

Department of Education
INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT
Fiscal Year 2021 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language	G-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	G-2
Appropriation, Adjustments, and Transfers	G-3
Summary of Changes	G-4
Authorizing Legislation.....	G-5
Appropriations History.....	G-6
Significant Items in FY 2020 Appropriations Reports.....	G-7
Summary of Request	G-11
Activities:	
Education innovation and research.....	G-13
Teacher and school leader incentive grants.....	G-22
American history and civics education	G-30
Supporting effective educator development	G-35
Charter schools grants.....	G-39
Magnet schools assistance.....	G-50
Ready to learn programming	G-55
Arts in education.....	G-59
Javits gifted and talented education.....	G-65
Statewide family engagement centers	G-68

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

[For carrying out activities authorized by subparts 1, 3 and 4 of part B of title II, and parts C, D, and E and subparts 1 and 4 of part F of title IV of the ESEA, \$1,103,815,000: *Provided*, That \$284,815,000 shall be for subparts 1, 3 and 4 of part B of title II and shall be made available without regard to sections 2201, 2231(b) and 2241:¹ *Provided further*, That \$629,000,000 shall be for parts C, 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 \$60,000,000 to carry out section 4304, of which not more than \$10,000,000 shall be available to carry out section 4304(k), \$140,000,000, to remain available through March 31, 2021, to carry out section 4305(b), and not more than \$15,000,000 to carry out the activities in section 4305(a)(3):⁴ *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 4601(b), \$190,000,000 shall be available through December 31, 2020 for subpart 1 of part F of title IV.]⁵ (*Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2020.*)

NOTES

The appropriations language for the Innovation and Improvement account is deleted because the fiscal year 2021 President's Budget Request would consolidate most formula and competitive grant programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended, and related programs, into an Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant in a new Improving Elementary and Secondary Education account.

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 \$284,815,000 shall be for subparts 1, 3 and 4 of part B of title II and shall be made available without regard to sections 2201, 2231(b) and 2241:]</p>	<p>This language provides funding for Teacher and School Leader Incentive Grants, American History and Civics Education, and Supporting Effective Educator Development without regard to the sections of the ESEA that specify the distribution of funds appropriated under title II of the ESEA.</p>
<p>² [<i>Provided further</i>, That \$629,000,000 shall be for parts C, 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:]</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.</p>
<p>⁴ [<i>Provided further</i>, That of the funds available for part C of title IV, the Secretary shall use \$60,000,000 to carry out section 4304, of which not more than \$10,000,000 shall be available to carry out section 4304(k), \$140,000,000, to remain available through March 31, 2021, 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 establishes, within the Charter Schools Grants appropriation, a specific funding amount for facilities grants and for Charter Management Organization grants and a maximum funding amount for State Facilities Incentive grants and for national activities. This language also extends the period of availability 6 months beyond the end of the appropriation year for the funds provided for Charter Management Organization grants.</p>
<p>⁵ [<i>Provided further</i>, That notwithstanding section 4601(b), \$190,000,000 shall be available through December 31, 2020 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>

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Appropriation, Adjustments, and Transfers
(dollars in thousands)

Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers	2019	2020	2021
Discretionary:			
Appropriation.....	<u>\$1,035,556</u>	<u>\$1,103,815</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, discretionary appropriation	1,035,556	1,103,815	0

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Summary of Changes
(dollars in thousands)

2020	\$1,103,815
2021	<u>0</u>
Net change	-\$1,103,815

Decreases:	<u>2020 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
Eliminate separate funding for the programs in this account because the fiscal year 2021 President's Budget Request would consolidate most elementary and secondary formula and competitive grant programs into an Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED Block Grant) in a new Improving Elementary and Secondary Education account. The ESED Block Grant would provide States with more flexible resources to allow them to determine how best to serve their students.	\$1,103,815	-\$1,103,815
Subtotal, decreases		<u>-1,103,815</u>
Net change		-1,103,815

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Authorizing Legislation
(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2020 Authorized	2020 Estimate	2021 Authorized	2021 Request
Education innovation and research (<i>ESEA IV-F-1</i>)	(1)	\$190,000	\$90,611 ²	0
Teacher and school leader incentive grants (<i>ESEA II-B-1</i>)	(3)	200,000	(2,3)	0
American history and civics education (<i>ESEA II-B-3</i>)	(3)	4,815	(2,3)	0
Supporting effective educator development (SEED) (<i>ESEA II-B-4, section 2242</i>)	(3)	80,000	(2,3)	0
Charter schools grants (<i>ESEA IV-C</i>)	300,000	440,000	300,000 ²	0
Magnet schools assistance (<i>ESEA IV-D</i>)	108,530	107,000	108,530 ²	0
Ready to learn programming (<i>ESEA IV-F-4, section 4643</i>)	(1)	29,000	(1,2)	0
Arts in education (<i>ESEA IV-F-4, section 4642</i>)	(1)	30,000	(1,2)	0
Javits gifted and talented education (<i>ESEA IV-F-4, section 4644</i>)	(1)	13,000	(1,2)	0
Statewide family engagement centers (<i>ESEA IV-E</i>)				
	<u>10,000</u>	<u>10,000</u>	<u>10,000²</u>	<u>0</u>
Total definite authorization	799,472		799,472	
Total appropriation		1,103,815		0

¹ For Part F of Title IV, a total of \$220,741 thousand is authorized for fiscal year 2020, of which \$5,000 thousand is reserved for Subpart 3. Of the remainder, 42 percent is authorized for Education Innovation and Research and 26 percent is authorized for Subpart 4, which includes Ready to Learn Programming, Arts in Education, and Javits Gifted and Talented Education.

² The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2021.

³ For Part B of Title II, a total of \$489,168 thousand is authorized for fiscal year 2020, of which 47 percent is authorized for Teacher and School Leader Incentive Grants, 4 percent is authorized for American History and Civics Education, and 14.8 percent is authorized for Subpart 4, of which not less than 74 percent is reserved for Supporting Effective Educator Development.

G-5

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2012 Discretionary	\$4,995,000	\$821,411 ¹	\$1,740,212 ¹	\$1,527,536
2013 Discretionary	4,332,166	799,133 ²	1,545,966 ²	1,447,637
2014 Discretionary	5,335,000	N/A ³	1,331,598 ⁴	931,317
2015 Discretionary	5,335,000	N/A ³	868,721 ⁴	852,111
2015 Mandatory	5,000,000	N/A ³	0 ⁴	0
2016 Discretionary	1,601,559	275,000 ⁵	694,616 ⁵	1,181,226
2016 Mandatory	1,000,000	0 ⁵	0 ⁵	0
2017 Discretionary	1,411,556	632,938 ⁶	942,743 ⁶	887,575 ⁶
2017 Mandatory	4,299,982	0 ⁶	0 ⁶	0 ⁶
2018 Discretionary	1,208,026	757,904 ⁷	880,375 ⁷	982,256 ⁷
2019 Discretionary	1,777,647	1,058,441 ⁸	1,042,256 ⁸	1,035,556 ⁸
2020 Discretionary	1,107,000	1,224,315	1,055,556 ⁹	1,103,815 ⁹
2021 Discretionary	0			

¹ The level for the House allowance reflects an introduced bill and the level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Committee action only.

