042,256 ¹¹	1,035,556 ¹¹
2020 Discretionary	1,107,000			

¹ The level for the House allowance reflect the House-passed full-year continuing resolution.

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

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 level for the House allowance reflects floor action on the Omnibus appropriations bill; the Senate allowance reflects Committee action on the regular annual 2018 appropriations bill; the Appropriation reflects the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115-141).

¹¹ The levels for the House and Senate allowance reflect Committee action on the regular annual 2019 appropriations bill; the Appropriation reflects enactment of the Department of Defense and Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Act, 2019 (P.L. 115-245).

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Significant Items in FY 2019 Appropriations Reports

Education Innovation and Research (EIR)

Senate: The Committee continues to direct the Department to work with other Federal agencies that issue grants in this area, including the National Science Foundation, to avoid duplication and ensure that activities funded under this program build on existing evidence or provide a unique benefit to the field. Further, within this amount, the Committee directs the Department to include funding to expand access to STEM education in rural areas, including grants to institutions of higher education, in partnership with rural school districts, to utilize virtual and remote access to makerspace technologies, such as 3D printers, to expand opportunities for students in rural areas where such tools are often cost prohibitive. Further, the Committee notes the importance of STEM knowledge and skills for individuals in and outside of the STEM workforce, including the workforce of national laboratories, for ensuring U.S. competitiveness globally. Finally, the Committee directs the Department to provide a briefing within 60 days of enactment to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on the Department's current and planned STEM education activities within EIR and across the Department.

Managers' Statement: The conferees direct the Secretary to submit the report described in section 313 of division B of H.R. 6157 as passed by the Senate on August 23, 2018.

Response: The Department is working with a number of agencies, including the National Science Foundation (NSF), to coordinate science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) activities across agencies. One way the Department carries out this coordination is through membership in the STEM Education Advisory Panel required under the American Innovation and Competitiveness Act of 2017 (AICA), which includes NSF, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). The Panel has been charged with improving and coordinating STEM education efforts across the Federal Government. The Department also participated in the development of the Administration's 5-year plan on STEM education, released in December 2018. The notices inviting applications for the EIR program were published on February 1, 2019, and the notices include language encouraging applicants propose projects that expand access to STEM education in rural areas, especially through partnerships with rural school districts that provide virtual and remote access to makerspace technologies, such as 3-D printers, in areas where the high costs of such tools otherwise may limit availability. In addition, the Department staff held conference calls with Committee staff in October and December of 2018 to provide a briefing on the Department's planned STEM education activities within the EIR program.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Significant Items in FY 2019 Appropriations Reports—continued

Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED)

Senate: The Committee directs the Department to ensure that SEED grants are awarded to a diverse set of eligible entities, including National non-profit organizations implementing evidence-based activities (as defined in section 8101(21)(A)(i) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) across a number of sites which can help bring to scale evidence-based programs of National significance across the country.

Response: The Department made 15 awards from the 2018 competition (14 in fiscal year 2018 and 1 in fiscal year 2019) to entities in 8 States. These grantees will be providing services across the country. The grantees include 5 national nonprofit organizations and 10 universities. All grantees will be conducting evidence-based activities. With the exception of 1 new grant from the 2018 slate, all fiscal year 2019 funds will be used for continuation awards.

Charter Schools Grants

Senate: The Committee requests the Department include in its CJs, starting with its submission for fiscal year 2020, a thorough discussion of how these investments are improving authorizing quality. Additionally, the Committee notes that the Department's Inspector General issued the Nationwide Assessment of Charter and Education Management Organizations audit report in September 2016. The Committee requests the Department to include in its fiscal year 2020 CJ a description of actions it has taken or plans to take in response to the report's findings and recommendations.

Response: The Department's actions in response to these requests are discussed in the Charter Schools Grants program narrative.

[Click here for accessible version](#)

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2020 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(in thousands of dollars)

	Cat Code	2018 Appropriation	2019 Appropriation	2020 President's Budget	2020 President's Budget Compared to 2019 Appropriation	
					Amount	Percent

Innovation and Improvement

1.	Education innovation and research (ESEA IV-F-1)	D	120,000	130,000	300,000	170,000	130.77%
2.	Teacher and school leader incentive grants (ESEA II-B-1)	D	200,000	200,000	200,000	0	0.00%
3.	American history and civics education (ESEA II-B-3)	D	3,515	4,815	0	(4,815)	-100.00%
4.	Supporting effective educator development (SEED) (ESEA II-B-4, section 2242)	D	75,000	75,000	0	(75,000)	-100.00%
5.	Charter schools grants (ESEA IV-C)	D	400,000	440,000	500,000	60,000	13.64%
6.	Magnet schools assistance (ESEA IV-D)	D	105,000	107,000	107,000	0	0.00%
7.	Ready to learn programming (ESEA IV-F-4, section 4643)	D	27,741	27,741	0	(27,741)	-100.00%
8.	Arts in education (ESEA IV-F-4, section 4642)	D	29,000	29,000	0	(29,000)	-100.00%
9.	Javits gifted and talented education (ESEA IV-F-4, section 4644)	D	12,000	12,000	0	(12,000)	-100.00%
10.	Statewide family engagement centers (ESEA IV-E)	D	10,000	10,000	0	(10,000)	-100.00%
Total		D	982,256	1,035,556	1,107,000	71,444	6.90%

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) incentivizing and evaluating innovative teaching practices. For fiscal year 2020, the Administration requests a total of \$1.1 billion for these activities.

Expanding Educational Options

The request includes \$500 million for **Charter Schools Grants**, an increase of \$60 million 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 \$107 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.

Elevating the Teaching Profession

The request would provide \$300 million for the **Education Innovation and Research** program, an increase of \$170 million, to improve the quality and effectiveness of classroom instruction by empowering teachers to select their own professional development activities. These funds also would support field-initiated projects that would promote innovation and reform in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education, including computer science, consistent with the Presidential Memorandum on STEM education.

The Administration is requesting \$200 million for the **Teacher and School Leader Incentive Grants** program, the same as the fiscal year 2019 appropriation, which would support a new competition aimed at recognizing and rewarding teaching excellence, improving continuing education for teachers, and expanding teacher preparation. In particular, the Department proposes to give priority to applicants that propose to create or enhance their performance-based compensation systems and human capital management systems to support (1) high-quality mentoring and residencies for novice teachers, or (2) increased compensation for effective teachers, particularly in high-need STEM fields and subjects, including computer science. These grants would address two key challenges for effective human capital management systems in school districts: improving the effectiveness of novice teachers and recruiting and retaining effective teachers in hard-to-staff fields.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Summary of Request—continued

Discontinued Programs

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

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Education innovation and research

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2020 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾

Budget Authority:

	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$130,000	\$300,000	+\$170,000

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 ties the size of the Federal investment to the evidence base for funded interventions. For example, the program may provide \$3 million in start-up funding to test promising innovations that are willing to undergo rigorous evaluation, while investing \$15 million for large-scale replication of proven interventions to assess their effectiveness in multiple settings with diverse student populations. Types of awards include: (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 Mid-phase 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 rigorous, independent evaluations of the effectiveness of their projects.

