

**Department of Education**  
**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

**Fiscal Year 2014 Request**

**CONTENTS**

	<u><b>Page</b></u>
Appropriations language .....	E-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes .....	E-2
Appropriation Adjustments and Transfers .....	E-3
Summary of Changes .....	E-4
Authorizing Legislation .....	E-6
Appropriations History .....	E-8
Significant Items in FY 2013 Appropriations Reports .....	E-9
Summary of Request .....	E-10
Activities:	
Effective teaching and learning: Literacy .....	E-13
Ready-to-learn television .....	E-16
Striving readers .....	E-22
Effective teaching and learning for a well-rounded education .....	E-27
Arts in education .....	E-30
College pathways and accelerated learning .....	E-37
High school graduation initiative .....	E-40
Advanced placement .....	E-45
Assessing achievement.....	E-51
Training and advisory services .....	E-57
Rural education .....	E-62
Supplemental education grants.....	E-72
Comprehensive centers .....	E-75
Native Hawaiian student education.....	E-83
Alaska Native student education.....	E-86
State tables*	

\*State tables reflecting final 2013 allocations and 2014 estimates will be posted on the Department's Web page at:  
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/statetables/index.html#update>.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

For carrying out school improvement activities authorized by section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002; the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003; and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, \$75,694,000, of which \$51,113,000 shall be available to carry out section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002:<sup>1</sup> *Provided, That* \$17,619,000 shall be available to carry out the Supplemental Education Grants program for the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands:<sup>2</sup> *Provided further, That* the Secretary of Education may reserve up to 5 percent of the amount referred to in the previous proviso to provide technical assistance in the implementation of the Supplemental Education Grants program.<sup>3</sup>

### NOTES

No language is included for programs authorized under the expired Elementary and Secondary Education Act; when new authorizing legislation for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is enacted, a budget request for these programs will be proposed.

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

**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

**Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes**

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>1</sup> <u>...\$51,113,000 shall be available to carry out section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002:</u></p>	<p>This language specifies the funding level for the Comprehensive Centers program.</p>
<p><sup>2</sup> <u>Provided, That \$17,619,000 shall be available to carry out the Supplemental Education Grants program for the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands:</u></p>	<p>This language specifies the funding level for Supplemental Education Grants to the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands.</p>
<p><sup>3</sup> <u>Provided further, That the Secretary of Education may reserve up to 5 percent of the amount referred to in the previous proviso to provide technical assistance in the implementation of the Supplemental Education Grants program.</u></p>	<p>This language allows the Secretary to reserve up to 5 percent of their Supplemental Education Grants funds to provide technical assistance for these grants.</p>

**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

**Appropriation Adjustments and Transfers**  
(dollars in thousands)

Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers	2012	2013	2014
<b>Discretionary:</b>			
Appropriation .....	\$4,550,018	\$4,544,596	\$1,075,559
Across-the-board reduction (P.L. 112-74) .....	-5,422	0	0
Across-the-board increase (P.L. 112-175) .....	<u>0</u>	<u>17,523</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, adjusted discretionary appropriation .....	4,544,596	4,562,119	1,075,559
Comparative transfer to:			
<u>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity</u> for:			
Homeless children and youth education .....	-65,173	-65,173	0
<u>Innovation and Instructional Teams</u> for:			
Improving teacher quality State grants .....	-2,466,567	-2,466,567	0
Mathematics and science partnerships .....	-149,716	-149,716	0
<u>Supporting Student Success</u> for:			
21st century community learning centers .....	-1,151,673	-1,151,673	0
Comparative transfer from:			
<u>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity</u> for:			
High school graduation initiative .....	48,809	48,809	0
Striving readers .....	159,698	159,698	0
<u>Innovation and Instructional Teams</u> for:			
Advanced placement .....	30,055	30,055	0
Arts in education .....	24,953	24,953	0
Ready-to-learn television .....	<u>27,194</u>	<u>27,194</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, comparative discretionary appropriation .....	1,002,176	1,019,699	1,075,559
<b>Advance:</b>			
Advance for succeeding fiscal year .....	-1,681,441	-1,681,441	0
Advance from prior year .....	<u>1,681,441</u>	<u>1,681,441</u>	<u>1,681,441</u>
Total, budget authority .....	1,002,176	1,019,699	2,757,000
Comparative transfer to:			
<u>Innovation and Instructional Teams</u> for:			
Improving teacher quality State grants .....			
Advance for succeeding fiscal year .....	1,681,441	1,681,441	0
Advance from prior year .....	<u>-1,681,441</u>	<u>-1,681,441</u>	<u>-1,681,441</u>
Total, comparable budget authority .....	1,002,176	1,019,699	1,075,559

NOTE: Amounts for transferred programs exclude the 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided by P.L. 112-175. The comparable total 0.612 percent across-the-board increase for the account is \$6,133 thousand.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Summary of Changes (dollars in thousands)

---

2012.....	\$1,002,176
2014.....	<u>1,075,559</u>
Net change .....	+73,383

---

<b>Increases:</b>	<u>2012 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
Program:		
Initial funding for the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program to support State and local efforts aimed at implementing a comprehensive literacy strategy that provides high-quality literacy instruction and support to students from pre-kindergarten to grade 12.	0	+\$186,892
Initial funding for the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education to support State and local efforts to develop and expand innovative practices to improve teaching and learning in the arts, health education, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, environmental education, economics, financial literacy, and other subjects.	0	+75,000
Initial funding for the proposed College Pathways and Accelerated Learning to support programs that prepare students in high-need school districts to enter and succeed in college.	<u>0</u>	<u>+102,200</u>
Subtotal, increases		+364,092
<b>Decreases:</b>	<u>2012 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
Program:		
Eliminate funding for Striving Readers and Ready-to-Learn Television because these programs are proposed for consolidation into the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program.	\$186,892	-\$186,892
Eliminate funding for Arts in Education because it is proposed for consolidation into the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education.	24,953	-24,953

**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

<b>Decreases:</b>	<u>2012 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
Eliminate funding for the High School Graduation Initiative and Advanced Placement programs because these programs are proposed for consolidation into the proposed College Pathways and Accelerated Learning.	<u>\$78,864</u>	<u>-\$78,864</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-290,709
Net change		+73,383

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Authorizing Legislation

(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2013 Authorized	2013 Estimate	2014 Authorized	2014 Request
Effective teaching and learning: Literacy:				
Effective teaching and learning: Literacy (proposed legislation)	--	--	To be determined	\$186,892
Ready-to-learn television (ESEA II-D-3)	0	\$27,194	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
Striving readers (ESEA I-E, section 1502)	0	159,698	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
Effective teaching and learning for a well-rounded education:				
Effective teaching and learning for a well-rounded education (proposed legislation)	--	--	To be determined	75,000
Arts in education (ESEA V-D, subpart 15)	0	24,953	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
College pathways and accelerated learning:				
College pathways and accelerated learning (proposed legislation)	--	--	To be determined	102,200
High school graduation initiative (ESEA I-H)	0	48,809	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
Advanced Placement (ESEA I-G)	0	30,055	0 <sup>1</sup>	0
Assessing achievement (ESEA VI-A-1)	0	389,214	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	389,214
Training and advisory services (CRA IV)	0	6,962	0	6,962
Rural education (ESEA VI-B)	0	179,193	To be determined <sup>1,2</sup>	179,193
Supplemental education grants (Compact of Free Association Act)	\$20,667 <sup>3</sup>	17,619	\$20,667 <sup>3</sup>	17,619
Comprehensive centers (ETAA section 203)	0	51,113	0 <sup>4</sup>	51,113
Native Hawaiian student education (ESEA VII-B and HEA VIII-Z)	0	34,181	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	34,181

**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

**Authorizing Legislation—continued**

Activity	2013 Authorized	2013 Estimate	2014 Authorized	2014 Request
Alaska Native student education (ESEA VII-C)	0	\$33,185	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	\$33,185
<u>Unfunded authorizations</u>				
Early reading first (ESEA I-B-2)	0	0	0	0
Special education teacher training (ESEA, Section 2151(d))	0	0	0	0
Early childhood educator professional development (ESEA, Section 2151(e))	0	0	0	0
Teacher mobility (ESEA, Section 2151(f))	0	0	0	0
Civic education (ESEA II-C-3)	0	0	0	0
Teaching American history (ESEA II-C-4)	0	0	0	0
State grants for innovative programs (ESEA V-A)	0	0	0	0
Foreign language assistance (ESEA V-D, Subpart 9)	0	0	0	0
Excellence in economic education (ESEA V-D, Subpart 13)	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total definite authorization.....	\$20,667		\$20,667	
Total appropriation .....		1,002,176		1,075,559
Portion of request subject to reauthorization				686,886
Portion of request not authorized				364,092
Total appropriation including the 0.612 percent across-the-board increase .....		1,008,309		

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2014 under new legislation.

<sup>2</sup> The amount appropriated to carry out Title VI, Part B is to be distributed equally between Subparts 1 and 2.

<sup>3</sup> Reflects amount initially authorized in fiscal year 2005, adjusted for inflation in accordance with the authorizing statute, which requires such adjustments through fiscal year 2023.

<sup>4</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2009. The President's fiscal year 2014 budget proposes authorizing this program through appropriations language.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2005 (2005 Advance for 2006)	\$5,940,493 (1,435,000)	\$5,661,401 (1,435,000)	\$5,730,632 (1,435,000)	\$5,619,657 (1,435,000)
2006 (2006 Advance for 2007)	5,332,219 (1,435,000)	5,393,765 (1,435,000)	5,457,953 (1,435,000)	5,255,478 (1,435,000)
2007 (2007 Advance for 2008)	4,973,158 (1,435,000)	N/A <sup>1</sup>	N/A <sup>1</sup>	5,255,478 (1,435,000)
2008 (2008 Advance for 2009) Supp. (P.L. 110-329)	4,698,276 (1,435,000) 0	5,693,668 (1,435,000) 0	5,198,525 (1,435,000) 0	5,289,076 (1,435,000) 15,000
2009 (2009 Advance for 2010) Recovery Act Supp. (P.L. 111-5)	4,566,323 (1,435,000) 0	5,399,609 <sup>2</sup> (1,435,000) 1,066,000	5,292,422 <sup>2</sup> (1,435,000) 1,070,000	5,362,016 (1,681,441) 720,000
2010 (2010 Advance for 2011)	5,182,181 (1,681,441)	5,244,644 (1,681,441)	5,197,316 <sup>3</sup> (1,681,441)	5,228,444 (1,681,441)
2011 (2011 Advance for 2012) Rescission (P.L. 112-74)	1,890,779 (0)	5,221,444 <sup>4</sup> (1,681,441)	5,388,173 <sup>3</sup> (1,681,441)	4,593,841 <sup>5</sup> (1,681,441) (-3,178)
2012 (2012 Advance for 2013)	1,664,979 (0)	4,332,102 <sup>6</sup> (1,681,441)	4,570,145 <sup>6</sup> (1,681,441)	4,544,596 (1,681,441)
2013 (2013 Advance for 2014)	1,219,357 (0)	4,394,880 <sup>7</sup> (1,681,441)	4,544,596 <sup>7</sup> (1,681,441)	4,562,119 <sup>8</sup> (1,681,441)
2014	1,075,559			

<sup>1</sup> This account operated under a full-year continuing resolution (P.L. 110-5). House and Senate allowances are shown as N/A (Not Available) because neither body passed a separate appropriations bill.

<sup>2</sup> The levels for the House and Senate allowances reflect action on the regular annual 2009 appropriations bill, which proceeded in the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress only through the House Subcommittee and the Senate Committee.

<sup>3</sup> The level for the Senate allowance reflects Committee action only.

<sup>4</sup> The level for the House allowance reflects the House-passed full-year continuing resolution.

<sup>5</sup> The level for appropriation reflects the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 112-10).

<sup>6</sup> The level for the House allowance reflects an introduced bill and the level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Committee action only.

<sup>7</sup> The levels for the House and Senate allowances reflect action on the regular annual 2013 appropriations bill, which proceeded in the 112<sup>th</sup> Congress only through the House Subcommittee and the Senate Committee.

<sup>8</sup> The amount shown includes the 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided by P.L. 112-175, in effect through March 27, 2013.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Significant Items in FY 2013 Appropriations Reports

#### Alaska Native Educational Equity

Senate: The Committee is aware that the ESEA includes a priority for funding under this program for applications from Alaska Native regional nonprofit organizations, or consortia that include at least one Alaska Native regional nonprofit organization. Therefore, the Committee directs the Department to distribute funding for new awards under this program based only on the priority authorized under part C of title VII of the ESEA.

Response: The Department understands the Committee's views regarding the use of the statutory priority for this program, but also believes that the supplemental priorities used in the fiscal year 2012 competition were essential for ensuring not only that funds were awarded to certain types of entities, but also that applicants were encouraged to think carefully about using funds to support important education reforms aimed at improving student outcomes.

#### Rural Education

Senate: The Committee expects that rural education funding will be equally divided between the Small, Rural Schools Achievement Program, which provides funds to LEAs that serve a small number of students, and the Rural and Low-Income Schools Program, which provides funds to LEAs that serve concentrations of poor students, regardless of the number of students served.

Response: As called for in the authorizing legislation, the Department will continue to use half of the Rural Education Achievement program appropriation for the Small, Rural School Achievement program and half for the Rural and Low-Income School program.

[Click here for accessible version](#)

(in thousands of dollars)

Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	2012 Appropriation	2013 Appropriation	2014 President's Budget	2014 President's Budget Compared to 2012 Appropriation	
					Amount	Percent
<b>Education Improvement Programs</b>						
1. Effective teaching and learning: Literacy:						
(a) Effective teaching and learning: Literacy (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	186,892	186,892	---
(b) Ready-to-learn television (ESEA II-D-3)	D	27,194	27,194	0	(27,194)	-100.000%
(c) Striving readers (ESEA I-E, section 1502)	D	159,698	159,698	0	(159,698)	-100.000%
Subtotal		186,892	186,892	186,892	0	0.000%
2. Effective teaching and learning for a well-rounded education:						
(a) Effective teaching and learning for a well-rounded education (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	75,000	75,000	---
(b) Arts in education (ESEA V-D, subpart 15)	D	24,953	24,953	0	(24,953)	-100.000%
Subtotal		24,953	24,953	75,000	50,047	200.565%
3. College pathways and accelerated learning:						
(a) College pathways and accelerated learning (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	102,200	102,200	---
(b) High school graduation initiative (ESEA I-H)	D	48,809	48,809	0	(48,809)	-100.000%
(c) Advanced placement (ESEA I-G) <sup>1</sup>	D	30,055	30,055	0	(30,055)	-100.000%
Subtotal		78,864	78,864	102,200	23,336	29.590%
4. Assessing achievement (ESEA VI-A-1)	D	389,214	389,214	389,214	0	0.000%
5. Training and advisory services (CRA IV)	D	6,962	6,962	6,962	0	0.000%
6. Rural education (ESEA VI-B)	D	179,193	179,193	179,193	0	0.000%
7. Supplemental education grants (Compact of Free Association Act)	D	17,619	17,619	17,619	0	0.000%
8. Comprehensive centers (ETAA section 203)	D	51,113	51,113	51,113	0	0.000%
9. Native Hawaiian student education (ESEA VII-B and HEA VIII-Z)	D	34,181	34,181	34,181	0	0.000%
10. Alaska Native student education (ESEA VII-C)	D	33,185	33,185	33,185	0	0.000%
Total		1,002,176	1,002,176	1,075,559	73,383	7.322%
<i>Across-the-board 0.612% increase applied to discretionary appropriation, provided in P.L. 112-175.</i>			6,133			
Total <sup>1, 2</sup>	D	1,002,176	1,008,309	1,075,559	73,383	7.322%

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

- FY 2013 discretionary appropriation amounts are based on P.L. 112-175, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2013, that provided appropriations through March 27, 2013. FY 2013 mandatory amounts are either specifically authorized levels, or are based on FY 2013 President's Budget Policy, updated for more recent estimates of mandatory costs, or FY 2014 President's Budget Policy, as applicable.
- Programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for which funds are requested or that are proposed for consolidation in FY 2014 are proposed under new authorizing legislation.
- Multiple programs affected by the proposed ESEA reauthorization have been renamed and moved among accounts, some of which also have been renamed.
- Account totals and programs shown within accounts in FY 2012 and FY 2013 have been adjusted for comparability with the FY 2014 President's Budget.

Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> Reflects a reprogramming to Advanced Placement in FY 2012 of \$2,906 thousand from Magnet Schools Assistance and \$200 thousand from Charter Schools Grants, appropriated to the Innovation and Instructional Teams account.