² 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.

³ The House allowance is shown as N/A because there was no Subcommittee action.

⁴ The level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Subcommittee action only.

⁵ 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.

⁶ The levels for the House and Senate allowances reflect Committee action on the regular annual 2017 appropriation bill; the Appropriation reflects the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017.

⁷ 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).

⁸ 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).

⁹ The Senate allowance reflects the Chairman's mark; the Appropriation reflects the Further Consolidated Appropriation Act, 2020 (P.L. 116-94).

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Significant Items in FY 2020 Appropriations Reports—continued

Significant Items in FY 2020 Appropriations Reports

Education Innovation and Research (EIR)

Senate: The Committee directs the Department to brief the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on the fiscal year 2020 funding opportunities available under this program, including any specified priorities, not less than 30 days prior to releasing a notice inviting applications.

Managers' Statement: Grant Priorities – There is significant demand from the field to test many types of strategies and to examine promising techniques that can be scaled-up in different settings. EIR should continue to support diverse and field-initiated interventions. The Department is directed to brief the Committees on the fiscal year 2020 funding opportunities available under this program, including any specified priorities, not less than 30 days prior to releasing a notice inviting applications.

Response: The Department will brief the Committees by the specified deadline.

House: The Committee rejects the Administration's proposal to fund professional development vouchers for teachers and directs that no funds are to be used for that purpose.

Response: Although this restriction was included in the House appropriations bill, it was not included in the Senate bill nor the final bill that was enacted into law. Therefore, the Department intends to use a portion of the funds available for the EIR program for projects that provide professional development vouchers.

House: Within 90 days of enactment of this Act, the Department is directed to brief the Committees on Appropriations on plans for carrying out the SEL competition. In addition, the Department shall provide notice to the Committees at least seven days before grantees are announced.

Managers' Statement: Within the total for EIR, the agreement includes \$65,000,000 to provide grants for social and emotional learning (SEL). Within 90 days of enactment of this Act, the Department is directed to brief the Committees on plans for carrying out the SEL competition. In addition, the Department shall provide notice to the Committees at least seven days before grantees are announced.

Response: The Department will brief the Committees by the specified deadline.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Significant Items in FY 2020 Appropriations Reports—continued

Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED)

- Managers' Statement: Within SEED, the Department is directed to support professional development that helps educators incorporate SEL practices into teaching, and to support pathways into teaching that provide a strong foundation in child development and learning, including skills for implementing SEL strategies in the classroom. Within 90 days of enactment of this Act, the Department is directed to brief the Committees on plans for supporting SEL within SEED. In addition, the Department shall provide notice to the Committees at least seven days before grantees are announced.
- House: The Committee recognizes the importance of integrating SEL into educator professional preparation and ongoing professional support and provides resources to expand access to these competencies. Within 90 days of enactment of this Act, the Department is directed to brief the Committees on Appropriations on plans for carrying out the SEL SEED competition. In addition, the Department shall provide notice to the Committees at least seven days before grantees are announced.
- Response: The Department will brief the Committees by the specified deadline.
- Managers' Statement: In addition, the SEED program is an ideal vehicle for helping ensure that more highly trained school leaders are available to serve in traditionally underserved LEAs. Therefore, the Secretary shall use a portion of funds made available for SEED to support the preparation of principals and other school leaders.
- Senate: [T]he Committee directs the Secretary to use a portion of funds made available for SEED to support the preparation of principals and other school leaders.
- Response: The Department will comply with this request.
- Senate: The Committee directs the Department to ensure grants are awarded to a diverse set of eligible entities operating programs of national significance, consistent with Congressional intent.
- House: Further, 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 ESEA) across a number of sites which can help bring to scale evidence-based programs of national significance across the country.
- Response: The SEED statute specifies that institutions of higher education, national nonprofit entities, the Bureau of Indian Education, or partnerships of one or more of those entities are eligible to receive awards, and requires the Department to ensure that, to the extent practicable, grants are distributed amount eligible

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Significant Items in FY 2020 Appropriations Reports—continued

entities that will serve geographically diverse areas. The Department will abide by these requirements.

Charter Schools Grants

Senate: In addition to standard reprogramming requirements, the Committee directs the Department to notify and brief the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate as soon as possible of any need to reprogram funds between the activities specified above.

Response: The Department will comply with this request.

House: The Committee is deeply concerned that the Department does not intend to be a responsible steward of taxpayer dollars when it comes to CSP funding, as it has rejected the multiple ED–OIG audit recommendations. Therefore, the Committee directs the Department, within 180 days of the enactment of this Act, to implement all of the recommendations included in the September 2018 ED–OIG report and brief the Committees on Appropriations on plans for implementation within 30 days of enactment of this Act.

Response: The Department has implemented actions that address each of the three recommendations in the September 2018 report and is working with the Office of Inspector General to conclude this audit.

House: The Committee directs the Department to include in their evaluation of State entity Charter School grant programs the extent to which State entities are utilizing this seven percent to ensure that charter schools receiving CSP grants are equipped to appropriately serve students with disabilities and, by extension, prepared to become high-quality charter schools. Further, the Committee directs the Department to include a summary of its findings in its fiscal year 2021 Congressional Budget Justification.

Senate: The Committee encourages the Department to include in their review of State entity grantees a review of how State entities are utilizing this 7 percent set-aside, including but not limited to the extent to which State entities are using it to ensure that charter schools receiving CSP grants are equipped to appropriately serve all students, including students with disabilities. The Committee further requests that the Department include in its CJs, starting with submissions for the 2021 fiscal year, a summary of those findings.

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

House: In addition, the Committee notes widespread findings of waste and abuse in the for-profit virtual charter school sector and directs the Department to provide the Committees on Appropriations, within 180 days of enactment of this Act, the amount of CSP funding this sector received between fiscal years 2014 through

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Significant Items in FY 2020 Appropriations Reports—continued

fiscal year 2019. In addition, the Department shall provide the total funding for all of the agency's programs that goes to for-profit, virtual charter schools.

Response: The Department will comply with this request.