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

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Education innovation and research

agency, or an institution of higher education. Awards length varies from 3 to 5 years. At least 25 percent of the funds appropriated for 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)
2015.....	\$120,000
2016.....	120,000
2017.....	100,000
2018.....	120,000
2019.....	130,000

FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST

The request includes \$300 million for the Education Innovation and Research (EIR) program, an increase of \$170 million over the fiscal year 2019 level. The request would fund a \$200 million demonstration aimed at improving the quality and effectiveness of classroom instruction by empowering teachers to select their own professional development activities. Requested funds would also maintain strong support for field-initiated projects that would promote innovation and reform in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education, including computer science.

The proposed \$200 million professional development demonstration is aimed at elevating the teaching profession—treating teachers like professionals who can identify their own needs and determine how to address those needs—by empowering teachers to select and pay for individualized professional development. Funds would be awarded competitively to local educational agencies (LEAs), which would then provide stipends to teachers to pay for professional development. Grantees would have flexibility in selecting the teachers or groups of teachers who would receive stipends, for example, stipends could be targeted to teachers of specific subjects such as math and science, to teachers in schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement or targeted support and improvement under the ESEA, or to teachers preparing for leadership roles in or out of the classroom. Grantees also could require teachers to select evidence-based training opportunities that have proven effective in improving classroom instruction, leadership skills (including mentoring skills), or student outcomes. Teachers seeking stipends would be required to describe how they would be used to support individual development plans (IDPs) designed to enhance instructional or leadership skills.

Although school-related factors such as curriculum, parent engagement, and funding contribute to student academic performance, research suggests that the single most important school-based factor impacting students' achievement is their teacher (Stronge & Tucker, 2000). However, despite heavy investment in teacher preparation at the Federal, State, and district levels, most teachers do not appear to improve substantially their practice from year to year,

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Education innovation and research

and improvements that are observed are not easily linked to a particular standardized professional development strategy.¹ Moreover, professional development needs vary widely among teachers a various phases of their careers. For example, novice teachers may need to improve classroom management skills, content knowledge, and pedagogy. More experienced teachers may seek to develop the advanced skills and knowledge required to teach Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate courses or the skills necessary to take on multiple leadership roles at the classroom, department, or school level. Consequently, the one-size-fits-all professional development activities typically funded by school systems are not likely to be effective and are not popular with teachers.

For these reasons, the Administration believes that empowering teachers to select their own individualized professional development activities is a critical strategy for both elevating the teaching profession and improving teacher and school leader performance. While some teachers report receiving stipends for professional development, the practice is not widely used and its impact is unknown. The request would support a rigorous demonstration of teacher professional development stipends paired with rigorous, project-level evaluations of program effectiveness. The requested funds would allow the program to make grants to a wide range of grantees serving high-need students in diverse settings (e.g., large urban districts, rural communities, BIE schools) and to provide sufficiently large stipends to support meaningful professional development. The amount requested for the proposal would enable LEAs to provide stipends of \$6,500 to approximately 25,000 teachers. The rigorous evaluations required under EIR potentially would also drive significant improvement in the use of other, much larger sources of Federal professional development funds, such as the nearly \$16 billion provided through the Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program.

The request also would support the Presidential Memorandum on STEM education by investing approximately \$100 million in field-initiated EIR projects that focus on 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 STEM occupations are higher than the median for all occupations, and STEM jobs pay more at all levels of education compared with other occupations.² However, 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.³ The EIR program is well-

¹ The New Teacher Project (TNTP). (2015). *The mirage: Confronting the hard truth about our quest for teacher development*. Brooklyn, NY: Retrieved from http://tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP-Mirage_2015.pdf.

² 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.

³ 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

structured to provide the investment needed to improve elementary and secondary STEM education, including computer science education, thanks to 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.

Consistent with the authorizing statute, the Department would reserve \$15 million in fiscal year 2020 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>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
EIR competition			
Amount for grants	\$115,445	\$122,200	\$282,000
Number of new awards	18	15-20	30-40
Range of new awards	\$3,000–15,000	\$3,000–15,000	\$3,000–15,000
Peer review of new award applications	\$633	\$1,300	\$3,000
National activities	\$3,922	\$6,500	\$15,000

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 2020 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The measures reported in this section include data for grants under both the predecessor program (i3) and EIR. Thus, the measures for Expansion grants include data for Scale-up grants that were still active in the reporting year; the measures for Mid-phase grants include data for Mid-phase grants; and the measures for Early-phase grants include data for Development grants. However, in the text below only the current terminology is used.

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 Expansion grantees that reached their annual target of students served.

Year	Target	Actual
2015	60%	50%
2016	66	66
2017	66	75
2018	66	
2019	66	
2020	66	

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

Year	Target	Actual
2016	65%	N/A
2017	65	N/A
2018	65	
2019	65	
2020	65	

Measure: The percentage of Mid-phase grantees that reached their annual target of students served.

Year	Target	Actual
2015	65%	52%
2016	68	52
2017	68	50
2018	68	
2019	68	
2020	68	

Measure: The percentage of Mid-phase 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	80%
2018	65	
2019	65	
2020	65	

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Education innovation and research

Additional information: The source of the data is annual grantee performance reports and final performance reports submitted through March 2018. One of the goals of Mid-phase and Expansion 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.

All five active Expansion grants and all 18 Mid-phase grants provided data on the GPRA measure. One Expansion grant two Mid-phase grants did not serve students in the reporting year and are thus excluded from the calculation. 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, including the accurate setting of yearly targets for students served. Data for fiscal year 2018 will be available by December 2019.

No Expansion grants ended their grants in the reporting period through March 2018, so there is no cumulative data on students served to report for Expansion. Five Mid-phase grants ended their grants in the reporting period and provided data on students served.

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 Expansion 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 What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Evidence Standards with or without reservations.

Year	Target	Actual
2015	80%	100%
2016	83	100
2017	100	100
2018	100	
2019	100	
2020	100	

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Education innovation and research

Measure: The percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Mid-phase 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
2015	75%	97%
2016	78	96
2017	100	100
2018	100	
2019	100	
2020	100	

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

Year	Target	Actual
2015	96%	98%
2016	96	98
2017	100	98
2018	100	
2019	100	
2020	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 2018 will be available by December 2019.

Measure: The percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Expansion 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
2015	80%	100%
2016	83	100
2017	100	100
2018	100	
2019	100	
2020	100	

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Education innovation and research

Measure: The percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Mid-phase 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
2015	90%	100%
2016	93	96
2017	100	100
2018	100	
2019	100	
2020	100	

Measure: The percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by a Early-phase 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
2015	90%	99%
2016	95	98
2017	100	98
2018	100	
2019	100	
2020	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 2018 will be available by December 2019.

Efficiency measures

The Department established cost per student as the efficiency measure for the 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 2017 represent grants that submitted an annual performance report and include four out of five Expansion grants (the fifth did not serve students and therefore does not have a cost per student), 16 out of 18 Mid-phase grantees (the two not included did not serve students and therefore do not have a cost per student), and 37 out of 45 Early-phase grants (four did not serve students and therefore do not have a cost per student, and four had incomplete data at

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Education innovation and research

this time). An additional 11 Early-phase grantees were not required to submit annual performance reports due to short no-cost extensions and instead will submit a final performance reports at a later date. 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 Mid-phase grants and 26 out of 30 Early-phase grants. Data for fiscal year 2018 will be available by December 2019.