<sup>2</sup> Adjusted for comparability. Excludes \$65,173 thousand in fiscal years 2012 and 2013 for Homeless Children and Youth Education requested in the FY 2014 President's Budget under the Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity account, and \$2,466,567 thousand for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants and \$149,716 thousand for Mathematics and Science Partnerships requested in FY 2014 under the Innovation and Instructional Teams account. Includes \$30,055 thousand in fiscal years 2012 and 2013 for Advanced Placement, \$27,194 thousand for Ready-to-Learn Television, and \$24,953 thousand for Arts in Education, appropriated to the Innovation and Instructional Teams account.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Summary of Request

The programs in the Education Improvement Programs (EIP) account support State and local efforts to implement the reforms and educational improvements called for in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). More specifically, the activities in this account provide flexible resources to strengthen instruction and increase student achievement across the core content areas; prepare students to enter and succeed in college; and pay the costs of developing and administering student achievement assessments. The account also includes a variety of smaller programs addressing particular educational needs or special populations.

The fiscal year 2014 appropriation would support the first year of a reauthorized ESEA. The Administration's request for programs in the EIP account (except for three non-ESEA programs) is proposed for later transmittal pending the enactment of the reauthorization. The Administration is requesting a total of approximately \$1.1 billion for programs in this account. This request represents a strengthening and expansion of existing ESEA programs under three broad program authorities: **Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy**, **Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education**, and **College Pathways and Accelerated Learning**. The budget also reallocates programs across budget accounts in order to better align the budget presentation with the structure of the ESEA as proposed for reauthorization.

The requested \$187 million for **Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy** would support State and local efforts aimed at implementing and supporting a comprehensive literacy strategy that provides high-quality literacy instruction and support to students from pre-kindergarten through grade 12.

The Administration also requests \$75 million for **Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education** to support States and high-need local educational agencies (LEAs) in developing and expanding innovative practices that improve teaching and learning in the arts, health education, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, environmental education, economics, financial literacy, and other subjects.

The Administration also is proposing a new \$102 million **College Pathways and Accelerated Learning** program to support competitive grants to States and LEAs for expansion of such activities as Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, dual high school/college enrollment, and "early college high schools" in order to prepare more students for high school graduation and success in college.

The Administration requests \$389 million for **Assessing Achievement** (State Assessments under current law) to assist States and other entities in developing and implementing assessments that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards. Formula funds would support States' implementation of the assessments currently required under Title I of the ESEA while they transition to new college- and career-ready standards and assessments that capture a fuller picture of what students know and are able to do. Funds also may be used to acquire, and to train teachers and other staff to use, the educational technology needed to implement new, computer-based assessments. Funds for competitive grants would also support targeted projects to advance States' and other entities' efforts to implement new assessment requirements of the reauthorized Title I and to develop additional assessments that support the improvement of teaching and learning. The proposed funding for fiscal year 2014 would support a grant competition to assist consortia of States in developing high-quality assessments in areas of common need.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

The 2014 request also includes:

- \$7 million for **Training and Advisory Services** to support regional equity assistance centers that provide technical assistance to school districts in addressing educational equity related to issues of race, gender, and national origin;
- \$179 million for **Rural Education** to provide resources to rural LEAs and schools that often face unique challenges in implementing ESEA;
- \$18 million for **Supplemental Education Grants** program to provide support to the Federated States of Micronesia and to the Republic of the Marshall Islands in place of grant programs in which those Freely Associated States no longer participate pursuant to the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003;
- \$51 million for **Comprehensive Centers** to provide comprehensive technical assistance to grantees under the Education Technical Assistance Act of 2002;
- \$34 million for **Native Hawaiian Student Education** to provide supplemental education programs and services to Native Hawaiian children and adults, in such areas as teacher training, family-based education, gifted and talented education, special education, higher education, and community-based education learning centers; and
- \$33 million for **Alaska Native Student Education** to support the development and operation of supplemental education programs and services for Alaska Native children and adults.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

**Effective teaching and learning: Literacy**  
(Proposed legislation)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: To be determined

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
0	0	\$186,892	+ \$186,892

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program would provide competitive grants to State educational agencies (SEAs), or SEAs in partnership with appropriate outside entities, to support the development and implementation of comprehensive, evidence-based State and local efforts to provide high-quality literacy programs aligned with college- and career-ready English-language arts standards. These programs would be designed to strengthen and support instruction and increase student achievement in high-need LEAs and schools, with flexibility for LEAs to focus funds on the areas of their greatest need from preschool through grade 12.

In awarding State Literacy grants, the Department would give a priority to SEAs that have adopted and are implementing a set of high-quality college- and career-ready standards for English language arts that are common to a significant number of States. States would be permitted to reserve up to 20 percent of grant funds for State-level activities that support development and implementation of a comprehensive preschool-through-grade-12 State literacy plan. The Department could, at a State's request, permit that State to use up to 20 percent of its grant to make subgrants to high-need LEAs and other entities for additional activities to provide high-quality literacy instruction. States would be required to use the remainder of their grant funds to make comprehensive literacy subgrants to high-need LEAs and other entities to implement a comprehensive high-quality literacy program, especially for projects in high-need schools. In making subgrants, States would be required to give priority to eligible entities that, among other things, propose projects supported by the strongest available evidence. The Department would be permitted to reserve up to 5 percent of the appropriation for competitive State Capacity-Building grants that support State efforts to strengthen their capacity to improve teaching and student achievement in literacy.

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$186.9 million in fiscal year 2014 for Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy, the same as the combined fiscal year 2012 level for Striving Readers and Ready to Learn Television. This request would support the first year of the program, which would address the need to strengthen and support instruction comprehensively and increase

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### **Effective teaching and learning: Literacy**

---

student achievement in literacy in high-need LEAs and schools. This new program would replace the Striving Readers and Ready to Learn Television programs (and other literacy-related programs currently authorized by the ESEA and funded in previous fiscal years) with a single comprehensive and coherent program that supports the improvement of education in reading, writing, and language arts while providing increased flexibility for States and LEAs to develop and implement strategies that best meet local needs. The Department believes that this approach would help ensure that States and high-need LEAs have in place a solid infrastructure across the grade levels to support high-need schools in implementing high-quality, developmentally appropriate, and systematic literacy instruction.

Research and assessment data provide strong justification for continued Federal investment in a large-scale, evidence-based literacy program targeted to high-need LEAs and schools. Findings released in July 2012 from the Department's Early Childhood Longitudinal Study indicate that, at kindergarten entry, children from low-income families have significantly lower reading scores than other children. These effects of socioeconomic status persist; on the 2011 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), more than half (53 percent) of fourth-grade students in high-poverty schools scored below the basic reading level, compared with only 15 percent in low-poverty schools. Forty-three percent of eighth-grade students in high-poverty schools scored below the basic reading level, compared with only 12 percent in low-poverty schools.

The new program would build on recent Congressional action that changed the antecedent Striving Readers program from an adolescent literacy program to a comprehensive literacy development and education program that provides support for the improvement of literacy instruction for children from birth through grade 12. The Department would not continue the current practice of allocating funding by specific student age ranges because it believes that State and local educators should have the flexibility to serve those students with the greatest need for improved literacy instruction, regardless of their age ranges.

The Department would use 2014 funds primarily to pay continuation costs for grants made prior to ESEA reauthorization under Striving Readers and Ready-to-Learn Television.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Effective teaching and learning: Literacy

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2014</u>
Amount for new awards	\$3,399
Number of new awards	2-5
Peer review of new award applications	\$500
Continuation awards for antecedent programs	<u>\$182,993</u>
Total, Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy	\$186,892

---

NOTE: Approximately \$182,993 thousand (\$157,811 thousand for Striving Readers and \$25,182 thousand for Ready-to-Learn Television) would be provided in FY 2014 to fund continuation awards for grants made prior to enactment of the reauthorization.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Ready-to-learn television

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title II, Part D, Subpart 3)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$27,194	\$27,194 <sup>2</sup>	0	-\$27,194

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2014 under new legislation.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes a 0.612 across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Ready-to-Learn (RTL) Television 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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Ready-to-learn television

---

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 three 5-year grants in September 2010:

- Window to the World Communications, which will receive \$32.5 million over the 5-year grant period, is partnering with DHX/Wildbrain Entertainment to develop Project UMIGO (“yoU Make It GO”), which is being designed to help children age 2 through 8 learn mathematics. Project UMIGO will use multiple platforms (including the Internet, cell phones, handheld gaming devices, television, DVDs, and books) and a media-based mathematics curriculum to offer child-initiated and creative play opportunities (e.g., digital paint, glue, and blocks) that support mathematics learning, as well as related support materials and digital resources for parents, caregivers, and teachers. The goal is to ensure that children learn the basic principles of mathematics and to think creatively, invent, and work collaboratively. (See <http://umigo.info/>)
- The Corporation for Public Broadcasting, in partnership with the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS), will receive \$71.1 million over the life of the grant to develop a “transmedia” collection (video content, interactive games, mobile apps, and white board applications) designed to raise the achievement of children ages 2 to 8 in high-needs communities. Project content will be aligned with rigorous mathematics and literacy academic standards, and a progress tracking system will provide feedback on student progress to parents and teachers. (See <http://pbskids.org/readytolearn/commitment.html>)
- The Hispanic Information and Telecommunications Network, which will receive \$30 million over 5 years, has partnered with Zinkia, Inc., the creators of Pocoyo, to form the Ready to Learn Early Learning Collaboration (ELC), which will develop transmedia learning applications that promote the acquisition of essential literacy and mathematics skills by 3-to-8 year olds. Each project will include multiple platforms, including mobile device and phone applications, interactive websites, and television, and will include training materials for families, caregivers, and educators. (See <http://www.hitn.tv/node/380>)

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009 .....	\$25,416
2010 .....	27,300
2011 .....	27,245
2012 .....	27,194
2013 .....	27,194 <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Excludes a 0.612 percent increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Ready-to-learn television

---

#### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Ready-to-Learn Television (RTL) program for fiscal year 2014. In place of this and several other narrowly targeted programs that seek to promote improvement of instruction for students of various grade spans, the Administration’s reauthorization proposal for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) would create a new broader authority, Effective Teaching and Learning for a Complete Education, that would address the need to comprehensively strengthen instruction and increase student achievement in a wide range of core academic subjects in high-need local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools. This new authority also would allow the Department to reserve funds to support a range of national activities, including research, developing high-quality educational and professional-development content, technical assistance, and identifying and disseminating information on effective programs and best practices. Public telecommunications entities—such as the Public Broadcasting Service, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and similar organizations—would be able to compete for this national activities funding to create high-quality educational content for children.

The fiscal year 2014 request for the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program would include funds to pay the 5<sup>th</sup> and final year of continuation costs for Ready-to-Learn Television grants originally made in 2010.

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures:</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Number of continuation awards	3	3	0
Continuation award funding	\$27,159	\$27,104	0
Evaluation (review of grant products)	<u>35</u>	<u>90</u>	<u>0</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>27,194</b>	<b>27,194</b>	<b>0</b>

---

NOTES: 2013 excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.  
Continuation costs of approximately \$25,182 thousand for projects awarded in fiscal year 2010 would be provided under the fiscal year 2014 request for Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

For the 2010 competition, the Department established two invitational priorities: (1) developing educational content in reading or mathematics that is designed to increase the literacy or numeracy skills of low-income children ages 2 to 8, delivering the content through coordinated use of multiple media platforms, and developing effective outreach strategies; and (2) providing for the development and dissemination of products and results through open educational resources and by making the products freely available through various media platforms. In

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Ready-to-learn television

---

addition, applicants could earn competitive-preference priority points for projects proposing a research plan that was based on rigorous scientifically based research methods to assess effectiveness. The Department made three awards, and the 2010 grantees will produce new materials and strategies that reflect changes in television distribution and production and the rise of new digital media platforms. Initially, the grantees will focus on the creation and launch of digital learning materials (including video), using these to stimulate interest among target children, and then later will pursue the more expensive production of television shows.

Because of these changes, in 2012, the Department revised the performance measures for the Ready to Learn program to better measure both Ready-to-Learn's effectiveness in improving what children learn and the number of children Ready-to-Learn is reaching. The revised measures are:

- (1) the percentage of summative experimental or quasi-experimental research studies that demonstrate positive and statistically significant gains in math or literacy skills when RTL transmedia properties are compared to similar non-RTL-funded digital properties or to other more traditional educational materials;
- (2) the percentage of educational transmedia products, along with necessary accompany 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.

### Performance Measures

The three 2010 grantees have planned a total of seven experimental or quasi-experimental research studies, to be conducted beginning in year three of the grant. The results of these studies will provide data on the first performance measure. The Department expects to have results from the first three studies available in fall 2013.

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. Panel members reviewed three transmedia product suites submitted by two grantees. Of the three suites, reviewers' scores determined that two were of high quality, receiving scores of 3.89 and 4.26. The third suite received a score of 3.56. The third grantee will submit products for review in 2013.

Data on the third performance measure will be available in summer 2013.

### Efficiency Measure

The Department developed a single efficiency measure for the RTL program: dollars leveraged from non-Federal sources over 5 years (the length of each grant award) per Federal dollar

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Ready-to-learn television

---

dedicated to core non-outreach program activities. Because high-quality children's television programs are expensive to develop, produce, and distribute, Federal support for new programming through the RTL programs is typically used by grantees to attract additional revenue from the private sector. Program quality is directly affected by the extent to which grantees succeed in using Federal dollars to leverage additional funds from alternate sources. Therefore, the Department will use this measure to compare the relative success of RTL grantees in leveraging non-Federal investments for the development and production of new children's television programs.

Because the Department does not expect grantees to establish annual leveraging targets, and does not set a schedule for obtaining matching funds, the meaningful period of analysis for purposes of comparing grantee performance is the entire 5-year award period. During the 5-year period comprising fiscal years 2005 through 2009, the Department provided two grantees with \$98.55 million in funding for programming. These two grantees together contributed a total of \$66.15 million in non-Federal funding to programming activities, or \$0.67 non-Federal dollars for every Federal dollar; the individual grantee amounts were \$0.29 and \$1.03. Initially, the Department had planned to use the \$0.67 figure established by the 2005 grantees as the baseline against which to measure future efficiency. However, because of changes instituted to the program in 2010, grantees will be producing fewer television shows and instead will be focusing, at least initially, on the creation and distribution of digital media products such as applications and online educational games. This makes it easier and less expensive to release content and requires fewer external funds to be leveraged in support of television production. In the first year of the 2010 grants, the three grantees leveraged \$9.8 million of non-Federal support compared to \$19.5 million in Federal dollars spent on production, or \$0.50 of non-Federal dollars for every Federal dollar. Because of the decrease in leveraged funds needed, the Department is reexamining how to assess progress against the efficiency measure.

### Other Performance Information

Both 2005 RTL programming grantees implemented multiple formative studies designed to improve their projects, as well as summative evaluations designed to provide evidence on the extent to which children's television programming contributes to gains in early literacy. Formative studies of program content supported by RTL grantees generally analyze a wide range of issues, such as appeal, comprehension, age appropriateness, and integration of literacy- or math-based curricula – including whether materials effectively incorporate learning objectives, such as the extent to which they incorporate such pre-literacy learning objectives as letter recognition, differentiation of phonemes, and rhyming. Findings from the formative studies provide ongoing feedback to producers and developers as they develop new programming content. Research conducted on Ready to Learn outreach activities has examined how families interact with children to support their learning; what barriers impede effective engagement of children, families, and caregivers; how television programming can be used to meet some of the educational needs of low-income families; and the role various technology platforms may play in enhancing learning through targeted programming and outreach.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting, with its partner the Public Broadcasting Service, published a summary report entitled *Findings from Ready to Learn, 2005-2010*, available online at <http://www.hitn.tv/node/380>, that provides a complete list of CPB/PBS television shows, materials, and resources as well as a bibliography of studies and other publications. Window to

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### **Ready-to-learn television**

---

the World Communications will be producing a companion document that will not only provide a summary of its research, but will also frame issues for future academic research.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Striving readers

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I, Part E, Section 1502)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$159,698	\$159,698 <sup>2</sup>	0	-\$159,698

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2014 under new legislation.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes a 0.612 across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Striving Readers program provides grants to eligible entities to support efforts to improve literacy instruction in high-need schools. In fiscal year 2010, Congress enacted appropriations language that changed Striving Readers from an adolescent literacy program to a comprehensive literacy development and education program intended to advance the literacy skills, including pre-literacy, reading, and writing skills, of students from birth through grade 12.

From the 2010 appropriation, the Department was required to reserve: (1) one-half of 1 percent for grants to the Department of the Interior/Bureau of Indian Education and one-half of 1 percent for the Outlying Areas; and (2) \$10 million for formula grants to States for the establishment or support of a State Literacy Team with expertise in literacy development and education for children from birth through grade 12 to assist the State in developing a comprehensive literacy plan. In addition, the Department had the authority to reserve up to 5 percent for national activities. The remaining funds were used to make competitive grants to States, which the Department awarded to six States. The fiscal year 2011 appropriations act did not include funding for the Striving Readers program. The fiscal year 2012 appropriations act continued the program but did not include State formula grant funding.