Statewide Family Engagement Centers

Managers'

Statement: The Committee is aware that the Department did not score a valid application for funding under the Statewide Family Engagement Centers program prior to making initial awards under the program at the end of fiscal year 2018. The Department subsequently scored this application and then awarded funding out of fiscal year 2019 resources since the application scored high enough to have been awarded a grant among those initially selected for an award in fiscal year 2018. This action created an approximately \$1,000,000 shortfall in funding for fiscal year 2019 with each fiscal year 2018 funded grantee receiving a notice from the Department that their second-year grant funding would be reduced by 9 percent. The Committee opposes this stated policy because of the impact of these cuts on the ability of centers to robustly engage families just as centers are beginning to ramp up their work as indicated in approved grant applications. The Committee directs the Secretary to avoid imposing such cuts and to work with the Committee using available flexibility and resources to implement a solution for this problem.

Response: The Department corrected the shortfall in fiscal year 2019 by reprogramming Charter School Program funds to the Statewide Family Engagement Centers program.

[Click here for accessible version](#)

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2021 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(in thousands of dollars)

	Cat Code	2019 Appropriation	2020 Appropriation	2021 President's Budget	2021 President's Budget Compared to 2020 Appropriation	
					Amount	Percent

Innovation and Improvement

1.	Education innovation and research (ESEA IV-F-1)	D	130,000	190,000	0	(190,000)	-100.00%
2.	Teacher and school leader incentive grants (ESEA II-B-1)	D	200,000	200,000	0	(200,000)	-100.00%
3.	American history and civics education (ESEA II-B-3)	D	4,815	4,815	0	(4,815)	-100.00%
4.	Supporting effective educator development (SEED) (ESEA II-B-4, section 2242)	D	75,000	80,000	0	(80,000)	-100.00%
5.	Charter schools grants (ESEA IV-C) ¹	D	427,859	440,000	0	(440,000)	-100.00%
6.	Magnet schools assistance (ESEA IV-D) ¹	D	113,701	107,000	0	(107,000)	-100.00%
7.	Ready to learn programming (ESEA IV-F-4, section 4643)	D	27,741	29,000	0	(29,000)	-100.00%
8.	Arts in education (ESEA IV-F-4, section 4642)	D	29,000	30,000	0	(30,000)	-100.00%
9.	Javits gifted and talented education (ESEA IV-F-4, section 4644)	D	12,000	13,000	0	(13,000)	-100.00%
10.	Statewide family engagement centers (ESEA IV-E) ¹	D	15,440	10,000	0	(10,000)	-100.00%
Total		D	1,035,556	1,103,815	0	(1,103,815)	-100.00%

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

¹ The 2019 Appropriation column reflects a reprogramming of \$12,141 thousand from Charter Schools Grants to Magnet Schools Assistance (\$6,700 thousand) and Statewide Family Engagement Centers (\$5,440 thousand).

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Summary of Request

The Administration is not requesting any funds for the programs in the Innovation and Improvement account for fiscal year 2021. Instead, the request proposes to consolidate most formula and competitive grant programs authorized by the ESEA (including all the programs in this account) as well as related programs into an Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED Block Grant). This proposal builds on the 2015 Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which reauthorized the ESEA and sought to restore State and local control over education by significantly reducing the mandates from Washington accompanying Federal education funds. The ESED Block Grant would further right-size the Federal role in education and allow States to decide how best to use ESEA funds to address local educational needs and circumstances and improve outcomes for all students. The request would consolidate more than 30 Federal elementary and secondary education programs into a single \$19.5 billion formula grant program. State educational agencies and local educational agencies would have discretion to use ESED Block Grant funds for any purpose authorized by the ESEA, including activities currently funded by programs in this account.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Education innovation and research

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2021 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾

Budget Authority:

<u>2020</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>2021</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>2020 to 2021</u>
\$190,000	0	-\$190,000

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.

² The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2021.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Education Innovation and Research (EIR) 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. The EIR program supports innovative and proven approaches that address persistent education challenges while also building knowledge of what works in education.

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 replications 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; (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; 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. All grantees must carry out rigorous, independent evaluations of the effectiveness of their projects.

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

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Education innovation and research

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)
2016	\$120,000
2017	100,000
2018	120,000
2019	130,000
2020	190,000

FY 2021 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2021, the Request would consolidate the Education Innovation and Research program into the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED Block Grant), which would combine nearly all currently funded formula and competitive grant programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as well as several related programs, into a single State formula grant program.

ESED Block Grant funds would be allocated by formula to State educational agencies and local educational agencies, which would have discretion to use those funds for any authorized purpose of the consolidated programs, including activities currently supported by EIR. In particular, States could use the 10 percent reservation for State-level activities under the ESED Block to support evidence-building activities similar to those currently funded by EIR. For more information on the ESED Block Grant, see the Improving Elementary and Secondary Education account.

During initial implementation of the ESED Block Grant, the Department would reserve sufficient funds to pay continuation awards to existing EIR grantees through the end of their approved project periods. While initial EIR awards are frontloaded and do not entail continuation costs, the Department may reserve ESED Block Grant funds to pay 2-year renewal awards for particularly promising EIR projects.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Education innovation and research

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
EIR competition			
Amount for grants	\$124,737	\$178,600	0
Number of new awards	42	35-50	0
Range of new awards	\$2,105–8,659	\$3,000–15,000	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$527	\$1,900	0
National activities	\$4,736	\$9,500	0

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 Federal resources provided for the program as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by the program.

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

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 targets of students served.

Year	Target	Actual
2016	66%	66%
2017	66	75
2018	66	
2019	66	
2020	66	
2021	66	

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

Year	Target	Actual
2016	65%	N/A
2017	65	N/A
2018	65	
2019	65	
2020	65	
2021	65	

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

Year	Target	Actual
2016	68%	52%
2017	68	50
2018	68	
2019	68	
2020	68	
2021	68	

Measure: The percentage of Mid-phase grantees that reached the targeted number of students specified in their applications by the end of the project.

Year	Target	Actual
2016	65%	N/A
2017	65	80%
2018	65	
2019	65	
2020	65	
2021		

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 on 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 and 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 September 2020.

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 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 an 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
2016	83%	100%
2017	100	100
2018	100	100
2019	100	
2020	100	
2021	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
2016	78%	96%
2017	100	100
2018	100	100
2019	100	
2020	100	
2021	100	

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

Year	Target	Actual
2016	96%	98%
2017	100	98
2018	100	100
2019	100	
2020	100	
2021	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 2019 will be available by December 2020.

Measure: The percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by an 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
2016	83%	100%
2017	100	100
2018	100	100
2019	100	
2020	100	
2021	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
2016	93%	96%
2017	100	100
2018	100	100
2019	100	
2020	100	
2021	100	

Measure: The percentage of programs, practices, or strategies supported by an 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
2016	95%	98%
2017	100	98
2018	100	100
2019	100	
2020	100	
2021		

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 2019 will be available by December 2020.