Measure: The cost per student served by the Expansion, Mid-phase, or Early-phase grant.

Year	Cost per student, Expansion grants	Cost per student, Mid-phase grants	Cost per student, Early-phase grants
2013	\$237	\$181	\$140
2014	201	21,463	633
2015	99	874	1,137
2016	135	5,329	1,887
2017	278	962	1,049

Additional information: The increase in the cost per student served for Expansion grants appears to be due to one grant that had a lower number of students served than targeted. It appears that schools included in the project either served only a portion of students in the targeted grade or enrolled fewer students than initially estimated. The decrease in the cost per student reported for 2017 for Mid-phase grants is due to fewer new grants, which generally have higher start up implementation costs, as well as most grants having lower actual costs per student than expected. The cost per student reported for 2017 for Early-phase grants is similar to previous years.

Measure: The cost per student for the Expansion, Mid-phase, or Early-phase grant for programs, practices, or strategies that were proven to be effective at improving educational outcomes for students.

Year	Cost per student, Expansion grants	Cost per student, Mid-phase grants	Cost per student, Early-phase grants
2015	\$375	\$1,154	\$928
2016	N/A	N/A	347
2017	N/A	728	776

Additional information: No Expansion projects ended in 2017, so this measure is not applicable for that year. For Mid-phase, eight projects ended in 2017, and six provided complete cost per student data. For Early-phase, 10 grant projects ended in 2017, and six provided complete cost per student data. The cost per student for Early-phase grants for 2017 is reflective of the scope of students served under these grants as well as estimated costs.

Other Performance Information

In June, 2018, the Department published *The Investing in Innovation Fund: Summary of 67 Evaluations Final Report*, which examined the extent to which the Investing in Innovation (i3) program, the predecessor to the EIR program, succeeded in its goal of building credible

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Education innovation and research

evidence that can be used to identify effective interventions that can improve student academic outcomes. This report examined 67 i3 impact evaluations and reached the following conclusions:

- Overall, nearly three-quarters of the 67 i3 impact evaluations unofficially met What Works Clearinghouse evidence standards.
- Almost 80 percent of the i3 implementation evaluations found that the interventions were implemented with adequate fidelity to the program models, with 18 percent evaluations finding positive impacts.
- Overall, nine evaluations (13 percent) met the long-term goal of i3 by finding evidence of both adequate fidelity and positive impacts on student academic outcomes.
- The findings from these evaluations, whether positive or negative, were sufficiently robust to help ED policymakers decide which educational programs warrant additional funding and testing.
- The i3 evaluations provide credible evidence to local decision makers considering whether to adopt particular interventions.

Additional information may be found at
<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20184013/pdf/20184013.pdf>.

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 2020 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾

Budget Authority:

	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$200,000	\$200,000	0

¹ A total of \$489,168 thousand is authorized for Part B of Title II. Of the total amount appropriated for Title II, Part B, 47 percent is available for Subpart 1 activities.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Teacher and School Leader (TSL) Incentive Grants 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; the Department has discretion to provide up to an additional 2 years of funding 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 that enable the LEA to make and implement human capital decisions (such as decisions related to hiring, professional development, dismissal, tenure, and promotion) and that include a performance-based compensation system. Performance-based compensation systems (PBCSs) are 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 school leaders demonstrated through additional responsibilities and evidence of professional achievement.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Teacher and school leader incentive grants

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.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2015.....	\$230,000
2016.....	230,000
2017.....	200,000
2018.....	200,000
2019.....	200,000

FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is requesting \$200 million for the Teacher and School Leader Incentive Grants program, the same as the fiscal year 2019 appropriation. The request would support a

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Teacher and school leader incentive grants

new competition in fiscal year 2020 as part of a comprehensive strategy to elevate the teaching profession by recognizing and rewarding teaching excellence, improving continuing education for teachers, and reforming teacher preparation.

In particular, the Department proposes to give priority to applicants that propose to create or enhance their performance-based compensation systems and human capital management systems to support:

- High-quality mentoring of novice teachers, including teacher residencies, or
- Increased compensation for effective teachers, particularly in high-need fields and subjects, such as science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) and computer science.

These grants would address two key challenges for effective human capital management systems in school districts: improving the effectiveness of novice teachers and recruiting and retaining effective teachers in hard-to-staff fields.

Grantees under the expanding high-quality mentoring priority could carry out projects that develop and implement strategies that help new teachers improve their craft and become excellent instructors. An essential component of the grants would be an assessment of the effects of participation in the projects on teaching skills and retention. The focus of these projects would be on providing one-on-one continuous mentoring, rather than stand-alone workshops and training, a practice that has been found to be promising in improving student achievement.¹ Residency programs could provide a year-long apprenticeship under the guidance of expert, effective teachers.

The second priority proposed for the fiscal year 2020 TSL competition reflects the Secretary's strong belief that "great teachers need to be supported, should be better compensated, and should be treated as professionals." Improved compensation practices are especially important for teachers in STEM fields, including computer science, where districts often face competition from technology-based private sector companies in recruiting talented individuals with the skills needed to improve student outcomes.

Grantees under the second priority would implement sustainable strategies for providing incentive payments or differential salary schedules for effective teachers, focusing particularly on subjects and areas for which recruitment and retention has traditionally been challenging (e.g., STEM fields, special education, and rural areas). Both State and local educational agencies would be eligible to receive grants. Priority would be given to applicants that provide concrete plans for sustaining increased compensation following the end of Federal funding.

The Department would evaluate the impact of projects funded under this proposal to build evidence on best practices for preparing and retaining effective teachers.

¹ <https://www.educationnext.org/taking-teacher-coaching-to-scale-can-personalized-training-become-standard-practice/>

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Teacher and school leader incentive grants

In addition to the new competition proposed for fiscal year 2020, the request would support continuation costs of the final year of 2016 grants made under the predecessor Teacher Incentive Fund program, technical assistance and evaluation activities.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
Funding			
New awards	0	0	\$110,016
Continuation awards	\$198,000	\$198,000	87,634
Peer review of new award applications	0	0	350
Evaluation and technical assistance	<u>2,000</u>	<u>2,000</u>	<u>2,000</u>
Total	200,000	200,000	200,000
Grant Award Information			
Number of new awards	0	0	12–15
Range of new awards	0	0	\$1,000–\$15,000
Number of continuation awards	27	27	13
Range of continuation awards	\$599–\$14,853	\$781–\$14,871	\$678–\$13,635

NOTE: The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including TSL, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. The Department did not reserve TSL funds for this purpose in fiscal year 2018 but may do so in fiscal years 2019 and 2020. Any amount pooled under section 8601 would not exceed the 1 percent evaluation and technical assistance reservation authorized for the TSL program.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data 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 and fiscal year 2020 and future 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) is 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.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Teacher and school leader incentive grants

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 in the 2012 cohort 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 evaluation system for either teachers or principals, or both. Thus, the data presented do not represent the same LEAs over time.