Pursuant to the appropriations language for fiscal years 2010 and 2012, each State educational agency (SEA) that receives a competitive grant must award at least 95 percent of its allocation competitively to local educational agencies (LEAs) or, for the purposes of providing early literacy services, to LEAs or other nonprofit providers of early childhood education that partner with a public or private nonprofit organization or agency with a demonstrated record of effectiveness in improving the early literacy development of children from birth through kindergarten entry and in providing professional development in early literacy. SEAs are required to: (1) give priority to such agencies or other entities serving greater numbers or percentages of disadvantaged children; and (2) ensure that at least 15 percent of the subgranted funds are used to serve children from birth through age 5, 40 percent to serve students in kindergarten through grade 5,

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Striving readers

---

and 40 percent to serve students in middle and high school. Further, States must equitably distribute funds between middle and high schools.

An SEA may reserve up to 5 percent of its allocation for leadership activities, including technical assistance and training, data collection, reporting, and administration. Eligible entities receiving subgrants must use Striving Readers funds for services and activities that have the characteristics of effective literacy instruction; specific activities may include professional development, screening and assessment, targeted interventions for students reading below grade level, and other research-based methods of improving classroom instruction and practice.

From fiscal years 2005 through 2009, the Striving Readers program supported competitive grants to improve middle- or high-school students' literacy skills. In fiscal year 2005 conference report language, Congress directed the Department to "make competitive grants to develop, implement, evaluate, and bring to scale reading interventions for middle- or high-school students who are reading significantly below grade level, prioritizing services to those schools and districts with one or more high or middle schools that include a significant number of students reading below grade level." In addition, Congress directed the Department to give competitive preference to schools that agreed to participate in randomized research studies and to balance grants between projects serving middle schools and projects serving high schools.

The Department followed these directives in awarding grants to the first cohort of adolescent literacy grantees in 2006. The Department made 5-year awards to local educational agencies (LEAs) that were eligible to receive funds under Part A of Title I of the ESEA and that had one or more high schools or middle schools with significant numbers of students reading below grade level or at risk of not meeting Title I adequate yearly progress requirements. Eligible applicants included such LEAs in partnership with institutions of higher education and public or private (nonprofit or for-profit) organizations, and permitted State educational agencies (SEAs) to apply on behalf of eligible LEAs and in partnership with other entities.

In conducting the second competition in 2009, the Department limited eligibility to SEAs applying on behalf of the SEA and one or more LEAs with governing authority over Title I-eligible schools that serve any of grades 6 through 12. Applicants were required to implement a supplemental literacy intervention (for students reading 2 or more years below grade level) during the second, third, and fourth years of the 4-year project period and to evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention using an experimental research design.

This is a forward-funded program. Funds become available for obligation from July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available through September 30 of the following year.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Striving readers

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009 .....	\$35,371
2010 .....	200,000 <sup>1</sup>
2011 .....	0
2012 .....	159,698
2013 .....	159,698 <sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Reflects a rescission of \$50,000 thousand under P.L. 111-226.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes a 0.612 across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Striving Readers program for fiscal year 2014. In place of this program and other literacy-related programs currently authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the Administration's reauthorization proposal would create a new, more flexible Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program that would address the need to comprehensively strengthen instruction and increase student achievement in literacy in high-need LEAs and schools.

Under the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program, the Department would provide competitive grants to States to support the development and implementation of comprehensive State and local efforts to provide high-quality literacy programs aligned with college- and career-ready English language arts standards. These programs would be designed to increase student achievement in high-need LEAs and schools for students from preschool through grade 12. This approach would replace the patchwork of literacy funding streams in current law with a single comprehensive program that would provide increased flexibility for States and LEAs to develop and implement strategies that best meet local needs. The Administration believes that this new program would help ensure that States and high-need LEAs have in place a solid infrastructure across the grade levels to support high-need schools in implementing high-quality, developmentally appropriate, and systematic literacy instruction.

The new program would build on 2010 appropriations language that changed the Striving Readers program from an adolescent literacy program to a comprehensive literacy development and education program that provides support for the improvement of literacy instruction for children from birth through grade 12. This change also required the allocation of funding by specific age ranges of students, which limits State and local flexibility to invest Federal funds based on their needs within the framework of a comprehensive preschool-through-12<sup>th</sup>-grade literacy plan.

The fiscal year 2014 request for Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy includes funds to pay 2014 continuation costs for the Striving Readers grants made in previous years.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Striving readers

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Amount for competitive grants (continuations)	\$157,811	\$158,102	0
Number of competitive grants	6	6	0
Amount for Bureau of Indian Education	\$798	\$798	0
Amount for Outlying Areas	\$798	\$798	0
National activities (including evaluation)	\$289	0 <sup>1</sup>	0

---

NOTES: 2013 excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.  
 In fiscal year 2014, continuation costs of approximately \$158,102 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program.

<sup>1</sup> Estimate. The Department may use up to \$7,899 thousand for national activities.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested for fiscal year 2014 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department established the following performance measures for the Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy grant program: (1) the percentage of participating 4-year-old children who achieve significant gains in oral language skills; (2) the percentage of participating 5th-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on State reading or language arts assessments; (3) the percentage of participating 8th-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on State reading or language arts assessments; and (4) the percentage of participating high school students who meet or exceed proficiency on State reading or language arts assessments.

All States are required to report on Performance Measure 1 above. States have the option of either reporting on Performance Measures 2, 3, and 4 above, or reporting proficiency rates for those same measures that include students who demonstrate adequate growth under the

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Striving readers

---

State's Department-approved growth model and are counted as meeting or exceeding proficiency for purposes of accountability determinations.

All of the performance measures described in this section will include data disaggregated for disadvantaged students, including limited-English-proficient students and students with disabilities. The Department expects to report baseline data on these measures in fall 2013.

### Other Performance Information

All 16 Striving Readers adolescent literacy grantees conducted rigorous experimental evaluations of their supplemental literacy interventions for struggling readers. The eight 2006 grantees also conducted experimental or quasi-experimental evaluations of their whole-school literacy-throughout-the-curriculum models for all students. In fall 2011, the Department released the year-4 evaluation reports for the 2006 grantees, which provided results from 4 years of implementation, including impact findings. Five of the eight evaluations found that 1 year of a targeted intervention had statistically significant positive impacts on achievement for either middle or high school students. None of the four evaluations examining interventions that could serve struggling readers for up to 3 years found positive impacts after 2 or 3 years of the interventions. None of the five evaluations that examined the effectiveness of the whole-school models found a statistically significant impact on student reading achievement. The evaluation reports are available at: <http://www.ed.gov/programs/strivingreaders/performance.html>.

In September 2012, the Department released the final year-5 evaluation reports covering all 5 years of data collection and updated the cross-site summary tables and project profiles to include the final results of the evaluations of the 2006 grants. The Department also released the project profiles and summaries of evaluation reports from the 2009 grants. These materials are posted on the program's Web site:

<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/strivingreaders/performance.html>.

It is important to note that the Department originally planned 3 years of implementation for the 2009 grants. However, the grants ended prematurely because the Department did not have the authority to use the fiscal year 2010 appropriation to continue support for the final year of that cohort of adolescent literacy grantees. As a result, the eight evaluations for that competition will be based on only 1 year of implementation and data collection, and will have samples smaller than originally planned. The relatively small samples will limit the studies' ability to detect policy relevant impacts of the 2009 grants.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Effective teaching and learning for a well-rounded education

(Proposed legislation)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: To be determined

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
0	0	\$75,000	+\$75,000

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education, part of the Administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization proposal, would provide competitive grants to SEAs, high-need LEAs, and institutions of higher education or nonprofit organizations in partnership with high-need LEAs to support the development and expansion of innovative and evidence-based practices to improve teaching and learning across a well-rounded curriculum that includes the arts, health education, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, environmental education, economics and financial literacy, and other subjects as identified by the Department.

In awarding grants, the Department would be authorized to give priority to applicants that plan to (1) integrate teaching or learning in one or more of the above subjects with reading, English-language arts, or STEM instruction; (2) establish articulation agreements with postsecondary programs for the continuation of instruction in an academic subject; or (3) achieve statewide impact in one or more States. The Department might use the first of these priorities particularly to promote integration of opportunities for civic learning and engagement. The Department could also give priority to proposals that are supported by the strongest available evidence or that use technology to address student learning challenges and increase student engagement and achievement or teacher effectiveness.

The Department would be authorized to reserve up to 10 percent of program funds to support a range of national activities, including identification of effective programs and best practices, development of high-quality educational and professional-development content, technical assistance, and dissemination.

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$75 million in fiscal year 2014 for the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program. The request would support the first year of the program under a reauthorized ESEA.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Effective teaching and learning for a well-rounded education

---

The Administration believes that all students should receive high-quality instruction across the academic content areas. However, Federal programs that have focused on the teaching and learning of specific subjects have been too fragmented to provide State and local officials with the tools they need to strengthen instruction and increase student achievement in a comprehensive manner. Nor have those programs been well-structured to enable educators and policymakers to identify and expand the most effective and innovative practices. As a single, comprehensive program, Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education would address these problems by driving resources to where they are most needed and generating evidence of what works. This new program would also provide States and LEAs with the flexibility necessary to meet the needs of their students and teachers across a well-rounded curriculum while focusing funding on programs that improve student achievement, especially in high-need LEAs.

Ensuring access to a well-rounded education is critical to our efforts to help students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers. Research indicates that instruction in subjects supported under Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education is associated with improvements in overall achievement and attainment, including for students from low-income families. For instance, James Catterall *et al* found, in *The Arts and Achievement in At-Risk Youth: Findings from Four Longitudinal Studies* (2012), that students from low-income families who had arts-rich experiences in high school had higher GPAs and were more likely to enroll in, and three times more likely to complete, a bachelor's degree program than their peers who had less involvement in the arts. In addition, annual reports from the College Board show a strong positive correlation between foreign language study and aptitude for college, with students who have had more years of foreign language study consistently outperforming their peers on each section of the SAT.

The Department would use a portion of the 2014 request for Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education to pay fiscal year 2014 continuation costs for grants made prior to ESEA reauthorization under Arts in Education.

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2014</u>
Amount for new awards	\$55,528
Number of new awards	15-30
Peer review of new award applications	\$500
National activities	\$7,500
Continuation awards for grants under Arts in Education	\$11,472

## **EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

### **Effective teaching and learning for a well-rounded education**

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### **Performance Measures**

The Department will establish goals and performance indicators to assess the impact of Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Arts in education

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 15)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$24,953	\$24,953 <sup>2</sup>	0	-\$24,953

---

<sup>1</sup>The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is proposed for consolidation in FY 2014 under new legislation.

<sup>2</sup>Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Arts in Education program supports national demonstration and Federal leadership activities to encourage the integration of the arts into the school curriculum. Allowable activities include: (1) research on arts education; (2) development and dissemination of information about model school-based arts education programs; (3) development of model State arts education assessments based on State academic achievement standards; (4) development and implementation of curriculum frameworks in the arts; (5) development of model professional development programs in the arts for teachers and administrators; (6) support of collaborative activities with Federal agencies or institutions involved in arts education, arts educators, and organizations representing the arts, including State and local arts agencies involved in art education; and (7) support of model projects and programs to integrate arts education into the regular elementary school and secondary school curriculum.

The Department supports a number of arts education activities through grants to local educational agencies (LEAs), State educational agencies (SEAs), nonprofit organizations, institutions of higher education, organizations with expertise in the arts, and partnerships of these entities. Model Development and Dissemination grants support the development, documentation, evaluation, and dissemination of innovative models that seek to integrate and strengthen arts instruction in elementary and middle schools and improve students' academic performance and achievement in the arts. Professional Development for Arts Education grants support the development of professional development programs for music, dance, drama, and visual arts educators.

With the fiscal year 2011 appropriation, the Department did not make directed grants to VSA and the Kennedy Center and instead initiated a new National Arts in Education competition to make grants to one or more national nonprofit arts organizations to carry out high-quality arts education programs for children and youth, with particular emphasis on serving students from

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Arts in education

---

low-income families and students with disabilities. The Department conducted a second competition in fiscal year 2012.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009 .....	\$37,533
2010 .....	38,166
2011 .....	27,447
2012 .....	24,953
2013 .....	24,953 <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for the Arts in Education program for fiscal year 2014. In place of this and other narrowly targeted programs focused on student achievement in specific subject areas, the Administration's reauthorization proposal for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act would create a broader program, Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education, that would include grants to support arts in education programs. This new program would address the need to strengthen instruction and increase student achievement, especially in high-need LEAs, across a range of subjects that contribute to a well-rounded education, such as arts, health education, physical education, foreign languages, civics and government, history, geography, environmental education, economics and financial literacy, and other subjects that may be identified by the Department.

The proposed Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program would make competitive awards to SEAs, high-need LEAs, and other entities to carry out such activities as development, implementation, and evaluation of successful programs; dissemination of evidence-based practices; and scaling up of effective programs. This approach would replace the patchwork of programs and funding streams in current law with a single comprehensive and coherent program that would allow States and LEAs to identify how best to meet the needs of their students and teachers across a well-rounded curriculum (which may include activities that support the improvement of student achievement or teacher effectiveness in the arts), and allow the Department to focus funding on programs that improve student achievement, especially in high-need LEAs. Eligible entities would include those eligible under the current Arts in Education program.

The fiscal year 2014 request for Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education would include funds to pay 2014 continuation costs for Arts in Education grants made in previous years.

**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

**Arts in education**

---

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

**National Demonstration and Leadership Activities**

***Model Arts Program***

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Total funds available	\$12,128	\$12,359	0
Amount for new awards	0	\$3,212	0
Number of new awards	0	8	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$11,778	\$8,672	0
Number of continuation awards	38	34	0
Interagency transfer to support the Arts Education Partnership	\$350	\$350	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$125	0

***Professional Development for Arts Educators***

<u>Measures</u>			
Total funds available	\$5,683	\$5,408	0
Amount for new awards	\$1,462	0	0
Number of new awards	5	0	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$4,221	\$5,408	0
Number of continuation awards	15-16	14	0
Peer review of new award applications	0 <sup>1</sup>	0	0

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Arts in education

---

#### *National Arts in Education Program*

##### Measures

Total funds available	\$6,700	\$6,700	0
Amount for new awards	\$6,633	0	0
Number of new awards	1	0	0
Amount for continuation awards	0	\$6,700	0
Number of continuation awards	0	1	1
Peer review of new award applications	\$67	0	0
<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>\$442</b>	<b>\$486</b>	<b>0</b>

NOTES: 2013 excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.  
 FY 2014 continuation costs of approximately \$11,472 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education program.

<sup>1</sup> The Department funded new applications in FY 2012 from the FY 2011 slate.

## PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested for fiscal year 2014 and future years, 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.*

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

**Additional Information:** This measure focuses on the Professional Development for Arts Educators (PDAE) program and examines the percentage of teachers who receive instruction that is “sustained and intensive”. In 2011, the Department defined sustained and intensive professional development for the PDAE program as completion of 40 or more of the professional

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Arts in education

---

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. (Prior to 2011, PDAE grantees developed their own definitions of sustained and intensive professional development.) Data collected in 2011 represent the baseline for this indicator and are the basis for targets for subsequent years. The Department continues to work with grantees to ensure that the same definition of “sustained and intensive” is used consistently across projects. In 2011, 27 percent of teachers participating in PDAE received professional development that was sustained and intensive. The Department expects to have 2012 performance data, representing school year 2011-2012, available in late 2013.

Beginning with the fiscal year 2011 cohort of grantees, the Department implemented a second performance measure for the PDAE program. The measure examines the percentage of PDAE projects in which teachers show a statistically significant increase in content knowledge in the arts. In implementing this measure, the Department requires that grantees administer a pre-test and a post-test of teacher content knowledge in the arts and include those data in their annual performance reports. In 2011, 100 percent of projects that submitted complete performance data had teachers who showed a statistically significant increase in arts content knowledge.

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

Year	Treatment	Control
2009	67.0	60.0
2010	53.9	51.4
2011	53.7	48.4
2012	64.0	55.0
2013		
2014		

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

Year	Treatment	Control
2009	63.0	41.0
2010	48.9	47.3
2011	47.7	42.2
2012	57.0	43.0
2013		
2014		

**Additional Information:** The Department developed two measures that focus on the Model Arts program and its impact on student achievement, specifically the percentage of Model Arts students who demonstrate proficient levels of achievement on State assessments in mathematics and in reading, compared to control or comparison groups. For the school year 2008-2009, the students in the treatment groups performed better than those in the control

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Arts in education

---

groups on both reading and mathematics measures. Both the treatment and control groups showed declines in performance between school years 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 (although the decline for the control group was very small in mathematics.) The Department expects to have finalized 2012 performance data, representing school year 2011-2012, available in late 2013.