Efficiency measures

The Department established cost per student as the efficiency measure for the program. 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 of the significant evaluation costs for projects under this program.

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 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 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

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Education innovation and research

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 September 2020.

Measure: The cost per student served by grant type.

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 by grant type 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 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:

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Education innovation and research

- 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 2021 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾

Budget Authority:

<u>2020</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>2021</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>2020 to 2021</u>
\$200,000	0	-\$200,000

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, 47 percent is available for Subpart 1 activities.

² The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2021.

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 and 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 measurable 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,

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Teacher and school leader incentive grants

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

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

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

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

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2016.....	\$230,000
2017.....	200,000
2018.....	200,000
2019.....	200,000
2020.....	200,000

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Teacher and school leader incentive grants

FY 2021 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2021, the Request would consolidate the TSL program into the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED Block Grant), which would combine nearly all currently funded formula and competitive grant programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as well as several related programs, into a single State formula grant program.

ESED Block Grant funds would be allocated by formula to State educational agencies and local educational agencies (LEAs), which would have discretion to use those funds for any authorized purpose of the consolidated programs, including activities currently supported by the TSL program. For more information on the ESED Block Grant, see the Improving Elementary and Secondary Education account.

During initial implementation of the ESED Block Grant, the Department would reserve sufficient funds to pay continuation awards to existing TSL grantees through the end of their approved project periods. In fiscal year 2021, the Department anticipates the continuation costs would be approximately \$104 million.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
Funding			
New awards	\$6,100	\$65,795	0
Continuation awards	191,900	103,687	0
Grant renewal awards	0	28,198	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	320	0
Evaluation and technical assistance	<u>2,000</u>	<u>2,000</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	200,000	200,000	0
Grant Award Information			
Number of new awards	1	8-12	0
Range of new awards	\$6,100	\$5,000-\$10,000	0
Number of continuation awards	27	14	0
Range of continuation awards	\$781-\$14,703	\$680-\$13,635	0
Number of renewal awards	0	5-7	0
Range of renewal awards	0	\$5,000-\$7,000	0

NOTES: 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 2019 but may do so in fiscal year 2020. Any amount pooled under section 8601 would not exceed the 1 percent evaluation and technical assistance reservation authorized for the TSL program. Continuation costs of approximately \$104,222 thousand for projects with outstanding continuation costs would be provided under the fiscal year 2021 request for the Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Teacher and school leader incentive grants

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 Federal resources provided for the program as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by the program. No targets are provided for 2021 because baseline data for the current measures are not yet available.

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. The final year for which data were reported for the 2012 cohort of grantees is 2017 and those data have not yet been analyzed.

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.

Goal: Improve student achievement by increasing teacher and principal effectiveness by reforming teacher and principal compensation systems so that teachers and principals are rewarded for increases in student achievement.

Objective: Show an increase in the percentage of teachers and principals in high-need schools who have a record of effectiveness.

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

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Teacher and school leader incentive grants

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.

Measure: The percentage of school districts participating in a Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF, the predecessor of the TSL program) 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 are reporting performance data based on 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.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Teacher and school leader incentive grants

- 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. Department staff are reviewing year 1 data from the 2016 and 2017 cohorts and anticipate completing analyses in the early spring of 2020. The Department anticipates completing the analysis of year 2 data in the summer of 2020.

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

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

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Teacher and school leader incentive grants

achievement: there was no impact on reading/English language arts achievement in either study year and 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 Fund¹ 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).

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.

In September 2018, IES began a new Impact Evaluation to Inform the Teacher and School Leader Incentive Program² that is designed to answer the following questions:

- What are the implementation experiences of the 2017 TSL grantees? What are their educator satisfaction, recruitment, and retention experiences with TSL, particularly among those grantees funding teacher leader roles?
- What is the effect on student achievement, educator satisfaction, recruitment, and retention of a teacher leader role strategy? Is the teacher leader strategy cost effective?

The evaluation will provide implementation information from all 2017 grantees, including information about strategies supported by grant funds. For those grantees supporting a teacher leader role, information will include teacher leader responsibilities and their teaching load, the stipend amount, how grantees select and train their teacher leader, the types of teachers targeted for support, and district and school contexts that facilitate or hinder the teacher leader

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

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

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Teacher and school leader incentive grants

role implementation. In addition, the evaluation will recruit approximately 100 schools to participate in an impact evaluation of funding teacher leaders to support their peers using activities similar to that funded within the TSL grantees.

Data collection will include a TSL grantee survey of all 14 TSL grantees receiving awards in 2017 to gather information about their TSL program; teacher and principal surveys to collect program implementation information as well as educator satisfaction and teacher recruitment activities and outcomes; teacher leader activity forms to provide information about teacher leader roles and activities; teacher and principal school assignment records to look at mobility and retention; student administrative records to look at student outcomes.

- The first report from the study is expected in 2021 and the study is scheduled for completion in August 2023.

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 2021 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾

Budget Authority:

<u>2020</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>2021</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>2020 to 2021</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.

² The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2021.

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

Presidential Academies for the Teaching of American History and Civics offer intensive 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. 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 maximize both the impact of the Federal investment and 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 past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2016.....	\$1,815
2017.....	3,515
2018.....	3,515
2019.....	4,815
2020.....	4,815

FY 2021 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2021, the Request would consolidate the American History and Civics Education program into the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED Block Grant), which would combine nearly all currently funded formula and competitive grant programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as well as several related programs, into a single State formula grant program.

ESED Block Grant funds would be allocated by formula to State and local educational agencies, which would have discretion to use those funds for any authorized purpose of the consolidated programs, including activities similar to those supported by the American History and Civics Education program. For more information on the ESED Block Grant, see the Improving Elementary and Secondary Education account.

During initial implementation of the ESED Block Grant, the Department would reserve sufficient funds to pay continuation awards to existing American History and Civics Education grantees through the end of their approved project periods. In fiscal year 2021, the Department anticipates the continuation costs would be approximately \$4 million.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

American history and civics education

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
American History and Civics Academies grants			
Amount for continuation awards	\$1,815	\$1,815	0
Number of continuation awards	3	3	0
National Activities grants			
Amount for new awards	\$1,822	0	0
Number of new awards	3 ¹	0	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$1,178	\$3,000	0
Number of continuation awards	2	5	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 2019, but may do so in fiscal year 2020.

Continuation costs of approximately \$3,994 thousand would be provided for projects with outstanding continuation costs under the fiscal year 2021 request for the ESED Block Grant, including \$1,018 thousand for American History and Civics Academies grants and \$2,976 thousand for National Activities grants.