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		

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, data are not comparable across years.

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	

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.

The grantees in the 2016 TIF and 2017 TSL cohorts will report using the following measures, which were published in the notices inviting applications:

- 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. Initial data for the 2016 and 2017 cohorts will be available in the late spring of 2019.

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 relevant to the TSL program:

The Impact Evaluation of Teacher and Leader Performance Evaluation Systems¹ examined districts' and educators' experiences with performance evaluation systems and their impact on 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 study's performance evaluation system 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 1 of the 2 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, was published in December 2017.

Key findings from all participating districts in the 2010 TIF cohort 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 of performance similar to those used in TIF (at least 80 percent), and additional pay for taking on extra roles or responsibilities (74 percent).

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

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 2020 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾

Budget Authority:

<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$4,815	0	-\$4,815

¹ A total of \$489,168 thousand is authorized for Part B of Title II. Of the total amount appropriated for Title II, Part B, 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)
2015.....	0
2016.....	\$1,815
2017.....	\$3,515
2018.....	\$3,515
2019.....	\$4,815

FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST

The request does not include funding for American History and Civics Education, consistent with the Administration's overall goal of refocusing Federal education investments on flexible State formula grant programs, eliminating duplicative activities, streamlining Federal program administration, and putting decision-making power back in the hands of States and local communities. The American History and Civics Education programs support 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 ESEA programs to improve instruction in American history and civics, including the \$15.9 billion Title I Grants to LEAs program, which makes awards annually to all States and approximately 15,000 LEAs.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

American history and civics education

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
American History and Civics Academies grants			
Amount for new awards	\$1,815	0	0
Number of new awards	3	0	0
Amount for continuation awards	0	\$1,815	0
Number of continuation awards	0	3	0
National Activities grants			
Amount for new awards	\$1,571	\$1,822	0
Number of new awards	2	3	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$129	\$1,178	0
Number of continuation awards	1	2	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 2018, but may do so in fiscal year 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 as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program. No targets are shown for 2020 because the program is proposed for elimination.

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.*

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

Year	Target	Actual
2017		13%
2018		15
2019	TBD	

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

American history and civics education

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

Year	Target	Actual
2017		10%
2018		15
2019	TBD	

Additional information: Data are for the 2016 grantee and from assessments created by the grantee's evaluator drawing on questions from nationally validated U.S. History tests.

The 2017 grantee did not use traditional testing instruments but rather conducted pre- and post-assessments of teacher lesson plans (in the case of the Presidential Academy) and student research papers (for the Congressional Academy) using a rubric developed by an external evaluator. Because of this grantee's approach to assessment, the Department does not believe it is appropriate to aggregate its performance data with those of the 2016 grantee. The 2017 grantee reported average content knowledge gains of 25 percent for Presidential Academy teachers and 20 percent for Congressional Academy students in 2018.

The Department may establish targets for these measures based on actual grantee performance in future years, including that of the three 2018 grantees in 2019.

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.

For the 2017 grantee, there was an average percentage gain of 28 percent in 2018.

Additional information: Data are from assessments created by the grantee's evaluator drawing on questions from nationally validated U.S. History tests. The Department may establish targets for this measure based on actual grantee performance in future years, including that of the two 2018 grantees in 2019.

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 2020 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾

Budget Authority:

	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$75,000	0	-\$75,000

¹ A total of \$489,168 thousand is authorized for Part B of Title II. Of the total amount appropriated for Title II, Part B, 14.8 percent is available for Subpart 4, of which 74 percent must be used for Section 2242.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Supporting Effective Educator 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. Allowable activities must be evidence-based and include:

- Supporting non-traditional preparation and certification pathways that allow teachers, principals, or other school leaders to obtain employment in traditionally underserved local educational agencies (LEAs);
- Providing evidence-based professional development that addresses literacy, numeracy, remedial education, or other needs of LEAs and the students they serve;
- Providing professional development to improve instruction in dual enrollment programs or early college high school settings;
- Making professional development and related learning opportunities freely available to LEAs, including through publicly accessible electronic means; or
- Providing 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; the Department has the discretion to renew awards for an additional 2-year period if grantees demonstrate 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

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Supporting effective educator development

or in kind, to cover at least 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)
2015	\$54,046
2016	93,993
2017	65,000
2018	75,000
2019	75,000

FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST

The request does not include funding for the SEED program. Instead, the request includes a significant increase for the Education Innovation and Research program to support the Administration’s goal of elevating the teaching profession—treating teachers like professionals who can identify their own needs and select professional development that addresses those needs—and improving teacher quality. 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 \$15.9 billion annually to approximately 15,000 LEAs 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, because SEED funds only activities and interventions with evidence of effectiveness, LEAs can be expected to turn to current and former SEED grantees when implementing the evidence-based school improvement plans required by the ESEA. For this reason, and consistent with the fiscal discipline required to reduce the Federal budget deficit while maintaining support for higher priority State formula grant programs serving the most vulnerable student populations, the request would terminate funding for the SEED program.

Grants awarded in fiscal year 2017 will receive their third and final year of funding in 2019. Grants awarded in fiscal year 2018 would receive only 2 years of funding, while the one new grant awarded in 2019 from the 2018 competition would receive funding for just 1 year.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Supporting effective educator development

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
Project Funding:			
New grant awards	\$33,638	\$8,444	0
Continuation grant awards	41,043	66,181	0
Peer review of new award applications	269	0	0
Evaluation	<u>50</u>	<u>375</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	75,000	75,000	0
Grant Award Information			
Number of new awards	14	1	NA
Range of new awards	\$971-\$3,591	NA	NA
Number of continuation awards	10	24	NA
Range of continuation awards	\$1,830-\$6,075	\$505-\$5,417	NA

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 pooled \$50,000 in fiscal year 2018 and may reserve funds in fiscal year 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 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. No targets are provided for 2020 because the Administration is not requesting funding for the program.

The Department first conducted a competition for SEED grants in fiscal year 2012 and established two performance measures for the program:

- 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 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).

Three grantees received awards in 2012, all of which addressed these 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

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Supporting effective educator development

length of some of the grants, performance data for these grantees are limited, and do not include the cost per participant. 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 and do not include the cost per participant. 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 on the first two measures are available for this cohort of grantees. Nine of the 13 2015 grantees 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. Updated data for the first two measures in the spring of 2019. Data are not yet available for the remaining two measures.

The four measures used in the 2015 competition also were used in the 2017 and 2018 competitions. In addition, beginning with the 2017 competition the following new measure was used: 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; information for the 2018 grantees is expected to be available in late 2020.

The Department also expects to receive information in early 2019 from 2-year evaluation extension awards made in 2016 to three of the 2013 grantees, the National Writing Project, the

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Supporting effective educator development

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2020 Authorization: \$300,000

Budget Authority:

	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$440,000	\$500,000	+\$60,000

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

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, 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.

CMO Grants

Under section 4305(b), the Department makes competitive grants to nonprofit CMOs to replicate and expand high-quality charter schools. 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.

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

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

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.