The Department developed four measures for the Arts in Education National Program (AENP). These measures are: (1) The total number of students who participate in standards-based arts education sponsored by the grantee; (2) the number of teachers participating in the grantee's program who receive professional development that is sustained and intensive; (3) the total number of students from low-income families who participate in standards-based arts education sponsored by the grantee; and (4) the total number of students with disabilities who participate in standards-based arts education sponsored by the grantee. The Department expects to have performance data for the 2011 grantee available in winter 2013. The Department expects to have baseline performance data for the 2012 grantee available in fall 2013 and data on the impact of implementation available in fall 2014.

### Other Performance Information

The fiscal year 2008 appropriation for Arts in Education included funding for a National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) survey on arts education in public elementary and secondary schools. NCES collected principal and teacher survey data nationwide during school year (SY) 2009-10 using the Fast Response Survey System (FRSS).

The report found that in school year (SY) 2009-10, 94 percent of elementary schools offered instruction in music, with 93 percent of those schools offering music instruction at least once a week and 91 percent employing arts specialists to teach the subject. On average, full-time music specialists reported spending 22 hours per week teaching 25 different music classes (i.e., different groups of students), with an average class size of 19 students.

In addition, NCES reported that 83 percent of elementary schools offered instruction specifically in visual arts, with 85 percent of those schools offering visual arts instruction at least once a week and 84 percent employing arts specialists to teach it. On average, full-time visual arts specialists reported spending 22 hours per week teaching 24 different visual arts classes, with an average class size of 22 students.

Only 3 percent of elementary schools offered instruction specifically in dance (53 percent of those schools offered dance instruction at least once a week and 57 percent employed arts specialists to teach it) and 4 percent of elementary schools offered drama or theater (58 percent of those schools offered instruction in it at least once a week and 42 percent had arts specialists teaching the subject).

Finally, the report noted that 88 percent of classroom teachers (i.e., teachers of self-contained classrooms) in elementary schools indicated that they included arts instruction in some aspect of their classroom instructional programs in 2009-10. Of these teachers, 6 percent taught music as a separate subject, 14 percent taught visual arts as a separate subject, 3 percent taught dance as a separate subject, and 8 percent taught drama or theater as a separate subject. In addition, of the classroom teachers who included arts instruction in their classroom instructional programs, 92 percent incorporated music instruction in other subject areas, 97 percent

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Arts in education

---

incorporated visual arts instruction in other subject areas, 87 percent incorporated dance instruction in other subject areas, and 53 percent incorporated drama or theater instruction in other subject areas.

NCES also looked at secondary schools and teachers, using data from SY 2008-09. Ninety-one percent of public secondary schools reported offering music in that year. On average, full-time music specialists spent 22 hours per week teaching 8 different music classes with a class size of 24 students. In addition, 89 percent of secondary schools reported offering instruction in visual arts. Full-time visual arts specialists spent, on average, 23 hours per week teaching 7 different visual arts classes with a class size of 22 students. The report also found that 12 percent of secondary schools offered dance and 45 percent offered drama or theater. Public secondary schools reported that arts specialists accounted for 97 percent of the teachers who taught music, 94 percent of the teachers who taught visual arts, 69 percent of the teachers who taught dance, and 73 percent of the teachers who taught drama or theater.

A second report will present findings on a broader set of indicators on the status of arts education in 2009–10. The results from this report are expected in spring 2013.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### College pathways and accelerated learning

(Proposed legislation)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: To be determined

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
0	0	\$102,200	+\$102,200

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program would support efforts to increase high school graduation rates and preparation for college matriculation and success by providing college-level and other accelerated courses and instruction in high-poverty middle and high schools and in high schools with low graduation rates. Grants would support the expansion of: (1) accelerated learning options such as Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) courses; (2) dual-enrollment programs that allow students to take college-level courses (including courses in career and technical education) and earn college credit while in high school; and (3) “early college high schools” that allow students to earn a high school degree and an associate’s degree or 2 years of college credit simultaneously. Grants would also support projects that re-engage out-of-school youth or students who are not on track to graduate, as well as accelerated learning opportunities for students across the performance spectrum, including those who exceed proficiency standards, in high-poverty elementary schools.

States and local educational agencies (LEAs) would be eligible to apply for competitive grants individually, in consortia, or in partnership with other entities. In order to receive a grant, an applicant would be required to demonstrate how it will use evidence to design, implement, and continuously improve proposed project activities.

The Department would be authorized to reserve up to 5 percent of program funds to carry out national activities, including research on promising accelerated learning models. In addition, the Department would reserve funds to make grants to States to pay for the cost of advanced test fees for students from low-income families.

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$102.2 million in fiscal year 2014 for the proposed College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program, which would be created through the Administration’s Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization proposal and would replace, with a more comprehensive and flexible program, several, sometimes narrowly

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### College pathways and accelerated learning

---

targeted, programs that offer accelerated learning opportunities or that seek to prevent students from dropping out of school.

Although students who drop out, or are at risk of dropping out, are often thought of as low achievers who need a watered-down curriculum to keep them in school, educators find that often the opposite is the case. Efforts to introduce AP, IB, and other accelerated curricula in schools with concentrations of at-risk students recently have shown strong success, as demonstrated by the increasing numbers of students from low-income families taking and passing AP tests. Further, research shows that students who participate in an accelerated high school curriculum have a high probability of enrolling in higher education. According to the Department's 2000 follow-up of the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS: 88/2000), 96 percent of students in the lowest socio-economic status quintile who participated in AP courses enrolled in postsecondary education programs, compared to 39 percent of those who did not participate. Clifford Adelman's 2006 study *The Toolbox Revisited* confirms the significance of those data. Adelman found that participation in a challenging curriculum, including programs such as AP and IB, is a key factor associated with a student's completion of a bachelor's degree and has a stronger correlation with degree completion than do high school test scores, class rank, or grade point average. The same study concluded that the impact of a challenging curriculum on rates of completion of a bachelor's degree is even higher for African-American and Hispanic students than it is for White students. These data strongly suggest that by promoting accelerated learning opportunities in high-poverty schools, the College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program would help address the needs of students at risk of dropping out, not just those who are already high achievers.

Dual-enrollment programs can be similarly effective in increasing student achievement and college preparedness in low-performing schools. A Department-funded 2007 report by the Community College Research Center found that dual-enrollment participants had more positive outcomes on a range of short- and long-term measures than did similar non-participants. Moreover, students from groups underrepresented in higher education, such as males and those from low-income families, appeared to benefit from dual-enrollment participation to a greater degree than other participants. Besides introducing "college culture" to secondary school students whose parents generally did not receive a college degree, dual-enrollment schools allow students from low-income families to reduce costs by avoiding remedial courses and graduating from college early or on time.

Early college high schools go a step further than dual-enrollment and AP or IB programs by providing students from low-income families with the course instruction and support they need to graduate from high school with 2 years of college credit already earned. A 2008 Early College High School Initiative report funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation found that early college high school students scored significantly higher than comparable high school students on State assessments and that early college high school classes often demonstrate higher levels of rigor than their college equivalents.

The College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program would also support other efforts to prevent students from dropping out and to re-engage out-of-school youth, including early warning systems and comprehensive dropout prevention and reentry plans. Early warning systems would seek to identify effectively those students at risk of not graduating on time and

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### College pathways and accelerated learning

---

would provide schools and LEAs with the information necessary to target interventions of the type and level necessary to support students' on-time graduation.

In fiscal year 2014, the Department would use College Pathways and Accelerated Learning funds to pay continuation costs for grants made prior to ESEA reauthorization under High School Graduation Initiative and to meet, in full, States' requests for grants for advanced course test fee costs (including by providing supplemental grants to make up for anticipated shortfalls in test fee funding in fiscal year 2013). The Department would not make new grants under the new authority until fiscal year 2015.

Separately, the Administration is proposing to use \$42 million in fiscal year 2014 funds from Career and Technical Education: National Programs (\$10 million) and GPRA Data/HEA Program Evaluation (\$32 million) to help establish or expand dual-enrollment programs that target local workforce needs and to evaluate those programs. College Pathways and Accelerated Learning would also complement Administration efforts to redesign high schools through the proposed High School Redesign program.

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2014</u>
Continuation awards for grants under High School Graduation Initiative	\$49,000
Grants for advanced course test fee costs	\$53,200

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### High school graduation initiative

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$48,809	\$48,809 <sup>2</sup>	0	-\$48,809

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The Administration proposes to consolidate the program in FY 2014 under new legislation.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The High School Graduation Initiative provides competitive grants to State educational agencies and local educational agencies to support the implementation of effective, sustainable, and coordinated dropout prevention and re-entry programs in high schools with annual dropout rates that exceed their State average annual dropout rate. Funds may also be used to support activities at middle schools that feed into such high schools. Grants are awarded for up to 5 years and may be used for activities such as early identification of students who are at risk of not graduating; services for at-risk students designed to keep them in school and on track to graduate, including counseling and mentoring; programs to identify youth who have left school without graduating and assist them in reentering and graduating, including through remedial education; and other comprehensive dropout prevention approaches.

The Department is required to use 10 percent of program funds for national activities, including technical assistance, data collection, evaluation, and information dissemination.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009 .....	0
2010 .....	\$50,000
2011 .....	48,902
2012 .....	48,809
2013 .....	48,809 <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### High school graduation initiative

---

#### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate fiscal year 2014 funding for the High School Graduation Initiative, which under current law is in the Education for the Disadvantaged account. In place of this and other narrowly targeted programs that seek to improve student achievement in high school or provide an accelerated curriculum, the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization, a broader program, College Pathways and Accelerated Learning. This program would support efforts to increase high school graduation rates and preparation for college matriculation and success by providing college-level and other accelerated courses and instruction to students in high-poverty middle and high schools and in high schools with low graduation rates. The program would also support projects that re-engage out-of-school youth or students who are not on track to graduate.

Students at risk of dropping out would be a critical target population for the new program. Educators find that giving such students the opportunity to enroll and succeed in demanding courses can be an effective approach to dropout prevention, as many students lose interest in and subsequently leave school because they are unchallenged by the standard curriculum. Further, research shows that students who participate in an accelerated high school curriculum are more likely to enroll in higher education. According to the Department's 2000 follow-up of the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS: 88/2000), 96 percent of students in the lowest socio-economic status quintile who participated in AP courses enrolled in postsecondary education programs, compared to 39 percent of those who did not participate.

The Department would also continue to provide significant assistance to high schools with low graduation rates through the School Turnaround Grants (formerly School Improvement Grants) program, which under the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal would serve Title I secondary schools with a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.

Under the Administration's reauthorization proposal, fiscal year 2014 High School Graduation Initiative continuation grant costs would be funded from the appropriation for the new College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program.

If the Congress does not reauthorize the ESEA prior to enactment of fiscal year 2014 appropriations, the Administration will request authority to use funds from the required 10 percent set-aside for national activities under High School Graduation Initiative to make grants for activities to improve school dropout prevention and reentry.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### High school graduation initiative

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Amount for continuation awards	\$43,928	\$43,928	0
Number of continuation awards	29	29	0
National activities	\$4,881	\$4,881	0

NOTES: 2013 excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.  
Continuation costs of approximately \$49,000 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for College Pathways and Accelerated Learning in fiscal year 2014.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested for fiscal year 2014 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

In 2011, the Department established performance measures for the fiscal year 2010 grantee cohort. The 2011 data are used as the baseline for the targets in subsequent years.

**Goal: To increase the number of students who graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma.**

**Objective:** *To increase the average daily attendance of returning high school dropouts.*

**Measure:** The average daily attendance of students served by the program who had not attended school for 60 or more instructional days immediately prior to their participation in the program.

Year	Target	Actual
<b>2011</b>		67.6
<b>2012</b>	69.0	77.0
<b>2013</b>	70.3	
<b>2014</b>	71.7	

**Additional Information:** Data for this measure represent the average daily rate of school attendance by applicable students. The 2012 data for this measure are reported for 21 of the 29 fiscal year 2010 grantees.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### High school graduation initiative

---

**Objective:** *To accelerate the credit accumulation of under-credited high school students.*

**Measure:** The percentage of participating students who were two or more years behind their expected age and credit accumulation in high school who earned one half or more of the credits they needed to graduate with a regular diploma.

Year	Target	Actual
2011		24.3
2012	24.8	28.0
2013	25.3	
2014	25.8	

**Additional Information:** The 2012 data are reported for 21 of 29 grantees.

**Objective:** *To increase the on-time graduation rate of high schools.*

**Measure:** The percentage of high school students served by the program who, during the most recent school year, earned one quarter of the credits necessary to graduate from high school with a regular diploma.

Year	Target	Actual
2011		47.6
2012	48.6	51.1
2013	49.5	
2014	50.5	

**Additional Information:** The 2012 data are reported for 23 of 29 grantees.

**Measure:** The average on-time graduation rate of high schools served by the program.

Year	Target	Actual
2011		58.4
2012	59.6	61.3
2013	60.8	
2014	62.0	

**Additional Information:** The 2012 data are reported for 22 of 29 grantees.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### High school graduation initiative

---

**Objective:** *To increase the percentage of eighth grade students who transition successfully to high school.*

**Measure:** The average daily attendance of schools served by the program that include an eighth grade.

Year	Target	Actual
2011		92.9
2012	93.4	93.2
2013	93.8	
2014	94.3	

**Additional Information:** Data for this measure are reported for each of the 14 fiscal year 2010 grantees that serve middle schools and represent the average daily rate of attendance of students enrolled in the applicable school.

**Measure:** The percentage of eighth grade students attending schools served by the project who enrolled in ninth grade at the start of the following school year.

Year	Target	Actual
2011		91.6
2012	92.1	93.2
2013	92.5	
2014	93.0	

**Additional Information:** The 2012 data are reported for 11 of the 14 grantees that serve middle schools.

### Other Performance Information

Reviews of rigorous research conducted for the Department's What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) show variation in the effectiveness of dropout prevention interventions. Since January 2008, reports on nine dropout prevention interventions have been published on the WWC website that include reviews of studies meeting WWC evidence standards with or without reservations. Of those nine interventions, four were found to have positive or potentially positive effects on students' staying in school, progressing in school, or completing school; four were determined to have no discernible effects in these areas; and one was found to have no discernible effects on progressing in school but potentially positive effects on completing school.

In October 2008, the Department issued a regulation that established a uniform measure for calculating high school graduation rates that must be used by all States for accountability purposes under ESEA Title I, Part A. Preliminary data for the 2010-2011 school year, the first year for which data are available using the uniform measure, indicate that the graduation rate for all students in a State ranged from 59 percent to 88 percent. For all economically disadvantaged students in a State, the graduation rate ranged from 53 to 86 percent.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Advanced placement

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$30,055 <sup>2</sup>	\$30,055 <sup>3</sup>	0	-\$30,055

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The Administration proposes to consolidate the program in FY 2014 under new legislation.

<sup>2</sup> Reflects a reprogramming in fiscal year 2012 of \$2,906 thousand from Magnet Schools Assistance and \$200 thousand from Charter Schools Grants to Advanced Placement to help address a funding shortfall in the Test Fee program.

<sup>3</sup> Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title I, Part G of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) authorizes two programs: the Advanced Placement Test Fee program and the Advanced Placement Incentive program. The purpose of both programs is to support State and local efforts to increase access to Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), and other approved advanced courses and tests (collectively referred to as “advanced placement courses and tests”) for students from low-income families. The statute requires the Department to give priority to funding the Advanced Placement Test Fee program, with remaining funds allocated to Advanced Placement Incentive grants.

*Advanced Placement Test Fee Program:* The Department makes 1-year noncompetitive awards to State educational agencies to enable them to cover all or part of the cost of test fees for students from low-income families who are enrolled in an advanced placement course and plan to take an advanced placement test. By subsidizing test fees, the program encourages students from low-income families to take advanced placement tests and obtain college credit for their courses, thereby reducing the time and cost required to complete a postsecondary degree.

*Advanced Placement Incentive Program:* The Department makes 3-year competitive awards to State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and national nonprofit educational entities with expertise in providing advanced placement services. Grants must be used to expand access for students from low-income families to advanced placement courses and programs. Authorized activities include, but are not limited to, teacher training, development of pre-advanced placement courses, activities to enhance coordination and articulation between grade levels in order to prepare students for academic achievement in advanced placement

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Advanced placement

---

courses, the purchase of books and supplies, and activities to enhance the availability of and expand participation in online advanced placement courses.

For fiscal year 2012, Congress appropriated \$27 million for Advanced Placement and stated in the accompanying conference report its intention that the Department use \$20 million for the Advanced Placement Test Fee program and \$7 million for grant continuations under the Advanced Placement Incentive program. To help address a shortfall under the Test Fee program at these funding levels (resulting from the rapid growth in the number of advanced placement tests taken annually by students from low-income families), the Department provided \$1.7 million less in Incentive program continuations than indicated in the conference report and reprogrammed \$3.1 million from Magnet Schools Assistance and Charter Schools Grants to Advanced Placement for Test Fee program purposes, resulting in final fiscal year 2012 funding levels for the Test Fee and Incentive programs of \$24.7 million and \$5.3 million, respectively. Even at this increased level for the Test Fee program, however, a shortfall of approximately \$7 million remained following the 2012 test cycle.