¹ New National Activities awards with fiscal year 2019 funds included two grants from a prior-year slate as well as a one-time award, supported through an interagency agreement with the National Endowment for the Humanities, for a set of convenings of subject-matter experts and practitioners to highlight innovative and evidence-based practices.

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

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

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

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

American history and civics education

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

Year	Target	Actual
2017	10%	13%
2018	10	15
2019	10	14
2020	10	
2021	10	

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

Year	Target	Actual
2017	10%	10%
2018	10	15
2019	10	11
2020	10	
2021	10	

Additional information: Data are from assessments created by the grantees' evaluators drawing on questions from nationally validated U.S. History tests.

Excludes data from a 2017 grantee that were deemed not comparable to performance data from other grantees due to the assessment instruments used. The 2017 grantee, which 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, reported average content knowledge gains of 25 percent for Presidential Academy teachers and 20 percent for Congressional Academy students in 2018, and gains of 23 and 15 percent, respectively, 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.*

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

American history and civics education

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

Year	Target	Actual
2018	10%	28%
2019	10	21
2020	10	
2021	10	

Additional information: Data are from assessments of participating teachers created by the grantees' evaluators drawing on questions from nationally validated U.S. History tests.

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 2021 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾ ⁽²⁾

Budget Authority:

	<u>2020</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>2021</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>2020 to 2021</u>
	\$80,000	0	-\$80,000

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

² The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2021.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED) grant 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 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.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Supporting effective educator development

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2016	\$93,993
2017	65,000
2018	75,000
2019	75,000
2020	80,000

FY 2021 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2021, the Request would consolidate the SEED program into the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED Block Grant), which would combine nearly all currently funded formula and competitive grant programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as well as several related programs, into a single State formula grant program.

ESED Block Grant funds would be allocated by formula to State educational agencies and local educational agencies (LEAs), which would have discretion to use those funds for any authorized purpose of the consolidated programs, including activities currently supported by SEED. For more information on the ESED Block Grant, see the Improving Elementary and Secondary Education account.

During initial implementation of the ESED Block Grant, the Department would reserve sufficient funds to pay continuation awards to current SEED grantees through the end of their approved project periods. In fiscal year 2021, the Department anticipates the continuation costs for the SEED grantees will be approximately \$45.3 million.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Supporting effective educator development

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
Project Funding:			
New grant awards	\$8,444	\$22,260	0
Continuation grant awards	66,556	50,051	0
Renewal awards	0	7,419	0
Peer review of new award applications	<u>0</u>	<u>270</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	75,000	80,000	0
Grant Award Information			
Number of new awards	1	8	0
Range of new awards	NA	\$750-\$1,500	0
Number of continuation awards	24	15	0
Range of continuation awards	\$481-\$5,417	\$810-\$8,203	0
Number of renewal awards	0	2-3	0
Range of renewal awards	NA	\$2,473-\$3,710	0

NOTES:

The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including Supporting Effective Educator Development, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. The Department did not pool evaluation funds in fiscal year 2019 but may do so in fiscal year 2020.

Continuation costs of approximately \$45,345 thousand in fiscal year 2021 for projects with outstanding continuation costs would be paid from a reservation for that purpose from the Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant.

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 Federal resources provided for the program as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by the program. Targets were not set for the program measures.

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;

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Supporting effective educator development

- 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) provided data on the second measure and reported that 28 percent of the participants served in schools with concentrations of high-need students and were highly effective. Data on this measure are not yet available for the other grantees.

No data are yet available for the remaining two measures. The Department will have final performance reports for the entire 2015 cohort by the end of 2020 so will be able to summarize performance information for the cohort by early 2021.

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. Years 1 and 2 performance information for the 2017 and 2018 cohorts will be available in late 2020. The Department also expects to receive information from 2-year evaluation extension awards made in 2016 to three of the 2013 grantees, the National Writing Project, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2021 Authorization: \$300,000¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2020</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>2021</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>2020 to 2021</u>
\$440,000	0	-\$440,000

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2021.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Charter Schools Grants support 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.

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

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

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.

Since fiscal year 2018, funds for CMO grants have been available for obligation by the Department for an 18-month period, or until March 31 of the fiscal year following the year in which they are appropriated.

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

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

facilities and guarantee and insure leases of personal and real property. These credit enhancements are intended to reduce risk to lenders, thereby creating access to credit or lowering interest rates and costs of borrowing for charter schools.

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

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)
2016.....	\$333,172
2017.....	342,172
2018.....	400,000
2019.....	427,859 ¹
2020.....	440,000

¹ Reflects a reprogramming of \$12,141 thousand from Charter Schools Grants to other programs in the Innovation and Improvement account, including \$6,700 thousand to Magnet Schools Assistance and \$5,440 thousand to Statewide Family Engagement Centers.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

FY 2021 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2021, the Request would consolidate the Charter Schools Grants program into the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED Block Grant), which would combine nearly all currently funded formula and competitive grant programs authorized by the ESEA, as well as several related programs, into a single State formula grant program.

ESED Block Grant funds would be allocated by formula to SEAs and LEAs, which would have discretion to use those funds for any authorized purpose of the consolidated programs, including activities currently funded by Charter Schools Grants. For example, an SEA could operate a State Entity Grant program without the burden and uncertainty of applying for a competitive grant for that purpose from the Department. For more information on the ESED Block Grant, see the Improving Elementary and Secondary Education account.

During the initial implementation of the ESED Block Grant, the Department would reserve sufficient funds to pay continuation awards to existing Charter Schools grantees through the end of their approved project periods. In fiscal year 2021, the Department anticipates the continuation costs will be approximately \$270 million.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
State Entity grants			
Amount for new awards	\$25,840	\$81,551	0
Number of new awards	3	3–8	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$105,269	\$132,999	0
Number of continuation awards	22	20	0
Amount for supplemental awards	\$85,488	0	0
Number of supplemental awards	9	0	0
Developer grants			
Amount for new awards	\$5,533	\$3,930	0
Number of new awards	8	8–12	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$291	\$6,070	0
Number of continuation awards	32	36	0
Peer review of new State Entity and Developer award applications	\$439	\$450	0
CMO grants			
Amount for new awards	\$66,225	0	0
Number of new awards	15–22	0	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$68,775	\$139,800	0
Number of continuation awards	54	60–67	0
Peer review of new award applications	0 ¹	\$200 ¹	0

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
Credit Enhancement grants			
Amount for new awards	\$43,721	\$44,421	0
Number of new awards	5	3-5	0
Amount for supplemental awards	\$5,078	\$10,479	0
Number of supplemental awards	1	1	0
State Facilities Incentive grants			
Amount for new awards	\$6,000	0	0
Number of new awards	1	0	0
Amount for continuation awards	0	\$5,000	0
Number of continuation awards	0	1	0
Peer review of new Credit Enhancement and State Facilities Incentive award applications	\$201	\$100	0
National activities	\$14,999	\$15,000	0

NOTES:

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 2019, but may do so in fiscal year 2020.