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 uses funds 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 Dissemination grants, through which State entities, charter school authorizers, and nonprofit organizations that operate, manage, or support charter schools can receive funds to disseminate information on issues of national significance.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2015.....	\$253,172
2016.....	333,172
2017.....	342,172
2018.....	400,000
2019.....	440,000

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$500 million for Charter Schools Grants for fiscal year 2020, an increase of \$60 million over the fiscal year 2019 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 2020 funding level and the ESEA's within-program funding allocations and allow the Department to use funds as follows:

- Not less than \$190 million for State Entity grants. The request will support additional new State Entity awards under 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 \$125 million for facilities grants, a maximum increase of \$70 million over the amount for these grants in fiscal year 2019. 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 to address ongoing charter school facility needs. Specifically, the request would increase the size and number of new Credit Enhancement grants, further leveraging capital and expanding charter school access to facility loans and bonds, while providing additional new support for the startup of dedicated State charter school facility funding streams.
- Up to \$185 million for Developer grants, Charter Management Organization (CMO) grants, and national activities (collectively authorized under section 4305 of the ESEA), of which up to \$15 million may be used for Developer grants and up to \$20 million for national activities.

The request would maintain the fiscal year 2019 level for Developer grants and be supported by rulemaking that the Department intends to conduct in fiscal year 2019 to ensure, among other things, that Developer grant funds continue to be targeted to disadvantaged student populations and focused on developers currently operating at most one charter school (i.e., to applicants that are not CMOs).

The request would also support a strengthened set of national activities, which could include new National Dissemination grants on priority topics and new, rigorous evaluation studies.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

Finally, the request includes an increase of approximately \$15 million for CMO grants over fiscal year 2019, and would retain the 18-month period of availability of CMO funds first provided in fiscal year 2018. The Administration anticipates continued strong demand for these grants, which through rulemaking completed in early fiscal year 2019 will be targeted to disadvantaged or underserved student populations, particularly students from low-income families and students in rural communities.

Charter Schools Grants have supported a significant percentage of the charter schools in operation today.¹ However, there is clearly room for growth and strong demand from families for more options. The National Alliance for Public Charter Schools has estimated that parents of approximately two million students would choose to enroll their children in a charter school if seats were available.² 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 340 schools serving 135,000 students.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
State Entity grants			
Amount for new awards	\$77,791	\$106,373	\$47,948
Number of new awards	8	3–8	3–6
Amount for continuation awards	\$120,006	\$113,189	\$141,302
Number of continuation awards	21	22	21–26
Developer grants			
Amount for new awards	\$16,165	\$14,250	\$9,180
Number of new awards	32	25–35	16–24
Amount for continuation awards	\$1,721	\$750	\$5,820
Number of continuation awards	7	32	53–63
Peer review of new State Entity and Developer award applications	\$318	\$438	0
CMO grants			
Amount for new awards	\$100,230	\$56,360	\$79,072
Number of new awards	20–30	13–19	16–24
Amount for continuation awards	\$19,648	\$78,518	\$70,928
Number of continuation awards	49	62–72	63–79
Peer review of new award applications	\$121	\$122	0

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

² See <http://www.publiccharters.org/press/national-alliance-statement-presidents-fy2018-budget/>.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
Credit Enhancement grants			
Amount for new awards	\$39,922	\$39,721	\$95,000
Number of new awards	4	3–5	8–12
Amount for supplemental awards	0	\$5,078	0
Number of supplemental awards	0	1	0
State Facilities Incentive grants			
Amount for new awards	0	\$10,000	\$20,000
Number of new awards	0	1–3	2–4
Amount for continuation awards	\$10,000	0	\$10,000
Number of continuation awards	1	0	1–3
Peer review of new Credit Enhancement and State Facilities Incentive award applications	\$78	\$201	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	0	\$750
National activities	\$14,000	\$15,000	\$20,000

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 2018, but may do so in fiscal years 2019 and 2020.

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 in fiscal year 2020 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The 2017 data for these performance measures are preliminary. The Department is considering revising the measures 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.*

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

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

Year	Target	Actual
2015	7,540	6,752
2016	8,010	6,859
2017	8,480	7,014
2018	8,950	
2019	9,420	
2020	9,890	

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.

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
2015	74.2%	48.3%
2016	79.2	49.4
2017	84.2	49.8
2018	89.2	
2019	94.2	
2020	99.2	

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
2015	71.4%	44.1%
2016	76.4	45.8
2017	81.4	46.8
2018	86.4	
2019	91.4	
2020	96.4	

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

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
2015	76.6%	52.3%
2016	81.6	53.8
2017	86.6	52.3
2018	91.6	
2019	96.6	
2020	100.0	

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
2015	63.7%	39.4%
2016	68.7	40.6
2017	73.7	43.2
2018	78.7	
2019	83.7	
2020	88.7	

Additional information: The low percentages of students scoring at or above the proficient level in 2015 and 2016 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.

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	2014 Cohort Target	2014 Cohort Actual
2015	1.11 : 1	1.99 : 1
2016	1.25 : 1	3.99 : 1
2017	1.67 : 1	3.99 : 1
2018	2.50 : 1	6.11 : 1
2019	5.00 : 1	

Additional information: The leveraging ratio is the total funds available (the Federal grant and the State match) compared to the Federal grant for a given year. The State match amount excludes State and local funds that would otherwise be used to provide charter school per-pupil facilities aid in absence of participation in the program.

The Department also tracks the amount of funds leveraged and the number of schools served under Credit Enhancement grants. In 2017, Credit Enhancement grants leveraged \$500 million

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

in facilities financing for 72 schools. Between program inception and 2017, Credit Enhancement funds have helped enable approximately \$5.3 billion in financing for facilities of 757 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 2015 show an average cost of \$1,129, for 2016 an average cost of \$1,173, and for 2017 an average cost of \$1,168. 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

Supporting Efforts to Strengthen Charter School Authorizing

Strong authorizing practices are essential to the success of the schools supported under Charter Schools Grants. In its effort to help strengthen school authorizing and oversight, the Department employs a multi-faceted approach that includes activities focused specifically on State Entity grantees and those designed to benefit States and authorizers more generally.

The Department's efforts to assist State Entity grantees begin by ensuring, through a thorough budget review prior to making awards, that they reserve between 7 and 10 percent of funds, as required by statute, for activities to improve authorizer quality and to assist charter school developers. The Department, both directly and through contracts, monitors grantees for compliance with these set-aside requirements and provides general and individualized technical assistance as needed in developing and improving set-aside activities. In particular, the Department's National Charter School Resource Center (Resource Center) has developed an authorizer evaluation protocol (based in part on the National Association of Charter School Authorizers's *Principles and Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing*) and is available to assist State Entity grantees in implementing the protocol for authorizers in their States.

State Entity grantees—the first cohort of which began implementing grant projects in fiscal year 2018—are still in the beginning phases of designing and carrying out their set-aside activities. At a later date, the Department (through the Resource Center) will prepare an initial summary and analysis of those activities. However, notable activities as reflected in grantee applications have included: providing authorizer training or stipends for training; developing and implementing authorizing standards, principles, and frameworks; developing authorizer report cards; providing technical assistance on authorizing practices specifically to LEAs that are authorizers; and providing training on authorizer closure.