The Department expects that, under the funding level anticipated for fiscal year 2013, the Test Fee program funding shortfall would increase as more students from low-income families continue to take advanced placement tests. As of March 2013, we are considering options to mitigate the shortfall, such as reducing the amount of the Department's contribution per test, eliminating our coverage of test registration fees, further reducing or eliminating Incentive program continuations, and reprogramming or transferring funds from other programs.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009 .....	\$43,540
2010 .....	45,840
2011 .....	43,253
2012 .....	30,055
2013 .....	30,055 <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate fiscal year 2014 funding for the Advanced Placement programs, which under current law are in the Innovation and Improvement account. In place of these and other narrowly targeted programs that seek to improve student achievement in high schools or provide an accelerated curriculum, the Administration has proposed to create, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization, a broader program, College Pathways and Accelerated Learning. This program would support efforts to increase preparation for college matriculation and success through the introduction and expansion of advanced placement courses in high-poverty middle and high schools as well as other accelerated curriculum options (such as dual-enrollment and early college high school programs) in those schools. It would also provide grants to States for payment of advanced course test fees for students from low-income families.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Advanced placement

---

The fiscal year 2014 request for the new College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program includes \$53.2 million to pay for advanced course test fees for students from low-income families. This amount includes funding to cover estimated shortfalls in payments to States for test fee costs in fiscal year 2013.

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
<b>Test Fee program</b>			
Amount for new and supplemental awards	\$24,740	\$24,740	0
Number of new awards	44	44	0
<b>Incentive program</b>			
Amount for continuation awards	\$5,315	\$5,315	0
Number of continuation awards	14	0	0

---

NOTES: 2013 excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.  
 Test fee costs of approximately \$53,200 thousand would be provided from the appropriation for College Pathways and Accelerated Learning in fiscal year 2014.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested for fiscal year 2014 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Goal: To increase the numbers of low-income high school students prepared to pursue higher education.**

**Objective:** *Encourage a greater number of low-income and other underrepresented categories of students to participate in the AP and IB programs and pass the exams.*

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Advanced placement

---

**Measure:** The number of Advanced Placement tests taken by low-income public school students nationally.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	378,272	399,809
2010	435,013	483,624
2011	500,265	596,241
2012	600,318	710,100
2013	781,110	
2014	859,221	

**Measure:** The number of Advanced Placement tests passed (tests receiving scores of 3-5) by low-income public school students nationally.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	150,552	147,654
2010	174,875	172,005
2011	203,108	210,870
2012	222,118	268,860
2013	300,727	
2014	335,955	

**Measure:** The percentage of Advanced Placement tests passed (tests receiving scores of 3-5) by low-income public school students nationally.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	39.8	37.0
2010	40.2	35.6
2011	40.4	35.4
2012	37.0	37.9
2013	38.5	
2014	39.1	

**Additional Information:** Data for these measures are obtained from the College Board and capture the effects of efforts to increase low-income public school students' participation in AP courses and success on AP exams. The targets for these measures have been revised beginning with the 2013 targets based on actual performance in 2012.

The International Baccalaureate Organization reported that, in 2012, 35,414 IB exams were taken by low-income public school students, with 19,295 of those exams, or 54.5 percent, receiving passing scores of 4-7.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Advanced placement

**Measure:** The number of Advanced Placement tests taken by minority (Hispanic, Black, Native American) public school students nationally.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	544,716	538,249
2010	626,423	616,992
2011	675,520	700,872
2012	721,562	751,428
2013	788,999	
2014	828,449	

**Additional Information:** Data for this measure are obtained from the College Board and capture the effects of efforts to increase minority public school students' participation in AP programs. The targets for this measure have been revised beginning with the 2013 target based on actual performance in 2012.

The International Baccalaureate Organization reported that, in 2012, 49,791 IB exams were taken by minority public school students.

**Measure:** The ratio of Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, or other approved advanced placement tests taken in public high schools served by Advanced Placement Incentive grants to the number of seniors enrolled at those schools.

Year	2006 Cohort Target	2006 Cohort Actual	2008 Cohort Target	2008 Cohort Actual	2009 Cohort Target	2009 Cohort Actual	2011 Cohort Target	2011 Cohort Actual
2009	0.79	0.62	0.78	0.81		0.97		
2010			0.93	0.84	1.03	1.24		
2011			1.10	0.84	1.09	1.32		0.78
2012					1.15	1.30	0.87	0.89
2013							0.96	
2014							1.14	

**Additional Information:** The Department did not award new Advanced Placement Incentive grants in 2007 or 2010.

**Measure:** The ratio of Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, or other approved advanced placement tests passed by low-income students in public high schools served by Advanced Placement Incentive grants to the number of low-income seniors enrolled at those schools.

Year	2011 Cohort Target	2011 Cohort Actual
2011		0.21
2012	0.23	0.23
2013	0.25	
2014	0.27	

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Advanced placement

---

**Additional Information:** Fiscal year 2011 grantees are the first grantees to collect and report data that address this new AP Incentive grant performance measure, which the Department established in order to assess the extent to which grantees are serving students from low-income families as intended. Tests passed include AP tests with scores of 3 or higher, IB tests with scores of 4 or higher, and other advanced placement tests with equivalent scores.

### Efficiency Measure

**Measure:** The cost per passage of an Advanced Placement test by a low-income public school student.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	\$91.29	\$110.99
2010	91.29	115.89
2011	91.29	151.45
2012	91.29	
2013	91.29	
2014	91.29	

**Additional Information:** The results for this measure are calculated by dividing the total amount of Federal funds that States receiving AP Test Fee grants report spending on AP test fees by the total number of tests passed by low-income students in those States. The increase in cost per passage in 2011 could be explained, in part, by the fact that California stopped partially subsidizing test fee costs with State funds that year, thus increasing the Federal share of test fee costs in that State. The 2012 data for this measure will be available in January 2014.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Assessing achievement

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$389,214	\$389,214 <sup>2</sup>	\$389,214	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2014.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes a 0.612 across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requires States to test all students annually in grades 3 through 8 and once in high school in reading (or language arts) and mathematics, and to administer annual assessments in science for each of three grade spans specified in the law. Furthermore, States must assess the English proficiency of all limited English proficient students annually. Under current law the annual assessments in reading and mathematics are used to determine whether States, local educational agencies (LEAs), and schools are making adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward the goal of all students attaining proficiency by 2013-2014; the science and language proficiency assessments are not required for the determination of adequate yearly progress. Under ESEA flexibility, the Department's initiative to provide States, districts, and schools with flexibility from current law in order to improve academic achievement and improve the quality of instruction for all students, nearly all of the 35 States approved thus far use these annual assessments to measure the progress of schools toward annual measurable objectives set as part of their systems of differentiated accountability, recognition, and support.

All assessments must be valid and reliable, include measures that assess higher-order thinking skills and understanding of challenging content, and enable achievement results to be disaggregated by major racial and ethnic group, gender, poverty, disability, English proficiency, and migrant status. The annual assessments can be a critical diagnostic tool for teachers and parents to use in improving instruction and meeting specific student needs.

The Grants for State Assessments program, authorized by Section 6111 of ESEA, provides formula grants to States to pay the costs of developing the standards and assessments required by ESEA Title I. Once a State has put in place those standards and assessments, it may use program funds to pay for the administration of the assessments and for other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and LEAs are held accountable for results. Such activities may include, among other things, developing standards and assessments in subjects other than

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Assessing achievement

---

those required by Title I, expanding the range of testing accommodations for students with disabilities and for limited English proficient students, professional development aligned with State standards and assessments, and developing multiple measures to ensure the validity and reliability of State assessments. Funds also may be used to acquire, and to train teachers and other staff to use the educational technology needed to implement new, computer-based assessments, and to purchase add-ons and diagnostic information related to such assessments.

Under the funding formula, 0.5 of 1 percent of the appropriation is reserved for the Department of the Interior/Bureau of Indian Education and 0.5 of 1 percent goes to the Outlying Areas. From the remaining funds, each State receives \$3 million and then a share of any remaining funds based on its proportion of students ages 5 through 17.

Section 6112 of the ESEA authorizes Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments, a competitive grant program under which the Department makes awards to support efforts by States, or consortia of States, to: (1) improve the quality, validity, and reliability of State academic assessments; (2) measure student academic achievement through the use of multiple measures from multiple sources; (3) chart student progress over time; and (4) use comprehensive instruments such as performance- and technology-based assessments. To date, the Department has made 50 awards under the program; those grants have supported projects to increase the accessibility and validity of assessments for students with disabilities or limited English proficiency; develop English language proficiency assessments; use technology to improve State assessments; and provide intensive, high-quality professional development for using assessment data to improve instruction.

Assessing Achievement is a forward-funded program. Funds become available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available for 15 months through September 30 of the following year.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009 .....	\$410,732
2010 .....	410,732
2011 .....	389,951
2012 .....	389,214
2013 .....	389,214 <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2014, the Administration requests \$389.2 million for Assessing Achievement (currently State Assessments), the same amount as the 2012 appropriation. The request would support one of the major reforms included in the Administration's proposal for reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the implementation of college- and career-ready (CCR) standards and aligned assessments in order to ensure that all students graduate from high school with the knowledge and skills they need to be successful in college and the workplace.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Assessing achievement

---

The Department would award \$380 million from the request to States through the same formula as in current statute, and the remaining \$9.2 million requested for fiscal year 2014 would be awarded on a competitive basis.

Funding for the reauthorized Assessing Achievement program would support the transition to and implementation of common assessments aligned with rigorous college- and career-ready standards in English-language arts and mathematics. A new generation of assessments is needed because existing State assessments generally fail to capture the full spectrum of what students know and can do. They focus on concepts that are easy to measure; rely mainly on multiple-choice items with fill-in-the-bubble answers; and provide time-sensitive data and results months later, when their instructional usefulness is largely past. Educators need high-quality assessment systems that more broadly and validly measure student achievement and provide more timely results. They need assessment systems that appropriately assess all students, including students with disabilities and English Learners, and that assess a range of content areas to support a well-rounded curriculum.

The Administration's reauthorization proposal would require States to adopt college- and career-ready standards and to administer assessments aligned with those standards in order to receive program funds. States are currently collaborating to develop common assessments aligned with rigorous college- and career-ready standards in English-language arts and mathematics. The resources provided through the reauthorized Assessing Achievement program would also support the improvement of other assessments and the reporting of assessment data. These resources would increase the number of States implementing assessment systems that measure whether students are on track to being college- and career-ready by the time they graduate from high school, and they also will help States align their standards and high school graduation requirements with college and career expectations.

In addition, the proposal would allow States to use formula funds to improve their own technological capacity, as well as that of their districts and schools, to implement computer-based assessments and use technology to implement other elements of their assessment systems (such as scoring and reporting).

Formula grant funds for fiscal year 2014 would flow to all States to support compliance with the current ESEA requirements for reading/language arts, mathematics, and science assessment. Once States have finished implementing the current ESEA assessment requirements, they could use their formula funds to support the transition to English-language arts and mathematics assessments aligned to college- and career-ready standards that are held in common by a number of States, to measure student attainment against college- and career-ready standards, or to measure student growth and to inform determinations of individual teacher and principal effectiveness for purposes of evaluation. States could also use formula funds to administer their current assessments; develop and implement assessments that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards in other subjects, including science, engineering, and technology; develop or improve assessments of English-language proficiency; develop or improve native language assessments; expand the range of accommodations available to English Learners and students with disabilities; or carry out other activities.

Starting with fiscal year 2015, funds would flow only to States that (1) have adopted college- and career-ready standards that are common to a significant number of States; and (2) are

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Assessing achievement

---

implementing, or have committed to implement, assessments in English-language arts and in mathematics in grades 3-8 and at least once in high school that are aligned with those standards.

The reauthorization proposal would also establish a program to award competitive grants to consortia of States, or partnerships of States and other organizations, for research on, or development, evaluation, and improvement of, assessments that are aligned with college- and career-ready content and achievement standards that are held in common by a significant number of States. The Department would set aside \$9.2 million of the fiscal year 2014 request to support a grant competition to assist consortia of States in developing high-quality assessments in areas of common need, particularly in strategic areas that may need additional resources for full development. Such activities might include developing or improving assessments in subjects other than English-language arts and mathematics, developing high school end-of-course assessments, developing formative or diagnostic assessments, enhancing early learning assessment instruments, or improving the reliability and validity of assessments for English Learners and students with disabilities.

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Grants for State Assessments:			
Amount for State Grants	\$376,200	\$376,200	\$376,200
Estimated number of awards	52	52	52
Range of awards	\$3,280-\$30,239	\$3,280-\$30,239	\$3,280-\$30,239
Average award	\$7,235	\$7,235	\$7,235
BIE and Outlying Areas	\$3,800	\$3,800	\$3,800
Grants for Enhanced			
Assessment Instruments:			
Amount for new awards	\$9,214	\$9,214	\$9,214
Number of new awards	1-2	1-2	1-2
Range of new awards	\$5,000-\$9,940	\$5,000-\$9,174	\$5,000-\$9,174
Peer review of applications	\$40	\$40	\$40

---

NOTE: 2013 excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

In December of 2012, the Department notified States that it is suspending the peer reviews of State assessment systems under Title I in order to review and revise the current peer review process within the context of other initiatives in the Department that affect State assessment systems. At this time, most States have either received or expressed intent to seek waivers of key provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act under ESEA flexibility. Under the terms of these waivers, States have to commit to adopting, or developing, and implementing high-quality assessments aligned to college- and career-ready standards by the 2014-15 school year. To

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Assessing achievement

---

meet these requirements, many States are also using funds under the Race to the Top-Assessments (RTTA) program to come together to develop the next generation of assessment systems aligned with new college- and career-ready standards. With these new standards and assessment endeavors underway, the Department believes that there is a need to revisit the peer review process for State assessment systems and determine what changes may be necessary. Besides considering how well the existing peer review process addresses the requirements for State assessment systems for States participating in ESEA flexibility or RTTA, the Department will consider changes to the peer review process that would help improve the technical quality, validity, and reliability of all State assessment systems.

Currently, 32 States have reading or language arts, mathematics, and science assessments that have received full approval from the Department. Five States have received approval of their reading or language arts assessments and mathematics assessments, but have not yet received approval for science. (The number of States that have received approval of their reading or language arts, mathematics, or science assessments has changed over time because some States have made revisions to their assessment systems and have had to re-submit evidence that their assessments still comply with the Title I requirements.) Six States do not currently have approval of their reading or language arts assessments or their mathematics assessments, or both, because they have made changes to their previously approved assessments. Nine States have never received approval; of those, four States entered into compliance agreements with the Department because it would take them additional time to come into compliance, and the remaining five were placed in “mandatory oversight” status. All compliance agreements ended on December 31, 2011. All States that were in mandatory oversight status or under compliance agreements submitted evidence to the Department for determination of whether their assessments systems now meet the Title I requirements.

In addition, under the regulations pertaining to State assessment systems under Title I issued on April 9, 2007, States have the option of developing alternate assessments based on modified standards for students with disabilities that meet certain criteria. One of the criteria is that there must be objective evidence demonstrating that a student’s disability has precluded the student from achieving grade-level proficiency. To date, 15 States have submitted evidence to the Department to demonstrate that their alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards meet the requirements established under the regulations. Of those, 4 States have received approval of their alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, and the remaining 11 States are in the process of submitting additional evidence regarding compliance with the regulatory requirements, or are waiting for the Department to make a determination of their status.

The Department conducted a pilot review of products from grantees that received fiscal year 2005 funding in order to obtain baseline data for the performance measures for the Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments program. These measures assess the extent to which funded projects produce significant research on assessments, in particular regarding accommodations and alternate assessments for students with disabilities, and whether grantees disseminate information on the advances in assessment that result from their grants. The grantee’s final products were reviewed by expert panels. The review found that five of the eight grants funded in fiscal year 2005 produced significant research, methodologies, products, or tools relating to assessment systems or assessments, and five of the eight grants also produced

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Assessing achievement

---

significant research, methodologies, products, or tools specifically relating to accommodations and alternate assessments for students with disabilities and limited English proficient students.