Continuation costs of approximately \$270,102 thousand would be provided for projects with outstanding continuation costs under the fiscal year 2021 request for the ESED Block Grant, including \$146,000 thousand for State Entity grants, \$6.324 thousand for Developer grants, \$113,778 thousand for CMO grants, and \$4,000 thousand for State Facilities Incentive grants.

¹ Fiscal year 2020 funds will support peer review of new award applications for CMO grants made with fiscal year 2019 funds, which are available through March 31, 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 future years as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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
2016	8,010	6,859
2017	8,480	7,014
2018	8,950	7,196
2019	9,420	
2020	9,890	
2021	10,360	

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
2016	79.2%	49.4%
2017	84.2	49.8
2018	89.2	48.6
2019	94.2	
2020	99.2	
2021	100.0	

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
2016	76.4%	45.8%
2017	81.4	46.8
2018	86.4	45.0
2019	91.4	
2020	96.4	
2021	100.0	

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
2016	81.6%	53.8%
2017	86.6	52.3
2018	91.6	48.7

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

Year	Target	Actual
2019	96.6	
2020	100.0	
2021	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
2016	68.7%	40.6%
2017	73.7	43.2
2018	78.7	40.2
2019	83.7	
2020	88.7	
2021	98.7	

Additional information: 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
2016	1.25 : 1	3.99 : 1
2017	1.67 : 1	6.10 : 1
2018	2.50 : 1	6.12 : 1
2019	5.00 : 1	6.51 : 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 2018, Credit Enhancement grants leveraged \$493 million in facilities financing for 34 schools. Between program inception and 2018, Credit Enhancement funds have helped enable approximately \$5.8 billion in financing for facilities of 791 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 2016 show an average cost of \$1,173, for 2017 an average cost of \$1,168, and for 2018 an average cost of \$1,078. Data for this measure, collected through

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

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 *Principles and Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing* published by the National Association of Charter School Authorizers) and is available to assist State Entity grantees in implementing the protocol for authorizers in their States. In 2020, the Resource Center will begin providing other enhanced support to State Entity grantees and hosting an online exchange for grantee practices on its website.

State Entity grantees are still in the early phases of designing and carrying out their set-aside activities. The Department (through the Resource Center) is conducting a summary and analysis of those activities, with initial results expected in spring 2020. 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 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 school authorizing and oversight.¹ These projects 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.

¹ See <https://oese.ed.gov/offices/office-of-discretionary-grants-support-services/charter-school-programs/expanding-opportunity-through-quality-charter-schools-program-csp-national-dissemination-grants/awards/>.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

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 a framework for high-quality authorizing and oversight, both of which are expected to be released in spring 2020.

Lastly, the Department 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 beginning 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.

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;
- 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.² 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

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

² See <https://credo.stanford.edu/studies/charter-school-studies> for links to reports from the CREDO studies.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

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 time period.

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.

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.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Charter schools grants

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 2021 Authorization: \$108,530¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2020</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>2021</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>2020 to 2021</u>
\$107,000	0	-\$107,000

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2021.

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 5-year awards 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 up to 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

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Magnet schools assistance

did not receive a grant the previous year receive priority for any funds appropriated above \$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)
2016	\$96,647
2017	97,647
2018	105,000
2019	113,700 ¹
2020	107,000

¹ Reflects a reprogramming of \$6,700 thousand from the Charter Schools Program to MSAP.

FY 2021 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2021, the Request would consolidate the MSAP program into the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED Block Grant), which would combine nearly all currently funded formula and competitive grant programs authorized by the ESEA, as well as several related programs, into a single State formula grant program.

ESED Block Grant funds would be allocated by formula to State educational agencies and LEAs, which would have discretion to use those funds consistent with any authorized purpose of the consolidated programs, including the creation or expansion of magnet schools or related activities designed to reduce racial isolation or increase socioeconomic diversity in public schools. For more information on the ESED Block Grant, see the Improving Elementary and Secondary Education account.

During initial implementation of the ESED Block Grant, the Department would reserve sufficient funds to pay continuation awards to existing MSAP grantees through the end of their approved project periods. In fiscal year 2021, the Department anticipates the continuation costs will be approximately \$107 million.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Magnet schools assistance

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
Amount for new awards	0	\$25,000	0
Number of new awards	0	9-10	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$112,632	\$80,730	0
Number of continuation awards	36	36	0
National activities	\$1,068	\$1,070	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$200	0

NOTES:

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 2019, but may do so in fiscal year 2020.

Continuation costs of approximately \$107,000 thousand would be provided under the fiscal year 2021 request for the ESED Block Grant.

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

The Department does not set aggregate performance targets for this program; rather, each grantee sets project-level performance targets. Data are from annual performance reports.

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.*

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Magnet schools assistance

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

Year	2013 Cohort	2016 Cohort	2017 Cohort
2016	23.5%		
2017		39.0%	
2018		21.1	45.2%
2019		10.5	36.3

Additional information: In 2019, about 10 percent (four schools) of the 38 schools in the 2016 cohort met their annual MGI performance targets, and 90 percent (34 schools) did not meet annual MGI performance measure targets. Of the 34 schools that did not meet their annual MGI performance targets, 19 schools made progress in the right direction toward achieving their targets. For the 2017 cohort, 36 percent (45 schools) of the 124 schools met their annual MGI targets; 79 schools did not meet or partially met them. Of the 77 schools that did not meet or partially met their targets, 40 schools made progress in the right direction.

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
2016	43.5%	
2017		35.4%
2018		39.3
2019		41.2

Additional information: Based on lessons learned administering the program, the Department has revised the measure for the 2017 cohort to focus on 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
2016	36.0%	
2017		34.1%
2018		35.9
2019		38.8

Additional information: Based on lessons learned administering the program, the Department has revised the measure for the 2017 cohort to focus on 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
2016	\$916	
2017		\$722
2018		1,235
2019		1,084

Additional information:

The Department has discontinued this measure for the 2017 cohort because it has not proven to be a useful indicator of grantee performance.

Based on lessons learned in measuring grantee performance, the Department introduced two new performance measures for the 2017 cohort focused on the percentage increase in students scoring at the proficient level or above on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics.

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

Year	2017 Cohort
2018	5.7%
2019	9.3

Additional information: The reported percentage for 2019 reflects data from 119 of the 124 cohort schools. These schools had achievement data from Years 1 and 2 available, both of which are required to calculate performance on this measure.