The Department's general support for authorizer quality notably includes the National Dissemination grants. Four of the program's eight inaugural awards in fiscal year 2018 were made under an absolute priority for projects that disseminate information to strengthen charter

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

school authorizing and oversight.¹ These projects, which began earlier this fiscal year, are intended to target dissemination efforts where they are needed most, including toward States that recently enacted charter school laws, authorizers with fewer than 10 charter schools (i.e., authorizers that generally are new or have limited resources), and authorizers with multiple schools experiencing significant low performance or compliance issues. The Department will provide more information on the implementation and effects of these projects in future budget requests.

The Resource Center is also engaged in ongoing general efforts to improve authorizing, with the most recent Resource Center contract featuring a task devoted explicitly to the topic and including, among other activities, a compilation of State authorizing initiatives and the identification and dissemination of key authorizing lessons learned.

Lastly, the Department's Policy and Program Studies Service has initiated development of a set of in-depth profiles of exemplary charter school practices, including practices related to school authorizing. The profiles, which are expected to be released in spring 2020, will be on topics identified based on a research review and recommendations of an expert panel, and will include descriptive data and information from schools identified through a "beating-the-odds" analysis as outperforming other schools with similar characteristics.

Monitoring and Mitigating Risk in Charter School Contractual Relationships with Management Organizations

In September 2016 the Department's Inspector General issued a report examining the relationships between charter schools and their management entities, including CMOs and education management organizations (EMOs).² The report, which was based in part on a review of 33 charter schools in 6 States, identified internal control weaknesses in these relationships that may pose financial and performance risks to Department program objectives and recommended that the Department take steps to mitigate these risks. The Department developed a corrective action plan in response to the report's specific recommendations. Each of the actions in the plan (summarized below) has been completed, with the exception of the release of the Dear Colleague Letter, which the Department expects to complete in early spring 2019:

- The Department established a formal oversight group to determine the most appropriate manner to review and assess risks posed to Department programs by charter school contractual relationships with CMOs or EMOs and to determine how best to respond to recommendations in the audit report.
- The Department will release a Dear Colleague Letter that provides SEAs with a suggested framework and strategy for performing a minimum level of monitoring, risk

¹ See <https://innovation.ed.gov/what-we-do/charter-schools/expanding-opportunity-through-quality-charter-schools-program-csp-national-dissemination-grants/awards/>.

² See <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2016/a02m0012.pdf>.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

assessment, and mitigation procedures related to charter school contractual relationships with CMOs or EMOs.

- The Department modified its fiscal review monitoring protocols to assist States in meeting their monitoring and oversight responsibilities under the Title I statute and regulations with respect to charter school contractual relationships with CMOs or EMOs.
- The Department revised and updated its monitoring protocols for the various Charter Schools Grants programs to assist grantees in meeting their monitoring and oversight responsibilities with respect to CMOs or EMOs.
- The Department developed and modified monitoring protocols to assist States in meeting their monitoring and oversight responsibilities under the IDEA statute and regulations with respect to charter school contractual relationships with CMOs or EMOs.
- The Department contacted the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools and the National Association of Charter School Authorizers to discuss how external partners and interest groups can assist SEAs and other authorizers in considering risks to Federal funds in their evaluation of proposals for charter schools and in determining what is an acceptable level of risk related to charter school contractual relationships with CMOs or EMOs. These external partners agreed to convene a taskforce or working group to examine these issues and develop steps to address the identified risks. The Department continues to work with these external partners as they develop and implement their work plan.
- The Department updated the OMB Uniform Guidance Compliance Supplement to include procedures to determine whether SEAs and LEAs, as appropriate, have internal controls to ensure that charter schools with contractual relationships with CMOs or EMOs have effective controls to mitigate financial risks, provide for accountability over Federal funds, and mitigate performance risks.

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.

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 2020 Authorization: \$108,530

Budget Authority:

	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$107,000	\$107,000	0

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)
2015.....	\$91,647
2016.....	96,647
2017.....	97,647
2018.....	105,000
2019.....	107,000

FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$107 million for MSAP, the same as the fiscal year 2019 appropriation, to maintain strong support for a program that expands the range of high-quality educational options and puts more decision-making power in the hands of students and their families. The request would support 36 continuation awards and the Department also would use up to 1 percent of appropriated funds for national activities 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 performance data.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
Amount for awards	\$103,948	\$105,395	\$105,395
Number of new awards	4 ¹	0	0
Number of continuation awards	32	36	36
National activities	\$1,050	\$1,070	\$1,070
Pooled Evaluation	0	\$535	\$535
Peer review of new award applications	\$2	0	0

NOTE: The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including MSAP, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. The Department did not reserve funds for this purpose from MSAP in fiscal year 2018, but expects to do so in fiscal years 2019 and 2020.

¹ Due to an increase in funding from the 2017 appropriation, MSAP funded four additional high-quality applications from the 2017 competition in fiscal year 2018.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Magnet schools assistance

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years, and those requested in fiscal year 2020 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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	2013 Cohort	2016 Cohort	2017 Cohort
2015	26.0%		
2016	23.5		
2017		39.0%	
2018		21.1	45.2%
2019			
2020			

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. Grantees set their own annual targets in their original applications; the program does not set aggregate performance targets.

Eight out of 38 schools supported by 2016 MSAP grantees met their minority-group isolation targets in fiscal year 2018. Of the 30 schools that did not meet their targets, 19 schools made progress toward achieving their targets. For the 2017 MSAP cohort, 52 out of 115 schools that reported data met their targets for this measure.

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	2013 Cohort	2016 Cohort
2015	40.3%	
2016	43.5	
2017		35.4%
2018		39.3
2019		
2020		

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. Grantees set their own annual targets in their original applications; the program does not set aggregate performance targets. Based on lessons learned administering the program, the Department has revised the measure for the 2017 cohort to focus in the percentage *increase* of students who score proficient or above State standards in reading/language arts (see below).

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

Year	2013 Cohort	2016 Cohort
2015	34.5%	
2016	36.0	
2017		34.1%
2018		35.9
2019		
2020		

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. Grantees set their own annual targets in their original applications; the program does not set aggregate performance targets. Based on lessons learned administering the program, the Department has revised the measure for the 2017 cohort to focus in the percentage *increase* of students who score proficient or above State standards in mathematics (see below).

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Magnet schools assistance

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.

Year	2013 Cohort	2016 Cohort
2015	\$1,122	
2016	916	
2017		\$722
2018		1,235
2019		
2020		

Additional information:

In grant year 2 for the 2016 cohort, the average cost per student of \$1,235. The Department has discontinued this measure for the 2017 cohort because it has not proven to be a useful indicator of grantee performance.

In addition to these performance measures, the Department introduced two new measures for the 2017:

Measure: Percentage increase of students who scored proficient or above State standards in reading/language arts.

Year	2017 Cohort
2018	5.7%
2019	
2020	

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. Grantees set their own annual targets in their original applications; the program does not set aggregate performance targets.