### Efficiency Measures

The Department has adopted an efficiency measure that tracks the average number of days per peer review session it takes the Department to issue an initial standards and assessment decision letter to a State after receiving a submission.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	90	78.23
2009	90	100.9
2010	90	183.4
2011	90	127.3
2012	90	111.3

**Additional information:** The Department began formal peer reviews of State standards and assessment systems in 2005 in order to determine whether a State has met each of the requirements specified in the authorizing statute. At this time every State has submitted evidence for review multiple times. Since the Department has announced suspension of peer reviews for State assessment systems, there will be no updates for this measure until a new peer review process for State assessment systems is implemented.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

**Training and advisory services**  
(Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IV)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: Indefinite

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$6,962	\$6,962 <sup>1</sup>	\$6,962	0

---

<sup>1</sup> Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Training and Advisory Services program supports efforts to achieve the intent of Title IV of the Civil Rights Act by aiding educators in preparing, adopting, and implementing plans for desegregating public schools and solving equity problems related to race, gender, and national origin. To carry out those activities, the Department awards 3-year grants to regional Equity Assistance Centers (EACs) in each of the 10 Department of Education regions.

The EACs provide services to school districts upon request. Typical activities include disseminating information on successful educational practices and on legal requirements related to nondiscrimination on the basis of race, sex, and national origin in educational programs. Other activities include training designed to develop educators' skills in such areas as the identification of race and sex bias in instructional materials and technical assistance in the identification and selection of appropriate educational programs to meet the needs of a diverse student body.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009 .....	\$9,489 <sup>1</sup>
2010 .....	6,989
2011 .....	6,975
2012 .....	6,962
2013 .....	6,962 <sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The appropriation included \$2.5 million for one-time grants to local educational agencies for implementation of desegregation plans that comply with a 2007 Supreme Court decision.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Training and advisory services

---

#### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2014, the Administration requests \$7.0 million for the Training and Advisory Services program, the same as the fiscal year 2012 appropriation. The request would support the first year of 3-year grants to 10 regional Equity Assistance Centers.

The fiscal year 2011 competition included four priorities for projects that would support the goal of equal access to a high-quality education for all students: (1) a competitive preference priority on improving the effectiveness and distribution of teachers or principals; (2) a competitive preference priority on strategies to improve school engagement, school environment, school safety, family and community engagement; (3) an invitational priority on enabling more data-based decision-making; and (4) an invitational priority on promoting science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education.

Final priorities are still to be determined for the fiscal year 2014 competition, but could include priorities from the previous competition as well as new priorities.

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Amount for continuation awards	\$6,939	\$6,939	0
Number of continuation awards	10	10	0
Amount for new awards	0	0	\$6,870
Peer review of new award applications	0	0	\$69
Number of new awards	0	0	10
Data collection	\$23	\$23	\$23

NOTE: 2013 excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested for fiscal year 2014 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department gathers data to inform the program's performance measures through customer surveys administered by the Library of Congress's Federal Research Division.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Training and advisory services

---

**Goal:** To support access and equity in public schools and help school districts solve equity problems in education related to race, sex, and national origin.

**Objective:** Provide high-quality technical assistance and training to public school districts in addressing equity in education.

**Measure:** The percentage of customers of Equity Assistance Centers who develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices in eliminating, reducing, or preventing harassment, conflict, and school violence.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	69	52
2010	70	36
2011	71	42
2012	72	62
2013	73	
2014	74	

**Additional information:** “Actual” data reflect results from the prior program year. The drop in positive responses for this measure from 2009 to 2011 could be explained by fewer customers seeking this type of assistance, compared to the large jump in 2012. The percentages for individual EACs ranged from 0 percent to 93 percent in 2012.

**Measure:** The percentage of customers of Equity Assistance Centers who develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices, or both, for ensuring that students of different race, sex, and national origin have equitable opportunity for high-quality instruction.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	74	85
2010	75	77
2011	76	82
2012	77	85
2013	78	
2014	79	

**Additional information:** Results have improved for this measure. The percentages for individual EACs ranged from 50 percent to 100 percent in 2012.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Training and advisory services

---

**Measure:** The percentage of customers who report that the products and services they received from the Equity Assistance Centers are of high quality.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	90	95
2010	90	90
2011	90	96
2012	90	94
2013	90	
2014	90	

**Additional information:** Customers have responded very positively on the quality of the products and services they have received, and 94 percent of the respondents gave the products and services a “very high” or “high” rating of quality in 2012. The percentages for individual EACs receiving a rating of “high” or “very high” ranged from 67 percent to 100 percent in 2012.

**Measure:** The percentage of customers who report that the products and services they received from the Equity Assistance Centers are of high usefulness to their policies and practices.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	88	92
2010	89	85
2011	90	90
2012	90	92
2013	90	
2014	90	

**Additional information:** Customers have responded positively to this measure for 7 years in a row, and the program has generally met or exceeded its targets. In 2012, 92 percent of the respondents gave the products and services a “very high” or “high” rating of usefulness. The percentages for individual EACs receiving a rating of “high” or “very high” ranged from 67 percent to 100 percent.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Training and advisory services

---

#### Efficiency Measures

The Department has implemented a measure of administrative efficiency to assess the Training and Advisory Services program and other technical assistance programs. A second efficiency measure was established specifically for Training and Advisory Services.

**Measure:** The percentage of Equity Assistance Center grant funds carried over in each year of the project.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	10	4
2010	10	2
2011	10	5
2012	10	6
2013	10	
2014	10	

**Additional information:** The Department has succeeded in keeping the total carryover funds below 10 percent. There were 3 centers with expected carryover that exceeded 10 percent and these centers are new grantee organizations. The Department is working with these centers to ensure that carryover is not excessive.

**Measure:** The number of working days it takes the Department to send a monitoring report to grantees after monitoring visits.

Year	Target	Actual
2010	45	184
2011	45	60
2012	45	30
2013	45	
2014	45	

**Additional information:** New program staff have focused on monitoring, which has helped to reduce delays that occurred in 2010 and 2011. In 2012, the Department conducted two monitoring visits and sent reports to the relevant centers within an average of 30 days.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Rural education

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title VI, Part B)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$179,193	\$179,193 <sup>2</sup>	\$179,193	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2014.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Part B of Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the Rural Education Achievement program (REAP), authorizes two programs to assist rural school districts in carrying out activities to help improve the quality of teaching and learning in their schools. The Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) program provides funds to rural local educational agencies (LEAs) that serve small numbers of students; the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) program provides funds to rural LEAs that serve high concentrations of poor students, regardless of the LEA's size. Funds appropriated for REAP are divided equally between the SRSA and the RLIS programs.

The two programs have similar accountability requirements. Participating LEAs are required to administer an assessment that is consistent with the ESEA Title I assessment requirements. An LEA has 3 years to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) as defined by the State under ESEA Title I. If, after 3 years, an LEA is making AYP, it may continue to participate in the program. If it does not make AYP, an LEA may continue to participate only if it agrees to use all of its applicable funding to carry out Title I school improvement activities.

REAP is a forward-funded program. Funds become available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available for 15 months through September 30 of the following year.

#### **SMALL, RURAL SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (Subpart 1)**

To be eligible to receive funds under the SRSA program, an LEA must: (1) (a) have a total average daily attendance (ADA) of less than 600 students; or (b) serve only schools that are located in counties that have a population density of fewer than 10 persons per square mile; and (2) serve only schools that (a) have a National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) locale code of 7 (rural) or 8 (rural near an urban area); or (b) are located in an area of the State defined as rural by a governmental agency of the State.

## **EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

### **Rural education**

---

The Department makes formula allocations directly to eligible LEAs based on the number of students in ADA in the schools served by the LEA and the amount the LEA received under certain Federal programs in the previous fiscal year. For each eligible LEA, the Department calculates an initial allocation that is equal to \$20,000 plus \$100 for each child in ADA above 50, with a maximum initial allocation of \$60,000. An LEA's final allocation is equal to the initial allocation minus the amount received in "applicable funding," which are funds allocated under the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, Educational Technology State Grants, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants, and State Grants for Innovative Programs, in the previous fiscal year (note that only the first of these programs was funded in fiscal years 2012 and 2013).

LEAs may use program funds to carry out activities authorized under: (1) Part A of Title I (Grants to Local Educational Agencies); (2) Part A of Title II (Improving Teacher Quality State Grants); (3) Part D of Title II (Educational Technology State Grants); (4) Title III (Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students); (5) Part A of Title IV (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants); (6) Part B of Title IV (21st Century Community Learning Centers); and (7) Part A of Title V (State Grants for Innovative Programs).

Eligible LEAs also may (under the "REAP-Flex" authority) consolidate funds they receive from these sources (except for Title I, Part A) to carry out effective activities under any of the authorized programs including under Title I, Part A.

### **RURAL AND LOW-INCOME SCHOOL PROGRAM (Subpart 2)**

Under the RLIS program the Department makes formula allocations to States based on each State's share of children in ADA in all eligible LEAs. Eligible LEAs must: (1) have a Census child-poverty rate of at least 20 percent and (2) serve only schools that have an NCES locale code of 6 (small town), 7 (rural), or 8 (rural near an urban area). States have the option of allocating funds to eligible LEAs competitively or through a formula based on the number of children in ADA in eligible LEAs within the State. A State may also use an alternative formula to allocate funds if it can demonstrate that an alternative method would better target funds to eligible LEAs that serve the highest concentrations of poor students.

LEAs use program funds for: (1) teacher recruitment and retention; (2) teacher professional development; (3) educational technology; (4) parental involvement activities; (5) activities authorized under Part A of Title IV (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities); (6) activities authorized under Part A of Title I (Grants to LEAs); and (7) activities authorized under Title III (Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students).

Lastly, the Department allocates one-half of 1 percent of RLIS funds to the Bureau of Indian Education of the Department of the Interior and an equal amount to the Outlying Areas.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009 .....	\$173,382
2010 .....	174,882
2011 .....	174,532
2012 .....	179,193
2013 .....	179,193 <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2014, the Administration is requesting \$179.2 million for REAP, the same as the fiscal year 2012 level. The budget request would be implemented under the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal, which would update the criteria by which a district is designated as rural to align with the most recent criteria developed by the Office of Management and Budget and the Census Bureau, extend "REAP-Flex" authority to RLIS subgrantees, and authorize national support for technical assistance, research, and other activities, including demonstration grants to help rural districts overcome the unique challenges they face. In fiscal year 2014, all funds would be used for SRSA and RLIS formula grants. The request would provide an average LEA award of approximately \$21,000 under SRSA and an average LEA subgrant of approximately \$37,000 under RLIS.

The Administration supports continued funding for REAP because of the significant challenges that rural LEAs face in meeting the objectives of the ESEA. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), in school year 2010-11, 32 percent of the Nation's public schools were located in rural areas, with 24 percent of all public school students enrolled at these schools. The small size and remoteness of many rural schools and districts creates a different set of challenges from those of urban schools and districts. For example, rural schools and districts generally do not benefit from economies of scale and, thus, can face greater per-pupil costs in areas such as staffing or transportation. According to the report *Status of Education in Rural America*, released by the NCES in July 2007, operating expenditures per student in 2003-04, adjusted for geographic cost differences, were higher in rural districts than in city and suburban districts.

This may explain, in part, why rural school districts often are not able to offer their students the same level of access to advanced coursework as other districts. During the 2002-03 school year, just 69 percent of rural high school students attended schools that offered Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate courses, compared to 93 percent of city and 96 percent of suburban high school students. The lack of such courses may contribute to lower college enrollment among rural individuals; in 2004 college enrollment among 18- to 24-years old was only 27 percent in rural areas, compared to a national average of 34 percent.

In addition, because of size and location, many small, rural districts have faced difficulty in meeting the ESEA requirement that students receive instruction in the core academic subjects from teachers who are fully certified by the State and have demonstrated competency in the

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

subjects they teach. These districts also face challenges recruiting and retaining effective teachers. Rural teachers are frequently called upon to teach multiple subjects, which, in turn, requires teachers to obtain multiple certifications in order to meet the statutory definition of “highly qualified.” A 2003 national survey conducted by the Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL) found that 57 percent of secondary school teachers in rural schools with 250 or fewer students were teaching multiple subjects. Another national study, conducted in 2005 by Edvantia, the successor to AEL, found the “highly qualified” requirement, geographic and social isolation, and lower pay to be the greatest challenges to rural district recruitment and retention of teachers. REAP funds can help rural LEAs meet the challenge of recruiting and retaining a staff of highly qualified and effective teachers.

The Administration’s reauthorization proposal is designed to support the unique needs of rural communities. It would make it easier for teachers to teach multiple subjects because it would define teacher quality not based exclusively on paper credentials, but on how well a teacher performs in the classroom, and would thus help rural schools keep effective teachers in the classrooms in which they are needed most. It would also provide greater local flexibility in designing interventions in schools that are not meeting their performance targets, so that rural communities can decide what works best for their schools.

Rural districts frequently receive allocations under State formula grant programs that are too small to allow the LEA to address effectively the purposes for which the funds are appropriated. For example, among districts eligible for SRSA in fiscal year 2012, the fiscal year 2011 median sum of allocations under the Federal formula grant program Improving Teacher Quality State Grants was \$18,184. Recognizing that rural districts frequently receive small allocations from Federal formula grants, the “REAP-Flex” authority—which would be continued for SRSA and expanded to include RLIS under the Administration’s reauthorization proposal—gives SRSA-eligible LEAs the flexibility to make more effective use of their small Federal formula allocations. An eligible LEA may use its formula allocation under the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program to carry out authorized activities or for activities authorized under Part A of Title I, Part D of Title II (Educational Technology), Title III (English Language Acquisition), Part A of Title IV (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities), Part B of Title IV (21st Century Community Learning Centers), or Part A of Title V (Innovative Programs). Fifty-one percent of eligible districts notified their respective State of their intention to take advantage of this authority in school year 2010-11. Yet even when the eligible LEAs consolidate their allocations under these programs, they typically do not have enough money to provide effective educator professional development, strengthen school safety, or address the other statutory objectives in a meaningful manner. REAP funds help to make up the difference and assist rural LEAs in financing and implementing approaches to meeting ESEA requirements and addressing the other challenges they face.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
<b>Small, rural school achievement</b>			
Total funding	\$89,596	\$89,596	\$89,596
Amount for LEA grants	\$89,148	\$89,596	\$89,596
Amount for evaluation	\$448	0	0
Number of LEAs receiving grants	4,296	4,296	4,312
Average LEA grant	\$21	\$21	\$21
Average award per student (whole \$)	\$79	\$80	\$80
Range of awards to LEAs	0 - \$60	0 - \$60	0 - \$60
<b>Rural and low-income schools</b>			
Total funding	\$89,596	\$89,596	\$89,596
Amount for State grants	\$88,252	\$88,700	\$88,700
Amount for BIE	\$448	\$448	\$448
Amount for Outlying Areas	\$448	\$448	\$448
Amount for evaluation	\$448	0	0
Number of States receiving grants	44	44	45
Number of LEAs receiving subgrants	2,042	2,042	2,409
Average State grant	\$2,006	\$2,016	\$1,971
Average LEA subgrant	\$43	\$43	\$37
Average award per student (whole \$)	\$22	\$22	\$18
Range of awards to States	\$13 - \$6,747	\$13 - \$6,781	\$11 - \$8,772
Estimated range of subgrants to LEAs	\$1-\$513	\$1-\$513	\$1-\$322

NOTES: 2013 excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.  
 The fiscal year 2014 data assume the introduction of new locale codes, as provided for in the ESEA reauthorization proposal.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

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

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

year 2014 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Goal:** Raise educational achievement of students in small, rural school districts.

**Objective:** Local educational agencies (LEAs) participating in REAP programs will make adequate yearly progress (AYP) after the third year.

**Measure:** The percentage of SRSA-participating LEAs that make adequate yearly progress after 3 years.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	97	95
2010	97	78
2011	98	69
2012	98	
2013	99	
2014	100	

**Measure:** The percentage of RLIS-participating LEAs that make adequate yearly progress after 3 years.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	82	49
2010	88	43
2011	94	31
2012	96	
2013	98	
2014	100	

**Additional information:** SRSA and RLIS grantees with 3 or more years in the program showed a significant decrease in meeting AYP between 2009 and 2011. SRSA has consistently had a greater proportion of grantees making AYP than RLIS, perhaps reflecting the fact that (1) RLIS districts are poorer, and poverty is highly correlated to low academic achievement; and (2) RLIS districts are larger and thus likely to have more subgroups that are counted in AYP determinations. (Note that, as shown in the tables that follow, the gap in proficiency rates for SRSA compared to RLIS districts is not as wide as their gap in the percentage of LEAs making AYP.) The declines for both programs in 2011 are likely attributable to increases in States' "annual measurable objectives" (the percentage of children achieving proficiency that an LEA must attain in order to make AYP) rather than declines in proficiency rates which have remained relatively stable as shown in the measures below. Data for 2012 are expected in October 2013.