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

Year	2017 Cohort
2018	9.4%
2019	9.6

Additional information: The reported percentage for 2019 reflects data from 115 of the 124 cohort schools. These schools had achievement data from Years 1 and 2 available, both of which are required to calculate performance on this measure.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Ready to learn programming

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2021 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾

Budget Authority:

<u>2020 Appropriation</u>	<u>2021 Request</u>	<u>Change from 2020 to 2021</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 Ready to Learn program.

² The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2021.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

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

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Ready to learn programming

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

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

The Department awarded two 5-year grants in 2015:

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

The Department plans to hold a competition for new 5-year grants in fiscal year 2020.

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

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2016.....	\$25,741
2017.....	25,741
2018.....	27,741
2019.....	27,741
2020.....	29,000

FY 2021 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2021, the Request would consolidate the RTL program into the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED Block Grant), which would combine nearly all currently funded formula and competitive grant programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as well as several related programs, into a single State formula grant program.

ESED Block Grant funds would be allocated by formula to State and local educational agencies, which would have discretion to use those funds for any authorized purpose of the consolidated programs, including support for activities similar to those funded by RTL. For more information on the ESED Block Grant, see the Improving Elementary and Secondary Education account.

During initial implementation of the ESED Block Grant, the Department would reserve sufficient funds to pay continuation awards to existing RTL grantees through the end of their approved

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Ready to learn programming

project periods. In fiscal year 2021, the Department anticipates the continuation costs will be approximately \$28.7 million.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
Number of new awards	0	1	0
New award funding	0	\$28,710	0
Number of continuation awards	2	0	0
Continuation award funding	\$27,691	0	0
Evaluation (review of grant products)	\$50	0	0
Peer review of new award applications	<u>0</u>	<u>\$290</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	27,741	29,000	0

NOTES:

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 2019, it may do so in fiscal year 2020.

Continuation costs of approximately \$28,710 thousand for projects with outstanding continuation costs would be provided under the fiscal year 2021 request for the Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

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;

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Ready to learn programming

- (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. However, both grantees experienced delays in production. The Department expects to receive the first of the studies in 2020.

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. In 2019, the Department received one transmedia suite from each grantee to review, both of which were high-quality with scores of 4.52 and 3.85.

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 (TPT) did not report any users for 2018. In 2019, 19.0 million users accessed RTL-produced products, 19.0 million for CPB and 1.2 thousand for TPT. TPT does not plan to publicly release any new digital games or TV episodes until summer 2020.

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. In the fourth year of the 2015 grants, the two grantees leveraged \$11.8 million of non-Federal support compared to \$11.6 million in Federal dollars spent on production, or \$1.02 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 2021 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾

Budget Authority:

<u>2020</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>2021</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>2020 to 2021</u>
\$30,000	0	-\$30,000

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.

² The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2021.

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 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 as follows:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2016.....	\$27,000
2017.....	27,000
2018.....	29,000
2019.....	29,000
2020.....	30,000

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Arts in education

FY 2021 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2021, the Request would consolidate the Arts in Education program into the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED Block Grant), which would combine nearly all currently funded formula and competitive grant programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as well as several related programs, into a single State formula grant program.

ESED Block Grant funds would be allocated by formula to SEAs and LEAs, which would have discretion to use those funds for any authorized purpose of the consolidated programs, including a wide range of activities to support arts education. For more information on the ESED Block Grant, see the Improving Elementary and Secondary Education account.

During initial implementation of the ESED Block Grant, the Department would reserve sufficient funds to pay continuation awards to existing Arts in Education grantees through the end of their approved project periods. In fiscal year 2021, the Department anticipates the continuation costs will be approximately \$14 million.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
<i>Arts Development and Dissemination</i>			
Total funds available	\$12,957	\$13,800	0
Amount for new awards	0	0	0
Number of new awards	0	0	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$12,457	\$13,300	0
Number of continuation awards	23	23	0
Interagency transfer to support the Arts Education Partnership	\$500	\$500	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	0	0
<i>Professional Development for Arts Educators (PDAE)</i>			
Total funds available	\$7,511	\$7,642	0
Amount for new awards	0	0	0
Number of new awards	0	0	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$7,511	\$7,642	0
Number of continuation awards	21	21	0

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Arts in education

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
<i>National Arts in Education Program (AENP)</i>			
Total funds available	\$8,000	\$8,000	0
Amount for new awards	0	0	0
Number of new awards	0	0	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$8,000	0	0
Number of continuation awards	1	0	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	0	0
<i>Evaluation</i>	\$532	\$558	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 2019, it may do so in fiscal year 2020.

Continuation costs of approximately \$14,031 thousand for projects with outstanding continuation costs would be provided under the fiscal year 2021 request for the Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant.

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

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.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Arts in education

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

Year	Target	Actual
2016	55%	58%
2017	60	74
2018	65	81
2019	70	60
2020	65	
2021	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 fiscal year 2018 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, and that may explain the lower actual reported for the 2019 data.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2016	100%	86%
2017	100	100
2018	100	90
2019	100	74
2020	75	
2021	80	

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. The fiscal year 2018 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, and that may explain the lower actual reported for the 2019 data.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Arts in education

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

Year	Treatment	Control
2016	35%	32%
2017	38	31
2018	37	32
2019	40	39
2020	42	
2021	44	

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

Year	Treatment	Control
2016	39%	38%
2017	40	36
2018	39	35
2019	45	49
2020	50	
2021	55	

Measure: The number of accessible, arts-based instructional materials that are developed. Grantees will report annually on each measure.

Year	Target	Actual
2019	84	84
2020	100	
2021	115	

Additional Information: This measure was added to the Arts Development and Dissemination program for the fiscal year 2018 cohort in response to statutory changes to the program authorization. Data for 2019 represents a baseline set by the fiscal year 2018 cohort.

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

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Arts in education

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

Year	Target	Actual
2016	2,100,000	2,140,365
2017	1,820,000	1,823,785
2018	1,911,000	2,151,664
2019	1,130,000	1,527,535
2020		
2021		

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

Year	Target	Actual
2016	800,000	806,092
2017	660,000	666,399
2018	693,500	693,065
2019	490,227	490,227
2020		
2021		

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

Year	Target	Actual
2016	200,000	219,316
2017	160,000	165,870
2018	168,000	173,195
2019	135,000	135,074
2020		
2021		

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

Year	Target	Actual
2016	50%	52%
2017	55	54
2018	57	85

Additional Information: Data for 2016 is 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 2021 Authorization: ⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾

Budget Authority:

<u>2020</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>2021</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>2020 to 2021</u>
\$13,000	0	-\$13,000

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.