Across the 2017 grant projects, 34.41 percent of students in MSAP schools tested proficient or above State annual progress standards in reading/language arts in Year 1, and 32.53 percent of students in MSAP schools tested proficient or above State annual progress standards in reading/language arts in the baseline year (grantees compared assessment data from the first grant year to baseline data provided in their funded applications). Of the 116 MSAP schools that reported school achievement data for reading/language arts, 72 schools (62 percent) had percentage increases for all students who scored proficient or above State standards, and 44 schools (38 percent) had percentage decreases for all students who scored proficient or above State standards.

The calculations showed the percentage increase of students by racial and ethnic groups who scored proficient or above State assessment standards in reading/language arts from school years

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Magnet schools assistance

2016-17 to 2017-18: -1.94 American Indian or Alaskan Native, -3.22 percent of Asian students, 3.03 percent of Black/African American students, 10.25 percent of Hispanic/Latino students, 0.03 percent of White students, and -6.17 percent of two or more races students.

Measure: Percentage increase of students who scored proficient or above State standards in mathematics.

Year	2017 Cohort
2018	9.4%
2019	
2020	

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. Grantees set their own annual targets in their original applications; the program does not set aggregate performance targets.

Across the 2017 grant projects, 29.61 percent of students in MSAP schools tested proficient or above State annual progress standards in mathematics in Year 1, and 27.06 percent of students in MSAP schools tested proficient or above State annual progress standards in mathematics in the baseline year (grantees compared assessment data from the first grant year to baseline data provided in their funded applications). Of the 115 schools that reported school achievement data for mathematics, 68 schools (59 percent) had percentage increases for all students who scored proficient or above State standards, and 47 schools (41 percent) had percentage decreases for all students who scored proficient or above state Standards.

The calculations showed the percentage increase of students by racial and ethnic groups who scored proficient or above State assessment standards in mathematics from school years 2016-17 to 2017-18: 16.22 American Indian or Alaskan Native, 2.81 percent of Asian students, 3.17 percent of Black/African American students, 14.70 percent of Hispanic/Latino students, -31.43 percent Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, 9.78 percent of White students, and -7.45 percent of two or more races students.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Ready to learn programming

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2020 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾

Budget Authority:

<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$27,741	0	-\$27,741

¹ A total of \$220,741 thousand is authorized for Title IV, Part F. Of the total amount appropriated for Title IV, Part F, \$5,000 thousand is reserved for Subpart 3; of the remainder, 26 percent is reserved for Subpart 4 activities, which include 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 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.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Ready to learn programming

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)
2015.....	\$25,741
2016.....	25,741
2017.....	25,741
2018.....	27,741
2019.....	27,741

FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funding for Ready to Learn (RTL) Programming in fiscal year 2020, a reduction of \$27.7 million below the fiscal year 2019 appropriation. Widespread access to the internet and the ready availability of a wide range of digital games and devices that support early learning have long made the RTL program less relevant and necessary than in the past. Private corporations increasingly produce and disseminate programming, online games, and “apps” that are both educational and entertaining without Federal support.

Consequently, and particularly in view of its goals of restoring the traditional, limited Federal role in education and making scarce Federal resources available for other priorities, the Administration believes that 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. The Department will award the fifth and final year of support for the 2015 grantees in fiscal year 2019, and thus the request would not adversely affect any current grantees.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Ready to learn programming

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
Number of continuation awards	2	2	0
Continuation award funding	\$27,711	\$27,691	0
Evaluation (review of grant products)	<u>\$30</u>	<u>\$50</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	27,741	27,741	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 2018, it may do so in fiscal year 2019.

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

The Department uses the following performance measures to assess RTL's effectiveness in improving what children learn, the quality of RTL-funded transmedia products, and the number of children RTL is reaching:

- (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, that will provide data on the first performance measure. The Department expects to receive the first of the studies in 2019.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Ready to learn programming

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. In 2018, the Department received one transmedia product suite from one grantee to review. That transmedia produce suite was of high-quality, which a score of 4.02.

For the third performance measure, grantees reported on the number of children who used RTL-produced products, by type of product. In 2018, 22.0 million users accessed RTL-produced educational media products. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) reported 22.0 million users, of which 14.0 million watched CPB television shows and 8.0 million used Web-based games. Twin Cities Public Television did not report any users for 2018.

Efficiency Measure

The Department uses 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. 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. In the third year of the 2015 grants, the two grantees leveraged \$8.8 million of non-Federal support compared to \$12.0 million in Federal dollars spent on production, or \$0.73 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 2020 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾

Budget Authority:

	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$29,000	0	-\$29,000

¹ A total of \$220,741 thousand is authorized for Title IV, Part F. Of the total amount appropriated for Title IV, Part F, \$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)
2015.....	\$25,000
2016.....	27,000
2017.....	27,000
2018.....	29,000
2019.....	29,000

FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funding for the Arts in Education program in fiscal year 2020, a reduction of \$29.0 million below the fiscal year 2019 appropriation. The Administration is proposing to eliminate funding for this program because it has limited impact, does not

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Arts in education

sufficiently target services to the highest-need students, and funds activities that are more appropriately supported with other Federal, State, local, and private funds. For example, the program duplicates activities that may be supported through the \$15.9 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, which may include arts instruction and related activities.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
<i>Arts Development and Dissemination</i>			
Total funds available	\$14,219	\$13,332	0
Amount for new awards	\$13,266	0	
Number of new awards	22	0	
Amount for continuation awards	\$450	\$12,907	0
Number of continuation awards	1	23	0
Interagency transfer to support the Arts Education Partnership	\$425	\$425	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$78	0	0
<i>Professional Development for Arts Educators (PDAE)</i>			
Total funds available	\$6,186	\$7,136	0
Amount for new awards	\$231	0	0
Number of new awards	1 ¹	0	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$5,955	\$7,136	0
Number of continuation awards	20	21	0
<i>National Arts in Education Program (AENP)</i>			
Total funds available	\$8,077	\$8,000	0
Amount for new awards	\$8,000	0	0
Number of new awards	1	0	0
Amount for continuation awards	0	\$8,000	0
Number of continuation awards	0	1	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$77	0	0
<i>Evaluation</i>	\$518	\$532	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 2018, it may do so in fiscal year 2019.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Arts in education

Consistent with the Department's request to eliminate funding for this program in fiscal year 2020, the output measures for fiscal year 2019 reflect the use of fiscal year 2019 funds to pre-pay continuation costs to allow existing grantees, to the extent possible, to complete their planned projects or transition to support from other Federal, State, or local sources of funding.

¹ The Department funded a new application for grants in fiscal year 2018 from the fiscal year 2017 slate.

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 2020 are not included because the 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
2015	50%	19%
2016	55	58
2017	60	74
2018	65	81
2019	70	

Additional Information: Sustained and intensive professional development for the PDAE program is defined 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.