**Objective:** Students enrolled in LEAs participating in REAP programs will score proficient or better on States' assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics in each year through the 2013-2014 academic year.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

**Measure:** The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in reading/language arts in each year through the 2013-2014 academic year.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	78	75
2010	82	74
2011	86	75
2012	90	
2013	94	
2014	100	

**Measure:** The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in mathematics in each year through the 2013-2014 academic year.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	76	71
2010	81	72
2011	86	71
2012	91	
2013	96	
2014	100	

**Measure:** The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in reading/language arts in each year through the 2013-2014 academic year.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	79	68
2010	84	67
2011	88	68
2012	92	
2013	96	
2014	100	

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

**Measure:** The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in mathematics in each year through the 2013-2014 academic year.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	75	67
2010	80	63
2011	85	66
2012	90	
2013	95	
2014	100	

**Additional information:** Among SRSA districts, the percentage of students who scored proficient or better on their State assessments increased slightly in reading and decreased slightly in mathematics from 2010 to 2011, and both did not meet the targets. RLIS districts showed increases in the percentage of students who score proficient or better on both reading and mathematics assessments, but remained below the targets for both measures. The performance targets for these measures reflect the ESEA goal that 100 percent of students enrolled in districts participating in both the SRSA and RLIS programs will be proficient by 2014. Data for fiscal year 2012 are expected in October 2013.

**Objective:** *Eligible rural school districts will use the REAP flexibility authority.*

**Measure:** The percentage of eligible school districts using the REAP flexibility authority.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	65	50
2010	65	56
2011	65	51
2012	65	
2013	65	
2014	65	

**Additional information:** While this measure was developed to capture the percentage of eligible districts actually using the flexibility authority, the best available information is on the number of districts reporting to the State their intent to use this authority. Since there is little reason to believe that LEAs would provide this notification and not use the authority, reported intent serves as a reasonable proxy. Data for 2012 are expected in October 2013.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

#### Program Efficiency Measure

**Measure:** The percentage of SRSA program grants awarded by August 30 of each fiscal year.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	80	100
2010	80	100
2011	80	100
2012	80	100
2013	80	
2014	80	

**Additional information:** Due to difficulty in processing over 4,000 SRSA grants to LEAs in a timely manner in the early years of the program, the Department established a measure to track the efficiency of this task. The Department has had great success since creating the measure, not only exceeding its target of awarding 80 percent of SRSA awards by August 30, but awarding 100 percent each year. Data for 2013 are expected in October 2013.

#### Other Performance Information

A 2006 evaluation conducted by the Urban Institute examined the use of REAP-Flex authority in rural school districts. The study found that 80 percent of SRSA-eligible districts that exercised the authority used its flexibility to maintain a stable level of effort for ongoing activities that had been affected by Federal and State budget cuts. Similarly, over 80 percent of REAP-Flex participants reported using the authority to target achievement outcomes, including 73 percent that had targeted math and 77 percent that had targeted reading.

The Department released an [evaluation report of the RLIS program](#) in June 2010. The purpose of this study was to examine implementation at the State and district levels. Specifically, the Department obtained information on State RLIS priorities and monitoring, State progress toward achieving RLIS goals, characteristics of RLIS districts, uses of RLIS funds, and student achievement and AYP trends in participating districts. The report found that the coordinators saw RLIS as a supplemental program, rather than as a stand-alone program, and that they believed that their subgrantee LEAs used their funds to support efforts to make AYP. All nine States in the sample were requiring RLIS districts to engage in a comprehensive planning process and to address gaps identified through local needs assessments, and seven of the States implemented RLIS through an integrated planning process that required LEAs to show how they planned to use funding from Federal programs. Survey respondents indicated that funds were primarily used to purchase technology, support professional development, and support Title I, Part A activities. From the 2002–03 school year to the 2007–08 school year, the rate of academic improvement in mathematics and reading for districts that received RLIS funding was significantly greater than for non-RLIS rural districts; however, the evaluation did not examine causality, and achievement gains cannot be attributed to the RLIS program. The report also found that, on average, RLIS districts had more students than other rural LEAs but fewer students than all LEAs nationally, that student-to-teacher ratios in RLIS LEAs were higher than

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

in other rural LEAs but similar to the national average, and that per-pupil expenditures were substantially lower in RLIS LEAs than in other rural LEAs and the national average.

Section 6224(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act requires the Department to prepare a biennial report to Congress on the RLIS program. The report must describe the methods SEAs have used to award grants and provide technical assistance, how LEAs and schools have used RLIS funds, and the progress made toward meeting the goals and objectives outlined in the SEA applications. In 2011, the Department submitted to Congress its biennial report for school years 2008-09 and 2009-10. The report includes the finding that of the 41 States receiving fiscal year 2009 funds, all but 5 awarded funds to eligible LEAs by formula based on each eligible LEA's share of students in average daily attendance. One State used a modified formula that targeted a greater share of program funds to LEAs with poverty rates greater than 40 percent, and four States awarded funds on a competitive basis. The report had findings that were consistent with the evaluation report, in that technology, professional development, and Title I, Part A activities were the most frequently reported uses of funds. Finally, it is difficult to link LEA progress toward goals to activities specifically supported with RLIS funds, but the report does include examples provided by the States of LEA progress toward program goals.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Supplemental education grants

(Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003, Section 105(f)(1)(B)(iii))

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: \$20,667<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$17,619	\$17,619 <sup>2</sup>	\$17,619	0

---

<sup>1</sup> Reflects amount initially authorized in fiscal year 2005, adjusted for inflation in accordance with the authorizing statute, which requires such adjustments through fiscal year 2023.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003 (P.L. 108-188) eliminated the participation of the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) and the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) in most domestic formula grant programs funded by the Departments of Education (ED), Health and Human Services (HHS), and Labor (DOL). As a replacement, beginning in fiscal year 2005, the Act authorizes supplemental education grants in an amount that is roughly equivalent to the total formula funds that these entities received in fiscal year 2004 under the Federal formula programs for which they are no longer eligible. These grants augment the funds that the FSM and the RMI receive for general education assistance under their Compacts of Free Association with the U.S. Government.

The Act eliminated the participation of the FSM and the RMI in the following Department of Education programs: Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies; Career and Technical Education Grants under Title I of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006; Adult Basic and Literacy Education State Grants; Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunities Grants; and Federal Work-Study. However, they remain eligible for participation in other Department programs, including the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act State Grants and programs under Part A, Subpart 1 of Title IV of the Higher Education Act, as well as ED, HHS, and DOL competitive programs. Also, the Act eliminated FSM and RMI participation in programs under Title I (other than Job Corps) of the Workforce Investment Act (DOL) and Head Start (HHS).

The Department of Education is required to transfer funds appropriated for Supplemental Education Grants to the Department of the Interior (DOI) for disbursement to the RMI and the FSM not later than 60 days after the appropriation becomes available. Appropriations are to be used and monitored in accordance with an interagency agreement between the four cabinet agencies and in accordance with the "Fiscal Procedure Agreements" entered into by the FSM and the RMI with the U.S. Government. These agreements call for the funds to be used at the

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Supplemental education grants

---

local school level for direct educational services focused on school readiness, early childhood education, elementary and secondary education, vocational training, adult and family literacy, and the transition from high school to postsecondary education and careers. They may not be used for construction or remodeling, the general operating costs of school systems, or teacher salaries (except the salaries of teachers who carry out programs supported by the grants).

The FSM and the RMI may request technical assistance from ED, HHS, or DOL, on a reimbursement basis. Past year's appropriations acts have also permitted the FSM and the RMI to reserve up to 5 percent of their grants to pay for such technical assistance as well as for administration of their grants.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009.....	\$17,687
2010.....	17,687
2011.....	17,652
2012.....	17,619
2013.....	17,619 <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$17.6 million, the same as the 2012 level, to maintain funding for Supplemental Education Grants to the RMI and the FSM. The request would ensure the continuation of services for residents of the RMI and the FSM. The Administration also is seeking appropriations language that would allow the Department of Education to reserve up to 5 percent of appropriated funds to provide technical assistance to support effective use of program funds to improve educational outcomes in the RMI and the FSM.

A majority of the funding in fiscal years 2005 through 2009 was used to support early childhood education. The RMI and the FSM have also used Supplemental Education Grants for education improvement programs, vocational and skills training, and professional development. Both the RMI and the FSM are also using funds to prepare students for jobs that may result from the Guam military build-up. For example, funds to the RMI have supported an Accelerated Boot Camp Trades Academy in collaboration with the College of the Marshall Islands while funds to the FSM have supported projects developed in partnership with the Guam Trades Academy. The Administration anticipates that fiscal year 2014 funding would be used for similar purposes.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Supplemental education grants

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Grant to the Federated States of Micronesia	\$11,752	\$11,752	\$11,752
Grant to the Republic of the Marshall Islands	5,867	5,867	5,867

NOTE: 2013 excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Supplemental Education Grants program was funded for the first time in fiscal year 2005. The Department has not established performance measures for this program because it is operated by the Department of the Interior.

A December 2006 General Accounting Office report, entitled *Compacts of Free Association: Micronesia and the Marshall Islands Face Challenges in Planning for Sustainability, Measuring Progress, and Ensuring Accountability*, documented both the continuing need for improvement in the public education systems of the Freely Associated States and the difficulties in obtaining and reporting performance data for this program. The RMI, according to the report, was not able to measure progress towards its educational goals because the data the Republic collected were inadequate, inconsistent, and incomplete. Tests to measure achievement were not administered in 2005 and 2006, and some of the tests the Republic used were not aligned with the curriculum used in RMI schools and thus were not adequate measures of student achievement. The FSM also lacked consistent performance outcomes and measures; measures and outcomes had been established but had constantly changed, making it difficult to track progress.

Additional information from the Department of the Interior covering the 5-year period between 2004 and 2009 highlights the continuing challenges faced by both entities in improving the quality of education due to a lack of qualified teachers, poor facilities, and a high absentee rate among students and teachers. While access to elementary and secondary education has increased in the RMI and student enrollment has also increased despite significant out-migration, the RMI continues to have few standardized tests for assessing student achievement, a high dropout rate, and a low percentage of highly qualified teachers.

The DOI information also notes that the FSM has made steady progress toward building the capacity to collect and report annually on a set of 20 indicators of educational progress but continues to struggle with low student achievement, discouraging student drop-out rates, and problematic teacher attendance. One area of improvement for the FSM was a slight increase, between 2005 and 2009, in the number and percentage of teachers holding an Associates of Arts degree for certification.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Comprehensive centers

(Education Technical Assistance Act of 2002, Title II, Section 203)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$51,113	\$51,113 <sup>2</sup>	\$51,113	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2009; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2014.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Education Technical Assistance Act (ETAA) authorizes support for not less than 20 comprehensive centers to provide training, technical assistance, and professional development in reading, mathematics, science, and technology, particularly to low-performing local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools. By statute, the Department is required to establish at least one center in each of the 10 geographic regions served by the regional educational laboratories (RELs). Allocations for regional centers are to be determined on the basis of the number of school-aged children, the proportion of disadvantaged students in the various regions, the higher cost of service delivery in sparsely populated areas, and the number of schools identified for improvement under Section 1116(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

In order to provide assistance to LEAs and schools in the most efficient and sustainable manner, in 2005 the Department established a system of technical assistance that includes regional and content centers that, rather than providing services directly to LEAs and schools, focuses on building the capacity of State educational agencies (SEAs) to meet the needs of the LEAs and schools in the State. The existing cohort of comprehensive centers, first funded in 2012, is organized into 15 *regional centers* that work with the SEAs within their geographic regions to help the SEAs implement school and district improvement measures and objectives. In addition, instead of requiring each regional center to have in-depth knowledge of all aspects of school improvement – from school turnaround to teacher and leader quality to assessment design – the Department has funded seven *content centers*, with one center specializing in each of the following seven content areas: standards and assessment implementation; innovations in learning; promoting great teachers and leaders; school turnaround; enhancing early learning outcomes; college- and career-readiness and success; and building State capacity and productivity. Each content center brings together resources and expertise to provide analyses, information, and materials in its focus area for use by the regional centers and SEAs.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

Each center developed a 5-year plan for carrying out authorized activities. The plan of each regional center addresses the needs of its SEAs in meeting the student achievement goals of the ESEA, as well as priorities established by the Department and the States. Each center has an advisory board that advises the center on: (1) allocation of resources; (2) strategies for monitoring and addressing the region's educational needs (or the regional centers' needs in the case of the content centers); (3) maintaining a high standard of quality in the performance of its activities; and (4) carrying out the center's activities in a manner that promotes progress toward improving student academic achievement.

The statute requires the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, a component under the Department's Institute of Education Sciences, to carry out an independent evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers to determine the extent to which each center meets its objectives.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009 .....	\$57,113
2010 .....	56,313
2011 .....	51,210
2012 .....	51,113
2013 .....	51,113 <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2014, the Administration requests \$51.1 million, the same as the fiscal year 2012 appropriation, to support the third year of funding for the second cohort of comprehensive centers funded under the ETAA.

The Department provided the first year of funding to 22 Comprehensive Center grantees in 2012. The 2012 competition restructured the program slightly, changing the configuration of the regions and reducing the number of regional centers to 15 from 16, while adding two content centers to bring the number of those centers to 7. The regions are aligned with the Department's REL regions, such that 1 or 2 regional centers are located in each of the 10 REL regions.

Regional centers must provide technical assistance that aligns with the work of the content centers and builds the capacity of SEAs to implement, support, scale up, and sustain initiatives statewide that are designed to improve student outcomes. This technical assistance must also focus on key reform priorities, which include (1) implementing college- and career-ready standards and aligned, high-quality assessments for all students; (2) identifying, recruiting, developing, and retaining highly effective teachers and leaders; (3) turning around the lowest-performing schools; (4) ensuring the school readiness and enabling the success of preschool-age children and their successful transition to kindergarten; (5) building rigorous instructional pathways that support the successful transition of all students from secondary education to

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

college, without the need for remediation, and careers; (6) identifying and scaling up innovative approaches to teaching and learning that significantly improve student outcomes; and (7) using data-based decision-making to improve instructional practices, policies, and student outcomes.

The content centers will continue to supply research-based products and services for the regional centers and the States they serve that is focused on one of 7 content areas.

Four of the 22 centers received additional funds from programs other than the Comprehensive Centers program. The Center on Great Teachers and Leaders received additional funding from the Special Education Technical Assistance and Dissemination program as well as from the Career and Technical Education National Activities program. These contributions support the provision of technical assistance on serving students with disabilities and on effective instruction and leadership in career and technical education. The Indian Education National Activities program provided support to 3 regional centers that serve States with the largest populations of American Indian/Alaska Native (AI/AN) students, for technical assistance designed to increase the capacity of SEAs to lead and support their LEAs and schools in improving student outcomes for AI/AN students.

The Administration is aware that States face many challenges in implementing reforms designed to improve student performance and close achievement gaps and has undertaken a cross-Department initiative designed to better coordinate ED-funded technical assistance to help meet these challenges. This initiative is intended to provide a consistent message about reform priorities, avoid duplication of effort, and better leverage existing resources. The immediate scope of these coordination efforts will focus on technical assistance provided by the Race to the Top program, the Regional Educational Laboratories, the Office of Special Education Programs' Technical Assistance and Dissemination Centers, and the Comprehensive Centers. Staff from the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, the Office of Special Education Programs, and the Office of the Deputy Secretary's Implementation and Support Unit will manage the implementation of this initiative.

The Department will use fiscal year 2013 funds to begin an IES evaluation of the new centers.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
<b>Comprehensive centers</b>			
Number of centers	22	22	22
Center awards	\$50,631	\$49,613	\$49,513
Average award	\$2,301	\$2,255	\$2,251
Evaluation	0	\$1,500	\$1,600
Regional advisory committees and peer review of new award applications	\$483	0	0

NOTE: 2013 excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested for fiscal year 2014 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

In response to deficiencies identified in the comprehensive centers under the antecedent program, the Department placed strong emphasis on creating a performance-based framework for the current centers that includes, among other things, annual performance measures. These measures were created as part of a Department-wide effort to bring consistency to the assessment of performance across technical assistance programs through the creation of common performance measures. The measures are designed to analyze the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the services provided by the centers, the extent to which each center meets the objectives of its respective plan, and whether their services meet the educational needs of the SEAs, LEAs, and schools.

As part of the Department's national evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers, initiated in 2006, the contractor led panel reviews and conducted surveys annually beginning in 2007. An analysis of the results of those reviews and surveys provided data for the centers' performance measures from 2007 - 2009. Grantees reported performance measurement data for 2010 and 2011 through their individual performance reports.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

**Goal:** To improve student achievement in low-performing schools under the ESEA.

**Objective:** *Improve the quality of technical assistance.*

**Measure:** The percentage of all Comprehensive Centers' products and services that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products and services.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	46	45
2010	52	
2011	59	
2012	66	
2013	73	
2014	80	

**Additional information:** Independent panels reviewed the substantive content of sample products and services provided by the centers and made an assessment of their technical quality on the following dimensions: demonstrated use of the appropriate documented knowledge base; fidelity of application of the knowledge base to the products and services provided; and clear and effective delivery. The Department distributed and discussed with each center the panelists' comments about its projects in order to help centers consider areas for improvement. The evaluation included only 2 years of data collection (2008 and 2009), and the data for 2010 and 2011 were collected and reported using client surveys developed by the centers in conjunction with their evaluators. For 2010 and 2011, the centers reported 91 and 92 percent, respectively, of all products and services to be of high quality. The designs of client surveys used to collect data for these measures varied widely by center.