² The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2021.

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 (LEAs), 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 as follows:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2016.....	\$12,000
2017.....	12,000
2018.....	12,000
2019.....	12,000
2020.....	13,000

FY 2021 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2021, the Request would consolidate the Javits Gifted and Talented Education program into the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED Block Grant), which would combine nearly all currently funded formula and competitive grant programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as well as several related programs, into a single State formula grant program.

ESED Block Grant funds would be allocated by formula to SEAs and LEAs, which would have discretion to use those funds for any authorized purpose of the consolidated programs, including activities currently supported by the Javits program. In addition, LEAs would develop and submit to their States for approval plans consistent with section 1112 of the ESEA, which includes provisions for describing how the LEA will assist schools in identifying and serving gifted and talented students. For more information on the ESED Block Grant, see the Improving Elementary and Secondary Education account.

During initial implementation of the ESED Block Grant the Department would reserve sufficient funds to pay continuation awards to current Javits grantees through the end of their approved project periods. In fiscal year 2021, the Department anticipates the continuation costs will be approximately \$13.5 million.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
Amount for new awards	\$4,048	\$1,850	0
Number of new awards	10	3–4	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$7,881	\$10,150	0
Number of continuation awards	17	24	0
National Research Center for the Education of Gifted and Talented Children and Youth	0 ¹	\$1,000	0

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Javits gifted and talented education

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
Peer review of new award applications	\$71	0	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 Department did not reserve funds from the program for this purpose in fiscal year 2019, but may do so in fiscal year 2020.

Continuation costs of approximately \$13,503 thousand for projects with outstanding continuation costs would be provided under the fiscal year 2021 request for the ESED Block Grant, including \$12,503 for program awards and \$1,000 for the National Research Center for the Education of Gifted and Talented Children and Youth.

¹ The Department did not use fiscal year 2019 funds to support the National Research Center for the Education of Gifted and Talented Children and Youth (Center), as the current Center grantee continued 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 and future years as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department has established the following new measures to assess program performance more frequently and effectively than previous measures, which were administered twice over the grant period and largely consisted of summary ratings of program performance. The first data for these measures, for the fiscal year 2019 cohort, are expected to be available in fall 2020.

Measure: The number of students newly identified as gifted and talented under the program.

Measure: The percentage of students newly identified as gifted and talented under the program who were served under the program.

Measure: Of the students served under the program who were in tested grades, the percentage who made gains on State assessments in mathematics.

Measure: Of the students served under the program who were in tested grades, the percentage who made gains on State assessments in science.

Measure: The number of teachers and other educators who received services that enable them to better identify and improve instruction for gifted and talented students.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Statewide family engagement centers

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2021 Authorization: \$10,000¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2020</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>2021</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Change from</u> <u>2020 to 2021</u>
\$10,000	0	-\$10,000

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2021.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Statewide Family Engagement Centers (SFEC) program provides 5-year grants to statewide organizations, or consortia of such organizations, to establish statewide centers that carry out programs that promote parent and family engagement in education or 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.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Statewide family engagement centers

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2016	0
2017	0
2018	\$10,000
2019	15,440 ¹
2020	10,000

¹ Reflects a reprogramming of \$5,440 thousand from the Charter Schools Program to SFEC.

FY 2021 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2021, the Request would consolidate the SFEC program into the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education for the Disadvantaged Block Grant (ESED Block Grant), which would combine nearly all currently funded ESEA formula and competitive grant programs, as well as several related programs, into a single State formula grant program.

ESED Block Grant funds would be allocated by formula to SEAs and LEAs, which would have discretion to use those funds for any authorized purpose of the consolidated programs, including efforts to increase parent and family involvement in their children’s education. In addition, under the ESED Block Grant LEAs would develop and submit to their States for approval plans consistent with section 1112 of the ESEA, which includes provisions describing how the LEA will implement effective parent and family engagement activities. For more information on the ESED Block Grant, see the Improving Elementary and Secondary Education account.

During initial implementation of the proposed ESED Block Grant, the Department would reserve sufficient funds to pay continuation awards to current SFEC grantees through the end of their approved project periods. In fiscal year 2021, the Department anticipates the continuation costs will be approximately \$9.8 million.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Statewide family engagement centers

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>
Amount for awards	\$15,240	\$9,800	0
Number of continuation awards	11	11	0
Technical assistance	\$200	\$200	0

NOTES:

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 2019, it may do so in fiscal year 2020.

Continuation costs of approximately \$9,800 thousand for projects with outstanding continuation costs would be provided under the fiscal year 2021 request for the ESED Block Grant.

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

The Administration established the following performance measures for grantees under this program. The Department is in the process of setting 2021 targets.

Measure: 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.

Year	Target	Actual
2019	Baseline year	49,746
2020	50,000	

Additional information: Eight grantees reported baseline data for this measure. The number of parents participating in informational activities reported ranged from 0 to 31,159 in Year 1. The Department anticipates that grantees will generally maintain performance in Year 1 with the exception of two grantees for whom the Department anticipates growth. One of these grantees used Year 1 as a planning year, and did not provide many services, and the other grantee was awarded off-cycle and has not yet reported its first year of performance data.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Statewide family engagement centers

Measure: 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.

Year	Target	Actual
2019	Baseline year	311
2020	350	

Additional information: Nine grantees reported baseline data for this measure. The number of high-impact activities or services reported ranged from 1 to 160 in Year 1. The grantees have worked with a technical assistance contractor to define “high-impact” as consistently as possible across all projects. The Department anticipates that grantees will generally maintain performance in Year 1 with the exception of two grantees for whom the Department anticipates growth. One of these grantees used Year 1 as a planning year and did not provide services, and the other grantee was awarded off-cycle and has not yet reported performance data.

Measure: 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.

Year	Target	Actual
2019	Baseline year	99
2020	100	

Additional information: Nine grantees reported baseline data for this measure. The number of high-impact activities or services reported ranged from 0 to 43 in Year 1. The grantees have worked with a technical assistance contractor to define “high-impact” as consistently as possible across all projects. The Department anticipates that grantees will generally maintain performance in Year 1 with the exception of two grantees for whom the Department anticipates growth. One of these grantees used Year 1 as a planning year and did not provide services, and the other grantee was awarded off-cycle and has not yet reported performance data.

Measure: 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.

Year	Target	Actual
2019	Baseline year	91.9%
2020	80%	

Additional information: Five grantees reported baseline data for this measure. The percentage of parents and families reported ranged from 83.75 to 100 percent in Year 1. The Department anticipates a drop in the average percentage of parents reporting enhanced capacity to work with schools and service providers because the percentage reported in Year 1 is based on less than half of grantees.