The low actual data for 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.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Arts in education

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

Year	Target	Actual
2015	100%	100%
2016	100	86
2017	100	100
2018	100	90
2019	100	

Additional Information: 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
2015	39%	35%
2016	35	32
2017	38	31
2018	37	32
2019	33	

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
2015	43%	40%
2016	39	38
2017	40	36
2018	39	35
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.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2015	859,273	1,245,824
2016	2,100,000	2,140,365
2017	1,820,000	1,823,785
2018	1,911,000	2,151,664
2019		

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Arts in education

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

Year	Target	Actual
2015	322,020	769,397
2016	800,000	806,092
2017	660,000	666,399
2018	693,500	693,065
2019		

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

Year	Target	Actual
2015	100,028	221,859
2016	200,000	219,316
2017	160,000	165,870
2018	168,000	173,195
2019		

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

Year	Target	Actual
2015	28%	48%
2016	50	52
2017	55	54
2018	57	85
2019		

Additional Information: Data for 2015 and 2016 are based on teacher participation in Changing Education Through the Arts, one of the programs 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 2020 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾

Budget Authority:

<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$12,000	0	-\$12,000

¹ A total of \$220,741 thousand is authorized for Title IV, Part F. Of the total amount appropriated for Title IV, Part F, \$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, typically for 5 years, 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, which may include 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)
2015.....	\$10,000
2016.....	12,000
2017.....	12,000
2018.....	12,000
2018.....	12,000

FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST

The request does not include funding for Javits Gifted and Talented Education, consistent with the Administration’s overall goal of refocusing Federal education investments on flexible State formula grant programs, eliminating duplicative activities, streamlining Federal program administration, and putting decision-making power back in the hands of States and local communities. 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 other Federal, State, local, or private resources, including the \$15.9 billion ESEA Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program, which includes provisions regarding identifying and improving instruction for gifted and talented students. 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>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
Amount for new awards	\$885	\$3,670	0
Number of new awards	1	6–9	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$10,114	\$7,210	0
Number of continuation awards	25	17	0
National Research Center for the Education of Gifted and Talented Children and Youth	\$1,000	0	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$1	\$120	0

NOTES: 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

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Javits gifted and talented education

Department did not reserve funds from the program for this purpose in fiscal year 2018, but may do so in fiscal year 2019.

The Department anticipates that we will not make a new award for the National Research Center for the Education of Gifted and Talented Children and Youth (Center) in fiscal year 2019, as we expect the current Center grantee will continue to operate under a no-cost extension.

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 reports data for the below measures twice over the grant period (at the middle and end of the period); results below are from the mid-term review of the 2014 and 2015 grantee cohorts. The Department is considering revising the measures to more effectively assess program performance in future years.

Goal: To improve the teaching and learning of gifted and talented students through research, demonstration projects, personnel training, and other activities of national significance.

Objective: *Develop models for developing the talents of students who are economically disadvantaged, are English learners, or have disabilities.*

Measure: The number of Javits Gifted and Talented Education project designs with average reviewer ratings for quality of high or above.

Nine of the 13 grantees in the 2014 cohort received an average reviewer rating of high or above in 2018.

Measure: The number of Javits Gifted and Talented Education projects with significant gains in academic achievement among target student populations.

Eleven of the 13 grantees in the 2014 cohort reported significant gains in academic achievement among target student populations in 2018.

Measure: The number of Javits Gifted and Talented Education project designs for effective professional development focusing on gifted and talented education with average reviewer ratings for quality of high or above.

Two of the eight grantees in the 2015 cohort, whose projects focused on professional development, received an average reviewer rating of high or above in 2018.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Statewide family engagement centers

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2020 Authorization: \$10,000

Budget Authority:

<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$10,000	0	-\$10,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Statewide Family Engagement Centers (SFEC) program provides funding to statewide organizations, or consortia of such organizations, to establish statewide centers that (1) carry out programs that promote parent and family engagement in education or (2) provide comprehensive training and technical assistance to State educational agencies (SEAs), local educational agencies (LEAs), schools, and organizations that support partnerships between families and schools.

Grantees must use funds to: assist parents in effectively participating in their children’s education; partner with SEAs to develop and implement systemic family engagement initiatives; and develop and implement parental involvement policies. Grantees must use at least 65 percent of their funds to serve LEAs, schools, and community-based organizations that serve high concentrations of disadvantaged students. In addition, grantees must use at least 30 percent of their funds to establish or expand technical assistance for evidence-based parent education programs. By statute, the Department gives priority to applicants that propose to use evidence-based strategies for improving family engagement in schools in general.

To help ensure that SFEC projects are supported in local communities and financially sustainable, grantees must secure matching funds from non-Federal sources after the first year of their projects. The Department may not award less than \$500,000 to an individual project, and may use up to 2 percent of funds to provide technical assistance to grantees on the establishment, development, and coordination of statewide family engagement centers.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2015.....	0
2016.....	0
2017.....	0
2018.....	\$10,000
2019.....	10,000

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Statewide family engagement centers

FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration's fiscal year 2020 request does not include funding for the SFEC program, reflecting an overall effort to refocus Federal education investments on flexible formula grant programs serving the Nation's most vulnerable student populations, eliminate duplicative activities, streamline Federal program administration, minimize regulations and requirements from Washington, and put decision-making power back in the hands of States and local communities.

While ensuring that families have access to a wide range of high-quality educational options remains a key priority, the Administration believes that the SFEC program is not designed to catalyze meaningful change for students and their families on a national scale. Moreover, other much larger Federal education programs already provide significant support for family engagement. For example, States participating in Title I, Part A of the ESEA must collect and disseminate effective parent and family engagement strategies to LEAs, which in turn must have written parent and family engagement policies as part of their local Title I plans and use a minimum of 1 percent of their Title I allocations (a potential total of approximately \$150 million nationwide) to conduct outreach to parents and family members and implement programs and activities to enhance their engagement in their children's education. Most other ESEA formula programs include similar requirements for State and local consultation with parents and other activities to promote parent and family involvement for the purpose of improving student achievement and other outcomes. Consequently, there is little need for a separate State-level family engagement program with a much more limited impact.

In fiscal year 2019, the Department funded one additional application from the 2018 slate that was not initially reviewed due to a clerical error and expects to use remaining funds for continuation awards. The Department would then encourage grantees to use statutorily required non-Federal matching funds to continue key activities in future years.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
Amount for awards	\$9,705	\$9,800	0
Number of new awards	11	1	0
Number of continuation awards	0	11	0
Technical assistance	\$200	\$200	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$95	0	0

NOTE: The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including SFECs, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. While the Department did not reserve funds from the SFEC program for this purpose in fiscal year 2018, it may do so in fiscal year 2019.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Statewide family engagement centers

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.

Fiscal year 2018 was the first year in which funds were appropriated for this program, so no performance data are currently available. The Administration set the following performance measures for the program:

- The number of parents who are participating in program activities designed to provide them with the information necessary to understand their annual school report cards and other opportunities for engagement under section 1116 and other related ESEA provisions.
- The number of high-impact activities or services provided to build a statewide infrastructure for systemic family engagement that includes support for State and local educational agency level leadership and capacity-building.
- The number of high-impact activities or services implemented to ensure that parents are trained and can effectively engage in activities that will improve student academic achievement, to include an understanding of how they can support learning in the classroom with activities at home or outside the school generally, as well as how they can participate in State and local decision-making processes.
- The percentage of parents and families receiving services who report having enhanced capacity to work with schools and service providers effectively in meeting the academic and developmental needs of their children.