**Measure:** The percentage of all Comprehensive Centers' products and services that are deemed to be of high relevance to educational policy or practice by target audiences.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	76	85
2010	77	84
2011	78	89
2012	79	
2013	80	
2014	80	

**Additional information:** As part of the national evaluation, an independent firm collected survey data from a random sample of SEA and intermediate education agency staff who participated in regional centers' projects and also from regional center staff who participated in content centers' projects. Projects were defined as a group of closely related activities or deliverables designed to achieve specific outcomes for a specific audience. The evaluation included only 2 years of data collection (2008 and 2009), and the data for 2010 and 2011 were collected and reported using client surveys developed by the centers in conjunction with their evaluators. The designs of client surveys used to collect data for these measures varied widely by center.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

**Objective:** *Technical assistance products and services will be used to improve results for children in the target areas.*

**Measure:** The percentage of all Comprehensive Centers' products and services that are deemed to be of high usefulness to educational policy or practice by target audiences.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	56	71
2010	60	88
2011	65	89
2012	70	
2013	75	
2014	80	

**Additional information:** As part of the national evaluation, an independent firm collected survey data from a random sample of SEA and intermediate education agency staff who participated in regional centers' projects and from regional center staff who participated in content centers' projects. Projects were defined as a group of closely related activities or deliverables designed to achieve specific outcomes for a specific audience. The evaluation included only 2 years of data collection (2008 and 2009), and the data for 2010 and 2011 were collected and reported using client surveys developed by the centers in conjunction with their evaluators. The designs of client surveys used to collect data for these measures varied widely by center.

### Efficiency Measures

The Department is implementing a common measure of administrative efficiency to assess the Comprehensive Centers program and other technical assistance programs. The measure is the percentage of grant funds that the centers carry over for each year of operations. Data for the measure are available each year in September, after Department staff have reviewed data for the previous 12-month budget cycle, and are presented in the table below. The Department also established a second efficiency measure for the program: the number of working days following a monitoring visit that it takes the Department to send a monitoring report to grantees.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

**Objective:** *Improve the operational efficiency of the program.*

**Measure:** The percentage of Comprehensive Center grant funds carried over in each year of the project.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	10	4
2010	10	2
2011	10	2
2012	10	3
2013	10	
2014	10	

**Additional information:** The centers had 40 percent carryover in 2006, the baseline year, which was likely the result of their receiving initial grant awards several months into the beginning of the first award year. Since then, grantees have greatly reduced the amount of funds they carry over each year.

**Measure:** The number of working days following a monitoring visit that it takes the Department to send a monitoring report to grantees.

Year	Target	Actual
2009		81
2010	45	78
2011	45	58
2012	45	NA
2013	45	
2014	45	

**Additional information:** The Department conducted two monitoring visits with reports due in fiscal year 2012. The report for the first visit was sent to the grantee within 28 working days after the visit, well within the target of 45 working days. Due to extensive preparations for the fiscal year 2012 grant competition, the report for the second visit was delayed. Since that grantee did not receive a new award under the fiscal year 2012 competition and thus was no longer a grantee beginning in fiscal year 2013, the Department will not send a report.

### Other Performance Information

In addition to providing data for the performance measures, the national evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers assessed: (1) the extent to which the centers have met the objectives of their respective technical assistance plans and the educational needs of SEAs, and (2) whether the centers' assistance has expanded SEAs' capacity to provide technical assistance to help LEAs and schools meet their statutory requirements. The evaluation also examined the centers' responses to changing SEA needs in technical assistance, SEAs' reliance on the centers compared to other technical assistance sources, the overall costs for SEAs in providing ESEA-related technical assistance, and the estimated dollar value of the centers' products and services to SEAs.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

In July 2010, the first interim report from the national evaluation provided an analysis of data obtained through surveys of comprehensive center clients and expert reviews of comprehensive center projects, covering the 2006-07 program year, the second year of center operations. In this first round of project ratings, the content centers had higher mean ratings of technical quality for their sampled projects than did the regional centers, while the regional centers had higher mean ratings of relevance than did the content centers. There was no statistically significant relationship between ratings of quality and ratings of relevance or usefulness, which suggests that achieving high technical quality (judged on the basis of expert peer reviews) was unrelated to the delivery of assistance thought by clients to be highly relevant or useful. There was a high correlation between relevance and usefulness.

The final report, covering the 2007-08 and 2008-09 program years, was released August 31, 2011 (see: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20114031/>). The report indicated that both the regional centers and the content centers conducted activities consistent with their design and that, over the 3-year period, the regional centers and content centers were increasingly involved in each other's projects. Similarly, an increasing number of State managers reported each year that center assistance served their purposes, with "statewide systems of support" cited most frequently as a State priority. The proportion of State managers reporting that center assistance had served the State's purposes completely rose from 36 percent in 2006-07 to 56 percent in 2008-09. Statewide systems of support was also the topic most frequently addressed in center projects each year. Among the managers who reported that their States' purposes were not completely served, a larger proportion in each year reported wanting more interaction with the centers. In 2008-09, 43 percent of those State managers said, "center staff are not able to spend as much time working with the State as we would like."

Further, State managers reported that center assistance had expanded State capacity in the area of Statewide systems of support. Among State managers who reported Statewide systems of support or school support teams to be a State priority for assistance in 2008-09, 82 percent credited center assistance with a "great" or "moderate" expansion of State capacity in this area. To a lesser extent, State managers also credited the centers with expanding their States' capacity in other areas during the same year: from 77 percent in the areas of research-based curriculum, instruction, or professional development in academic subjects to 39 percent in ESEA provisions on supplemental educational services and choice.

On average, across each of the 3 years, the ratings for quality, relevance, and usefulness increased. The average quality rating was consistently higher for content center projects than for regional center projects while the average relevance ratings were higher for regional centers than content centers in the first 2 years of the study. There were no consistent differences in the usefulness ratings between regional centers and content centers.

**EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

---

**Native Hawaiian student education**

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title VII, Part B)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1,2</sup>

	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
	\$34,181	\$34,181 <sup>3</sup>	\$34,181	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2014.

<sup>2</sup> Under current law, of the amount available to carry out Sections 7204 and 7205 of ESEA, \$500 thousand is to be reserved for a direct grant to the Native Hawaiian Education Council to carry out Section 7204.

<sup>3</sup> Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

---

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The Native Hawaiian Student Education program supports the provision of supplemental education services to the Native Hawaiian population. Competitive grants are awarded to eligible applicants for a variety of authorized activities in such areas as teacher training, family-based education, gifted and talented education, special education, higher education, and community-based education learning centers. Eligible applicants include Native Hawaiian educational organizations and community-based organizations, public and private nonprofit organizations, agencies, and institutions with experience in developing or operating Native Hawaiian programs or programs of instruction in the Native Hawaiian language, and other entities.

The program also supports the activities of the Native Hawaiian Education Council. The Council uses funds directly and is authorized to make grants to facilitate its coordination of the educational and related services and programs available to Native Hawaiians. It also provides administrative support and financial assistance to island councils authorized by the statute. The Council receives a minimum award of \$500,000 annually.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009 .....	\$33,315
2010 .....	34,315
2011 .....	34,246
2012 .....	34,181
2013 .....	34,181 <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Native Hawaiian student education

---

#### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2014, the Administration requests \$34.2 million for the Native Hawaiian Student Education program, the same amount as fiscal year 2012. The budget request assumes the Administration's reauthorization proposal for of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which would require that grantees ensure that academic projects use evidence-based approaches and report academic achievement data for the students they serve.

Data on the educational performance of Native Hawaiian students demonstrate the continuing need for this program. Across all assessed grades in 2012, 59.9 percent of Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students demonstrated grade-level proficiency in reading and 46.3 percent in mathematics on Hawaii's State assessment, compared to 71.1 percent in reading and 59.2 percent in mathematics for all Hawaiian students. This gap between Native Hawaiians and their peers remains consistent across grade levels. In the 4<sup>th</sup> grade, 60.5 percent of Native Hawaiian students met or exceeded proficiency in reading and 51.1 percent met or exceeded proficiency in mathematics, compared to 71.8 percent in reading and 63.2 percent in mathematics for all Hawaiian students. In the 8<sup>th</sup> grade, 60.4 percent of Native Hawaiian students met or exceeded proficiency in reading and 44.3 percent met this level in mathematics, compared to 71.8 percent in reading and 58.8 percent in mathematics for all Hawaiians students.

Data from the 2011 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) show similar trend in achievement gaps. In 4<sup>th</sup>-grade reading, 18 percent of Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students in Hawaii were proficient or advanced, while the overall national average for all students was 34 percent. There were similar differences in 8<sup>th</sup>-grade reading (13 percent proficient compared to 34 percent nationally), 4<sup>th</sup>-grade mathematics (29 percent proficient compared to 40 percent nationally), and 8<sup>th</sup>-grade mathematics (17 percent proficient compared to 35 percent nationally).

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measure:</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Amount for new awards	\$10,784	\$2,046	\$9,454
Number of new awards	17	5	18
Amount for continuation awards	\$22,555	\$31,635	\$23,885
Number of continuation awards	31	40	22
Native Hawaiian Education Council	\$500	\$500	\$500
Peer review of new award applications	\$342	0 <sup>1</sup>	\$342

---

NOTE: 2013 excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

<sup>1</sup>The Department plans to fund new applications in FY 2013 from the FY 2012 slate.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Native Hawaiian student education

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested for fiscal year 2014 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department established new performance measures for this program in 2008, partly in response to recommendations from the Government Accountability Office (GAO), to more accurately and reliably gauge the effectiveness of this program. The Department used the new measures beginning with the fiscal year 2009 cohort of new grantees. Baseline data is available for 2012. The new indicators measure (1) the percentage of Native Hawaiian students in schools served by the program who meet or exceed proficiency standards for reading, mathematics, and science on the State's annual assessments; (2) the percentage of Native Hawaiian children participating in early learning programs who demonstrate school readiness in literacy as measured by the Hawaii School Readiness Assessment (HSRA); (3) the percentage of students in schools served by the program who graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma in 4 years; and (4) the percentage of students receiving Hawaiian language instruction through a grant under the program who meet or exceed proficiency standards in reading on a test of the Hawaiian language.

In 2012, 59 percent of students met or exceeded proficiency standards in reading, 47 percent of students met or exceeded proficiency standards in math, and 48 percent of students met or exceeded proficiency standards in science on the State's annual assessments. The second measure regarding school readiness only applied to a two grantees and the information is not yet available. Seventy seven percent of students in schools served by the program graduated from high school with a high school diploma in 4 years. No grantees reported on the final GPRA measure regarding Hawaiian language proficiency. The Department expects to have year one data available in fall 2013.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Alaska Native student education

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$33,185	\$33,185 <sup>2</sup>	\$33,185	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2014.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Alaska Native Student Education program supports supplemental educational programs and services for Alaska Natives. The program awards competitive grants to eligible applicants for a variety of authorized activities, such as teacher training and student enrichment programs. Eligible applicants include Alaska Native organizations, educational entities with experience in developing or operating Alaska Native programs or programs of instruction conducted in Alaska Native languages, cultural and community-based organizations, and other entities. At least \$1 million must be used for parenting education activities.

Activities supported by these grants include the development and implementation of curricula and educational programs that address needs of the Alaska Native student population, professional development activities for educators, the development and operation of home instruction programs for Alaska Native preschool children that help ensure the active involvement of parents in their children's education, family literacy services, student enrichment programs in science and mathematics, and dropout prevention programs.

Section 7304(d)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requires the following grants to be awarded annually: \$1 million for cultural education programs operated by the Alaska Native Heritage Center; \$1 million for a cultural exchange program operated by the Alaska Humanities Forum; \$2 million for an Alaska Initiative for Community Engagement; and \$2 million for the Cook Inlet Tribal Council's Partners for Success program, a dropout prevention program. However, the fiscal year 2012 appropriations act required that all program funds must be awarded competitively that year.

All grantees may use no more than 5 percent of the funding for administrative costs.

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Alaska Native student education

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009 .....	\$33,315
2010 .....	33,315
2011 .....	33,248
2012 .....	33,185
2013 .....	33,185 <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

### FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2014, the Administration requests \$33.2 million for the Alaska Native Student Education program, the same as the fiscal year 2012 level. The budget request assumes the Administration's reauthorization proposal of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), and would support the continued provision of education-related services to the Alaska Native population, funding the program's first year of operation under a reauthorized ESEA. The reauthorization proposal would also eliminate directed funding for particular organizations in the current statute under this program because the Administration believes that competing these funds will lead to higher-quality programs and improved student outcomes.

Data on the educational performance of Alaska Native students demonstrate the continuing need for this program. Results from the spring 2012 Alaska Standards-Based Assessment indicated that Alaska Native and American Indian students in the State continue to lag behind their peers in academic performance. Because Alaska Natives constitute approximately 95 percent of the State's American Indian/Alaska Native (AI/AN) student population, the AI/AN scores are good proxies for Alaska Native achievement. Fifty six percent of AI/AN students demonstrated proficiency on the 4<sup>th</sup>-grade reading assessment, compared to 77 percent of all 4<sup>th</sup>-grade students, and 57 percent of AI/AN students achieved proficiency in mathematics, compared to 74 percent of all 4<sup>th</sup>-grade students. Eighth-grade assessments showed similar results as 66 percent of AI/AN students demonstrated proficiency on the 8<sup>th</sup>-grade reading assessment, compared to 83 percent of all 8<sup>th</sup>-grade students, and 49 percent of AI/AN students achieved proficiency in mathematics, compared to 69 percent of all 8<sup>th</sup>-grade students.

Data from the 2011 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) show similar trends in achievement gaps. In 4<sup>th</sup>-grade reading, 8 percent of AI/AN students in Alaska were proficient, while the overall national average for all students was 34 percent. There were similar differences in 8<sup>th</sup>-grade reading (10 percent proficient compared to 34 percent nationally), 4<sup>th</sup>-grade mathematics (14 percent proficient compared to 40 percent nationally), and 8<sup>th</sup>-grade mathematics (15 percent proficient compared to 35 percent nationally).

According to the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development, in the 2011-2012 school year, the annual dropout rate (the proportion of students who drop out of school during the course of a year) among Alaska Natives and American Indian students in grades 7 through 12 was 8.0 percent. This was higher than the rate for any other racial or ethnic group in the

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Alaska Native student education

---

State and well above the statewide rate of 4.8 percent. Further, Alaska's *Report Card to the Public: 2011-2012* reported that the American Indian/Alaska Native high school graduation rate was 53.9 percent, while the statewide figure was 69.6 percent.

Alaska's geography and population patterns add to the challenge of delivering quality educational services to Alaska Native students. The State has many rural districts, which often house few schools spread out over large remote areas, and Alaska Native students are disproportionately enrolled in small, rural, and isolated schools.

Program grants help address these barriers by developing programs tailored to the educational and cultural needs of Alaska Native students in order to improve their performance in the classroom and increase their chances of graduating from high school.

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measure:</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Amount for new awards	\$20,860	\$3,082	\$10,422
Number of new awards	44	2	19
Amount for continuation awards	\$11,403	\$30,103	\$22,431
Number of continuation awards	19	61	46
Peer review of new award applications	\$332	0 <sup>1</sup>	\$332

---

NOTES: In 2012, \$590 thousand was used to make an award to the last applicant on the fiscal year 2011 slate. 2013 excludes a 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

<sup>1</sup>The Department plans to fund new applications in FY 2013 from the FY 2012 slate.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested for fiscal year 2014 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department established new and revised performance measures in 2008 that more accurately and reliably gauge the effectiveness of this program. The Department used these measures beginning with the fiscal year 2009 cohort of new grantees. Baseline data is available for 2012. The new indicators measure (1) the percentage of Alaska Native students in schools

## EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### **Alaska Native student education**

---

served by the program who meet or exceed proficiency standards for reading, mathematics, and science on the State's annual assessments; (2) the percentage of Alaska Native children participating in early learning and preschool programs who demonstrate school readiness in language and literacy as measured by the Revised Alaska Developmental Profile (RADP); and (3) the percentage of students in schools served by the program who graduate from high school with a high school diploma in 4 years.

In 2012, 48 percent of students in schools served by the program met or exceeded proficiency standards for reading, 44 percent of students met or exceeded proficiency standards for math, and 22 percent of students met or exceeded proficiency standards in science on the State's annual assessments. The second measure regarding school readiness applied to only three grantees and information is not yet available. Fifty three percent of students in schools served by the program graduated from high school with a high school diploma in 4 years. The Department expects to have year one data available in fall 2013.

## State tables